

Reviewer 2 Comments

	Yes	Can be improved	Must be improved	Not applicable
Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?	(x)	()	()	()
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	()	()	(x)	()
Is the research design appropriate?	(x)	()	()	()
Are the methods adequately described?	(x)	()	()	()
Are the results clearly presented?	()	()	(x)	()
Are the conclusions supported by the results?	()	()	(x)	()

The article has been slightly improved, but there is still a lot to improve. The authors did not correct Figures 2-5 as recommended. It is still not known what dates appear on the X axis.

We separated figures into several sections and explain each of them. In addition, we enlarge the size of those figures to make the dates more visible.

The literature review still needs to be refined from the perspective of the latest studies from 2023.

We add two 2023 literatures (Examining Rural and Urban Sentiment Difference in COVID-19--Related Topics on Twitter: Word Embedding--Based Retrospective Study and Deep Learning Model for COVID-19 Sentiment Analysis on Twitter). In addition, we added the recommended literature (A Hybrid Feature Extraction Method for Nepali COVID-19-Related Tweets Classification)

I recommend that the authors create separate results and discussion sections.

We separated the result and the discussion sections

Conclusion still pretty poor. The authors do not refer to the research results achieved or to what has been achieved in the literature in the field of the topic undertaken by the authors. The manuscript still needs a lot of work.

We revised the conclusion