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Section I. Overview

A. Reader Interest

1. Which category describes this manuscript?
   - [x] Practice/Application/Case Study/Experience Report
   - ___Research/Technology
   - ___Survey/Tutorial/How-To

B. Content

1. Please explain how this manuscript advances this field of research and/or contributes something new to the literature.
   This is an innovative way to parse and extract meaning out of text found in Twitter. There are very few specialized tools for semantic analysis of twitter data.

C. Presentation

1. Does the introduction state the objectives of the manuscript in terms that encourage the reader to read on?
   - [x] Yes
   - ___Could be improved
   - ___No

2. How would you rate the organization of the manuscript? Is it focused? Is the length appropriate for the topic?
   - [x] Satisfactory
   - ___Could be improved
   - ___Poor

3. Please rate and comment on the readability of this manuscript.
   - [x] Easy to read
   - ___Readable - but requires some effort to understand
   - ___Difficult to read and understand
   - ___Unreadable

Section II. Evaluation

Please rate the manuscript. Explain your choice.
   - ___Award Quality
   - ___Excellent
Section III. Detailed Comments (provide your thoughts/criticism about the ideas in the paper; not only summarize the paper but have a critical look here)

The paper describes a good amount of specialized analysis of Tweets and is fascinating when it comes to analyzing the data available. The linguistics used in tweets on the other hand and informal and I personally did not understand how the application tackles that problem. The statistical approach described in the paper was a bit ambiguous.

Additional Comments:
1. Provide one aspect that you liked the most in this paper.

Use of DBpedia was a good approach to narrow down ambiguities.

2. Provide one aspect that you disliked the most in this paper.

The part for sentiment extraction was found to be ambiguous.

Section IV. Discussion Points (provide at least 3 discussion topics/questions related to ideas/techniques described in the paper; these will be used for discussions in the class)

How does the sentiment engine work?
How would the topic of analysis decided?
How will this be applied for conflict detection?