![Gmail logo]

**fitri maya puspita <pipitmac140201@gmail.com>**

# otification for paper #1570636346 ('Improved Incentive Pricing-Based Quasi-Linear Utility Function of Wireless Networks')

2 messages

---

**fitri maya puspita** <pipitmac140201@gmail.com>        Sat, Sep 19, 2020 at 8:30 AM
To: ijeecs.iaes@gmail.com

Dear Editor,
We would like to know about the status of the paper #1570636346 ('Improved Incentive Pricing-Based Quasi-Linear Utility Function of Wireless Networks') ..since the edas.info gave different information with the email sent to me. it is said, i need to revise 3 of papers I submitted.
Please give us clearer information.

Thank you...
Regards,
Fitri Maya Puspita

--
Fitri Maya Puspita

---

**IJEECS Editor** <ijeecs.iaes@gmail.com>        Sat, Sep 19, 2020 at 10:06 AM
To: fitri maya puspita <pipitmac140201@gmail.com>

## Notify author for #1570636346: *Improved Incentive Pricing-Based Quasi-Linear Utility Function of Wireless Networks*

| | |
|---|---|
| **To:** | Fitri Maya Puspita <pipitmac140201@gmail.com> |
| **From:** | "ijeecs.iaes@gmail.com" <ijeecs.iaes=gmail.com@edas.info> |
| **Cc:** | Atika Ayu Shaputri <atikaiaes@gmail.com>, Iqbal Busthomi <iq.iaes@gmail.com>, Hendril Satrian Purnama <Lfriyan220@gmail.com>, Nooria Sukmaningtyas <nooria13@gmail.com>, Ahmad Sulaiman <ahmadsapi@gmail.com>, TH Sutikno <ts@ee.uad.ac.id>, Tole Sutikno <thsutikno@ieee.org>, Ijeecs Editor T Sutikno <ijeecs.iaes@gmail.com> |
| **Reply-to:** | ijeecs.iaes@gmail.com |
| **Subject:** | ID# 1570636346: Preparing paper for a Scopus indexed journal caliber |
| **Content-type:** | text/plain; charset=utf-8 |

```
-- Please refer to: http://citei.intconference.org/list-of-accepted-papers-and-registration/ and see at "Revisions
Required" column. This email is addressed to authors of the papers in this list.
-- Please Strictly use and follow to the template Manuscript:
-- IJEECS: http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijeecs.docx (Word Format)
-- IJAI: http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijai.docx (Word Format)
-- IJERE: http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijere.docx (Word Format)
-- Checklist for preparing your final paper for publication: http://ijeecs.iaescore.com/index.php/IJEECS
/about/editorialPolicies#custom-3 or http://ijai.iaescore.com/index.php/IJAI/about/editorialPolicies#custom-2

-- Please upload the updated paper before Oct 20, 2020

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------


Dear Dr. Fitri Maya Puspita,
```

Congratulations!! Your paper is selected for publication in one of our journals. However, after editorial team meeting and careful re-review, your paper ID #1570636346 entitled "Improved Incentive Pricing-Based Quasi-Linear Utility Function of Wireless Networks" requires MAJOR REVISIONS before being scheduled for publication in one of Scopus indexed journals. We suggest for extension and improvement on results and analysis of your paper. You are asked revise your paper seriously & carefully, and to re-submit your updated manuscript according to reviewers' comments, editors' comments, editorial office comments (http://citei.intconference.org/list-of-accepted-papers-and-registration/, see comments at "Revisions Required" column) and the guidelines for authors. The editors will re-check whether your updated paper already address the comments and  guidelines, and fulfill for a Scopus indexed journal standard. Failing to do proper revisions may lead to delays for publication and/or re-evaluation of your paper. So, please take your attention for the requirements.

The reviews are below or can be found at https://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1570636346, using your EDAS login name pipitmac140201@gmail.com.

