I. Paper Submission Received



II. Acceptance Notification



III. Reviewers Feedback



Reviewer Feedback Form

Date August 5, 2021

International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications (IJACSA)

Paper Title Hybrid Spelling Correction and Query Expansion for Relevance Document Searching

Reviewer Recommendation Neutral

Reviewer Ratings

The authors contribution to the paper	Fair
Potential interest to research community	Fair
Originality of the work	Fair
Use of examples and illustrations	Fair
Quality of questions or problems raised by the Author	Fair
Reader's confidence in Author's knowledge	Fair
Formatting and Presentation	Fair
Awareness of related work	Poor
Scientific Impact or Practical Utility	Poor
Citations and References	Poor
Paper Organization	Fair

Detailed Comments:

In this paper, author proposed a model to solve the problem by combining the spell correction and query expansion. Some suggestions-

- A particular keyword used was not mentioned in the abstract.
- The first time author uses an abbreviation in the text (Keywords), author should present both the spelled-out version and the short form.
- At the end of Introduction section, a short description of the paper structure is recommended.
- A new section should be created entitled "literature review" or "related works".
- The authors should clearly highlight the gap studies and justify the reasons.
- Figures and tables are meaningful, although some figures were blurred.
- Avoid putting references only at the end of paragraphs. If you do this we are tempted to think the whole paragraph came from the reference and has no input from you.

Grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors:

.

Reviewer Feedback Form

Date August 7, 2021

International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications (IJACSA)

Paper Title Hybrid Spelling Correction and Query Expansion for Relevance Document Searching

Reviewer Recommendation Neutral

Reviewer Ratings

The authors contribution to the paper	Good
Potential interest to research community	Fair
Originality of the work	Good
Use of examples and illustrations	Fair
Quality of questions or problems raised by the Author	Fair
Reader's confidence in Author's knowledge	Fair
Formatting and Presentation	Fair
Awareness of related work	Fair
Scientific Impact or Practical Utility	Fair
Citations and References	Fair
Paper Organization	Fair

Detailed Comments:

What is missing is a more thorough discussion of differences between the proposed approach and today prevailing systems. Additionally, it would be desirable to indicate possible generalization pathways to more complex cases

In the Results section, it should not only explain the experimental results, but also add an explanation of the implications of these findings on the theory or method of previous similar studies that have been reviewed in the related work section. This will highlight the contribution of the author's research.

Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details.

Grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors:

A grammar perusal and correction will greatly improve the paper.

Reviewer Feedback Form_1

NO	Suggestion	Status
1.	A particular keyword used was not mentioned in the abstract.	Already added in abstract.
2.	The ¦rst time author uses an abbreviation in the text (Keywords), author should present both the spelled-out version and the short form.	Already added in abstract.
3.	At the end of Introduction section, a short description of the paper structure is recommended.	Already written at the end of introduction
4.	A new section should be created entitled "literature review" or "related works".	Already revised
5.	The authors should clearly highlight the gap studies and justify the reasons.	Already revised
6.	Figures and tables are meaningful, although some ¦gures were blurred.	All the pictures are clear.
7.	Avoid putting references only at the end of paragraphs. If you do this we are tempted to think the whole paragraph came from the reference and has no input from you.	Already revised

Reviewer Feedback Form_2

NO	Suggestion	Status
1.	it would be desirable to indicate possible generalization pathways to more complex cases What is missing is a more thorough discussion of differences between the proposed approach and today prevailing systems.	Already revised
2.	Additionally, In the Results section, it should not only explain the experimental results, but also add an explanation of the implications of these ndings on the theory or method of previous similar studies that have been reviewed in the related work section. This will highlight the contribution of the author's research.	Already written. "Search results with keyword correction have higher average recall and precision value than those without keyword correction even though each trial has same keywords. The reason is that the use of Levenshtein Distance algorithm can correct some typo-indicated keywords correctly, so that system can find documents that have the keywords." "Fig. 5 shows that recall value of testing with spelling correction and query expansion is higher than that without them. The reason is that the use of spelling correction can display documents with typo-indicated keywords while the use of query expansion can find documents that have similar meaning with keywords from user's query."
3.	Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientic value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your ndings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details.	Already revised

IV. Revise paper from author



V. Published