

# Review Form of NLPir 2025

<http://www.nlpir.net/>

**Paper ID:** KS027

**Paper Title:** Information Sources for Query Refinement: A Comprehensive Survey

|   | Please rate the following: (5 excellent, 1 poor)          | 5                        | 4                                   | 3                                   | 2                                   | 1                        |
|---|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ● | Relevance to the conference                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● | Contribution to academic debate                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● | Structure of the paper                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● | Standard of English                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● | Appropriateness of the research/study method              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● | Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● | Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● | Use and number of keywords/key phrases                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● | Discussion and conclusions                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● | Reference list, adequate and correctly cited              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## RECOMMENDATION

- ☐ Publish unaltered
- ☐ Publish in minor, required changes
- ☒ Publish after major required changes
- ☐ Review again after major changes
- ☐ Reject (a major rewrite is required; encourage resubmission)
- ☐ Reject (paper is seriously flawed; do not encourage resubmission.)

## COMMENTS

Specific reviewer comments to be passed to the author/s. *Please expand on any weak areas in the checklist and offer specific advice as to how the author(s) may improve the paper.*

The manuscript presents a descriptive literature survey on query refinement methods based on two main taxonomic axes: contextual and non-contextual information sources. It addresses an important area for information retrieval research, particularly in the NLP domain. However, several substantive concerns need to be addressed before publication:

- You must introduce a comparative assessment of the surveyed methods using clear criteria—effectiveness, scalability, robustness to query drift, and personalisation capabilities.

- The article lacks a clear research design. A formalised survey methodology, inclusion/exclusion criteria, database sources, or time span of papers reviewed, is missing. The selection appears ad hoc, weakening academic rigour. Without such structure, readers cannot reproduce or rely on the comprehensiveness of your claims.
- There are no tables, graphs, or taxonomies included. This is a significant omission in a survey paper. At minimum, a comparison table summarising core methods across dimensions (e.g., source type, model architecture, data dependency, reported gains) should be introduced. An illustrative diagram showing the flow from query issue to refinement stages using different data sources would enhance clarity and reader engagement.
- Several parts are repetitive, particularly sections 3.1.1, 3.2, and 4.2. These could be tightened. The structure would benefit from a clearer hierarchy or subcategorisation. For instance, PRF methods are scattered under both contextual and non-contextual discussions without distinction. Streamlining such content under a unified section may improve coherence.

### **Specific Suggestions**

- Include a taxonomy table for all techniques reviewed.
- Formalise your survey methodology (what papers were selected and why).
- Introduce a "Challenges and Open Issues" section with critical insights.
- Enhance the conclusion by summarising limitations and concrete future work areas.
- Add figures and diagrams.

The reference is recommended cite in this paper:

Edgars Rencis, "Application of a Configurable Keywords-Based Query Language to the Healthcare Domain," Journal of Advances in Information Technology, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 142-147, May 2021. doi: 10.12720/jait.12.2.142-147