Please submit your updated paper through EDAS system before Oct 20, 2020.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Best Regards,
Assoc. Prof. Tole Sutikno, Ph.D.
Editor-in-Chief, Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
General Chair, 2020 1st Conference on Internet of Things and Embedded Intelligence


------------------------
COMMENTS FROM REVIEWERS:
------------------------
======= Full paper review 1 =======

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.
Good (4)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the
analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.
Solid work of notable importance. (4)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.
Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.
Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

Optimization with the "Linear Program" model is much desired.
People need, because it helps formulation to find the best solution with structured.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

The writing language is mathematical. This is difficult to be understood by people who don't have the same background as the author.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

An implementation test in reality is required.
Improve your paper, especially writing in English a lot of mistakes.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Ok

======= Full paper review 2 =======

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper
within its area of research.
Acceptable (3)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.:
completeness of the
analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its
soundness and scientific rigour.
Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in
the paper.
It has been said many times before. (1)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the
completeness and accuracy of references.
Substantial revision work is needed. (2)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

(i) The optimization technique gives robust results for big data sets.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

This paper contains several flows:
(i) the topic has been researched in the past, see for instance a paper from the same authors published
in 2017, i.e., F. M. Puspita and M. Oktaryna, "Improved bundle pricing model on wireless internet
pricing scheme in serving multiple qos network based on quasi-linear utility function," 2017
International Conference on Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (ICECOS), Palembang, 2017, pp.
38-43
(ii) There are no figures to display the obtained results.
(iii) There is a lack of simulation and mathematical analysis convergence.
(iv) Lack of explanation in the obtained results presented using the numerical values.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the
paper if accepted.

The contribution of this work is marginal; it is strongly suggested to investigate new pricing methods
as well as optimization techniques to improve the open research issues in this field.
The authors are suggested to explore new tools such as Game-Theoretic Pricing, Auction-Based Pricing or
Network Utility Maximization (NUM)-based Pricing. They are also suggested to improve the formulation of
their problem and provide solutions in graphs instead of tables for their results.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording
differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes.

======= Full paper review 3 =======

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper
within its area of research.
Acceptable (3)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.:
completeness of the
analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its
soundness and scientific rigour.
Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in
the paper.
Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the
completeness and accuracy of references.
Substantial revision work is needed. (2)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

-The idea of mixing several function is good
- Parameters used in the optimisation problem are numerous and relevant.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

- The English level is low (phrase structure, grammar and spelling problems) and impairs the
understanding of the work presented in this paper.
- The model used (equation 1) is not well enough described, particularly in the meaning of each part of
the equation in the global problem that has to be optimized
- moreover, some information should be given in the bounds of equations 1.2 to 1.26
- parameters should be tracked for each iteration of the different optimization cases in tables 5 to 7
in order to see the way they are converging
- I can not make a link between this work and any practical usage. I think this point should really be
enhanced. Authors should imagine a use case with realistic numbers and solve it to highligth the
benefit of their work.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the
paper if accepted.

cf. what is described in 'weak aspects'

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording
differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

yes

======= Full paper review 4 =======

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper
within its area of research.
Acceptable (3)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.:
completeness of the
analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its
soundness and scientific rigour.
Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in
the paper.
Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the
completeness and accuracy of references.
Substantial revision work is needed. (2)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

These are some strong aspects in the paper
- the scope
- the mathematical model used

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

These are some weak aspects

- the languages is very poor
- the intro is badly written
- the scenario is very primitive
- rudimentary results shown
- conclusion is very weak

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the
paper if accepted.

- the language must be improved (some typos exist)
- more extensive results need to be carried
- the presentation of the model and the results must be changed to convey what's been developed and
what's been found

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording
differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

yes

======= Full paper review 5 =======

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper
within its area of research.
Little (2)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.:
completeness of the
analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its
soundness and scientific rigour.
Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in
the paper.
Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the
completeness and accuracy of references.
Substantial revision work is needed. (2)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

Paper combines all constraints and comes up with a more comprehensive cost function for joint
optimization. Explores better the overall trade-off space compared to previous works.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

English is awful. Sentences need to be rephrased. Statements like "the most optimal value" does not
have any meaning.
Paper is not properly motivated. Even if attempted, due to English, it is not very well expressed.
No information about how hard the optimization problem becomes when bundling issues, quasi-linear
utility function, the problem of consumers, and Reverse Charging are altogether considered jointly.
Section 2 is too short.
The problem is fixed to "2 services and 2 wireless networks" which seems to be a pretty big limitation.
In addition, the problem seems not to be extensible to the general case as Table 3 is generated based
on this assumption.
How are the numbers in Table 3 and 4 are generated? Based on data? This info is missing.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the
paper if accepted.

