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**Abstract**

Title too long

Grammatical error in abstract: 1st sentence

**Intro**

Problem defined well

Significance explained well with examples of application areas

Related works explained well – current works and changes in tasks due to LCP

Aim explained well

Annotation tasks and methods and scenarios defined well

Likert scale annotation and pairwise annotation explained and differentiated clearly

**Annotators**

3.1 7th line Known to… -grammatical mistake?

Disadvantages of the choice of annotators clearly stated but advantages missing

4th last line 2nd para Grammatical - More so than other countries

Solutions to financial incentives, how such people to be removed (who did not do their tasks properly) were selected – not stated?

Why annotations by native annotators more accurate – not enough reasons to validate the claim. (or well explained)

**Summary**

Some context on SV000g missing.

Research question can be made more specific in terms of quantitative and qualitative measurements

**4.1 Datasets**

Grammar error: 2nd sentence .They (no space)

**4.3**

2nd sent, …

Since chi square formula contains O – E , it should be mentioned difference of expected from observed although the results are same

Why p value of 0.05 chosen?

**4.4**

the shorter the word is the more likely it is to be remembered and

recalled

All Hypothesis well defined.

**Findings**

Results well presented to support or disprove the stated hypothesis. However, small datasets used. Only a sample of words used to reach to conclusion on the hypothesis.

6.3 instance spelling

Conclusion and future recommendations well written