

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

Zilal Meccawy<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> King Abdul Aziz University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Analysing the sentiments and opinions about online education in during COVID-19 pandemic is a worthwhile topic. This a good paper overall, however, there are some issues in this paper that could improve it:

1. The abstract was quite short in V1. To improve this, some recommendations and more results should be added. However, in the latest version, this has been addressed and it reads better.
2. The headings in the paper follow the essay form, not academic research standards; for example, I suggest the Kurdish Language heading be re-titled as the background in the literature, related work should be titled as the literature review, and data collection and experiments be within the methodology section, not separate headings. In the introduction, sentences such as "That caused the world to descend into chaos, . . ." comes across as sensationalist, not academic language. Another ambiguous sentence: "One of the concerns was education, and COVID-19 forced educational institutions to switch from face-to-face to online education. However, regardless of the readiness level of different regions and countries for such a dramatic shift, many wondered about its efficiency." Concerns of what? Efficiency of what? I suggest rewriting for clarity and cohesion.
3. More studies related to COVID-19, online learning, Kurdish language learning, sentiment in online contexts, and recent work are needed in the literature.
4. The research gap and problem are not stated clearly. Clearly communicating this would aid locate your work within the relevant literature for the readers.
5. There are no research objectives or research questions (RQs) by which the paper is guided. The reader needs to know what you are trying to study. What do you want to know? To investigate? What are the questions you are attempting to answer.
6. Although the method is described in detail, more information could be added related to the research design, sample and participants, duration of the experiments, and ethical considerations. This would help other researchers replicate your study in other parts/ contexts and compare results, which in turn enriches the research body of literature in this field/ topic. Some of this is addressed in the latest version.
7. Did you derive the method from another work? If yes, you must justify and support your answer and give credit. If not, also explain how it was done in detail to demonstrate transparency and to allow future replication/validation of your method.
8. The sample of the collected tweets should be translated to be understood by all the readers regardless of the languages they speak.

9. Although there are 5 experiments and scenarios, no examples of any results are given.
10. There is no discussion in which the results are linked to the literature regarding the sentiments and the accuracy of the analysis methods.
11. Based on the results, the topic is more related to assessing the experiment rather than exploring the sentiments, so I suggest editing the title to reflect your work. This is where RQs would have helped guide the work clearly (see point #5).
12. The limitations and practical implications should be added to the conclusion.
13. Although the research was during COVID-19, I think there is no need to add it to the title, as you can connect the results to online education in general.

Wishing you all the best!