The paper needs to be rewritten based on the weak aspects.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording
differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes.

======= Full paper review 6 =======

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper
within its area of research.
Acceptable (3)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.:
completeness of the
analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its
soundness and scientific rigour.
Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in
the paper.
Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the
completeness and accuracy of references.
Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

This paper focuses on interesting topics on the pricing incentive model of the internet.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

There are a lot of parameters shown in the paper. However, descriptions or the roles on the parameters
are not sufficient.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the
paper if accepted.

Several typos are seen in the paper. For example, line 8 of section 3, 'ALstly' is considered a typo.
Besides this, a couple of typos are seen. All the typos need to be corrected.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording
differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes.

======= Full paper review 7 =======

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper
within its area of research.
Good (4)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.:
completeness of the
analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its
soundness and scientific rigour.
Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in
the paper.
Significant original work and novel results. (4)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the
completeness and accuracy of references.
Well written. (4)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

1. The paper is well written clearly justifying the work carried out by them.

2. Analysis of proposed work is presented in fair manner.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

more comparison with previous work may be added.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

1. Formatting issue(Column width) in the Introduction heading needs to be rectified.
2. The Citations may be written in [11-16] fashion.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

yes

======= Full paper review 8 =======

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.
Acceptable (3)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.:
completeness of the
analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its
soundness and scientific rigour.
Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.
Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.
Substantial revision work is needed. (2)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

This is a relevant topic for the conference. However, you have to improve the way of presentation.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

There are several typo errors. Some of the sentences need complete reorganization. The state-of-the-art is very poorly written. So, provide a good state-of-the-art in the final version. Other sections are also not properly organized.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

This paper is relevant for the conference. However the presentation is poor. So please rewrite the paper considering the other feedback provided above.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes, I think so.

======= Full paper review 9 =======

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.
Acceptable (3)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.:

completeness of the
analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its
soundness and scientific rigour.
Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in
the paper.
Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the
completeness and accuracy of references.
Substantial revision work is needed. (2)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

The paper attempts to address the critical issue of Internet usage pricing that focuses on the user but
still taking into the consideration the need for the ISPs to make profit and remain in business of
providing services

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

The mode of presentation and use of language diminishes the ease of appreciating the essence of the
work.
Most of the concepts used are well known in literature but utilized fairly well in the incentive
pricing model
There is the need to be explicit in describing certain assertion(s), e.g. "The calculation of this
model is divided into four cases which is based on whether to increase 〚PQ〛_ij or to increase x or
otherwise". It is NOT apparent to me what the four cases are and what "or otherwise" means.
It is NOT apparent what the source(s) of Tables 3 & 4 are or whether they are just hypothetical

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the
paper if accepted.

1) Substantial editorial revision to improve of language (structure & form)
2) Improvement in the structure of the paper especially in the way of presenting mathematical
expressions. It is untidy mixing up equations in text lines
3) There is a need to critically review the list of those constraints (1.1-1.26). They seem too many
and some are "building up" like Si
4) It has to be clear as to the source of data used, especially considering Tables 3 & 4

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording
differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes

======= Full paper review 10 =======

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper
within its area of research.
Acceptable (3)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.:
completeness of the
analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its
soundness and scientific rigour.
Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in
the paper.
Minor variations on a well investigated subject. (2)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the
completeness and accuracy of references.
Substantial revision work is needed. (2)

> \*\*\* Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

The authors attempted to introduce an incentive pricing model for wireless network users.

> \*\*\* Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

Extensive Grammar editing is required.

> \*\*\* Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

The paper needs a thorough grammar editing to make it readable.

> \*\*\* Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes

```
---------------------------------------------------
COMMENTS FROM EDITORS: GUIDELINES FOR REVISIONS
---------------------------------------------------
```
For ORIGINAL/RESEARCH Paper Type, the paper should be presented with IMRaD model:
1. Introduction (I)
2. The Proposed Method/Algorithm/Procedure specifically designed (optional). Authors may present complex proofs of theorems or non-obvious proofs of correctness of algorithms after introduction section (obvious theorems & straightforward proofs of existing theorems are NOT needed).
3. Method (M)
4. Results and Discussion (RaD)
5. Conclusion.
We will usually expect a minimum of 25-30 references primarily to journal papers, depending on the length of the paper (number of minimum references = 2n+10, n=page length). Citations of textbooks should be used very rarely and citations to web pages should be avoided. REMOVE ALL LOCAL REFERENCES. All cited papers should be referenced within the text of the manuscript. Choose ONLY the most important figures and/or tables, and prepare all figures in high quality images. Avoid paper with too many Figures and/or Tables. Figures and Tables are each MAX 4 entries.

