The author uses three classification methods and a new evaluation metric AUC to solve the problem of sentiment analysis in Twitter in given datasets.

2.

1) The author uses tables and figures to show the results, which is very clear to identify.

2) The author uses several illustrative examples to show the important features in negative and neutral class, which is good.

3) The author uses examples to show that the background information is also important for sentiment analysis, which means that the sentiment doesn’t only depends on the meaning of words, but also the meaning of the whole sentence.

3.

1) The author uses random-choice and simple-neutral as baseline, which doesn’t make sense. What we should do is to choose a classification method as a baseline, which is easy to build, train, and predict, like Naïve Bayes.

2) The author chooses Area Under the ROC Curve (AUC) as evaluation metric, instead of common evaluation metrics like precision, recall and F-measure. The author doesn’t give a reason why he/she abandon these metrics.

3) The author didn’t compare and explain different classification methods, he/she only shows the result and finished, he/she should pay more attention on difference of classification methods, instead of talking about the feature and challenges.

4) The author should pay more attention on give the evidence of answer the main question (can we use tweet to help us to identity people sentiment on Twitter?). I didn’t get any useful information from this report.

5) In the introduction part, the author should talk about the aim of this report, instead of only talking about what is sentiment analysis.

1.

The author uses 3 machine learning techniques and two data representations (word vector and lexicon feature vector) to identify which method work the best for sentiment analysis. Methods include Naïve Bayes, decision tree and SVM.

2.

1) The structure of the paper is clear, which is easy to read.

2) the author used tables and figures to show the result, which is clear to classify.

3) The author analyzes the dataset, and explain it in detail, which is good.

4) The author uses Affective tweets package in Weka to select features, which greatly increases the performance of classification methods.

3.

1) The author should add a section to related work about what others have done in sentiment analysis, instead of quoting some statements in explaining methods.

2) The author should pay more attention on comparing classification methods, and discuss about the pros and cons of techniques, instead of only showing the results and briefly explain it.

3) The author doesn’t use illustrative examples to clearly analyze the result, which is abstract and not convincing.

4) The author uses two ways of features. One is the word vector, which is in given dataset, the other is to use affective tweets package to select features in Weka. It is a good attempt, but the author only shows the result, doesn’t give an impressive explanation for that.

5) In summary, I think the author should focus more on explanation, instead of describing the methods.