Journal of Basic and Applied Engineering Research
Print ISSN: 2350-0077; Online ISSN: 2350-0255; Volume 2, Number 14; April-June, 2015 pp. 1214-1219

http://www.krishisanskriti.org/jbaer.html

Sentiment Analysis of Mobile Reviews using Sentiwordnet

Gaurav Dudeja[1] and Kapil Sharma[2]

[1,2]*Department of Computer Science Delhi Technological University New Delhi, India*
E-mail: [1]gdudeja@gmail.com, [2]kapil@ieee.org

Abstract—*This paper presents our experimental work on a domain specific feature-based for aspect level sentiment analysis of mobile phone reviews. In decision making, the opinions of others have a significant effect on customers ease in making choices regards to online shopping, choosing products, etc. We have devised an rule based domain independent scheme that analyses the textual reviews of a phone and assign a sentiment label on each aspect. The semantic score of subjective sentences is extracted from SentiWordNet Library to calculate their sentiment as positive, negative or neutral based on the textual sentence structure. We have used SentiWordNet library as a dataset with two different approaches of selections comprising of adverbs and verbs,adjectives and n-gram feature extraction. We also used our SentiWordNet library to compute the document level sentiment for each phone reviewed and compared its label with results obtained using Alchemy API. The sentiment label of a phone is also compared with the document level sentiment result. The results obtained show that our approach produces a more accurate sentiment label than the simple document level sentiment analysis.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Sentiment analysis is language process task that uses a approach to spot textual content and categorize it as positive or negative. The unstructured matter knowledge on the net usually carries expression of opinions of users. Sentiment analysis tries to spot the expressions of opinion and mood of writers. a straightforward sentiment analysis rule tries to classify a document as 'positive' or 'negative', supported the opinion expressed in it. The document-level sentiment analysis drawback is basically as follows: Given a collection of documents D, a sentiment analysis rule classifies every document d D into one among the 2 categories, positive and negative. Positive label denotes that the document d expresses a positive opinion and negative label means d expresses a negative opinion of the user. additional refined algorithms try and establish the sentiment at sentence-level, feature-level or entity-level.

There are mainly three types of approaches for sentiment classification of texts: (a) By using a machine learning primarily based text classifier -such as Naïve Thomas Bayes, SVM or kNN- with appropriate feature choice theme; (b) By using the unsupervised semantic orientation scheme of extracting relevant n-grams of the text so treated them either as +ve or -ve and consequentially the document; and (c) By using the SentiWordNet opensource used based online library that gives positive, negative and neutral scores for words. a number of the relevant past works on sentiment classification is found in [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11] and [12].

Now a days web of internet hosts an outsized volume of information created by numerous users. Users are currently co-creators of website, instead of being passive customers. The social media is currently a serious a part of the internet. The statistics shows that each four out of five users on the net use some sort of social media. The user contributions to social media vary from blog posts, tweets, reviews and photo or video uploads etc. an outsized quantity of the information on the net is unstructured text. Opinions expressed in social media in sort of reviews or posts represent a very important and attention-grabbing space price exploration and exploitation. With increase in accessibility of opinion resource product reviews, moive reviews, blog reviews, social network tweets, the new difficult task is to mine giant volume of texts and devise appropriate algorithms to know the opinion of others. This info is of very useful and informatial to firms that try and grasp the feedback regarding their product or services. This feedback helps them in taking user choices. additionally to be helpful for firms, the reviews and opinion strip-mined from them, is useful for users in addition. reviews about hotels in a city may help a user going to a city searching a good hotel. Similarly, phone reviews help other users in deciding whether the phone is worth to purchase or not. Similarly, phone reviews facilitate different users choose whether or not the mobile phone is worth for money or not. during this paper we have got tried to explore a new SentiWordNet primarily based theme for each document-level and aspect-level sentiment classification. The document-level classification involves use of various linguistic options (ranging from Adverb+Adjective combination to Adverb+Adjective+Verb combination). we have got additionally devised a new domain specific heuristic for aspect-level sentiment classification of mobile phone reviews. This theme locates the self-opinionated text round the desired aspect feature in an exceedingly review and computes its sentiment orientation. For a mobile phone, this is used for all the reviews.