For REVIEW Paper Type, the paper should present a critical and constructive analysis of existing published literature in a field, through summary, classification, analysis and comparison. The function and goal of the review paper is:
1) to organize literature;
2) to evaluate literature;
3) to identify patterns and trends in the literature;
4) to synthesize literature; or
5) to identify research gaps and recommend new research areas.
The structure of a review paper includes:
1. Title – in this case does not indicate that it is a review article.
2. Abstract – includes a description of subjects covered.
3. Introduction should be presented within 3-6 paragraphs, includes a description of context (ex: paragraph 1-3), motivation for review (ex: paragraph 4, sentence 1) and defines the focus (ex: paragraph 4, sentences 2-3)
4. Body – structured by headings and subheadings
5. Conclusion – states the implications of the findings and an identifies possible new research fields
6. References ("Literature Review") – organised by number in the order they were cited in the text. Number of minimum references for review paper is 50 references (included minimum 40 recently journal articles).

We would like also your cooperation with the double check of your revised paper:
```
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```
(1) TEMPLATE- Please Strictly use and follow to the template Manuscript:
-- IJEECS: http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijeecs.docx (Word Format)
-- IJAI: http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijai.docx (Word Format)
-- IJERE: http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijere.docx (Word Format)

(2) Authors may present complex proofs of theorems or non-obvious proofs of correctness of algorithms after introduction section (obvious theorems & straightforward proofs of existing theorems are NOT needed).

(3) Introduction section within 3-6 paragraphs: explain the context of the study and state the precise objective. An Introduction should contain the following three (3) parts:
- Background: Authors have to make clear what the context is. Ideally, authors should give an idea of the state-of-the art of the field the report is about.
- The Problem: If there was no problem, there would be no reason for writing a manuscript, and definitely no reason for reading it. So, please tell readers why they should proceed reading. Experience shows that for this part a few lines are often sufficient.
- The Proposed Solution: Now and only now! - authors may outline the contribution of the manuscript. Here authors have to make sure readers point out what are the novel aspects of authors work.
Authors should place the paper in proper context by citing relevant papers. At least, 15 references (recent journal articles) are cited in this section to explain gap of analysis and to support your state of the art.

(4) Method section: the presentation of the experimental methods should be clear and complete in every detail facilitating reproducibility by other scientists.

(5) Results and discussion section: The presentation of results should be simple and straightforward in style. This section report the most important findings, including results of statistical analyses as appropriate and comparisons to other research results. Results given in figures should not be repeated in tables. This is where the author(s) should explain in words what he/she/they discovered in the research. It should be clearly laid out and in a logical sequence. This section should be supported suitable references.

(6) (URGENT)!!! About Figures & Tables in your manuscript:
- Because tables and figures supplement the text, all tables and figures should be REFERENCED in the text. Authors MUST EXPLAIN what the reader should look for when using the table or figure. Focus only on the important point the reader should draw from them, and leave the details for the reader to examine on her own.
- Tables are to be presented with single horizontal line under: the table caption, the column headings and at the end of the table. All tables are produced by creating tables in MS Word. Captured tables are NOT allowed.
- All figures MUST in high quality images

(7) Conclusion section: Summarize sentences the primary outcomes of the study in a paragraph. Are the claims in this section supported by the results, do they seem reasonable? Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and to earlier research? Does the article support or contradict previous theories? Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward?

(8) Most importantly, please ensure the similarity score is less than 25%. You can refer to EDAS to see the similarity score of your paper. Any paper with a similarity score of more than 25% will be dropped. Please make sure your revised paper follow this rule. If the similarity score of final version is more than 25%, the Editors has the right to cancel the paper to be published in one of our Scopus indexed journals.

(9) Please ensure the maximum page of your final paper is 8-page, but still allowed up to 12 pages (required to pay an extra fee).

[Quoted text hidden]