Thanks for the detailed responses to my previous comments. This article has been improved significantly compared to the previous version, but it still needs much hard work before being published in PeerJ Computer Science. Below are my comments on the revised version.

1. *Used English: The language used still needs significant improvement. The list of issues I gave you in the first version is just a sample. The article still suffers from ambiguities,* typos, *grammatical mistakes*, and misplaced or missing *punctuation*. Some of the a*dditional issues in the revised version include (**but are not limited to**) the following.*
   - " to select a more inexpensive"
   - By analyzing and processing travelers' comments, the tourism industry prompts scenic
   - 41 spots to identify problems …'
   - "This method, which::is based: on: a model of an artificial neural network,"
   - analyzed the effects of classification results with different parameters and word vectors.
   - "After obtaining the word vector matrix, and then in the hybrid neural network
   - layers, we use"

2. ***New comment.*** *In your answer to comment 4 about the benefit of combining CNN and LSTM, my question is which part is responsible for capturing global semantic features and which one captures the local features. Still, the point needs to be clarified.*
3. ***New comment.*** *In your response to comment 5, the expression "input classification" is unusual. I understand that you mean the classification of the review that has been fed as an input to the network, but it is not usually expressed this way.,*
4. ***New comment*** *about your response to Comment 7. Even though the abstract has been improved, it still has issues. For example, "*To further enhance the classification accuracy and applicability of the model*," You didn't mention any models prior to this sentence you can refer to. Besides* ("from Transformers (BERT)"*), instead of using this, you can simply say, from "BERT, a transformer-based model", as you have only used BERT. Additionally, the sentence "*Moreover, it indicates that our model for sentiment analysis is reasonable and effective*." is subjective.*
5. ***A new comment*** *about your repose to comment 9, you compare (in the updated sentence) the text SA to the traveling-related reviews, and these are not comparable. You may compare these reviews to other types of reviews. Besides, you need to support this assertion. Personally, I believe the reviews are always subjective.*
6. ***New comment (line 52)****: What do you mean by* "sentiment words"? Do *you mean the words of the review, the review and the sentiment are not the same? The sentiment is the opinion expressed through writing a review.*
7. ***New comment (line 64),*** *what do you mean by* "After model optimization,:: it was"?

8. ***New comment about your response to comment 11****. In your revised text that you added as comment 11 (from the first review round), you mention that* "The fundamental models CNN and LSTM (long short-term memory) have poor feature extraction abilities, cannot extract deep-text sentiment features adequately, and cannot identify critical elements that

have a more significant influence on sentiment tendency." *How do you support this claim?!!!*

9. ***New comment.*** *Same note about your response to comment 12, how do you support your claim?*
10. ***Table 1 needs to be supported with more information about the related work, such as the used datasets (names, sizes), the domain and some sort of experimental results.***
11. ***A new comment*** *about your response to Comment 26. The table also should display information about the training/dev/ testing splitting.*
12. ***New comment*** *about your response to Comment 29. I don't think that using the term "quantity" is accurate here.*
13. ***A new comment*** *about your response to Comment 32. I don't believe that adding the results of individual epochs makes any difference regarding my concern, it may give us insights about the training behavior, but we care more about the final reported results when comparing the method to the baselines.*
14. ***New comment. There are a LOT of unsupported claims in this article, besides the claims mentioned above; please check this:*** "It is
15. more advantageous in processing long sequences of text and alleviates the gradient disappearance phenomenon."
16. ***The activation function is called ReLU, not Rule (line 363)***