The sentiment scores on a particular aspect from all the selected reviews are then aggregated. This process is carried out for all aspects under consideration. Finally a summarized sentiment profile of the mobile phone on all aspects is presented in an easy to visualize and understandable pictorial form. The remaining paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the basic approach of uaing SentiWordNet formulation for sentiment classification, along details of our implementation. Section 3 describes the dataset used for classification and performance metrics computed. Section 4 presents the results and the paper concludes with key observations in Section 5.

2. SENTIMENT CLASSIFICATION

We have primarily based our classification formula on the publically avaiable library SentiWordNet [38]. The SentiWordNet approach involves getting sentiment score for every opinion containing term of the text by a search in its library. during this lexical resource every term t occurring in WordNet is associated to a few numerical scores obj(t), pos(t) and neg(t), describing the target, positive and negative polarities of the term, severally. These 3 scores square measure computed by combining the results created by eight ternary classifiers. to create use of SentiWordNet we want to initial extract relevant narrow terms and so search for his or her scores within the SentiWordNet. Use of SentiWordNet needs tons of selections to be taken relating to the linguistic options to be used, deciding what quantity weight is to be to every linguistic feature, and therefore the aggregation technique for consolidating sentiment scores. we have got enforced the SentiWordNet primarily based algorithmic formulation for each document-level and aspect-level sentiment classification.

3. DOCUMENT-LEVEL SENTIMENT CLASSIFICATION

The document level sentiment analysis attempts to analyise the entire document (such as one review) into '+ve' ,'-ve' or neutral class. The methodologies based on SentiWordNet focuses the term profile of the review document and concentrate terms having desired POS label (such as adjectives, adverbs or verbs). This obviously shows that before applying the SentiWordNet based formulation; the review text should be applied to a POS tagger which tags each term occurring in the review text. At that point some chose terms (with wanted POS tag) are removed and the opinion score of every extricated term is gotten from the SentiWordNet library. The scores for every removed term in a review are then accumulated utilizing some weightage and accumulation plan. Subsequently two key issues are to choose (a) which POS labels ought to be separated, and (b) how to choose the weightage of scores of distinctive POS labels extricated while registering the total score.

We have investigated with diverse linguistic highlights and scoring plans. Computational Linguists propose that modifiers are great markers of reviews. Case in point, if a review sentence says "The phone is incredible", then utilization of modifier "incredible" lets us know that the phone was loved by the analyst and perhaps he had a superb experience by utilizing it. At times, Adverbs further adjust the sentiment communicated in audit sentences. Case in point, the sentence "The phone is extremely good" communicates a more positive supposition about the phone than the sentence "the phone is great". A related past work [14] has additionally inferred that "Adverb+Adjective" consolidate creates preferred results over utilizing modifiers alone. Subsequently we favored the "adverb+adjective" consolidate over removing "descriptive word" alone. The adverbs are usually used as complements or modifiers. Few more examples of adverb usage are: he ran quickly, only adults, very dangerous trip, very nicely, rarely bad, rarely good etc. In all these examples adverbs modify the adjectives. Though adverbs are of various kinds, but for sentiment classification only adjectives of degree seem useful.

Some past works have recommended misusing the "verb" POS labels in addition to 'adjective' for sentiment classification. Here, we have investigated with two semantic highlight determination plans. In one we only concentrate 'adjectives' and any 'adverbs' going before the selected adjective. In the other one we seperate both 'adjectives' and 'verbs', along with any 'adverbs' going before them. Since, adverbs are changing the scores of succeeding terms, it needs to be chosen as to what extent the sentiment score of an 'adverb' should change the succeeding 'adjective' or 'verb' sentiment score, to obtain higher accuracy. We have chosed the modifying weightage (scaling factor) of adverb score as 0.35, in view on the conclusions reported in [14] and [11]. The other fundamental issue that remains to be addressed is how should the sentiment scores of chosed 'adverb+adjective' and 'adverb+verb' consolidated be aggregated. For this we have attempted different factors of weight ranging from 10% to 100%, i.e. the 'adverb+verb' scores are combined to 'adverb+adjective' scores in a weighted way.

