



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	<u>Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_68182
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF LSA, NMF and ILSA IN ELECTRONIC ASSESSMENT OF FREE TEXT DOCUMENT
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In this paper, the authors evaluated the performance of an Improved Latent Semantic Analysis (ILSA), Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA), Non-Negative Matrix Factorization (NMF) algorithms in an Electronic Assessment Application using metrics, Semantic Adequacy, Term-Term Similarity, Precision, Recall and F-measure function, Mean divergence and Assessment Accuracy	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The contribution of the paper can support its publication in this journal. However, in order to do that some minor revisions need to be considered in the manuscript.</p> <p>1 - In the introduction, the context should be improved and clearly presented to help the reader understand the aim and theoretical gap of the research. The recently advances of the related researches should also be emphasized and expanded.</p> <p>2 – Methodology: The proposed method can be represented in a much better way. The data sets, materials and procedures to undertake the experiments need to be clearly presented.</p> <p>3 - Results: In comparison with the existing techniques, there is significant improvement of the results obtained by the proposed method. However, I suggest these to be presented in a way that there will be coherence between the text and /or tables and figures. Figures should come after description and, the equations and procedures presented in the results and discussion section should be in the methodology section.</p> <p>4 – Based on the experimental results, in your conclusions please point out the main performance difference between the proposed methods with other similar methods? And if any, what similar methods should be added for the comparison purposes in future studies.</p> <p>5 - There are some minor problems with formatting and presentation of the manuscript. Please revise.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	André Fenias Moiane
Department, University & Country	Instituto Politécnico De Ciências da Terra E Ambiente, Mozambique