Home > User > Author > **Active Submissions**

Active Submissions

ACTIVE ARCHIVE

ID	MM-DD SUBMIT	SEC	AUTHORS	TITLE	STATUS
7665	10-04	Computer_Informatics	Amin, Stiawan, Ermatita, Budiarto	PROPOSED THRESHOLD-BASED AND RULE-BASED APPROACHES TO...	IN EDITING

1 - 1 of 1 Items

Start a New Submission

CLICK HERE to go to step one of the five-step submission process.

Refbacks

ALL NEW PUBLISHED IGNORED

	DATE ADDED	HITS	URL	ARTICLE	TITLE	STATUS	ACTION
☐	2019-11-30	265	https://scholar.google.com/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2019-12-01	2	http://scholar.google.fr/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2019-12-01	7	http://scholar.google.com/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2019-12-02	20	https://scholar.google.co.id/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2019-12-02	10	http://beei.org/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2019-12-02	3	http://scholar.google.com.br/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2019-12-04	1	http://scholar.google.co.za/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2019-12-04	3	https://scholar.google.co.za/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2019-12-10	1	https://scholar.google.com/citations?hl=en&user=...	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2019-12-10	110	https://www.google.com/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2020-01-18	1	https://scholar.google.fi/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2020-01-18	10	https://scholar.google.com.br/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE

☐	2020-01-23	2	https://scholar.google.at/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2020-02-02	1	https://www.google.com.sa/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2020-02-21	2	https://xue.xiayige.org/scholar?hl=zh-CN&as_sdt=...	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2020-02-28	1	https://scholar.google.se/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2020-03-05	1	https://scholar.google.com/scholar?start=30&q=E-...	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2020-03-12	1	https://scholar.google.co.in/scholar?oi=bibs&hl=...	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2020-03-19	2	https://scholar.google.co.kr/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2020-03-20	1	https://scholar.google.nl/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2020-03-25	3	https://scholar.google.it/	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2020-04-13	2	http://google.com/search?q=publications	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2020-05-01	1	https://www.scopus.com/record/display.uri?eid=2-...	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2020-05-05	1	https://scholar.google.com/scholar?as_ylo=2020&q...	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE
☐	2020-05-15	1	https://www.scopus.com/record/display.uri?eid=2-...	Interoperability framework for integrated e-health services	—	New	EDIT | DELETE

1 - 25 of 84 Items

1 2 3 4 > >>

Publish   Ignore   Delete   Select All

Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics

http://beei.org | ISSN 2089-3191, e-ISSN 2302-9285

Q3
SJR 2022 0.299
SNIP 2022 0.639

CiteScore 2022 **3.0**

HOME   ABOUT   USER HOME   SEARCH   CURRENT   ARCHIVES   ANNOUNCEMENTS

Home > User > Author > Submissions > #7665 > Review

#7665 Review

SUMMARY   **REVIEW**   EDITING

Submission

Authors	M. Miftakul Amin, Deris Stiawan, Ermatita Ermatita, Rahmat Budiarto
Title	Proposed threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database
Section	Computer and Informatics Engineering
Editor	Hamid Alinejad-Rokny (Review) Arcangelo Castiglione (Review) Vicente Garcia Diaz (Review) Ahmad Hoirul Basori (Review) Taghi Javdani Gandomani (Review)

Peer Review

Round 1

Review Version	7665-18151-1-RV.DOCX 2023-10-04
Initiated	2023-10-05
Last modified	2024-01-06
Uploaded file	None

Editor Decision

Decision	Accept Submission 2024-02-11
Notify Editor	Editor/Author Email Record 2024-02-23
Editor Version	None
Author Version	7665-19633-1-ED.DOCX 2024-01-28 DELETE 7665-19633-2-ED.DOCX 2024-01-28 DELETE 7665-19633-3-ED.DOCX 2024-02-22 DELETE 7665-19633-4-ED.DOCX 2024-02-22 DELETE 7665-19633-5-ED.PDF 2024-02-22 DELETE
Upload Author Version	Browse... No file selected. Upload

03305075

Bulletin of EEI Stats

USER

You are logged in as...
deris
- My Profile
- Log Out

CITATION ANALYSIS
- Dimensions
- Google Scholar
- Scholar Metrics
- Scinapse
- Scopus

QUICK LINKS
- Editorial Boards
- Reviewers
- Abstracting and Indexing
- Guide of Authors
- **Online Papers Submission**
- **Peer Review Process**
- **Publication Fee**
- Publication Ethics
- Visitor Statistics
- DOI Deposit Report
- Contact Us

AUTHOR

Submissions
- Active (1)
- Archive (1)
- New Submission

HOW TO SUBMIT

How to submit a pap...