In the first plan of utilizing only 'adverb+adjective' join, we have picked a scaling element sf = 0.35. This is proportionate to giving just 35% weight to adverb scores. The changes in adjective scores are thus in a fixed proportion to adverb scores. Since we picked a value of scaling variable sf = 0.35, the adjective scores will get a higher priority in the consolidated score. The demonstrative pseudo-code of key steps for this plan i.e. SentiWordNet (AAC) is illustrated below. Here AAC refers to Adverb+Adjective Combine.

```
For each sentence, extract adv+adj
combines.
For each extracted adv+adj combine do:
 • If adj score=0, ignore it.
 • If adv is affirmative, then
   o If score(adj)>0
     ▪ fsAAC (adv,adj)=
       min(1,score(adj)+sf*score(adv))
   o If score(adj)<0
     ▪ fsAAC (adv,adj)= min(1,score(adj)-
       sf*score(adv))
 • If adv is negative, then
   o If score(adj)>0
     ▪ fsAAC(adv,adj)= max(-
       1,score(adj)+sf*score(adv))
   o If score(adj)<0
     ▪ fsAAC(adv,adj)= max(-1,score(adj)-
       sf*score(adv))
```

Here, adj refers to adjectives and adv refers to adverbs. The last sentiment values (fsAAC) are scaled form of adverb and adjective SentiWordNet scores, where the adverb score is given 35% weightage. The presence of 'Not' is taken care by negating the scores obtained. First of all we picked sentence boundaries of a review and then we process all the sentences. For every sentence we picked the adv+adj joins and then compute their sentiment scores according the scheme described in the 713 pseudo-code. The final document sentiment score is an addition of sentiment scores for every sentences occurring in it. The score value decided the polarity of the review.

```
For each sentence, extract adv+adj and
adv+verb combines.
1. For each extracted adv+adj combine do:
 • If adj score=0, ignore it.
 • If adv is affirmative, then
   o If score(adj)>0
     ▪ f(adv,adj)=
       min(1,score(adj)+sf*score(adv))
   o If score(adj)<0
     ▪ f(adv,adj)= min(1,score(adj)-
       sf*score(adv))
 • If adv is negative, then
   o If score(adj)>0
     ▪ f(adv,adj)= max(-
       1,score(adj)+sf*score(adv))
   o If score(adj)<0
   o f(adv,adj)= max(-1,score(adj)-
     sf*score(adv))
2. For each extracted adv+verb combine do:
     ▪ If verb score=0, ignore it.
     ▪ If adv is affirmative, then
       • If score(verb)>0
         o f(adv,verb)=
           min(1,score(verb)+sf*score(a
           dv))
       • If score(verb)<0
         o f(adv,verb)=
           min(1,score(verb)-
           sf*score(adv))
     ▪ If adv is negative, then
       • If score(verb)>0
         o f(adv,verb)= max(-
           1,score(verb)+sf*score(adv))
       • If score(verb)<0
         o f(adv,verb)= max(-
           1,score(verb)-sf*score(adv))
3. fAAAVC(sentence)=f(adv,adj)+
 0.3*f(adv,verb)
```

The second usage that we attempted joins both 'adverb+adjective' and 'adverb+verb' sentiment scores. It is same like to the previous scheme in its method of joining adverbs with adjectives or verbs, but it differs in the logic that it counts both adjectives and verbs for chosing the overall sentiment score. We have tried with different aggregation weights for adjective and verb scores and conclud that 30% weight for verb score produces best precision levels. The occurrence of 'not' has been handled in a similar manner as in previous scheme. The indicative pseudo-code of key steps for this scheme, i.e., SentiWordNet (AAAVC) is illustrated below. Here AAAVC refers to Adverb+Adjective and Adverv+Verb Combine.

In this scheme, we compute sentiment score for all 'adverb+adjective' and 'adverb+verb' combines in a sentence and aggregate them together. This is done for all sentences and the document-level sentiment polarity value is determined based on the aggregated sentiment score of the review document.

