Reviews of ECONJOURNAL-D-23-00229R1

Functional Analysis of English Carriers and Related Resources of Cultural Communication in Internet Media

Round 1

Reviewer 1

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your article to our journal. While the article presents valuable insights, it currently does not fully meet the objectives and methods as outlined. Additionally, there are instances where it diverges from our journal's established guidelines. Please find below detailed comments and suggestions for revision:

1. In the "Related Work" subsection, bolstering your statements with pertinent references is imperative to solidify their credibility and ensure alignment with empirical data.

2. Furthermore, it is necessary to appropriately cite sources for the formulas utilized in your study.

3. There is an inconsistency in the numbering of formulas; notably, Formula 11 is referred to as Formula 10 in the text, which requires rectification for accuracy.

Your manuscript holds significant potential, and addressing these points will substantially elevate the quality of your work. We appreciate the effort and research that has gone into this study and look forward to receiving the revised manuscript.
Thank you for considering our feedback. We eagerly anticipate your revised submission.

Best regards,
Mohammad Mahdi Safari

Reviewer 2

Reviewer Comments on "Functional Analysis of English Carriers and Related Resources of Cultural Communication in Internet Media"
This is an intriguing study, and the author has worked hard to design a method that categorizes text and language keyword extraction ranking that i

ncorporates semantic feature weights and external knowledge. The article is clear, concise, and well-written but not organized well. The abstract is clear and well-written. The introduction is grounded in theory and pertinent. The authors have provided enough information regarding the results of other studies to enable readers to understand the reasoning behind and methods used in the existing related work. However, the arrangement of related work is not in sequence order. Although the techniques workflow isn't explicitly stated, describe the theoretical underpinnings that served as the basis for your methodology. Overall, the findings are understandable and well-stated. Additionally, pronouns like "He" and "She" are not used in academic writing. Instead, use gender-neutral alternatives like "the author," "the researcher," or "they." in their place. The contributions of the authors to the research literature in this field of study are organized. The specific comments follow.

Introduction

p. 2, lines 2: The term "can" suggests that there must be "could"

p. 2 line 4: use the proper citation format for this "PPT et al.", or what do you mean by that?

p. 2 line 12: through speech recognition", "and uses text classification "removes the comma"

Related work

(1) Ensure consistency in citation style throughout the related work section. For example, the current citation format includes both initials and full names for some authors (e.g., Sun C et al.), Shijie Zheng (2022), Rahman M M et al. (2018), while others are listed with full names (e.g., Bai B et al.). Please standardize the format for clarity and conformity. Review and correct the formatting of the citations to maintain a uniform and standard appearance.

(2) The citation appears to be non-sequential in the manuscript. To enhance the readability and organization of the references, please consider arranging them sequentially based on the publication year. For instance, Gaurav Nanda (2021), Putri et al. (2021), Nie Wenyan et al. (2021), and HUJie (2022).

(3) From the review of related, you did not include the results of some existing research carried out in the article. To maintain the accuracy and reliability of the literature review, it is advisable to cross-verify and include results from studies that are considered foundational or seminal in the field

(4) provide a citation to the 2.1 write-up

Other Comments

(1) The paper lacks a clear overall structure, making it challenging for readers to follow the logical flow of information. Consider organizing the content into sections such as Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion.

(2) Methodology Section: The methodology section requires a more structured presentation. Clearly outline the research design, participants, materials, and procedures.

(3) The relevance of specific figures in the manuscript needs further clarification. Ensure that each figure is explicitly justified and explained within the study context.
(4) Including a section or discussion that sheds light on the origin and development of the BERT model is crucial.
(5) The results table appears incomplete, as it does not include the outcomes of the proposed BERT-TextRank video annotation model.
(6) It introduces the concept of a MOOC and its relevance to your research. Briefly explain a MOOC and why it is a suitable educational platform for your study.
(7) When using abbreviations in your article, it's a good practice to provide their full explanation or definition the first time they appear.
(8) Overall, the English language and presentation style should be improved significantly. There were a lot of grammatical errors and typos. I suggest you have a colleague proficient in English and familiar with the subject matter review your manuscript or contact a professional editing service.

Round 2

Reviewer 1

Dear authors,

Thank you for opting for our publication. The manuscript has been sufficiently revised, with all comments meticulously addressed, leading to substantial enhancements throughout the text. It appears to be well-prepared for inclusion in our journal.

Best regards,
Mohammad Mahdi Safari

Reviewer 2

Reviewer Report:
Manuscript ID: ECONJOURNAL-D-23-00229R1
Title: Functional Analysis of English Carriers and Related Resources of Cultural Communication in Internet Media

The authors have diligently addressed the concerns raised during the initial review process. Their revisions have significantly improved the clarity, coherence, and overall quality of the manuscript. Based on the thorough revisions made by the authors, I am pleased to recommend the acceptance of the manuscript for publication in its current form. I commend the authors for their diligence and responsiveness throughout the revision process and look forward to seeing their work disseminated within the academic community.

Aderemi Emmanuel Tunbosun
aderemi.tunbosun@lmu.edu.ng
+2347039787571