UNIVERSITAS AHMAD DAHLAN

Herman Yuliansyah <herman.yuliansyah@tif.uad.ac.id>

[IJAIN] Submission Acknowledgement

1 message

Andri Pranolo <info@ijain.org>   1 August 2022 at 14:21
To: Herman Yuliansyah <herman.yuliansyah@tif.uad.ac.id>

Herman Yuliansyah:

Thank you for submitting the manuscript, "Extending Adamic Adar for Cold-Start in Link Prediction Based on Network Metrics" to International Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics. With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging in to the journal web site:

Manuscript URL: https://ijain.org/index.php/IJAIN/author/submission/882
Username: hermanyuliansyah

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering this journal as a venue for your work.

Andri Pranolo
International Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics

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

SCOPUS Indexed Journal | CiteScore 2021 = 2.8 |
CiteScoreTracker 2022 = 2.0 (Last updated on 5 May 2022)
SCOPUS: https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100890645

SJR 2021 = 0.386
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

UNIVERSITAS AHMAD DAHLAN

Herman Yuliansyah <herman.yuliansyah@tif.uad.ac.id>

[IJAIN] Editor Decision for Paper entitled (Extending Adamic Adar for Cold-Start in Link Prediction Based on Network Metrics)

3 messages

Dr. Haviluddin Haviluddin <haviluddin@gmail.com>   29 October 2022 at 14:01
To: Herman Yuliansyah <herman.yuliansyah@tif.uad.ac.id>
Cc: Zulaiha Ali Othman <zao@ukm.edu.my>, Azuraliza Abu Bakar <azuraliza@ukm.edu.my>

Dear Herman Yuliansyah

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to the International
Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics, "Extending Adamic Adar for
Cold-Start in Link Prediction Based on Network Metrics".

Our decision is: Accept Major Revisions

Please kindly submit the revision within TWO WEEKS or before November 12,
2022, and follow the instructions carefully,

1. Do the corrections with track changes.

2. We required five 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, and
d) Similarity check results. Upload all files in *.ZIP extension file.
e) Proofread proof from a professional proofreader.

3. The similarity level must be less than 10% (Exclude Bibliography), and
the similarity score to each source is no more than 3%.

4. Section structure. Authors are suggested to present their articles in the
section structure: Introduction - Method - Results and Discussion –
Conclusion

5. References. Expect a minimum of 30 references, primarily with a minimum
of
80% of journal papers were published between 2018 and 2022.

6. Follow IJAIN author guidelines at
http://ijain.org/index.php/IJAIN/about/submissions#authorGuidelines

Please be advised that authors are only permitted to resubmit their article
ONCE. If the author(s) do 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,

Andri Pranolo
(Editor-in-chief)

Dr. Haviluddin Haviluddin
(Section Editor)

Reviewer B:

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:
        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:

Comments on the minor details of the article:
        The paper attacks an important problem of cold start in information
systems. Authors extended known approaches to solve this problem and offer
their own methods. These methods studied in theoretical and experimental
ways and their benefits are shown in the paper.

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?:
      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?:
      Fair

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?:
      Fair

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:
      Good

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

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:
      This article provides three strategies based on the extension of Adamic
Adar and network metrics. The primary purpose is to use network metrics to
encourage future relationship formation between isolated or new nodes. The
method proposed is known as the extended Adamic Adar index based on Degree
Centrality (DCAA), Closeness Centrality (CloCAA), and Clustering Coefficient

(CC) (CluCAA).

Comments on the minor details of the article:
    Several things need to be improved, including:

a. Affiliation:
Check whether it is correct.

b. Introduction:
1. What are some of its most significant drawbacks?
2. What do you want to accomplish with this?
3. Are there any potential solutions already available?

c. Method:
1. Figure 1 is too small. The use of figures must be proportional and can be seen clearly by the reader.
2. If described, how is the picture of the proposed method proposed in this study?
3. How is the flow of the process in this research carried out?

d. Result and Discussion:
1. The results section requires far greater organization and structuring. The analysis is too general, and the reported results are somewhat selective. This section needs to be more carefully and systematically constructed.
2. In the evaluation metrics "where n is the number of independent comparisons, n1 is the number of the higher scores missing links than non-existent links, and n2 is the number of the missing links, and non-existent links have equal scores. " information about equation notation, please write still using the font of the equation used. *as well as for the description of other equations in this manuscript, please check and correct all of them
3. Explain what the results mean and how they are important? Because in the article there must be an explanation of how the research results can have an impact on developing science or for further research
4. Highlight the new different, or important results from this funding with other similar research. Articles must consider aspects of novelty and originality, contain up-to-date material and add to the knowledge that is currently developing
5. Figure 1 in 3.4. Experimental Results and Discussions should be named Figure 2. Because Figure 1 is already in section 2.2. Adamic Adar Index. Please replace Figure 2 with a clearer one so that the information contained in the picture can be read properly.
6. Describe the confines of your research and suggest further work.