4. ASPECT-LEVEL SENTIMENT ANALYSIS

The document-level sentiment classification is a reasonable measure of positivity or negativity expressed in a review. However, in selected domains it may be a good idea to explore the sentiment of the reviewer about various aspects of the item in that domain, expressed in that review. Moreover, practically most of the reviews have mixture of positive and negative sentiment about different aspects of the item and it may be difficult and inappropriate to insist on an overall document-level sentiment polarity expressed in a review for the item. Thus, the document-level sentiment classification is not a complete, suitable and comprehensive measure for detailed analysis of positive and negative aspects of the item under review. The aspect-level sentiment analysis allows us to analyze the positive and negative aspects of an item. However, this kind of analysis is often domain specific. The aspect-level sentiment analysis involves the following: (a) identifying which aspects are to be analyzed, (b) locating the opinionated content about that aspect in the review, and (c) determining the sentiment polarity of views expressed about an aspect.

Since we are restricted to phone reviews, a focused domain, we tried to explore the aspect-level sentiment analysis of the phone reviews. The first step was to identify which aspects are worth considering in phone domain. We made an extensive search for identifying the aspects in different phone review sites and phone magazines and worked out a list of aspects. Since a particular aspect is expressed by different words (such as screen size, looks, pricing) by users, we created an aspect-vector for all aspects under consideration. Another example is use of words like camera, audio, volume while referring to multimedia component of a phone. After creating aspect vectors, we parse a review sentence-by-sentence. For each sentence, we look for presence of opinion about an aspect. If there is one, we use the SentiWordNet based approach to determine its sentiment polarity. This is done for all the sentences in a review and subsequently for all reviews of a phone. The scores for a particular aspect from all the reviews of a phone are aggregated to obtain an opinionated analysis of that aspect.

The sentiment analysis around aspects thus first locates an opinionated content about an aspect in a review and then uses the SentiWordNet based approach to compute its sentiment polarity. We used the SentiWordNet (AAC) scheme for this purpose. When an aspect indicating term (those terms that belong to the aspect vector created in the beginning) is located, we first lookup up to 5-gram backward for occurrence of adjectives or adverb+adjective combines. If no such term is found, we search up to 5-gram forward for their occurrence. In both cases the lookup terminates at 5-gram or sentence boundary whichever is encountered first. Then the sentiment polarity for these terms is computed using the SentiWordNet based formulation for AAC, described earlier.

5. APPROACH

In this section we quickly describe procedures and objectives of this study and we aim to succeed as a result. This study sorted into three stages. Initial phase is the web page crawling phase,in which data is collected from mobile phone review websites. The second stage is the dissecting phase, in which the data is parsed, pprepared and dissected to concentrate valuable information. The third stage is the visualization phase, in which the information is visualized to better understand the results.

6. COLLECTING DATASETS

We have collected 200 reviews each for 200 mobile phones from the popular mobile phone review database website www.gsmarena.com[15].We have labeled all these reviews manually to evaluate performance of implemented algorithmic formulations. Out of 50000 phone reviews collected, 32000 are labeled positive and 18000 are labeled as negative reviews.

7. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Keeping in mind the end goal to assess the exactness and execution of our algorithmic definitions, we processed the standard execution measurements of Accuracy, Precision, Recall and Fmeasure. The measure of Accuracy An utilized by us is:

$$A = \frac{Number\ of\ Correctly\ Classified\ Documents}{Total\ Number\ of\ Documents} \tag{1}$$

The equation for F-Measure Fused by us is as follows:

$$Precision\ (l,c) = n_{lc}/n_c \tag{2}$$

$$Recall\ (l,c) = n_{lc}/n_l \tag{3}$$

$$F(l,c) = \frac{2*Recall(l,c)*Precision(l,c)}{Precision(l,c)+Recall(l,c)} \tag{4}$$

$$Overall\ F = \sum_i \frac{n_i}{n} \max(F(i,c)) \tag{5}$$

where Nlc is a number of documents with original label l in classified label c;nc is number of documents classified as c and nl is number of documents in original class with label l. The equation for Entropy E used by us is following:

$$E_c = -\sum_l P(l,c) * \log(P(l,c)) \tag{6}$$

$$Overall\ E = \sum_c \frac{n_c*E_c}{n} \tag{7}$$

where, P(l,c) is the probability of documents of characterized class with name c belongs to original class with name l, and n is aggregate number of documents. As we can see from the comparisons above, exactness is measured in rate, though Precision, Recall and F-measure metric qualities range from 0 – 1. A littler worth for entropy metric is a marker of good execution of the calculation. We have additionally assessed slant aftereffects of our information utilizing the Alchemy API [16], to analyze the execution of our calculation.

