Edit Review

We are pleased to welcome you as a member of the review panel for ICBR 2023 organized by the University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka. Please select the appropriate response based on your judgment regarding the given aspects. If necessary, provide your comments/suggestions under "Any other comments for the author/s" or upload a review document as a PDF file to the submission portal. The identity of the reviewer will be kept confidential.

Paper ID   18

Paper Title   Sentiment Analysis on User Perspective of the Android Earthquake Early Warning Alert System through Twitter Data

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Does the title adequately represent the content of the paper? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

○ Poor
○ Below average
○ Average
○ Good
◉ Very good

2. Does the abstract clearly and concisely summarize the paper and state the main results? Can the abstract and main body of the paper each stand-alone? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

○ Poor
○ Below average
○ Average
◉ Good
○ Very good

3. Do the keywords appropriately reflect the main concepts and focus of the study (up to 5 words)? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

○ Poor
○ Below average
◉ Average
○ Good
○ Very good

4. Does the introduction clearly state the relevance and significance of the study? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

○ Poor
○ Below average
○ Average
◉ Good
○ Very good

5. Are the aims and objectives of the study clearly stated and aligned with the research problem/gap? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

- ○ Poor
- ○ Below average
- ○ Average
- ◉ Good
- ○ Very good

6. Does the literature review clearly demonstrate that the authors have studied a wide range of knowledge and justified the research problem/gap that the present study attempts to address? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

- ○ Poor
- ○ Below average
- ○ Average
- ◉ Good
- ○ Very good

7. Does the methodology clearly outline the research design, data sources, approaches, and methods used to address the research objectives? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

- ○ Poor
- ○ Below average
- ○ Average
- ◉ Good
- ○ Very good

8. Are the data analyses appropriate? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

- ○ Poor
- ○ Below average
- ◉ Average
- ○ Good
- ○ Very good

9. Do the results clearly and concisely present the key findings/outcomes of the study? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

- ○ Poor
- ○ Below average
- ◉ Average
- ○ Good
- ○ Very good

10. Are the interpretations and discussion supported by the results and findings presented? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

- ○ Poor
- ○ Below average
- ◉ Average

○ Good

○ Very good

11. Do the conclusions logically follow and address the research question/s and the objectives of the study? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

○ Poor

○ Below average

◉ Average

○ Good

○ Very good

12. Are the conclusions and potential impacts of the paper clear? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

○ Poor

○ Below average

◉ Average

○ Good

○ Very good

13. Is there adequate referencing? Is the research background well supported by credible and relevant references? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

○ Poor

○ Below average

◉ Average

○ Good

○ Very good

14. Are the tables and figures clear and comprehensive? Are their captions self-explanatory? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

○ Poor

○ Below average

◉ Average

○ Good

○ Very good

15. Is the paper clearly and concisely written? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

○ Poor

○ Below average

○ Average

◉ Good

○ Very good

16. Is the study original and contributes to the field of study? * *(visible to authors after notification)*

○ Poor

○ Below average

- ○ Average
- ● Good
- ○ Very good

17. The recommendation of the reviewer on the paper * *(visible to authors after notification)*

- ○ Accept as it
- ○ Accept with minor revision
- ● Review after major revision
- ○ Reject

18. Any other comments for the author/s *(visible to authors after notification)*

With substantial revisions, changes, and further explanations, this paper has the potential to become even more impactful.

1. Certain statements in the introduction should be substantiated with references from relevant literature.

19. Any comments for Editor-in-Chief (confidential and will not be disclosed to authors)

evaluate user responses and the factors influencing their feedback. The paper discusses a very important topic. However, there are certain areas within the paper that require clarification. With substantial revisions, changes, and further explanations, this paper has the potential to become even more impactful.

REVIEW FILES

You can upload from 0 to 3 files. Maximum file size is 20 Mb. We accept **pdf** formats.

review_report.pdf (87 Kb, 10/12/2023, 10:55:01 AM) ✖

```
Drop files here
-or-
⊕ Upload from Computer
```

| Submit | Save Draft | Last draft saved at 10/12/2023, 10:53:25 AM |
| Cancel | | |