Building of Informatics, Technology and Science (BITS)

REVISION DETAILS

Paper ID   : 6734
Paper Title   : Political Sentiment Post 2024 Presidential Election: Comparison of Naïve Bayes and Support Vector
                       Machine

No.	Reviewer	Review Comment	Revision	Page	Paragraph/ Line number
1	1	The phrase "Political Sentiment" might be too broad. If the research focuses on public opinion or attitudes towards political events, using more precise terms such as "Public Political Sentiment" could enhance clarity.	The title has been adjusted to "Public Political Sentiment Post 2024 Presidential Election: Comparison of Naïve Bayes and Support Vector Machine" because "Political Sentiment" was too broad.	1	Title
	2	Good enough. The title is informative enough.			
2	1	The abstract contains several grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that may affect readability. For example: "Particularly among X users" could be clearer as "particularly among users of platform 'X'." "The outcome of the 2024 presidential election has a lot of advantages and disadvantages" is vague and could be revised to specify the context or sentiment. "Each model in this investigation underwent TF IDF feature extraction, yielding NBC (62.41%) and SVM (62.19%) accuracies" is overly compact and could benefit from clearer sentence structure.	The abstract has been revised to improve clarity and readability. For example, "particularly among X users" has been updated to "particularly among users of platform 'X'" and the purpose of research has been clarified to emphasize it is contribution to sentiment analysis by focusing on public political sentiment following the 2024 Indonesian presidential election. The relationship between the method and results is now explicitly stated, highlighting how TF-IDF feature extraction and machine learning models were applied to classify.	1	Abstract
	2	Clarify the purpose of the research and its contribution to the study of sentiment analysis, and make explicit the relationship between the method and the results in the context of the problem being solved.			

3	1	The writing contains grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that may hinder clarity. For example: "Post-election, speculation and debate arose regarding the results of the presidential and vice-presidential elections" could be rephrased as "Following the election, speculation and debates emerged regarding the results." "A fairly accurate picture of public sentiment" might be revised to "a meaningful representation of public sentiment." Phrases like "to classify public sentiment on social media X, a comparison of methods between Naïve Bayes Classifier (NBC) and Support Vector Machine (SVM)" need rephrasing for fluency.	The writing has been revised to improve clarity and fluency. For instance, "Post-election, speculation and debate arose regarding the results of the presidential and vice presidential elections" has been rephrased to "Following the election, speculation and debates emerged regarding the results." Two additional previous studies have been incorporated to meet the requirements, providing a broader context for the research.	1-2	Introduction
	2	Add two more previous studies to meet the requirements, strengthen the GAP explanation, and state the research contribution explicitly. Make sure the reference format is in accordance with IEEE.			
4	1	Explain why specific parameters (e.g., N-gram range, linear kernel for SVM) were chosen and discuss alternative approaches briefly. Provide details on the rationale for keyword selection and discuss ethical considerations, such as ensuring compliance with API usage terms. Specify details on evaluation techniques, such as validation strategies (e.g., train-test split ratio or cross-validation) and tools used for analysis.	The revised section now explains that the N-gram range was chosen to capture both unigram and bigram features, balancing simplicity and contextual understanding of sentiment. The images and tables have been updated to improve quality and readability, using the higher resolution and clear labels for each element.	2-5	Research Methodology
	2	Improve the image quality to make it easy to read and understand. Each image and table must be given a detailed explanation of the contents of the image/table, and mention the numbering in the explanation.			

5	1	Rewrite grammatically incorrect sentences and eliminate redundancy. For example: Original: "Random oversampling makes the previously unbalanced data become balanced." Revised: "Random oversampling addresses data imbalance by creating a more evenly distributed dataset." Provide a more nuanced discussion of NBC and SVM, acknowledging specific strengths of each model in different scenarios. Highlight why NBC performs more consistently and the potential limitations of SVM under specific conditions. Detail how random oversampling with SMOTE was implemented (e.g., library or parameters used). Explain why certain parameter choices (e.g., splitting ratios or unigram-bigram combinations) yielded optimal results.	The writing has been revised to improve grammatical accuracy and eliminate redundancy. For example, "Random oversampling makes the previously unbalanced data become balanced" has been rephrased to "Random oversampling addresses data imbalance by creating a more evenly distributed dataset." Parameter choices were optimized based on performance metrics. Splitting ratio (40:60) were chosen for an effective balance between training data and generalization testing. A brief explanation has been added to highlight the relevance of the results to previous research. An in-depth discussion explores the reasons for SVM's performance degradation. Unlike NBC, which assumes conditional independence and performs well with simple probabilistic models, SVM's dependency on appropriate kernel functions and hyperparameter optimization makes it less robust in imbalanced datasets. All tables and figures have been updated with clear, informative, and consistent captions.		Result and Discussion
	2	1. Add a brief explanation of the relevance of the results to previous research. 2. Provide a more in-depth discussion of the reasons for the SVM's performance degradation compared to NBC. 3. Ensure that all tables and figures have informative and consistent captions.			
6	1	The sentence structure is occasionally awkward, such as "Following three test situations, the Naïve Bayes Classifier (NBC) model's accuracy remained more consistent than that of the Support Vector Machine (SVM) model." This could be simplified for clarity. Terms like "neutral, good, or unfavorable" should be standardized to "neutral, positive, or negative" for consistency. While the NBC model is highlighted as more consistent, the SVM model's strengths or comparative performance in specific scenarios are not mentioned, creating an imbalanced perspective. The conclusion does not discuss the broader implications of the findings (e.g.,	The sentence structure has been simplified for clarity. Terms such as "neutral, good, or unfavorable" have been standardized to "neutral, positive, or negative" for consistency throughout the text. A more balanced discussion of both models has been included. While NBC's consistency is highlighted, SVM's strength in handling complex decision boundaries and its potential for higher accuracy with better-turned parameters are acknowledged. Redundant information repeating the results section has been removed, and the discussion now focuses on highlighting the main findings.		Conclusion

		how the results could be applied in sentiment analysis or public opinion tracking).	The main findings have been strengthened by discussing practical implications. The limitations of the study have been addressed.		
	2	1. The presentation of some information seems to repeat the results section and does not sufficiently highlight the main findings. 2. These main findings could be further strengthened by explaining their practical implications, for example how these results are relevant in sentiment analysis related to elections. 3. The limitations of the study have not been mentioned.			
7	1	Pretty good.	Reference number [14] has been revised to conform to IEEE format. The correct format includes the author's name, title of the article, journal name, volume number, year of publication, and DOI.		References
	2	Reference number [14] does not use IEEE format. IEEE format contains: author name, title, journal name, vol. no., year, DOI.			

Bandung, 13 Januari 2025

Dr. Putu Harry Gunawan,S.Si.,M.Si.,M.Sc.