e. Conclusion:
1. "This research will be developed in the future using more varied and private datasets derived from real-world datasets.". What is meant by more varied and private datasets derived from real-world datasets? Please mention examples of real data.

f. References:
1. Articles must pay attention to the novelty aspect, for that try to use a reference list of no more than 5 years. Because there are still many references from 2018 and below that are used, then fix the references by updating them with articles published in 2018-2022.
2. References contained in the body of the article must be fully cited in the list of references, and vice versa.

Note: The language in the paper should be improved cause the grammatical structure of some sentences must be corrected.

Reviewer J:

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?:
      Fair

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

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?:
      Fair

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:
      Fair

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:
      Fair

Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:
      Poor

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

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

Comments on the minor details of the article:
      * The study proposed three methods based on Adamic adar. However, there is
still a lack of information that describes the extended method. Instead of
showing the equation of each method, it requires to describe the differences
between the original Adamic adar with each extended method.
*Also, it also needs to describe the advantages of each method and

motivation that state that the extended method could be better than the
original one.

_____

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

SCOPUS Indexed Journal | CiteScore 2021 = 2.8 |
CiteScoreTracker 2022 = 2.0 (Last updated on 5 May 2022)
SCOPUS: https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100890645

SJR 2021 = 0.386
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

Herman Yuliansyah <herman.yuliansyah@tif.uad.ac.id>   31 October 2022 at 08:14
To: "Dr. Haviluddin Haviluddin" <haviluddin@gmail.com>
Cc: Zulaiha Ali Othman <zao@ukm.edu.my>, Azuraliza Abu Bakar <azuraliza@ukm.edu.my>

Thank you Dr. Haviluddin Haviluddin.

> On Sat, 29 Oct 2022 at 14:01, Dr. Haviluddin Haviluddin <haviluddin@gmail.com> wrote:
> Dear Herman Yuliansyah
>
> We have reached a decision regarding your submission to the International
> Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics, "Extending Adamic Adar for
> Cold-Start in Link Prediction Based on Network Metrics".
>
> Our decision is: Accept Major Revisions
>
> Please kindly submit the revision within TWO WEEKS or before November 12,
> 2022, and follow the instructions carefully,
>
> 1. Do the corrections with track changes.
>
> 2. We required five 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, and
> d) Similarity check results. Upload all files in *.ZIP extension file.
> e) Proofread proof from a professional proofreader.
>
> 3. The similarity level must be less than 10% (Exclude Bibliography), and
> the similarity score to each source is no more than 3%.
>
> 4. Section structure. Authors are suggested to present their articles in the
> section structure: Introduction - Method - Results and Discussion –
> Conclusion
>
> 5. References. Expect a minimum of 30 references, primarily with a minimum
> of
> 80% of journal papers were published between 2018 and 2022.
>
> 6. Follow IJAIN author guidelines at
> http://ijain.org/index.php/IJAIN/about/submissions#authorGuidelines
>
> Please be advised that authors are only permitted to resubmit their article
> ONCE. If the author(s) do 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,

Andri Pranolo
(Editor-in-chief)

Dr. Haviluddin Haviluddin
(Section Editor)

Reviewer B:

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:
      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:

Comments on the minor details of the article:
        The paper attacks an important problem of cold start in information systems. Authors extended known approaches to solve this problem and offer their own methods. These methods studied in theoretical and experimental ways and their benefits are shown in the paper.

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?:
        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?:
        Fair

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?:
        Fair

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:
        Good

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

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:
    This article provides three strategies based on the extension of Adamic Adar and network metrics. The primary purpose is to use network metrics to encourage future relationship formation between isolated or new nodes. The method proposed is known as the extended Adamic Adar index based on Degree Centrality (DCAA), Closeness Centrality (CloCAA), and Clustering Coefficient (CC) (CluCAA).

