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Abstract: Analysis of sentiment’s or opinion mining is one of the major challenge of NLP (natural language processing). Business Analytics plays a major role in the present scenario with a view to improve their business. These human beings especially relies upon on reviews about their product to resist in the marketplace and information analytics which can give us an excellent insight on what to expect in the future. Opinions can be referred to, with which futures opinions can be expected. Few words or terms can determine outcomes or results. As maximum of these business people try to improve their business to get maximum profit by selling quality products. So, in this regard sentiment analysis has gain a whole lot attention in current years. SA is an area of study within NLP which is used in identifying the view or opinion of a particular feature inside a content i.e., text. This paper is based on the different techniques used to classify a specified text according to the views expressed in it, i.e. whether a person’s overall mentality is negative or positive or neutral. We also examine the two-advance methods (feature classification followed by polarity classification) followed along with the experimental results. Finally in this paper we compared 3 ML classification techniques 1) SVM, 2) Naive Bayes (NB) 3) Logistic Regression with Hybrid Algorithm in which hybrid algorithm gives more accuracy when compared with the other 3 ML algorithms.
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I. INTRODUCTION:

Social websites such as Twitter, Facebook and Blogs, LinkedIn, etc. have become an significant forum for people to communicate their valuable opinions on some subjects. Various opportunities and challenging circumstances have been lifted with such platforms to effectively employ multiple approaches to draw and acknowledge the opinions of others. The internet social web documents feedback assessment has a variety of uses like customer reviews for film, brand, facilities and alertness. The tweet SA is the favorable or bad or neutral classification of tweets. Sentiment analysis relying on Lexicon related to the appearance in reports of favorable words. Lexicon has distinguishing characteristics including voice tagging, emotion values, sentence subjectivity and many others. The Tweet Sentiment analysis notes the use of these characteristics given by these lexicons. The use of this is enabled by averaging the emotions of phrases to achieve maximum polarity of tweet the machine learning method of sentiment analysis needs the classification to be developed with marked instances through practice.

This requires first collecting a data set with positive, negative and neutral capacities and extracting the sentences from this data set, then teaching the rule selection based on instances that is one of the most prevalent on social networking sites [4]. Sometimes individuals publish a tweeting activity online on social websites. Tweets are dynamic and precious as a result of the number of internet social websites [7]. As a result, social pages are one of the most valuable places for opinions on all topics. This enables computer scientists to assess their emotions and expand the routes to mining facts. These data may be used in marketing, sales or polling assessments. Comments can be collected in a timely fashion by comparing human email social sites on the Internet [1, 2, and 3]. In order to build unsourced public opinion polls on important social subjects, scientists can use the information sets [1]. Twitter and Facebook and other social websites have become a powerful instrument for the public to engage in politics, the media and businesses.

Certain responsibilities have become almost practicable with the continuing development of techniques of data assessment. The credibility of information and results is larger than anticipated. In general, manual studies and polls are not confidential, while the human error range for data mining and subsequent evaluation may be far less or insignificant. People log in to social media sites in order to post or comment on their opinions and thoughts, after any case, action or social unrest. Social media is strongly used to spread social recognition of crimes, diseases and epidemics. Online social websites have become a solid and reliable product not only for clients, but also for researchers. Consolidated information can provide excellent visual characteristics on human criticism. Social media, particularly on internet social sites, exhibit the notable viewpoint of the public [1]. Sentimental analysis is a field of how documents express feeling and criticism. Methods for emotional classification is based completely on rules-based lexicons, which gadgets gain comprehension and employ strong teaching strategies [2]. The technique for classification of tweets on pre-consistent guidelines is called method-based strategies. The method used to determine action directions by opinion sentences or the lexicon is primarily referred to as the technique based on lexicons [1]. Together with the lexicon strategies, directives centered completely on technical strategies are extremely precise, but we must not forget small [2] guidelines. Emoticons, informal languages and abbreviations may match undetected textual data or unclassified in the lexicon-based method, "Apple, in comparison with Samsung, is a good in terms of a particular function, for specific feature.
However, it could be classified as neutral or not by a classifier using a fully lexicon-based technique. Although these sentences can be described, but it is hard to categorize [2] due to a steady exchange of their use. The mechanism to interpret the technique used for assessing feelings [4, 8]. This procedure enables the classifier to decide positives and negative and neutral emotions in the phrases and documents classified by training [4, 8]. In addition, every other categorization has been supplied [6] with the categories of statistical, knowledge-primarily based and hybrid methods. There may be an area for putting out hard research in comprehensive areas through computational analysis of views and feelings [7]. Therefore, a slow practice has risen to obtain the data accessible on social networks for predicting an election, applying for academic tasks, or for company, discussion, and advertising areas. The precision of sentiment analysis and predictions can be obtained through behavioral analysis based on social networks [8]. Opinion Lexicon [10] has become used to discover a complete amount of huge, neutral and bad tweets. This dataset is analyzed to understand algorithms with both monitored and unsupervised system-getting. Using the Rainbow tool [1], it applied Prind, K nearest neighbors (KNN) [1], and Naïve Bayes. Current surveys have screened that internet social sites are capable of obtaining the perception of humans from their profiles as compared to traditional methods of acquiring opinion statistics. In addition, writers of [2] suggested an algorithm to exploit emotions from tweets while thinking about a big scale of documents for evaluating emotions.

