



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>)



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	<p>1. Reorganize the main body of the paper into the following sections: Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusions.</p> <p>2. The "Context" written under the Abstract should be incorporated in the Abstract or in the Introduction or much better in both the Introduction and the Abstract (but not with exact words and sentences – that is, what have been written in the main text of the paper should not be repeated verbatim in the Abstract).</p> <p>3. The last part of the Introduction should clearly state the objectives of the study. The main objective should be regarding the development of the model that can capture the mood and behavior of social media users, since this was the main results presented in the Abstract.</p> <p>4. The "Big Five personality traits" enumerated in the Introduction in "bulleted format" should be presented and discussed in "paragraph format".</p> <p>5. The section "Detailed Approach" should be re-titled "Materials and Methods". The "functional components of the approach" given in this section (page 2) should be presented and discussed in paragraph format.</p> <p>6. The contents of subsections 2.4.1, 2.4.2, and 2.4.3 in page 4 should also be presented and discussed in paragraph format.</p> <p>7. There should be a section, Results and Discussion, where the results for each presented objective of the study should be presented and discussed. The main result should be regarding the proposed model mentioned in the Abstract. Some discussions in the "Detailed Approach" may be transferred in this section and the Materials and Method section may be simplified.</p> <p>8. Each presented objective should have corresponding result and each result should have corresponding conclusion to be presented in the section, Conclusions.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. The subsections under the Introduction have the same titles: "1.1 Utilities and Applications" and "1.2 Utilities and Applications". However, instead of renaming or re-titling one, both subsection titles may be deleted.</p> <p>2. When using the "numbered style" of citation, the numbers should be enclosed in brackets and not in parentheses. For example, the citation for the Big Five personality traits (page 1) should be "[1]" and not "(1)".</p> <p>3. In page 2, there is a citation "(2)" but in the list of references (page 2) there are two different references under the same number 2. As such, the reference "https://sites.google.com/michalkosinski.com/mypersonality" should be 2 and the reference "https://github.com/dbrehmer/Knowself" should be 3 and the citation in page 2 (if citing both references) should be written as "[2, 3]". And then, re-numbered the succeeding citations and references. For example, the citation "(3)" for the "Language of Personality" (page 3) shall now be "[4]".</p> <p>4. If using the "numbered style" of citation, the "author-year" citation style should not be indicated anymore. Hence, in page 3, the citation "(Pennebaker et al., 2001)" should be deleted and the citation "(4)" should now be "[5]" (note: in brackets and if re-numbered).</p> <p>5. Other citations in page 4 should be restated using only the "numbered style" and reconstructing the sentence if necessary. In particular:</p> <p>5.1. For the citation "Pennebaker and King 1999", it can be restated as: Significant correlations between these features and each of the Big Five personality traits had been found earlier [6].</p> <p>5.2. "(Coltheart, 1981) (6)" should be simply replaced by "[7]".</p> <p>5.3. For "Heylighen and Dewaele 2002": Generally, introverts would take longer to reflect on the words they say, and it was suggested that an introvert's vocabulary is more precise [8], implying a lower frequency of use.</p> <p>5.4. For "Gill and Oberlander 2002": In an earlier used of MRC set, it was demonstrated</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>that extraversion is negatively correlated with concreteness [9].</p> <p>5.5. "(Gill & Oberlander, 2003) (9)" should be simply replaced by "[10]".</p> <p>6. Note also that there should be corresponding reference for the citations "Gill and Oberlander 2002" and "Gill and Oberlander 2003" in the reference list while the references "Oberlander & Nowson 2006" (Reference 8) and "Oberlander & Gill 2006" (Reference 9) should be deleted since these were not cited in the text.</p> <p>7. The citations for subsection titles in page 4 should be deleted. Instead, the citations should be indicated in the text/content under such subsections.</p> <p>8. There are missing elements in the entries of references particularly in references 1, 2 and 3 (page 5). Follow the journal's guidelines on referencing.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed **VANCOUVER reference** style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

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:	Romer C. Castillo
Department, University & Country	Batangas State University, Philippines