

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_110817
Title of the Manuscript:	Application Research on Semantic Analysis using Latent Dirichlet Allocation and Collapsed Gibbs Sampling for Topic Discovery
Type of the Article	Servey

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Somewhat Mostly suits review in place of application research somewhat need to improve need to improve need to add latest refernces	Noted
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to revise	Done
Optional/General comments	1. Need to write the abstract correctly by keeping in mind the flow of your work. flow- general subject overview then what is the shortcoming you found in the existing systems then for the same how you are going to propose the solution and how you achieve better results by using which new or hybrid methods and techniques with your achieved experimental results over existing one etc. 2.In related work try to maintain the flow when you discuss each literature work. like what the problem authors discussed, which method and techniques they used along with dataset details, what results they achieved, and finally highlight the shortcomings or the future work of that literature. 3.in methodology the fig1 should be visible. Need to explain the algorithm with the help of programmatically or mathematical steps apart from theoretical explanation 4.results and discussion need to improve with dataset description, experimental setup, and measures and matrices used with formulation and each table needs explanation, need to add graphical representation for better comparative analysis.	Corrected all

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	