Given a collection of reviews with feature terms identified, we might prefer to accurately estimate the sentiment of every incidence of a feature term in a sentence. With one aspect per sentence, an assumption are often created that polarity among the sentence is associated with the polarity of the feature. Once multiple feature terms are present in one sentence, words related to one feature term might incorrectly be associated with another feature term, inflicting the polarities of every feature term among the sentence to aspect of another. An issue with using aspect terms one by one is that often, multiple aspect terms can confer with the identical of comparable aspects. For instance, "Best" and "Excellent" refer to the identical aspect, nonetheless are thought-about separate aspect terms. This implies that how to categorize aspect terms is challenging one planning a system to accurately rate important aspects of a review's subject. As such, we are going to concentrate on accurately distinguishing the sentiment of instances of aspect terms, instead of aggregating these terms to supply a lot of accurate view of a more general "aspect category".

**Research methodology:**
This paper predicts the star rating given to a feedback from a product consumer. We will also use features like effectiveness to enhance our prediction. In this document we consider that messages about a particular feature and judge whether it is positive, negative or neutral. To do this, the evaluation of text and phrase levels involves systems: (1) Hybrid Algorithm; (2) Support Vector Machinery (SVM). (3) Naïve Bayes (NB) (4) Logistic regression, etc... This includes classifying algorithms [7]. In this paper we use a combination of the two methods, also called as hybrid method. Typically, combinations are used for the assessment of subjectivity and then for the learning algorithm [8]. Similar strategy used in [9], which classifies the phrase in only two positive & negative categories, no neutral category generates an issue. 10] But they use distinct techniques of analyzing feelings. But these are different from our approach, we first preprocess the data to remove unwanted data from it. Then we use Lexicon dictionary for polarity identification and then use the Learning algorithm to implement this outcome. In order to determine whether a phrase is positive, negative or neutral, we follow different methods. For sentence level SA, VADER Sentiment Analysis is a favorable, for overall rating of the sentence whether it is positive negative or neutral.

**II. VADER SENTIMENT ANALYSIS**
VADER (Valence Aware Dictionary and Sentiment Reasoner) is a lexicon-based sentiment analysis method geared specifically to the feelings conveyed in social media. VADER utilizes a blend of feeling lexicon as a list of lexical features (e.g., sentences) usually labeled as either positive or negative according to their conceptual meaning. VADER has been discovered to be quite effective in coping with social media textbooks, NY Times editorials, film reviews, and item reviews, because VADER not only informs us about the Positivity and Negativity rating, but also informs us how positive or negative a feeling is.
Hybrid Approach:
The hybrid model incorporates rules-based, lexicon-based, and machine learning approaches into a unified scheme that uses the powerful fields of individual classifiers while concurrently attempting to prevent their weaknesses. Classifiers relying on rules and Lexicon have elevated accuracy but poor recall. They therefore function as the original two phases of the hybrid system. The proposed algorithm is a rule-based model for performing sentiment analysis on a per-sentence basis. The system was trained on online media text, a number of including product reviews utilizes a sentiment lexicon created with the aim of being generalizable to multiple aspect-based Sentiment Analysis domains. This makes the hybrid algorithm significantly appropriate for analyzing on-line review information. In addition, by classifying on a per-sentence basis and performing unsupervised, this algorithm can simply be applied and tested on newly-seen information and data across domains. Their sentiment lexicon was based on many existing sentiment lexicons, as well as common emoticons and acronyms. It includes valence scores (between 1 and 5) that contain data concerning sentiment intensity (how powerfully a word expresses a sentiment) additionally to sentiment polarity using VADER algorithm for generating polarity. Given a sentence, VADER algorithm calculates a polarity score to measure the sentiment intensity and polarity. 6 major heuristics are used to confirm the valence score of a given sentence.
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III. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS
For Evaluations we perform the sentiment analysis using Hybrid approach. And compare the results obtained by other algorithms like Naïve Bayes, SVM etc.