JOURNAL CONTENT

Search

Search Scope
All

Search

Browse
- By Issue
- By Author
- By Title

INFORMATION
- For Readers
- For Authors
- For Librarians

Editor/Author Correspondence

Editor	Subject: [EEI] Editor Decision - Revisions required	**DELETE**

2024-01-20
12:50 PM

-- Paper ID# 7665
-- Strictly adhere to the guidelines for authors https://iaescore.com/gfa/beei.docx
-- Also please read: https://bit.ly/35R6JTs and https://bit.ly/2DxU9MI

Dear Prof. Dr. Deris Stiawan,

We have reached a decision regarding your submission entitled "Proposed threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database" to Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics, a Scopus(Elsevier)/ScimagoJR indexed journal, CiteScore: 3.0, SNIP: 0.639, and SJR: 0.299.

Our decision is: revisions required

Please revise your paper (in MS Word or LATEX file format) in consideration of reviewers' comments and in strict accordance with the authors' guide (available at https://iaescore.com/gfa/beei.docx or https://iaescore.com/gfa/beei.rar for LATEX file format), and and follow the checklist for preparing your FINAL paper for publication: https://beei.org/index.php/EEI/about/editorialPolicies#custom-3, also make sure it is free of spelling and grammar errors. Failing to do proper revision may lead to the rejection of your paper.

I hope to receive your highlighted updated manuscript as soon as possible (within 8 weeks).

Thank you

Best Regards,
Prof. Dr. Ir. Tole Sutikno, ASEAN Eng.
Universitas Ahmad Dahlan
beei@iaescore.com
http://beei.org/index.php/EEI

:: M.Eng. (S2) in Electrical Engineering (Intelligent Systems Engineering) ::

Want to study Master's Program of Electrical Engineering at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta? In our Master of Electrical Engineering in Intelligent Systems Engineering (ISE) program, you will gain technical expertise in computational engineering and artificial intelligence—the future of engineering and problem solving. Please take a look at the attached flyer #1 (https://s.id/1G0O8) or flyer #2 (https://s.id/1G0On).

Reviewer A:

Does the title of the paper accurately reflect the major focus contribution of this paper? Is the abstract an appropriate and adequate digest of the work? Is the paper clear, concise, and well organized?

Please suggest change of the title as appropriate, and how should authors organize their paper
:

How does this paper show the rate of contribution strength and scientific quality to the field? Do authors place the paper in proper context by citing relevant papers? Is the paper free from obvious errors, misconceptions, or ambiguity? Is the paper written in correct English? Please note grammatical errors and suggest corrections:

Please mark approite scale for the overall grade for this paper?:
Good

Reviewer's comments and suggestions how to improve the paper
:

Explain your "Proposed threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database" in greater detail , so that it is clear and complete for other scientists to reproduce.

- In Figure 5, we want to make sure, is it correct to use commas? because in English thousands use commas (1,234) and decimals use dots (0.123). Please use the original file, not screenshots, as well as Figure 6 to Figure 9.
- Figure 1 is a little blurry, so the writing is a little broken. It is better to increase the resolution of the figure again so that the writing is clear (not broken).
- Figure 7 is not mentioned in the body text, it is better to mention Figure 7 first then show Figure 7 below it. The same applies to the other figures.
- Table 3 should be mentioned first in the body text, then display Table 3 below it. The same applies to other tables.

Reviewer B:

Does the title of the paper accurately reflect the major focus contribution of this paper? Is the abstract an appropriate and adequate digest of the work? Is the paper clear, concise, and well organized?

Please suggest change of the title as appropriate, and how should authors organize their paper
:

How does this paper show the rate of contribution strength and scientific quality to the field? Do authors place the paper in proper context by citing relevant papers? Is the paper free from obvious errors, miscomceptions, or ambiguity? Is the paper written in correct English? Please note grammatical errors and suggest corrections:

Please mark approite scale for the overall grade for this paper?:
Good

Reviewer's comments and suggestions how to improve the paper
:

- In Table 2, Figures 4-9, we just want to make sure whether or not to use commas ? because in English, thousands use commas (6,190) and decimals use periods (6.190).
- Please provide the DOIs of the references (if any).

_____
Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics
http://beei.org

| Author | Subject: Proposed threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database | DELETE |

2024-01-28 06:26 PM

Dear Editors,

We have tried to improve the manuscript according to the instructions given. Directions Revisions from Reviewer A are highlighted in Turquoise, and Revisions from Reviewer B are highlighted in Yellow in the manuscript.

Thus we have revised our manuscript, hopefully it can fulfill the reviewers' directions.

Best regards

Author(s)
_____

Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics
http://beei.org

Author
2024-01-28
06:27 PM

Subject: [EEI] Paper ID #7665 revisions Required   **DELETE**
_____

Dear Editors,

We have tried to improve the manuscript according to the instructions given. Directions
Revisions from Reviewer A are highlighted in Turquoise, and Revisions from Reviewer B are
highlighted in Yellow in the manuscript.

Thus we have revised our manuscript, hopefully it can fulfill the reviewers' directions.

