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Section I. Overview

A. Reader Interest

1. Which category describes this manuscript?
   ___Practice/Application/Case Study/Experience Report
   _X_ Research/Technology
   ___Survey/Tutorial/How-To

B. Content

1. Please explain how this manuscript advances this field of research and/or contributes some thing new to the literature.
   Provide many features of the tweets, it can be used as the standard to extract the newsworthy topic and label it as credible information.

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.
   ___Easy to read
   _X_ 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
   _X_ Excellent
   ___Good
   ___Fair
I love the data analysis of this paper, and their strategies to get the result.

**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)

This paper found a special way to mine the newsworthy topic from the tweets according credibility features. I just doubt the sentiment analysis because this part cannot be the standard.

**Additional Comments:**
1. **Provide one aspect that you liked the most in this paper.**
   It provides a lot of statistic analysis methods to support their conclusion.

2. **Provide one aspect that you disliked the most in this paper.**
   It did not show the news topic they extracted from the dataset of twitter past data. Using some common news events to compare with the newsworthy topic, then we could get the news. Will be easy to understand and check their evaluation methods.

**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)

1. Since they using the “past data” of twitter, ask someone to manually separate the data maybe not very correct, why not using the real news events result so far to check the result of their automatic tool.
   For example, the topic “Chile earthquake”

2. In section 4.3, it mentioned that based features include the sentiment of the tweets. Personally, I don’t think this is a good standard for extracting the newsworthy topic. Because, the emotion of a person is hard to determined by himself/herself or other people.

3. In the search, they asked person to manually classify the dataset, how many people attend this part?