

Author response for Review Comments

Paper ID: 646

Paper Title: Detecting Offensive Language in Tamil YouTube Comments

Reviewer #2

Reviewer Comment:

- The paper should be properly checked for typos and grammatical mistakes. Authors must do a proofread of the paper.

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have checked for typos and grammatical mistakes and completed the proof reading.

Reviewer Comment:

- The reference should be properly cited. In web references, the access date should be mentioned.

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have updated the reference section as per your comments.

Reviewer Comment:

- The numberings in the equations are missing.

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have updated the equation number as per your comments.

Reviewer Comment:

- Table 1 is not cited in the text.

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have updated the citation of Table 1 as per your comments.

Reviewer Comment:

- The figure quality is poor and that should be improved.

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have improvised the image quality as per your comments.

Reviewer Comment:

- The abstract needs to be revised. Authors must discuss about the considered dataset

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have updated the abstract as per your comments.

Reviewer Comment:

- The block diagram of the studied framework must be included.

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have included the architecture diagram as per your comments.

Reviewer Comment:

- The key findings of the presented work must be discussed

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have updated the result analysis section as per your comments.

Reviewer Comment:

- Authors must discuss the considered BERT models in details.

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have updated the methodologies section as per your comments.

Reviewer Comment:

- Results analysis parts should be more elaborative and include more graphical analysis in the paper.

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have updated the result analysis section as per your comments.

Reviewer #8

Reviewer Comment:

The methodology section outlines the approach taken in the study. It would be helpful to provide more details on the data collection process and the criteria used for annotating offensive language.

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have updated the data preprocessing and annotations as per your comments.

Reviewer Comment:

Include information on the inter-annotator agreement for the manual annotation of offensive language. Additionally, elaborate on the specific preprocessing techniques applied to the Tamil YouTube comments dataset.

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have updated the data preprocessing and annotations as per your comments.

Reviewer Comment:

The results section presents the findings of the study effectively. Including visual representations of the performance metrics for each BERT model would be beneficial.

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have included Figure 2 for visual representations of the performance as per your comments.

Reviewer Comment:

The author needs to follow the given template.

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have updated the article in the required template

Reviewer Comment:

Correct all grammatical errors.

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have checked the grammatical errors of the article

Reviewer Comment:

Each figure must be captioned and must be discussed in the text.

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have checked the grammatical errors of the article

Reviewer Comment:

Equation Numbers are missing. Properly mention the numbers with cite in the text.

Author Response:

Dear reviewer, we have updated the equation numbers.