8. RESULTS

We have explored diverse linguistic highlight selection, weighing and total schemes. For document-level sentiment characterization, we used the SWN (AAC) and SWN (AAAVC) plans. We calculated result of document level sentiment classification of the info collected using both these plans and also using Alchemy API. Table I intorduces the values of performance measurements obtained for our own execution formulaes and Alchemy API.

TABLE I. PERFORMANCE VALUES ON PHONE REVIEW DATASET

Method	Performance measure	Value
SWN (AAC)	Accuracy	77.6%
	F-measure	0.7642532
	Entropy	0.21800485
SWN (AAAVC)	Accuracy	78.7%
	F-measure	0.77374506
	Entropy	0.21472746
Alchemy API	Accuracy	77.4%
	F-measure	0.7778397
	Entropy	0.2068102

The table 1 introduces an examination of the conclusion name assignments by our algorithmic plans and the Alchemy API with physically marked information. We can see that out of aggregate number of 32000 real positive reviews, SWN (AAC) marks 29000 as positive, SWN (AAAVC) names 31500 and Alchemy API marks 33521 as positive. Additionally out of 18000 real negative reviews, the three algorithmic details name negative 17600, 16760 and 18000 reviews, separately. The table III presents the rate insightful notion mark task measurements by the three algorithmic plans. As should be obvious from the table, out of 50000 aggregate reviews, the SWN (AAC) marks 82% as positive, SWN (AAAVC) names 82.9% as positive and Alchemy API names 73.4% as positive. So also out of aggregate 50000 reviews, the three algorithmic definitions name negative 18%, 17.1% and 26.6% reviews, individually.

Method	*Phone Review Dataset*	
SWN (AAC)	POS	82%
	NEG	18%
SWN (AAAVC)	POS	82.9%
	NEG	17.1%
Alchemy API	POS	73.4%
	NEG	26.6%

As mentioned earlier, we have explored utilizing different weightage variables for adding the 'adverb+verb' sentiment scores to 'adverb+adjective' sentiment scores. We attempted with distinctive values for weightage variables for 'adverb+verb' consolidate from 10% to 100%.

The document-level sentiment classification results obtained by our algorithmic formual are not only accurate as compared to actual sentiment labels, but are also comparable to the results obtained by Alchemy API. Among the all three methods, SWN (AAAVC) produces the most exact results with verb score weightage factor of 30%. The SWN (AAC) strategy is closer to the performance level of SWN (AAAVC), but it's the later method which has a marginal edge

9. CONCLUSION & OBSERVATION

The document-level plans executed by us include utilization of 'Adverb+Adjective' consolidate only, and utilization of 'Adverb+Verb' combined with the 'Adverb+Adjective' combination. This is done to explore the opinionated value of distinctive linguistic features of a review and discovering a way As a result, many of the sentiment calculation were highly influenced by the tacit assumption is that a review describes about only best aggregate all the opinionated information in a review together to produce the document level sentiment summary. The results demonstrate that joining the sentiment score of 'Adverb+Verb' joins to the commonly used 'Adverb+Adjective' joined further improves the accuracy of sentiment analysis result. The best weightage factor for verb scores got through multiple experimental runs is 30%.

The aspect-level sentiment analysis algorithmic formulation designed by us is a novel and unique way of obtaining a complete sentiment profile of a phone from multiple reviews on different aspects of evaluation. The resultant sentiment profile is informative, easy to understand, and extremely useful for users. Moreover, the algorithmic formulation used for aspect-level sentiment profile is very simple, quick to implement, fast in producing results and does not require any previous training. It can be used on the run and produces very useful and detailed sentiment profile of a phone on different aspects of interest. This part of the implementation can also be used as an add-on step in phone recommendation systems that use content-filtering, collaborative-filtering or hybrid approaches. The sentiment profile can be used as an additional filtering step for designing appropriate phone recommender systems as explored earlier in [17] and [18]. This aspectlevel sentiment profiling is a valuable form of sentiment analysis and subsequent exploitation of information expressed by a large number of users about a particular phone. The only restriction with this aspect-level implementation is that it is domain specific. However, only little changes (in aspect vectors) would be required to use this algorithmic formulation in a different domain.

