



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_47119
Title of the Manuscript:	Mood State and Behavior Predictions in Social Media through Unstructured Data Analysis
Type of the 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The probability density function of Dirichlet distribution is not supposed to be in the abstract. Some scripts are not well placed, like in the case of βr. -The abstract should be re-ordered to form a single paragraph. -The author(s) should explain what "~10k records" means. -The word "we" should be minimized, rather refer to the study. -Mathematical steps that translates to result needs to be shown. -The analytical software used was not mentioned. "Softmax" appears to be a function and not software. -The author(s) should relate how useful the output is to readers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As advised I have removed Dirichlet distribution from the abstract and included in later sections. Also, correction done for subscripts as advised. - The abstract has been reordered to one paragraph as advised - "~10k records" has been elaborated to 10000 records as advised - The usage of 'we' has been minimized - Mathematical steps has been shown as advised wherever applicable - As advised, mentioned the name of software (R). - Added 'Results' section, elaborated 'conclusions', simplified figures, added dataset sample for better clarity.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The author(s) embarked on interesting area of study. However, the corrections identified should be made, and the work should be accepted for publication after all the corrections.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All advised corrections have been made sincerely in the paper.

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