Best regards
Author(s)
_____

Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics
http://beei.org

Editor
2024-02-11
03:39 PM

Subject: [EEI] Accepted - Scopus-indexed CiteScore: 3.0, SNIP: 0.639, and SJR: **DELETE**
0.299
_____

-- Paper ID# 7665

Dear Prof. Dr. Deris Stiawan,

It is my great pleasure to inform you that your paper entitled "Proposed threshold-based and
rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database" is initially
ACCEPTED and will be published on the Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics
(BEEI), ISSN: 2089-3191, e-ISSN: 2302-9285, http://beei.org. This journal is indexed by
Scopus (https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100826382) and ScimagoJR (https://
www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21100826382&tip=sid&clean=0). Congratulations!

Please prepare your final camera-ready paper (in MS Word file format), adhere to every
detail of the final checklist at https://beei.org/index.php/EEI/about/editorialPolicies#custom-4,
and check it for spelling and grammatical mistakes. For your information, according to
international regulations, the similarity score of camera-ready paper should be less than 25%.
A single author is NOT acceptable, and will never publish in this journal. The editor(s) will
decide whether or not your camera-ready paper is complete and meets the final checklist.
Please present each reference as completely as possible while adhering to IEEE style
(including volume, number, pages, and DOIs). Failing to make a proper revision may lead to
the delay of your paper for publication, even may lead to the rejection of your paper.

Please submit your documents below by replying this email within 6 weeks.
1. Final paper (MS Word file format, or LATEX source files)
2. Similarity report (by Turnitin or iThenticate)

Authors also should write "research grant or contract" in the acknowledgement section.

After you submit your documents and your final paper meets the final guidelines, you will be
granted "fully accepted" status.

Your cooperation is very appreciated

Best Regards,
Prof. Dr. Ir. Tole Sutikno, ASEAN Eng.
Universitas Ahmad Dahlan
beei@iaescore.com
http://beei.org

:: M.Eng. (S2) in Electrical Engineering (Intelligent Systems Engineering) ::

Want to study Master's Program of Electrical Engineering at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan,
Yogyakarta? In our Master of Electrical Engineering in Intelligent Systems Engineering (ISE)
program, you will gain technical expertise in computational engineering and artificial
intelligence—the future of engineering and problem solving. Please take a look at the
attached flyer #1 (https://s.id/1G0O8) or flyer #2 (https://s.id/1G0On).

Reviewer A:

Results and Discussion section:

An excellent discussion is well-organized. A rigorous and concise discussion section is one of
the keys to achieving an excellent paper. It serves as a critical platform to interpret and
connect your findings with the broader scientific context.
The structure presented below is a traditional 6-step approach for composing a well-crafted
discussion section.
1). Introduction—mention gaps in previous research
Example: This study investigated the effects of ".....". While earlier studies have explored the
impact of ".....", they have not explicitly addressed its influence on ".....".
2). Summarizing key findings—let your data speak
Example: We found that "....." correlates with ".....". The proposed method in this study
tended to have an inordinately higher proportion of "....." as ".....".
3). Interpreting results—compare with other papers
Example: Our study suggests that higher "....." is not associated with poor performance in
"....." . The proposed method may benefit from "....." without adversely impacting ".....".
4). Addressing limitations—their potential impact on the results
Example: This study explored a comprehensive "....." with ".....". However, further and in-
depth studies may be needed to confirm its ".....", especially regarding ".....".
5). Implications for future research—how to explore further
Example: Our study demonstrates that"....." are more resilient than ".....". Future studies may
explore "....." with feasible ways of producing ".....".
6). Conclusion—summarize content
Example: Recent observations suggest that the ".....". Our findings provide conclusive
evidence that this phenomenon is associated with "....." change, not due to elevated numbers
of ".....".

Reviewer B:

1. Identify the key findings and justify their novelty and contribution to the work.
2. The contribution and novelty are not clearly defined; the author should rewrite some
sections to emphasize the originality and novelty proposed.
3. Clearly explain how your solution improves existing approaches.
4. The abstract and conclusion need to be improved. Neither the abstract nor the conclusion
adequately addressed the manuscript's motivation and achievements.
5. The abstract is overly broad and was not prepared objectively. It should briefly highlight the
paper's novelty, such as the main problem, how it was solved, and where the novelty lies.
6. In the abstract, the author should go into greater detail about the proposed approach.
7. A related works section should be included, and the contribution should be placed in
context with previous work.
8. The descriptions provided in this proposed scheme are insufficient; this manuscript only
used a variety of existing methods to complete the experiment, which lacks strong
hypotheses or methodical theoretical arguments. As a result, the reviewer believes that this
paper requires additional work.
9. The author should compare the proposed algorithm to other recent works and provide a
discussion. Otherwise, the reader may struggle to identify the work's novelty and contribution.
10. The proposed model should be compared to existing approaches.
11. The author should justify and elaborate on the obtained results.
12. Despite the brief discussion, it is insufficient to establish a fair and accurate comparison.
The proposed method should clearly state why it is superior to others.
13. Please identify some drawbacks and suggestions for future research to improve the
technique.