Comments on the minor details of the article:
    Several things need to be improved, including:

a. Affiliation:
Check whether it is correct.

b. Introduction:
1. What are some of its most significant drawbacks?
2. What do you want to accomplish with this?
3. Are there any potential solutions already available?

c. Method:
1. Figure 1 is too small. The use of figures must be proportional and can be seen clearly by the reader.
2. If described, how is the picture of the proposed method proposed in this study?
3. How is the flow of the process in this research carried out?

d. Result and Discussion:
1. The results section requires far greater organization and structuring. The analysis is too general, and the reported results are somewhat selective. This section needs to be more carefully and systematically constructed.
2. In the evaluation metrics "where n is the number of independent comparisons, n1 is the number of the higher scores missing links than non-existent links, and n2 is the number of the missing links, and non-existent links have equal scores. " information about equation notation, please write still using the font of the equation used. *as well as for the description of other equations in this manuscript, please check and correct all of them
3. Explain what the results mean and how they are important? Because in the article there must be an explanation of how the research results can have an impact on developing science or for further research
4. Highlight the new different, or important results from this funding with other similar research. Articles must consider aspects of novelty and originality, contain up-to-date material and add to the knowledge that is currently developing
5. Figure 1 in 3.4. Experimental Results and Discussions should be named Figure 2. Because Figure 1 is already in section 2.2. Adamic Adar Index. Please replace Figure 2 with a clearer one so that the information contained in the picture can be read properly.
6. Describe the confines of your research and suggest further work.

e. Conclusion:
1. "This research will be developed in the future using more varied and private datasets derived from real-world datasets.". What is meant by more varied and private datasets derived from real-world datasets? Please mention examples of real data.

f. References:
1. Articles must pay attention to the novelty aspect, for that try to use a

reference list of no more than 5 years. Because there are still many references from 2018 and below that are used, then fix the references by updating them with articles published in 2018-2022.
2. References contained in the body of the article must be fully cited in the list of references, and vice versa.

Note: The language in the paper should be improved cause the grammatical structure of some sentences must be corrected.

Reviewer J:

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?:
      Fair

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

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?:
      Fair

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:
      Fair

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:
      Fair

Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:
      Poor

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

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

Comments on the minor details of the article:
    * The study proposed three methods based on Adamic adar. However, there is
still a lack of information that describes the extended method. Instead of
showing the equation of each method, it requires to describe the differences
between the original Adamic adar with each extended method.
*Also, it also needs to describe the advantages of each method and
motivation that state that the extended method could be better than the
original one.

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

SCOPUS Indexed Journal | CiteScore 2021 = 2.8 |
CiteScoreTracker 2022 = 2.0 (Last updated on 5 May 2022)
SCOPUS: https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100890645

SJR 2021 = 0.386
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

--
--
*Salam

Herman Yuliansyah, ST., M.Eng.
==
*
Program Studi Teknik Informatika
Universitas Ahmad Dahlan

Herman Yuliansyah <herman.yuliansyah@tif.uad.ac.id>   3 November 2022 at 10:49
To: "Dr. Haviluddin Haviluddin" <haviluddin@gmail.com>

Dear Dr. Haviluddin Haviluddin,

I'm currently improving the manuscript. There is one comment that I don't understand based on the reviewer's
comments. The comment is:

2. In the evaluation metrics, "where n is the number of independent comparisons, n1 is the number of the higher
scores missing links than non-existent links, and n2 is the number of the missing links, and non-existent links have
equal scores. " information about equation notation, please write still using the font of the equation used. *as well
as for the description of other equations in this manuscript, please check and correct them.

Based on this comment, I don't understand the "please write still using the font of the equation used" statement.
May I get a more detailed explanation for this statement?

Thank you for your response.

On Mon, 31 Oct 2022 at 08:14, Herman Yuliansyah <herman.yuliansyah@tif.uad.ac.id> wrote:
    Thank you Dr. Haviluddin Haviluddin.

On Sat, 29 Oct 2022 at 14:01, Dr. Haviluddin Haviluddin <haviluddin@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Herman Yuliansyah

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to the International
Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics, "Extending Adamic Adar for
Cold-Start in Link Prediction Based on Network Metrics".

Our decision is: Accept Major Revisions

Please kindly submit the revision within TWO WEEKS or before November 12,
2022, and follow the instructions carefully,

1. Do the corrections with track changes.

2. We required five 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, and
d) Similarity check results. Upload all files in *.ZIP extension file.
e) Proofread proof from a professional proofreader.

3. The similarity level must be less than 10% (Exclude Bibliography), and
the similarity score to each source is no more than 3%.

4. Section structure. Authors are suggested to present their articles in the
section structure: Introduction - Method - Results and Discussion –
Conclusion

5. References. Expect a minimum of 30 references, primarily with a minimum
of
80% of journal papers were published between 2018 and 2022.

