



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_42930
Title of the Manuscript:	Conversation Modeling with Neural Network
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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)Results and discussions are very concise, author are suggested to expand results and discussions.</p> <p>2)Figure 4,5,6 are not discussed properly, please do the same.</p> <p>3)There is lack of flowcharts and block diagrams in the article, try to add few to increase the appeal of the article.</p> <p>4)After modifying the article, similarity index should be checked by turnitin , and it should be strictly less than 10 percent.</p>	<p>1. discussion about figure 4,5,6 are added to the paper in Results and Discussion section</p> <p>2. I don't think there is much scope to add flowchart as this article only covers text generation part with machine learning</p> <p>3. I don't have access to turnitin, but i have checked plagiarism on urkund and it is less than 10%</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1) It is suggested to add 6 keywords after abstract section.</p> <p>2) Redraw figure 1 with smart or ms visio.</p> <p>3) Avoid word (we) in abstract & article.</p> <p>4) Separate introduction section from related search ,Add a full fledged related search section after introduction.</p> <p>5) Give a section of objective measures used in this study?</p> <p>6) Conclusion is not informative and meaningful , rewrite the whole conclusion section again</p> <p>7) Most of the equations in the article is not cited by the author, it is suggested to cite the content and equations which do not belong to you</p> <p>8) have you compared your rule or technique with any other benchmark technique?if not kindly do so to validate your protocol.</p>	<p>1. keywords are added</p> <p>2. changed figure to cleaner version of same</p> <p>3. made changes in article regarding usage of word (we)</p> <p>4. related search is covered in literature survey</p> <p>5. re-written conclusion</p> <p>6. Equation are cited properly</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>ARTICLE HAVE GOOD TECHNICAL MERIT , AURTHOR ARE SUGGESTED TO CAREFULLY ADDRESS THE POINTS MENTIONED ABOVE</p>	Thank you