Review Form

Submission #111: TJUdeM: A Combination Classifier for Aspect Category Detection and Sentiment Polarity Classification **Authors:** Zhifei Zhang, Jian-Yun Nie and Hongling Wang **Submission Type:** System description paper (for participants) **SemEval-2015 Task Number:** Task 12: Aspect Based Sentiment Analysis	**Reviewer:** Zhiqiang Toh **Secondary Reviewer:**

Summary Ranking

Please evaluate the submission according to the criteria below.

Evaluation Category	Enter Your Score
Appropriateness Is this paper appropriate for SemEval? This should be a system description paper for a participating team.	(•) Appropriate (most submissions) ( ) Not appropriate
Clarity (1-5) For a reasonably well-prepared reader, is it clear what was done and why? Is the paper well-written and well-structured? 5 = Very clear. 4 = Understandable by most readers. 3 = Mostly understandable with some effort. 2 = Important questions were hard to resolve even with effort. 1 = Much of the paper is confusing.	( ) 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 (•) 5
Soundness (1-5) Is the technical approach sound and well-chosen? Can one trust the claims of the paper – are they supported by proofs or proper experiments where the results of the experiments are correctly interpreted? 5 = The approach is sound, and the claims are convincingly supported. 4 = Generally solid, but there are some aspects of the approach or evaluation I am not sure about. 3 = Fairly reasonable, but the main claims cannot be accepted based on the material provided. 2 = Troublesome. Some interesting ideas, but the work needs better justification or evaluation. 1 = Fatally flawed.	( ) 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 (•) 4 ( ) 5
Replicability (1-5) Will members of the research community be able to reproduce or verify the results described in this paper? A lower score might be assigned if an insufficient amount of detail has been provided, if there is a highly subjective component to the setting of certain parameters, or if proprietary data have been used in the experiments. A low score here does not necessarily imply a low overall recommendation. Members of the SemEval community, and of the NLP community in general… 5 = could easily reproduce the results and verify the correctness of the results described here. 4 = could mostly reproduce the results described here, although there may be some variation because of sample variance or minor variations in their interpretation of the protocol or method. 3 = could possibly reproduce the results described here with some difficulty. The settings of parameters are underspecified or very subjectively determined; the training data required are not widely available. 2 = could not reproduce the results described here no matter how hard they tried. The author simply has not provided a sufficient amount of detail nor access to resources for us to do anything more than accept their conclusions without question. 1 = not applicable (please use this very sparingly, such as for short submissions that are opinion pieces).	( ) 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 (•) 4 ( ) 5
Overall Recommendation In deciding on your ultimate recommendation, please think over all your scores above, but remember that no paper is perfect, and that SemEval has traditionally accepted all system description papers that have been properly written; the reject rate has been extremely low. Remember also that the author has about a month to address reviewer comments before the camera-ready deadline.	Accept ▾

Detailed Comments

Please supply detailed comments to back up your rankings. These comments will be forwarded to the authors of the paper. The comments will help the committee decide the outcome of the paper, and will help justify this decision for the authors. Moreover, if the paper is accepted, the comments should guide the authors in making revisions for a final manuscript. Hence, the more detailed you make your comments, the more useful your review will be - both for the committee and for the authors.

This paper describes hybrid approaches to Aspect Category Detection and Sentiment Polarity Classification. For category detection, a SVM classifier is combined with a rule-based implicit aspect indicator. For polarity classification, a SVM classifier is combined with a lexicon-based classifier.

The paper is generally well-written, with enough details for the reader to reproduce the results.

The SVM classifiers used by the authors seem to use similar configurations/settings as the SVM baseline classifiers provided by the organizers. It is unclear if they are reusing the provided baselines (or some substantial changes have been made to the provided baselines). If so, a brief mention of the source and usage can help in reproducibility.

For Section 2.2, the authors cited examples of the word lists for the "price" and "quality" aspects. Besides these two aspects, which other aspects also have word lists? In other words, how many word lists are used in total?

The authors only indicate their overall system performances, i.e. the performances of the combined classifiers. In the case where their SVM baselines are different from the official baselines, it would be beneficial to the reader if the authors can additionally include performance figures on the absolute performance gains contributed by the implicit aspect indicator and lexicon-based polarity classifier, with respect to their own baselines. This will further demonstrate the usefulness of their proposed rule-based/lexicon-based classifiers.

Typo:
"more nd better"

Confidential Comments for Committee

You may wish to withhold some comments from the authors, and include them solely for the committee's internal use. For example, you may want to express a very strong (negative) opinion on the paper, which might offend the authors in some way. Or, perhaps you wish to write something which would expose your identity to the authors. If you wish to share comments of this nature with the committee, this is the place to put them.

Submit