Our experimental work makes two important contributions. First, it explores the use of 'Adverb+Verb' combine with 'Adverb+Adjective' combine for document-level sentiment classification of a review. Second, it proposes a new feature-based heuristic scheme for aspect-level sentiment classification of a phone. The aspect level sentiment classification produces an accurate and easy to understand sentiment profile of a phone on various aspects of interest. Interestingly, the aspect-level sentiment profile result is congruent to the document level sentiment classification of reviews of a phone. Though, the aspect-level sentiment profile produces a more focused and accurate sentiment summary of a particular phone and is more useful for the users.

REFERENCES

[1] M.A. Hearst, "Untangling text data mining," Proceedings of the 37th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics on Computational Linguistics, 1999, pp. 3-10.

[2] D.J. Orre, P. Gerstl, and R. Seiffert, "Text mining: finding nuggets in mountains of textual data," Proceedings of the fifth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining, 1999, pp. 398-401.

[3] P. Falinouss, "Stock trend prediction using news articles: a text mining approach," Lule{å} tekniska universitet, 2007.

[4] M. Sharp, "Text mining," Rutgers University, School of Communication, Information and Library Studies, Allen, J. Natural Language Understanding, Second Edition. Redwood City, CA: Benjamin/Cummings, 2001, pp. 1-12.

[5] A. Khan, B. Baharudin, L.H. Lee, and K. Khan, "A Review of Machine Learning Algorithms for Text-Documents Classification," Journal of Advances in Information Technology, vol. 1, 2010, pp. 4-20.

[6] A. Khan, B. Baharudin, and K. Khan, "Sentiment Classification from Online Customer Reviews Using Lexical Contextual Sentence Structure," Communications in Computer and Information Science, Software Engineering and Computer Systems,, Springer Verlag, 2011, pp. 317-331.

[7] S. Chakrabarti, "Data mining for hypertext: A tutorial survey," ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter, vol. 1, 2000, pp. 1-11.

[8] R. Kosala and H. Blockeel, "Web mining research: A survey," ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter, vol. 2, 2000, pp. 1-15.

[9] J.M. Wiebe, "Tracking point of view in narrative," Internation Journal of Computational Linguistics, vol. 20, 1994, pp. 233-287.

[10] J. Wiebe, T. Wilson, R. Bruce, M. Bell, and M. Martin, "Learning subjective language," Internation Journal of Computational linguistics, vol. 30, 2004, pp. 277-308.

[11] J. Wiebe and E. Riloff, "Creating subjective and objective sentence classifiers from unannotated texts," Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Text Processing, 2005, pp. 486-497.

[12] J.M. Wiebe, "Learning subjective adjectives from corpora," Proceedings of the National Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 2000, pp. 735-741.

[13] B. Pang and L. Lee, "Opinion mining and sentiment analysis," Foundations and Trends Int. J Comp Sci. Emerging Tech Vol-2 No 4 August, 2011 550 in Information Retrieval, vol. 2, 2008, pp. 1-135.

[14] B. Pang, L. Lee, and S. Vaithyanathan, "Thumbs up: sentiment classification using machine learning techniques," Proceedings of the ACL-02 conference on Empirical methods in natural language processing-Volume 10, 2002, pp. 79-86.

[15] S.M. Kim and E. Hovy, "Determining the sentiment of opinions," Proceedings of the 20th international conference on Computational Linguistics, 2004, pp. 1367-1374.

[16] J.M. Wiebe, "Identifying subjective characters in narrative," Proceedings of the 13th conference on Computational linguistics-Volume 2, 1990, pp. 401-406.

[17] A. Esuli and F. Sebastiani, "Determining term subjectivity and term orientation for opinion mining," Proceedings the 11th Meeting of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (EACL-2006), 2006, pp. 193-200.