_____

Author 2024-02-22 07:18 PM	Subject: Proposed threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database	**DELETE**

Dear Editors,

We have tried to improve the manuscript according to the instructions given. Directions Revisions from Reviewer A are highlighted in Turquoise, and Revisions from Reviewer B are highlighted in Yellow, and Overlapping suggestions will be colored bright green in the manuscript.

Also attached the camera-ready paper similarity score which less than 25%.

Thus we have revised our manuscript, hopefully it can fulfill the reviewers' directions.

Best regards
Author(s)

_____

Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics
http://beei.org

Editor 2024-02-23 11:24 PM	Subject: [EEI] Accepted - Scopus-indexed CiteScore: 3.0, SNIP: 0.639, and SJR: 0.299	**DELETE**

-- Paper ID# 7665

Dear Mr. M. Miftakul Amin ,

It is my great pleasure to inform you that your paper entitled "Proposed threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database" is ACCEPTED and will be published on the Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics (BEEI), ISSN: 2089-3191, e-ISSN: 2302-9285, http://beei.org. This journal is indexed by Scopus (https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100826382) and ScimagoJR (https://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21100826382&tip=sid&clean=0). Congratulations!

Authors also should write "research grant or contract" in the acknowledgement section.

Your cooperation is very appreciated

Best Regards,
Prof. Dr. Ir. Tole Sutikno, ASEAN Eng.
Universitas Ahmad Dahlan
beei@iaescore.com
http://beei.org

:: M.Eng. (S2) in Electrical Engineering (Intelligent Systems Engineering) ::

Want to study Master's Program of Electrical Engineering at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta? In our Master of Electrical Engineering in Intelligent Systems Engineering (ISE) program, you will gain technical expertise in computational engineering and artificial intelligence—the future of engineering and problem solving. Please take a look at the attached flyer #1 (https://s.id/1G0O8) or flyer #2 (https://s.id/1G0On).

Each accepted paper will be charged USD 315 to cover a portion of the registration fee. This fee is for the first eight pages of a published manuscript; any additional pages will cost USD50. Indonesian authors should transfer in IDR instead of USD. (Please refer to https://www.xe.com for the exchange rate).

The payment should be made by bank transfer (T/T):

Bank Account name/Beneficiary (please be exact): TOLE SUTIKNO
Bank Name: Bank Syariah Indonesia (PT Bank Syariah Indonesia Tbk)*
Branch Office: Yogyakarta Kusumanegara
City: Yogyakarta
Country: Indonesia
Bank Account/Beneficiary Account Number #: 7168633321

SWIFT Code (BIC) / IBAN: BSMDIDJAXXX
*Predecessors: Bank Syariah Mandiri (PT Bank Syariah Mandiri Tbk)
see: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bank_Syariah_Indonesia

or as alternative, you can pay by using PayPal to email: info@iaesjournal.com

----
_____
Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics
http://beei.org

Close

Response to Reviewers' Comments
Title:
Proposed threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database
Paper ID: 7665-18151

Revisions from Reviewer A are highlighted in Turquoise, and Revisions from Reviewer B are highlighted in Yellow, and Overlapping suggestions will be colored bright green in the manuscript.

Reviewer: 1 (A)

No.	Comments	Responses
1	Introduction—mention gaps in previous research Example: This study investigated the effects of ".....". While earlier studies have explored the impact of ".....", they have not explicitly addressed its influence on ".....".	Gaps from previous research have been presented in the last paragraph of the introduction section.
2	Summarizing key findings—let your data speak Example: We found that "....." correlates with ".....". The proposed method in this study tended to have an inordinately higher proportion of "....." as ".....".	Arguments regarding the research findings have been presented in the last paragraph of the results and discussion section.
3	Interpreting results—compare with other papers Example: Our study suggests that higher "....." is not associated with poor performance in "....." . The proposed method may benefit from "....." without adversely impacting ".....".	an additional explanation of the comparison with other papers is provided in the last 3 paragraphs of the results and discussion section.
4	Addressing limitations—their potential impact on the results Example: This study explored a comprehensive "....." with ".....". However, further and in-depth studies may be needed to confirm its ".....", especially regarding ".....".	The limitations of the research have been mentioned in paragraph 2 of the conclusion section followed by future work from this research.
5	Implications for future research—how to explore further Example: Our study demonstrates that"....." are more resilient than ".....". Future studies may explore "....." with feasible ways of producing ".....".	Some drawbacks and suggestions have been added at the end of the section conclusion paragraph.
6	Conclusion—summarize content Example: Recent observations suggest that the ".....". Our findings provide conclusive evidence that this phenomenon is associated with "....." change, not due to elevated numbers of ".....".	The conclusion has summarized the research results in more detail based on the results and discussion section in the first paragraph of the conclusion section.

