

Review of: "Sentiment Analysis of Opinions about Online Education in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq during COVID-19"

Eric Msughter Aondover¹

¹ Caleb University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Reviewer's Comments

1. The authors should rewrite the abstract using this abstract format: Opening sentence, objectives, method, findings (which should reflect the objectives), conclusion and recommendations.
2. The introduction is not well written to focus on the subject matter. There is a need for the authors to rewrite the introduction to focus on the subject matter.
3. The introduction should be done thematically using the traditional approach of general to specific.
4. The background needs to be rewritten to focus on the subject matter and providing a gap to fill or an articulated problem.
5. The problem has not been properly articulated to give a convincing reason for the work. Assumption would not suffice.
6. The authors did not identify the gap and contextual evidence from the existing study. What has been presented as the motivation of the study is a mere situation analysis.
7. The objective section is missing to guide the study; there should be clearly stated objectives or research questions, which would be addressed in the findings and discussion of findings section. The objectives would also guide the literature review (Thematic Review).
8. There is a major problem of syntax and sentence flow. The authors should revisit the work and edit it carefully.
9. Literature review is about synthesizing the previous works and correlating the existing findings.
10. The literature reviews are predominantly stand-alone review. It would be good if the authors interrogate the literature.
11. There is nowhere in the study the authors made an attempt to explain the meaning of Covid-19. They assume that the readers know the meaning of Covid-19, which is not proper in a research of this nature.
12. In the methodology, it is not clear when was this study conducted?
13. The authors did not explain the sampling technique and procedure.
14. The authors did not explain the research instrument and how was it used to measure the variables. These explanations would help eliminate bias in the study.
15. The findings of the study leave a lot to be desired.
16. Findings are presented based on the stated objectives, unfortunately, because there are no clearly stated objectives, it is hard to appreciate the findings.
17. There is no discussion of the findings in the work, the authors should address this.
18. If the authors address all these issues, the manuscript will be publishable.

