PIONEER PROJECT PEER REVIEW FORM

Reviewer: Hüseyin Yağız Devre

Student Reviewed: Sally Song

Answer the following questions after or as you review a peer's paper.

RESEARCH QUESTION or PROBLEM STATEMENT

1. What is the project about? What "puzzle" is the writer trying to resolve? What is the need they are trying to address or the problem they are trying to solve? Please identify and, in your own words, restate the writer's research question or topic.

Sally Song's research is about the error analysis of VADER for sentiment analysis in news data to analyze polarity and bias.

2. Is the research question or problem statement clear and precise? Does it address a problem that is interesting and <u>relevant</u>?

Yes the research question is clear and precise. Also I really liked the research is interesting because in news there is often a bias and analyzing it with AI is very informative.

ARGUMENT

3. What is the author's main point or argument? Please restate it in your own words.

Sally Song's main point/ argument is compression of two models, VADER and Naive Bayes. The really nice thing about the paper is stating an hybrid model approach to the dataset and task used.

4. Is the main point or argument clear and precise? Does it answer the research question?

Yes, the main point and argument is clear and precise and answer the research question

RESEARCH DESIGN

5. Does the writer provide a clear and convincing "road map" of the research project? Is the data used suitable and enough to answer the research question?

Yes Sally Song provide a clear and convincing road map to the research question. The data is sutable and enough for such tasks

6. Does the writer have a sufficient number of sources for references? Are there a diversity of sources, i.e. are they all from different areas, book, internet, articles, journals, etc. Are the sources relevant to the research question? Do the sources provide new information to aid in answering the research question or problems statement?

Yes the writer have a sufficient number of sources for references and there is a diversity of sources. The sources are relevant to the research question. Yes they provide a new information to aid in the answer

STRUCTURE and LANGUAGE

7. Is the paper well organized?

Yes the paper is well organized.

8. Is there a logical flow of information and analysis?

   Yes there is a logical flow of information and analysis in this paper

9. Are the paragraphs coherent? How are the transitions?

   Yes the paragraph's are coherent and transitions are well

10. How is the language? Is the paper well-written (engaging)? Are there any colloquialisms and slang that should be removed?

The language is easy to understand and using technical terms and equations makes a deeper understanding. Yes it is well written. No there are not

OVERALL

11. Is the paper overall coherent? Yes the paper is overall coherent

12. Do you have any general comments and suggestions?

In my opinion, you can improve these:
You stated the shortcomings to Vader and I think that you can state the shortcomings of Naive Bayes as well. I think that you can state some more on the hybrid model. I liked that you give information on VADER and I think that you can give some more information on the learning algorithm. You can give more results and perhaps the results where the most difference is present. Your topic is very interesting and I learned a lot about the tool that you used VADER. As Lakshya stated, your research paper is informative and I can not wait to see the final result.

WRITER'S SELF-ASSESSMENT *(To be done after receiving peer feedback)*

1. What was the main idea that you tried to convey and did the reviewer understand it? How can you make it clearer (if needed)?

2. What area or areas do you most want to revisit or improve (i.e. which areas/aspects do you most want to rework)?

3. What are you most proud of in your paper and want to make sure you keep in each draft?