
[IJAIN] Editor Decision for Paper entitled (CAE-COVIDX: Automatic Covid-19 Disease Detection Based on X-Ray Images Using Enhanced Deep Convolutional and Auto Encoder)

1 message

Prof. Dr. Yves Rybarczyk <yr@uninova.pt>
To: muh hanafi <hanafi@amikom.ac.id>
Cc: andri.pranolo@tif.uad.ac.id

Fri, Jan 1, 2021 at 5:59 AM

muh hanafi:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to International Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics, "CAE-COVIDX: Automatic Covid-19 Disease Detection Based on X-Ray Images Using Enhanced Deep Convolutional and Auto Encoder".

Our decision is: Accept with Minor Revisions

Please kindly submit the revision before TWO WEEKS after received this notification, and follow the instructions carefully,

1. Do the corrections with track changes.
2. We required 3 files as feedback, a) File with track changes corrections; b) A file without track changes (Final copy/clean copy); c) Table of correction as a response to editors/ Reviewers comments. Upload all files in *.ZIP extension file.

3. Follow IJAIN Author guidelines at
<http://ijain.org/index.php/IJAIN/about/submissions#authorGuidelines>

Please NOTED that if the author(s) not follow the feedback instruction and submit the revisions at the time, it would be editor(s) reasons to DECLINE your submission.

Should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us by email. We look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

Prof. Dr. Yves Rybarczyk
(SCOPUS ID: 6506582516, Universidad de las Americas)
yr@uninova.pt

Reviewer D:

Significance:

- How important is the work reported? Does it attack an important/difficult problem (as opposed to a peripheral/simple one)?
- Does the approach offered advance the state of the art?
- Does it involve or synthesize ideas, methods, approaches from multiple disciplines?
- Does it have interesting implications for multiple disciplines?:
Excellent

Originality: - Is this a new issue? Is this a novel approach to an issue? - Is this a novel combination of familiar ideas/techniques/methods/approaches? - Does the paper point out differences from related research? - Does the paper properly situate itself with respect to previous work?:
Good

Quality: - Is the paper technically sound? How are its claims backed up? - Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contribution?:
Good

Clarity: - Is the paper clearly written? Does it motivate the research? Does it describe clearly the methods employed (e.g., experimental procedures, algorithms, analytical tools), if any? - Are the results, if any, described and evaluated thoroughly? - Is the paper organized in a sensible and logical fashion?:
Good

Relevance:

- Is the paper closely related to the theme of the journal (broadly conceived)?
- Is the content interesting enough to a broad audience?
- Is the paper readable in a multi-disciplinary context?:
Good

Technical (1): Structure of the paper:
Good

Technical (2): Standard of English:
Good

Technical (3): Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper:
Good

Technical (4): Use and number of keywords/key phrases:
Good

Technical (5): Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables:
Good

Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:
Good

Technical (7): Reference list, adequate and correctly cited:
Good

Explanations for the above ratings and other general comments on major issues:

Abstract:

In the abstract section, it would be better if the statement "... to enhance previous work ..." is replaced by a research contribution from this research, namely "Novel method to extract image features and Novel method to classify COVID-19".

Proposed Method:

- In this section it is necessary to explain a novel method to extract image feature.
- Fig 7 needs to be explain about the method for doing image pre-processing

Evaluation Metric:

The statement "We measured precision, accuracy, and confusion matrix", does this mean "We measured precision, accuracy, and recall"?

Result and Discussion:

There is no measurement result of the Recall value.

Comments on the minor details of the article:

Expect a minimum of 30 references primarily with a minimum of 80% to journal papers published between 2017 and 2020

Reviewer F:

Significance:

- How important is the work reported? Does it attack an important/difficult problem (as opposed to a peripheral/simple one)?
- Does the approach offered advance the state of the art?
- Does it involve or synthesize ideas, methods, approaches from multiple disciplines?
- Does it have interesting implications for multiple disciplines?:

Good

Originality: - Is this a new issue? Is this a novel approach to an issue? - Is this a novel combination of familiar ideas/techniques/methods/approaches?

- Does the paper point out differences from related research? - Does the paper properly situate itself with respect to previous work?:

Good

Quality: - Is the paper technically sound? How are its claims backed up? - Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contribution?:

Good

Clarity: - Is the paper clearly written? Does it motivate the research? Does it describe clearly the methods employed (e.g., experimental procedures, algorithms, analytical tools), if any? - Are the results, if any, described and evaluated thoroughly? - Is the paper organized in a sensible and logical fashion?:

Good

Relevance:

- Is the paper closely related to the theme of the journal (broadly conceived)?

- Is the content interesting enough to a broad audience?

- Is the paper readable in a multi-disciplinary context?:

Good

Technical (1): Structure of the paper:

Good

Technical (2): Standard of English:

Fair

Technical (3): Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper:

Fair

Technical (4): Use and number of keywords/key phrases:

Good

Technical (5): Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables:

Good

Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:

Fair

Technical (7): Reference list, adequate and correctly cited:

Fair

Explanations for the above ratings and other general comments on major issues:

The paper contributes to the community that CNN and AE when combined can perform optimally.

The abstract and discussion need to be strong to reflect the paper

particularly the outcome.
The article is interesting.

Comments on the minor details of the article:
Some minor issues.

Reviewer I:

Significance:

- How important is the work reported? Does it attack an important/difficult problem (as opposed to a peripheral/simple one)?
- Does the approach offered advance the state of the art?
- Does it involve or synthesize ideas, methods, approaches from multiple disciplines?
- Does it have interesting implications for multiple disciplines?:
Excellent

Originality: - Is this a new issue? Is this a novel approach to an issue? - Is this a novel combination of familiar ideas/techniques/methods/approaches? - Does the paper point out differences from related research? - Does the paper properly situate itself with respect to previous work?:
Good

Quality: - Is the paper technically sound? How are its claims backed up? - Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contribution?:
Good

Clarity: - Is the paper clearly written? Does it motivate the research? Does it describe clearly the methods employed (e.g., experimental procedures, algorithms, analytical tools), if any? - Are the results, if any, described and evaluated thoroughly? - Is the paper organized in a sensible and logical fashion?:
Good

Relevance:

- Is the paper closely related to the theme of the journal (broadly conceived)?
- Is the content interesting enough to a broad audience?
- Is the paper readable in a multi-disciplinary context?:
Excellent

Technical (1): Structure of the paper:
Good

Technical (2): Standard of English:

Fair

Technical (3): Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper:
Good

Technical (4): Use and number of keywords/key phrases:
Good

Technical (5): Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables:
Good

Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:
Good

Technical (7): Reference list, adequate and correctly cited:
Good

Explanations for the above ratings and other general comments on major issues:

The authors have proposed a method for identifying COVID-19 based on x-ray images with the use of convolutional neural networks and auto encoder. The authors have started from a detailed review of the related research and on that basis formulated the research goal. Next, the proposed approach is presented. The proposed approach was verified experimentally with the use of publicly available dataset. During the experiments the results of the proposed approach were compared with the results of two other machine learning approaches.

Comments on the minor details of the article:

The English language should be improved when it comes to grammar and style.

International Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics (IJAIN)
ISSN 2442-6571 (print) | 2548-3161 (online)

SCOPUS Indexed Journal | SNIP 2019 = 1.4 | CiteScoreTracker 2020 = 1.5 (Last updated on 10 June, 2020)

SCOPUS: <https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100890645>

SJR 2019 = 0.17

SJR:

<https://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21100890645&tip=sid&exact=no>

Website: <http://ijain.org/index.php/IJAIN>

Contact: ijain@uad.ac.id, info@ijain.org