Reviewer: 2 (B)

No.	Comments	Responses
1	Identify the key findings and justify their novelty and contribution to the work.	key findings and novelty have been presented in the last paragraph of the introduction section.
2	The contribution and novelty are not clearly defined; the author should rewrite some sections to emphasize the originality and novelty proposed.	A more detailed description of the approach proposed in this study has been presented in the 2nd paragraph of section 3.2 of the comparison stage.
3	Clearly explain how your solution improves existing approaches.	An explanation of the performance improvement of the proposed model is provided in the last 3 paragraphs of the results and discussion section.
4	The abstract and conclusion need to be improved. Neither the abstract nor the conclusion adequately addressed the manuscript's motivation and achievements.	Suggested improvements have been added to the abstract and conclusion.
5	The abstract is overly broad and was not prepared objectively. It should briefly highlight the paper's novelty, such as the main problem, how it was solved, and where the novelty lies.	Suggested improvements have been added to the abstract.
6	In the abstract, the author should go into greater detail about the proposed approach.	Suggested improvements have been added to the abstract.
7	A related works section should be included, and the contribution should be placed in context with previous work.	A related works has been described in paragraph 9 to paragraph 15 in the Introduction section.
8	The descriptions provided in this proposed scheme are insufficient; this manuscript only used a variety of existing methods to complete the experiment, which lacks strong hypotheses or methodical theoretical arguments. As a result, the reviewer believes that this paper requires additional work.	an additional explanation of the comparison with other works is provided in the last 3 paragraphs of the results and discussion section.
9	The author should compare the proposed algorithm to other recent works and provide a discussion. Otherwise, the reader may struggle to identify the work's novelty and contribution.	an additional explanation of the comparison with other works is provided in the last 3 paragraphs of the results and discussion section.
10	The proposed model should be compared to existing approaches.	an additional explanation of the comparison with other works is provided in the last 3 paragraphs of the results and discussion section.
11	The author should justify and elaborate on the obtained results.	an obtained results are provided in the last paragraphs of the results and discussion section.
12	Despite the brief discussion, it is insufficient to establish a fair and accurate comparison. The proposed method should clearly state why it is superior to others.	an additional explanation of the comparison with other works is provided in the last 3 paragraphs of the results and discussion section.
13	Please identify some drawbacks and suggestions for future research to improve the technique.	Some drawbacks and suggestions have been added at the end of the section conclusion paragraph.

≡   **M** Gmail

🔍 Search in mail   莊   ● Active ⌄   ⑦ ⚙ ⦂⦂⦂   ⭐ pol**sri** 👤

✉ Mail	✏ Compose
💬 Chat	
📹 Meet	

📥 **Inbox**

☆ Starred

🕐 Snoozed

📨 Important

▷ Sent

🗋 **Drafts**   4

▾ 🗀 Categories

   🧑‍🤝‍🧑 Social

   ⓘ Updates

   🖵 Forums

   🏷 Promotions

   ⌄ More

Labels   +

←   ▢ ⊙ ▣   ✉ ⏱ ⊘   ▣ ▷   ⋮   48 of 7,937   ‹   ›   ■ ▾

[EEI] Accepted - Scopus-indexed CiteScore: 3.0, SNIP: 0.639, and SJR: 0.299   ⤢ 🖶 ☑

External   ▶   Inbox ✕

B   **Prof. Dr. Ir. Tole Sutikno, ASEAN Eng.** via beei2.org   Sun, Feb 11, 3:39 PM (12 days ago)   ☆   ↩   ⋮

to Deris, me, Ermatita, Rahmat ▾

-- Paper ID# 7665

Dear Prof. Dr. Deris Stiawan,

It is my great pleasure to inform you that your paper entitled "Proposed
threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in
bibliographic database" is initially ACCEPTED and will be published on the
Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics (BEEI), ISSN: 2089-3191,
e-ISSN: 2302-9285, http://beei.org. This journal is indexed by Scopus
(https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100826382) and ScimagoJR
(https://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21100826382&tip=sid&clean=0).
Congratulations!