[18] S.M. Kim and E. Hovy, "Automatic detection of opinion bearing words and sentences," Companion Volume to the Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (IJCNLP), 2005, pp. 61-66.

[19] S. Bethard, H. Yu, A. Thornton, V. Hatzivassiloglou, and D. Jurafsky, "Automatic extraction of opinion propositions and their holders," 2004 AAAI Spring Symposium on Exploring Attitude and Affect in Text, 2004, pp. 2224-2236.

[20] P. Turney, "Thumbs up or thumbs down? Semantic orientation applied to unsupervised classification of reviews," Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL'02), 2002, pp. 417-424.

[21] S. Argamon, K. Bloom, A. Esuli, and F. Sebastiani, "Automatically determining attitude type and force for sentiment analysis," Human Language Technology. Challenges of the Information Society, 2009, pp. 218-231.

[22] L. Polanyi and A. Zaenen, "Contextual valence shifters," Computing attitude and affect in text: Theory and applications, 2006, pp. 1-10.

[23] S. Hariharan, R. Srimathi, M. Sivasubramanian, and S. Pavithra, "Opinion mining and summarization of reviews in web forums," Proceedings of the Third Annual ACM Bangalore Conference, 2010, pp. 1-4.

[24] C.W.K. Leung and S.C.F. Chan, "Sentiment Analysis of Product Reviews," Encyclopedia of Data Warehousing and Mining Information Science Reference,, 2008, pp. 1794-1799.

[25] A. Andreevskaia and S. Bergler, "Mining WordNet for fuzzy sentiment: Sentiment tag extraction from WordNet glosses," Proceedings of EACL, 2006, pp. 209-216.

[26] M. Koppel and J. Schler, "The importance of neutral examples for learning sentiment," Computational Intelligence, vol. 22, 2006, pp. 100-109.

[27] T. Zagibalov and J. Carroll, "Unsupervised classification of sentiment and objectivity in Chinese text," IJCNLP, 2008, pp. 304-311.

[28] B. Pang and L. Lee, "Seeing stars: Exploiting class relationships for sentiment categorization with respect to rating scales," Proceedings of the ACL, 2005, pp. 115-124.

[29] A.B. Goldberg and X. Zhu, "Seeing stars when there aren't many stars: Graph-based semi-supervised learning for sentiment categorization," Proceedings of the First Workshop on Graph Based Methods for Natural Language Processing, 2006, pp. 45-52.

[30] X. Zhu and A.B. Goldberg, "Kernel regression with order preferences," PROCEEDINGS OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE, 2007, pp. 681-686.

[31] A. Andreevskaia and S. Bergler, "When specialists and generalists work together: Overcoming domain dependence in sentiment tagging," Proceedings of ACL-08: HLT, 2008, pp. 290-298.

[32] C.W.K. Leung, S.C.F. Chan, and F. Chung, "Integrating collaborative filtering and sentiment analysis: A rating inference approach," Proceedings of The ECAI 2006 Workshop on Recommender Systems, 2006, pp. 62-66.

[33] P.D. Turney, "Mining the web for lexical knowledge to improve keyphrase extraction: Learning from labeled and unlabeled data," Int. J Comp Sci. Emerging Tech Vol-2 No 4 August, 2011 551 Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research, Arxiv preprint cs/0212011, 2002, pp. 1-34.

[34] A. Esuli and F. Sebastiani, "Determining the semantic orientation of terms through gloss classification," Proceedings of the 14th ACM international conference on Information and knowledge management, 2005, pp. 617-624.

[35] C.O. Alm, D. Roth, and R. Sproat, "Emotions from text: machine learning for text-based emotion prediction," Proceedings of the conference on Human Language Technology and Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, 2005, pp. 579-586.

[36] T. Wilson, J. Wiebe, and P. Hoffmann, "Recognizing contextual polarity in phrase-level sentiment analysis," Proceedings of the conference on Human Language Technology and Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, 2005, pp. 347-354.

[37] http://google.com

[38] http://sentiwordnet.isti.cnr.it

[39] http://www.sentiwordnet.isti.cnr.it

[40] http://www.gsmarena.com