Review of: "LFOSum: Summarizing Long-form Opinions with Large Language Models"

Bijay Kumar Paikaray[1]

1 Sri Sri University, Cuttack, India

1. The introduction mentions a "new dataset of long-form user reviews," but it would be helpful to specify more details about the dataset, such as the types of entities covered (e.g., products, restaurants) and how the reviews were sourced.

2. Providing information on the dataset's size and diversity can strengthen the paper's contribution.

3. The manuscript introduces "two training-free LLM-based summarization approaches," but it does not elaborate on how these approaches are structured or what makes them unique compared to existing methods.

4. While the text describes both reference-based and reference-free evaluation metrics, a deeper explanation of how these metrics function and their advantages would enhance clarity.

5. Specifically, how does the proposed "reference-free evaluation" offer a more granular assessment compared to traditional methods?

Cite the below suggested articles:

a. Anandika, A., Chakravarty, S., & Paikaray, B. K. (2023). Named entity recognition in Odia language: a rule-based approach. *International Journal of Reasoning-based Intelligent Systems*, *15*(1), 15-21.

b. Pramanik, J., Paikaray, B. K., Jayanthu, S., & Samal, A. K. (2023). Machine learning approach to roof fall risks classification in UG mines using Adaboost and XGboost incorporating transfer learning technique. *International Journal of Reasoning-based Intelligent Systems*, *15*(3-4), 249-258.

6. Adding a brief review of related work in opinion summarization and recent advancements in LLMs can contextualize the study and highlight the novelty of your research.

7. Throughout the manuscript, ensure consistent use of terms like "LLM," "summarization approaches," and "evaluation metrics" to maintain clarity and reduce confusion.