Please prepare your final camera-ready paper (in MS Word file format),
adhere to every detail of the final checklist at
https://beei.org/index.php/EEI/about/editorialPolicies#custom-4, and check
it for spelling and grammatical mistakes. For your information, according to
international regulations, the similarity score of camera-ready paper should

M Gmail

🔍 Search in mail   ⚏   ● Active ▾   ⑦ ⚙ ▦   🌼 **pol**/ri 👤

✏ **Compose**	← 🗀 ⊙ 🗎 ⊠ ⊙ ⊘ 🗀 ▷ ⋮ 3 of 7,957 ‹ › ▬ ▾

📧 Mail

💬 Chat

📹 Meet

- 📥 **Inbox**
- ☆ Starred
- ⊙ Snoozed
- ▷ Important
- ▷ Sent
- 🗋 **Drafts**   4
- ▾ 🗋 Categories
  - 🚏 Social
  - ⊙ Updates
  - 🗐 Forums
  - 🏷 Promotions
  - ▾ More

Labels   +

Re: [EEI] Accepted - Scopus-indexed CiteScore: 3.0, SNIP: 0.639, and SJR: 0.299   ⤫ 🖶 ⬈

External ▸ Inbox ✕

Miftakul Amin <miftakul_a@polsri.ac.id>   ⌨ Thu, Feb 22, 7:18 PM (21 hours ago) ☆ ↩ ⋮
to Bulletin ▾

Dear Editors,

We have tried to improve the manuscript according to the instructions given. Directions Revisions from Reviewer A are highlighted in Turquoise, and Revisions from Reviewer B are highlighted in Yellow, and Overlapping suggestions will be colored bright green in the manuscript.

Also attached the camera-ready paper similarity score which less than 25%.

Thus we have revised our manuscript, hopefully it can fulfill the reviewers' directions.

Best regards
Author(s)

3 Attachments · Scanned by Gmail ⓘ   ⬇ @

Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics

11:24 PM (0 minutes ago)

to me

-- Paper ID# 7665

Dear Mr. M. Miftakul Amin ,

It is my great pleasure to inform you that your paper entitled "Proposed threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database" is ACCEPTED and will be published on the Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics (BEEI), ISSN: 2089-3191, e-ISSN: 2302-9285. http://beei.org. This journal is indexed by Scopus (https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100826382) and ScimagoJR (https://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21100825382&tip=sid&clean=0). Congratulations!

Authors also should write "research grant or contract" in the acknowledgement section.

Your cooperation is very appreciated

Best Regards,
Prof. Dr. Ir. Tole Sutikno, ASEAN Eng.
Universitas Ahmad Dahlan
beei@aescore.com
http://beei.org

:: M.Eng. (S2) in Electrical Engineering (Intelligent Systems Engineering) ::

Want to study Master's Program of Electrical Engineering at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta? In our Master of Electrical Engineering in Intelligent Systems Engineering (ISE) program, you will gain technical expertise in computational engineering and artificial intelligence—the future of engineering and problem solving. Please take a look at the attached flyer #1 (https://is.id/1G0O8) or flyer #2 (https://is.id/1G0On).

_____

Each accepted paper will be charged USD 315 to cover a portion of the registration fee. This fee is for the first eight pages of a published manuscript; any additional pages will cost USD50. Indonesian authors should transfer in IDR instead of USD. (Please refer to https://www.xe.com for the exchange rate).

The payment should be made by bank transfer (T/T):
_____

Bank Account name/Beneficiary (please be exact): TOLE SUTIKNO
Bank Name: Bank Syariah Indonesia (PT Bank Syariah Indonesia Tbk)*
Branch Office: Yogyakarta Kusumanegara
City: Yogyakarta
Country: Indonesia
Bank Account/Beneficiary Account Number #: 7168633321
SWIFT Code (BIC) / IBAN: BSMDIDJAXXX
*Predecessors: Bank Syariah Mandiri (PT Bank Syariah Mandiri Tbk)
see: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bank_Syariah_Indonesia

Editor/Author Correspondence

Dear Prof. Dr. Deris Stiawan,

We have reached a decision regarding your submission entitled "Proposed threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database" to Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics, a Scopus(Elsevier)/ScimagoJR indexed journal, CiteScore: 3.0, SNIP: 0.639, and SJR: 0.299.

Our decision is: revisions required

Please revise your paper (in MS Word or LATEX file format) in consideration of reviewers' comments and in strict accordance with the authors' guide (available at https://iaescore.com/gfa/beei.docx or https://iaescore.com/gfa/beei.rar for LATEX file format), and and follow the checklist for preparing your FINAL paper for publication: https://beei.org/index.php/EEI/about/editorialPolicies#custom-3, also make sure it is free of spelling and grammar errors. Failing to do proper revision may lead to the rejection of your paper.

I hope to receive your highlighted updated manuscript as soon as possible (within 8 weeks).

Thank you

Best Regards,
Prof. Dr. Ir. Tole Sutikno, ASEAN Eng.
Universitas Ahmad Dahlan
beei@iaescore.com
http://beei.org/index.php/EEI

:: M.Eng. (S2) in Electrical Engineering (Intelligent Systems Engineering) ::

Want to study Master's Program of Electrical Engineering at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta? In our Master of Electrical Engineering in Intelligent Systems Engineering (ISE) program, you will gain technical expertise in computational engineering and artificial intelligence—the future of engineering and problem solving. Please take a look

at the attached flyer #1 (https://s.id/1G0O8) or flyer #2 (https://s.id/1G0On).

