

Intelligent Networks and Systems Society

# Review Form

International Journal of Intelligent Engineering and Systems (IJIES)

<b>Paper ID</b>	20221204
<b>Paper Title</b>	Enhance Rating Prediction for E-commerce Recommender System using Hybridization SDAE, Attention Mechanism and Probabilistic Matrix Factorization

**Recommendation for Publication**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (Evaluation A:) Accept                      | <input type="checkbox"/> (Evaluation B:) Accept after Minor Revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (Evaluation C:) Accept after Major Revision | <input type="checkbox"/> (Evaluation D:) Reject                      |

**Comments from reviewers 1 & 2:**

1. “long short term memory (LSTM) and SDAE in 1,6%” -> “long short term memory (LSTM) and SDAE in 1.6%”. The authors should distinguish between “.” and “,”.
2. “GLOVE” -> “GloVe”
3. In the Introduction part, strong points of this proposed method should be further stated and organization of this whole paper is supposed to be provided in the end.
4. To help readers’ understanding, please add equation numbers to all equations.
5. The presentation of figures is not professional. In figures, letters are too small. Enlarge or Redraw figures. e.g. see Fig. 3 and 4.
6. The equation of RMSE should be improved. See root.
7. Please provide the reference number of the article compared to the proposed method in section 3.
8. In Figs. 6 and 7, the meaning of each graph is not clear.
9. There is no X-axis label in Figs. 6 and 7.

---

1. This is well written and organized paper. It is scientifically sound and contains sufficient interest to merit publication.
2. To help readers’ understanding, the authors should add a notation list, because there are many variables in equations. Besides, the meaning of some functions are variables is not clear. The authors describes the notation of equations. However, it’s not enough.
3. Which articles did you compare with the proposed technique? Indicate the reference number in sentences. Besides, the authors must cite the compared articles in References. The reviewer fails to understand the relationship between the compared techniques and the research survey.
4. The results of this research are not clear in Conclusions. Show the scientific contribution of this work with concrete data.

---

From Editor:  
Please space one line around equations.

Please improve the reference format. This is very important for indexing service. If you did not follow the following format, your paper will be rejected automatically.

# Review Form

\*Do not use “et al.” in author names.

e.g.

[1] R. Ruskone, S. Airault, and O. Jamet, “Vehicle Detection on Aerial Images”, International Journal of Intelligent Engineering and Systems, Vol.1, No.1, pp.123-456, 2009.

(In the case of Journal Papers)

[2] R. Ruskone, L. Guigues, S. Airault, and O. Jamet, “Vehicle Detection on Aerial Images”, In: Proc. of International Conf. On Pattern Recognition, Vienna, Austria, pp.900-904, 1996.

(In the case of Conference Proceedings)

\*Note: e.g. In the case of the author name: "John Doe", express as "J. Doe". ("John" is the first name and "Doe" is the family name.)

\* \* Please send your revised manuscript with the response letter for the 2nd review. (Please highlight modifications and additions inside the paper by red font.)

Please add “Conflicts of Interest” and “Author Contributions”. (see the IJIES format.docx)

Conflicts of Interest (Mandatory)

Declare conflicts of interest or state “The authors declare no conflict of interest.” Authors must identify and declare any personal circumstances or interest that may be perceived as inappropriately influencing the representation or interpretation of reported research results.

Author Contributions (Mandatory)

For research articles with several authors, a short paragraph specifying their individual contributions must be provided. The following statements should be used as follows: “conceptualization, XXX and YYY; methodology, XXX; software, XXX; validation, XXX, YYY, and ZZZ; formal analysis, XXX; investigation, XXX; resources, XXX; data curation, XXX; writing—original draft preparation, XXX; writing—review and editing, XXX; visualization, XXX; supervision, XXX; project administration, XXX; funding acquisition, YYY”, etc. Authorship must be limited to those who have contributed substantially to the work reported.

## Evaluation of Paper

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Innovation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Innovate <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficiently Innovate <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly Innovate <input type="checkbox"/> Not Novel
	<b>Integrity</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding
	<b>Presentation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Totally Accessible <input type="checkbox"/> Mostly Accessible <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Accessible <input type="checkbox"/> Inaccessible
	<b>Technical depth</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Superficial <input type="checkbox"/> Suitable for the non-specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate for the generally knowledgeable individual working in the field <input type="checkbox"/> Suitable only for an expert
<b>Presentation &amp;</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Needs improvement <input type="checkbox"/> Poor	

# Review Form

<b>English</b>	
<b>Overall organization</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Could be improved <input type="checkbox"/> Poor

INASS