Evaluation Process:
We use measure Accuracy to evaluate the sentiment classification performance. This measure can be check against classification features such as Unigram, Bigram and Trigram with different training size.

Expected Evaluation Result:
### Table 1 – Naive-Bayer’s.

| Algorithm                  | STAR RATING | Precision | recall | f1-score | support |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----------|--------|----------|---------|
| Decision Tree Classifier   | 1           | 0.84      | 0.64   | 0.73     | 231     |
|                            | 5           | 0.92      | 0.97   | 0.95     | 995     |
|                            | micro avg   | 0.91      | 0.91   | 0.91     | 1226    |
|                            | macro avg   | 0.88      | 0.81   | 0.84     | 1226    |
|                            | weighted avg| 0.90      | 0.91   | 0.90     | 1226    |

| Hybrid Classifier          | STAR RATING | precision | recall | f1-score | support |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----------|--------|----------|---------|
|                            | 1           | 0.84      | 0.64   | 0.73     | 231     |
|                            | 5           | 0.94      | 0.98   | 0.96     | 995     |
|                            | micro avg   | 0.93      | 0.92   | 0.92     | 1226    |
|                            | macro avg   | 0.88      | 0.84   | 0.86     | 1226    |
|                            | weighted avg| 0.94      | 0.94   | 0.94     | 1226    |

| Logistic Regression        | STAR RATING | precision | recall | f1-score | support |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----------|--------|----------|---------|
|                            | 1           | 0.60      | 0.21   | 0.31     | 231     |
|                            | 5           | 0.84      | 0.97   | 0.90     | 995     |
|                            | micro avg   | 0.83      | 0.83   | 0.83     | 1226    |
|                            | macro avg   | 0.72      | 0.59   | 0.61     | 1226    |
|                            | weighted avg| 0.80      | 0.83   | 0.79     | 1226    |

| Random Forest Classifier   | STAR RATING | precision | recall | f1-score | support |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----------|--------|----------|---------|
|                            | 1           | 0.81      | 0.61   | 0.69     | 231     |
|                            | 5           | 0.91      | 0.97   | 0.94     | 995     |
|                            | micro avg   | 0.90      | 0.90   | 0.90     | 1226    |
|                            | macro avg   | 0.86      | 0.79   | 0.82     | 1226    |
|                            | weighted avg| 0.89      | 0.90   | 0.89     | 1226    |

| Decision Tree Classifier   | STAR RATING | precision | recall | f1-score | support |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----------|--------|----------|---------|
|                            | 1           | 0.81      | 0.61   | 0.69     | 231     |
|                            | 5           | 0.91      | 0.97   | 0.94     | 995     |
|                            | micro avg   | 0.90      | 0.90   | 0.90     | 1226    |
|                            | macro avg   | 0.86      | 0.79   | 0.82     | 1226    |
|                            | weighted avg| 0.89      | 0.90   | 0.89     | 1226    |

### IV. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE SCOPE:

We implemented Hybrid technique for aspect classification and polarity identification of product review using machine learning (SVM) combined with Lexicon Based approach. Our experimental results indicate that the proposed techniques have achieved about 94% accuracy when compared with the other 4 algorithms and are very promising in performing their tasks. We accept that further utilizing bigger dataset of client reviews accessible on the Internet will expand the extension and ease of use of this application.
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