Reviewer A:

Does the title of the paper accurately reflect the major focus contribution of this paper? Is the abstract an appropriate and adequate digest of the work? Is the paper clear, concise, and well organized?

Please suggest change of the title as appropriate, and how should authors organize their paper
:

How does this paper show the rate of contribution strength and scientific quality to the field? Do authors place the paper in proper context by citing relevant papers? Is the paper free from obvious errors, misconceptions, or ambiguity? Is the paper written in correct English? Please note grammatical errors and suggest corrections:

Please mark approite scale for the overall grade for this paper?:
Good

Reviewer's comments and suggestions how to improve the paper
:

Explain your "Proposed threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database" in greater detail , so that it is clear and complete for other scientists to reproduce.

- In Figure 5, we want to make sure, is it correct to use commas? because in English thousands use commas (1,234) and decimals use dots (0.123). Please use the original file, not screenshots, as well as Figure 6 to Figure 9.
- Figure 1 is a little blurry, so the writing is a little broken. It is better to increase the resolution of the figure again so that the writing is clear (not broken).
- Figure 7 is not mentioned in the body text, it is better to mention Figure 7 first then show Figure 7 below it. The same applies to the other figures.
- Table 3 should be mentioned first in the body text, then display Table 3 below it. The same applies to other tables.

Reviewer B:

Does the title of the paper accurately reflect the major focus contribution of this paper? Is the abstract an appropriate and adequate digest of the work? Is the paper clear, concise, and well organized?

Please suggest change of the title as appropriate, and how should authors organize their paper
:

How does this paper show the rate of contribution strength and scientific quality to the field? Do authors place the paper in proper context by citing relevant papers? Is the paper free from obvious errors, miscomceptions, or ambiguity? Is the paper written in correct English? Please note grammatical errors and suggest corrections:

Please mark approite scale for the overall grade for this paper?:
Good

Reviewer's comments and suggestions how to improve the paper
:

- In Table 2, Figures 4-9, we just want to make sure whether or not to use commas ? because in English, thousands use commas (6,190) and decimals use periods (6.190).
- Please provide the DOIs of the references (if any).

_____

55 Review

REVIEW (EDIT V2)

...mission

M. Mehdno Amir, Davis Barbato, Benedito Bonaldo, Roberto Ruzzano
Proposed threshold based and rule based approaches to detecting blackouts in biological brain networks
Computer and Information Engineering
Hamid Allaujad-Robby (Review)
Anamaria Castellano (Review)
Vincent Garcia Diaz (Review)
Kimberli Abina Rocor (Review)
Taghi Javdani Gandomani (Review)

...Review

... 1

... 2023-10-06

... 2024-01-06

... None

...r Decision

Revisions Required 2024-01-06

... Editor/author Final Review 2024-01-06

... None

... 2023-10-06 11:40 JSON 2024-01-26 DELETE
... brain cards files copy 2024-01-26 FOR HTM

Editor/Author Correspondence

Subject: [EEI] Editor Decision - Revisions required   DELETE

-- Paper ID# 7665
-- Strictly adhere to the guidelines for authors https://iaescore.com/gfa/beei.docx
-- Also please read: https://bit.ly/35R6JTs and https://bit.ly/2DxU9MI

Dear Prof. Dr. Deris Stiawan,

We have reached a decision regarding your submission entitled "Proposed threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database" to Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics, a Scopus(Elsevier)/ScimagoJR indexed journal, CiteScore: 3.0, SNIP: 0.639, and SJR: 0.299.

Our decision is: revisions required

Please revise your paper (in MS Word or LATEX file format) in consideration of reviewers' comments and in strict accordance with the authors' guide (available at https://iaescore.com/gfa/beei.docx or https://iaescore.com/gfa/beei.rar for LATEX file format), and and follow the checklist for preparing your FINAL paper for publication: https://beei.org/index.php/EEI/about/editorialPolicies#custom-3, also make sure it is free of spelling and grammar errors. Failing to do proper revision may lead to the rejection of your paper.

I hope to receive your highlighted updated manuscript as soon as possible (within 8 weeks).

Thank you

Best Regards,
Prof. Dr. Ir. Tole Sutikno, ASEAN Eng.
Universitas Ahmad Dahlan
beei@iaescore.com
http://beei.org/index.php/EEI

Reviewer A:

Does the title of the paper accurately reflect the major focus contribution of this paper? Is the abstract an appropriate and adequate digest of the work? Is the paper clear, concise, and well organized?

Please suggest change of the title as appropriate, and how should authors organize their paper
:

How does this paper show the rate of contribution strength and scientific quality to the field? Do authors place the paper in proper context by citing relevant papers? Is the paper free from obvious errors, misconceptions, or ambiguity? Is the paper written in correct English? Please note grammatical errors and suggest corrections:

Please mark approite scale for the overall grade for this paper?:
Good

Reviewer's comments and suggestions how to improve the paper
:

Explain your "Proposed threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database" in greater detail , so that it is clear and complete for other scientists to reproduce.

