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• **Goals and Contributions:**i. Do the authors clearly state the research goals of the   
work? Yes, in the introduction part.  
ii. Does the paper clearly indicate what the contributions   
are? Yes, in the conclusion part.  
iii. Are the claimed contributions original and significant in   
terms of  
o Novel methodology? Yes.  
o New applications? Yes.  
iv. Does the paper describe the methods in sufficient detail   
for readers to replicate the work? No.  
• **Evaluation:**i. Do the authors carefully evaluate the approach?

No, the evaluation data set is small and it doesn’t include comparison with other state-of-the-art technique.  
ii. Does the paper include systematic experiments, a careful theoretical analysis, or give evidence of generality?

It has a careful theoretical introduction of its methodology, but lacks analysis and this method cannot be generalized to other language scripts because of the grammatical rules.  
• **Discussion:**i. Does the paper discuss relevant earlier works, noting similarities, differences and progress?

Yes.  
ii. Does it discuss the limitation of the approach as well as its advantages?

Yes, in the conclusion part.  
iii. Does it consider the implication of the work and outline direction for future work?

Yes, in the conclusion part.  
• **Presentation:**i. Is the paper properly organized and well written? Yes.  
ii. Is the paper grammatically correct and free of spelling errors? Yes.  
iii. Does it use standard terminology? Yes.  
• **Detailed Comments:**

This work deals with Nepali scripts to solve plagiarism detection problem. In my view, this work is well organized and using a solid NLP technique, besides, it also invents original grammatical rules to do lemmatization, which is very impressive. But given the fact that this paper only relies on root word frequency and category information in each document to do similarity computation. I am afraid that the experiment result may not be optimistic enough to be accepted.

• **Recommendation:**i. The paper could be published in its current form.  
ii. The paper could be published after minor revision:  
o Another round of review is needed. ☑  
o No review is needed.  
iii. The paper requires major revision for further consideration.  
iv. The paper is not suitable for publication in this journal.