

Review of: "A Comparative Analysis of Advertising in the 2020 Presidential Elections & Phoenix Mayoral Elections using Natural Language Processing"

Margareta Nadanyiova

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Author,

The manuscript was processed at an average level, but its scientific content is weak. The article should be processed according to recommended research manuscript sections - Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion. The literature review is very poor, and previous studies are missing. The article lacks determination of the hypotheses as well as the use of mathematical-statistical methods to accept or reject the hypotheses, which I consider to be an important shortcoming in this type of scientific publication to improve the scientific quality of the article. In the Discussion, it would be appropriate to compare the authors' own conclusions with the literature review, add new context to the topic, which may outline the direction of further research, and enrich the article with the actual opinion of the authors on the issue (not older than 5 years). In conclusion, it is necessary to comment on the limits and barriers of research as well as to ensure the continuity of research by outlining its further direction. References are not sufficient for this type of scientific publication. It would be appropriate to fill in the references using the most recent contributions from journals indexed in the Web of Science database or the SCOPUS database.