
[IJAIN] Editor Decision

1 message

Andri Pranolo <andri.pranolo@tif.uad.ac.id>

To: muh hanafi <hanafi@amikom.ac.id>

Cc: ijain@uad.ac.id

Thu, Nov 22, 2018 at 2:49 PM

muh hanafi:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to International Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics, "Exploit Dynamic Convolutional-NN to Eliminate Item Sparse Data by Extract Product Review in Case E-commerce Recommendation System".

Our decision is: Accept with Major Revisions

Please kindly submit the revision before TWO WEEKS after received this notification, and make sure to follow the IJAIN Author guidelines at <http://ijain.org/index.php/IJAIN/about/submissions#authorGuidelines>.

Regards,

Andri Pranolo
(Managing Editor)

Notes:

1. Abstract should be containing a primary objective, research design, methodology, main outcomes and results, and the conclusions.
2. Section structure must be Introduction - The Proposed Method/Algorithm (optional) - Method - Results and Discussion – Conclusion
3. References must be minimum of 30 references primarily with minimum 60% to journal papers.

Reviewer B:

Significance:
Fair

Originality:
Fair

Quality:

Good

Clarity:

Fair

Relevance:

Good

Technical (1): Structure of the paper:

Fair

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:

This paper proposed a method for e-commerce based on CNN. It is quite interesting but the experiments were too limited.

As stated in Table 4, the authors need to compare their results to those of existing approaches instead of only one other method.

The English should be improved. For example, in Conclusion, "Applied of product description have proven could be increase the level of...". The grammar is incorrect.

Comments on the minor details of the article:

Ask a naive English speaker to check the grammar.

Reviewer C:

Significance:

Fair

Originality:
Fair

Quality:
Fair

Clarity:
Fair

Relevance:
Good

Technical (1): Structure of the paper:
Fair

Technical (2): Standard of English:
Poor

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

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

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

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:

1. The English language should be improved – there are lots of grammar, style and spelling errors.
2. Please better analyze the pros and cons of the proposed technique as compared to other approaches.
3. Please summarize what is new in the proposed approach as compared to other approaches.
4. Please better describe the proposed approach in such a way that it would be possible to recreate it.

Comments on the minor details of the article:

1. The equations are too large and look like images – equation editor should be used instead.
2. In Section 6 the reference should be to Table 4 (not 3).

Reviewer F:

Significance:

Good

Originality:

Fair

Quality:

Good

Clarity:

Fair

Relevance:

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:

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:

Collaborative Filtering-based Web recommendation refers to recommending services according to the past composition history, the similarity of users, or the similarity of services. I think it would be better if the author

include a similarity calculation part in textual description. Please see:
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0957417418303385>

In Sentiment Analysis, It would be better if this research must take into consideration all characters in words and not only Words. For example, important information can appear in different parts of a hash tag. Please see:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274380447_Deep_Convolutional_Neural_Networks_for_Sentiment_Analysis_of_Short_Texts

Comments on the minor details of the article:

In the Proposed Model, the word Analisis must be Analysis.

Make sure that your paper is prepared using the IJAIN paper template

International Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics (IJAIN)

ISSN 2442-6571 (print) | 2548-3161 (online)

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

Email: ijain@uad.ac.id, andri.pranolo@tif.uad.ac.id