- In Figure 5, we want to make sure, is it correct to use commas? because in English thousands use commas (1,234) and decimals use dots (0.123). Please use the original file, not screenshots, as well as Figure 6 to Figure 9.
- Figure 1 is a little blurry, so the writing is a little broken. It is better to increase the resolution of the figure again so that the writing is clear (not broken).
- Figure 7 is not mentioned in the body text, it is better to mention Figure 7 first then show Figure 7 below it. The same applies to the other figures.
- Table 3 should be mentioned first in the body text, then display Table 3 below it. The same applies to other tables.

Reviewer B:

Does the title of the paper accurately reflect the major focus contribution of this paper? Is the abstract an appropriate and adequate digest of the work? Is the paper clear, concise, and well organized?

Please suggest change of the title as appropriate, and how should authors organize their paper
:

How does this paper show the rate of contribution strength and scientific quality to the field? Do authors place the paper in proper context by citing relevant papers? Is the paper free from obvious errors, miscomceptions, or ambiguity? Is the paper written in correct English? Please note grammatical errors and suggest corrections:

Please mark approite scale for the overall grade for this paper?:
Good

Reviewer's comments and suggestions how to improve the paper
:

- In Table 2, Figures 4-9, we just want to make sure whether or not to use commas ?
because in English, thousands use commas (6,190) and decimals use periods (6.190).
- Please provide the DOIs of the references (if any).

_____
Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics
http://beei.org

| Author 2024-01-28 06:26 PM | Subject: Proposed threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database | DELETE |

Dear Editors,

We have tried to improve the manuscript according to the instructions given. Directions Revisions from Reviewer A are highlighted in Turquoise, and Revisions from Reviewer B are highlighted in Yellow in the manuscript.

Thus we have revised our manuscript, hopefully it can fulfill the reviewers' directions.

Best regards
Author(s)

_____
Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics
http://beei.org

| Author 2024-01-28 06:27 PM | Subject: [EEI] Paper ID #7665 revisions Required | DELETE |

Dear Editors,

We have tried to improve the manuscript according to the instructions given. Directions Revisions from Reviewer A are highlighted in Turquoise, and Revisions from Reviewer B are highlighted in Yellow in the manuscript.

Thus we have revised our manuscript, hopefully it can fulfill the reviewers' directions.

Best regards
Author(s)

_____
Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics

Title :

Proposed threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database

==Revisions from Reviewer A are highlighted in Turquoise==, ==and Revisions from Reviewer B are highlighted in Yellow.==

Reviewer: 1 (A)

No.	Comments	Responses
1	Explain your "Proposed threshold-based and rule-based approaches to detecting duplicates in bibliographic database" in greater detail , so that it is clear and complete for other scientists to reproduce.	A more detailed discussion related to threshold-based and rule-based approaches has been explained in segment 3.2 Comparison Stage and visualized in Figure 3 Model of field/record comparison calculation. It is highlighted in Turquoise color on page 6.
2	In Figure 5, we want to make sure, is it correct to use commas? because in English thousands use commas (1,234) and decimals use dots (0.123). Please use the original file, not screenshots, as well as Figure 6 to Figure 9.	For Figure 5, the decimal point (.) has been adjusted, the thousands marker with a comma (,) is marked with a yellow highlight on page 7.
3	Figure 1 is a little blurry, so the writing is a little broken. It is better to increase the resolution of the figure again so that the writing is clear (not broken).	Figure 1 has been adjusted in resolution to make it clearer, highlighted by the Turquoise color on page 4.
4	Figure 7 is not mentioned in the body text, it is better to mention Figure 7 first then show Figure 7 below it. The same applies to the other figures.	The caption for Figure 7 has been placed in the segment before Figure 7 is displayed. Marked with Turquoise color highlight on page 9.
5	Table 3 should be mentioned first in the body text, then display Table 3 below it. The same applies to other tables.	The caption for Table 3 has been placed in the segment before Table 3. Marked with Turquoise color highlights on page 8.

Reviewer: 2 (B)

No.	Comments	Responses
1	In Table 2, Figures 4-9, we just want to make sure whether or not to use commas ? because in English, thousands use commas (6,190) and decimals use periods (6.190).	• Table 2 is indeed a marker for thousands so it uses commas, while the narrative for Table 2 has been adjusted to use commas (,) marked with yellow highlights on page 5. • For Figure 4, Figure 5, Figure 6, Figure 7, Figure 8, and Figure 9, the decimal marker has been adjusted using a period (.), the thousand marker with a comma (,) which is marked with a yellow highlight.
2	Please provide the DOIs of the references (if any).	DOI information has been completed in the reference section. A total of 42 references, there

		were only 5 that did not include a DOI, because no DOI information was obtained for the article.