

[IJEEI] Editor Decision on paper (ID:3134): Enhanced Deep Learning Intrusion Detection in IoT Heterogeneous Network with Feature Extraction

External

Inbox x



IJEEI Editorial Office ijeei.iaes@gmail.com via [s132-148-29-26.secureserver.net](#)

Sat, Aug 14, 5:38 PM



Dear Dr. Stiawan

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Informatics (IJEEI), a Scopus-indexed journal.

Based on the comments from reviewers, your paper (ID:3134) "Enhanced Deep Learning Intrusion Detection in IoT Heterogeneous Network with Feature Extraction" requires REVISION.

The comments and feedback from reviewers are at the end of this email. Please make the necessary changes based on reviewers' comments and suggestions.

After revision, please upload the revised version of your paper to the submission system (as author version in the same paper ID number, below the decision, NOT as new paper submission). In addition, please upload another document explaining all answers to the reviewer's comments and corrections made in the revised paper.

The Editor will check whether the submitted revision properly addresses the reviewers' comments or not. A timely response will greatly help fasten the decision process and the following steps of publication.

Thank you.

Enhanced Deep Learning Intrusion Detection in IoT



Active



section. Please recheck. Proofread is suggested

Please mark appropriate scale for the overall grade for this paper? (A score of 7 or above typically provides ground for IJEEI acceptance):

7

Reviewer's comments and suggestions on how to improve the paper. (If it is not possible, kindly please use separate sheets or a copy of the paper for comments and suggestions for revision. Indicate whether revisions are mandatory or suggested. Please use word processing type format if possible, and then upload or submit via email to IJEEI.IAES@gmail.com):

The idea is interesting. However, several comments for further improvement:

1. Please explain abbreviations in the first use.
2. WIFI and XBee datasets consist of 96 and 64 features, respectively. Please explain the WiFi and XBee datasets' features further.
3. Please explain the setup for the experimental test. How many nodes are really included in the tests? etc.
4. Unfortunately, the paper only uses accuracy as a sole performance metric. This is insufficient to evaluate the proposed algorithm thoroughly. Please consider F1-score and confusion matrices.
5. It seems that this work is the continuation of authors' previous work. Therefore, please compare and discuss this work with the previous one more elaboratively.
6. Please rewrite the caption of figures, as some of the existing captions are less informative and grammatically incorrect.

Reviewer B:

Does the title of the paper accurately reflect the major focus contribution of this paper?:

Yes

Proses revisi penulis