6. Follow IJAIN author guidelines at
http://ijain.org/index.php/IJAIN/about/submissions#authorGuidelines

Please be advised that authors are only permitted to resubmit their article
ONCE. If the author(s) do 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,

Andri Pranolo
(Editor-in-chief)

Dr. Haviluddin Haviluddin
(Section Editor)

Reviewer B:

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:
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:

Comments on the minor details of the article:
The paper attacks an important problem of cold start in information systems. Authors extended known approaches to solve this problem and offer their own methods. These methods studied in theoretical and experimental ways and their benefits are shown in the paper.

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?:
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?:
    Fair

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?:
    Fair

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:
    Good

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

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:
    This article provides three strategies based on the extension of Adamic Adar and network metrics. The primary purpose is to use network metrics to encourage future relationship formation between isolated or new nodes. The method proposed is known as the extended Adamic Adar index based on Degree Centrality (DCAA), Closeness Centrality (CloCAA), and Clustering Coefficient (CC) (CluCAA).

Comments on the minor details of the article:
    Several things need to be improved, including:

a. Affiliation:
Check whether it is correct.

b. Introduction:
1. What are some of its most significant drawbacks?
2. What do you want to accomplish with this?
3. Are there any potential solutions already available?

c. Method:
1. Figure 1 is too small. The use of figures must be proportional and can be seen clearly by the reader.
2. If described, how is the picture of the proposed method proposed in this study?
3. How is the flow of the process in this research carried out?

d. Result and Discussion:
1. The results section requires far greater organization and structuring. The analysis is too general, and the reported results are somewhat selective. This section needs to be more carefully and systematically constructed.
2. In the evaluation metrics "where n is the number of independent comparisons, n1 is the number of the higher scores missing links than non-existent links, and n2 is the number of the missing links, and non-existent links have equal scores. " information about equation notation, please write still using the font of the equation used. *as well as for the description of other equations in this manuscript, please check and correct all of them
3. Explain what the results mean and how they are important? Because in the article there must be an explanation of how the research results can have an impact on developing science or for further research
4. Highlight the new different, or important results from this funding with other similar research. Articles must consider aspects of novelty and originality, contain up-to-date material and add to the knowledge that is currently developing
5. Figure 1 in 3.4. Experimental Results and Discussions should be named Figure 2. Because Figure 1 is already in section 2.2. Adamic Adar Index. Please replace Figure 2 with a clearer one so that the information contained in the picture can be read properly.
6. Describe the confines of your research and suggest further work.

e. Conclusion:
1. "This research will be developed in the future using more varied and private datasets derived from real-world datasets.". What is meant by more varied and private datasets derived from real-world datasets? Please mention examples of real data.

f. References:
1. Articles must pay attention to the novelty aspect, for that try to use a reference list of no more than 5 years. Because there are still many references from 2018 and below that are used, then fix the references by updating them with articles published in 2018-2022.
2. References contained in the body of the article must be fully cited in the list of references, and vice versa.

Note: The language in the paper should be improved cause the grammatical structure of some sentences must be corrected.

Reviewer J:

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?:
    Fair

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

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?:
    Fair

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:
    Fair

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:
    Fair

Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:
    Poor

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

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

Comments on the minor details of the article:
    * The study proposed three methods based on Adamic adar. However, there is
still a lack of information that describes the extended method. Instead of
showing the equation of each method, it requires to describe the differences
between the original Adamic adar with each extended method.
*Also, it also needs to describe the advantages of each method and
motivation that state that the extended method could be better than the
original one.

_____

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

--
--
*Salam

Herman Yuliansyah, ST., M.Eng.
===
*
Program Studi Teknik Informatika
Universitas Ahmad Dahlan

--
--
*Salam

Herman Yuliansyah, ST., M.Eng.
===
*
Program Studi Teknik Informatika
Universitas Ahmad Dahlan

UNIVERSITAS
AHMAD DAHLAN

Herman Yuliansyah <herman.yuliansyah@tif.uad.ac.id>

[IJAIN] Editor Final Decision

1 message

Dr. Haviluddin Haviluddin <haviluddin@gmail.com>   25 November 2022 at 12:40
To: Herman Yuliansyah <herman.yuliansyah@tif.uad.ac.id>
Cc: Zulaiha Ali Othman <zao@ukm.edu.my>, Azuraliza Abu Bakar <azuraliza@ukm.edu.my>

Dear Herman Yuliansyah

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to the International
Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics, "Extending Adamic Adar for
Cold-Start in Link Prediction Based on Network Metrics".

Our decision is to: Accept Submission

Please keep attention to the copy editing and proofreading process, which
are the final publicity process for IJAIN Journal. Your paper is scheduled
to be published in the upcoming issue after we finish the process.

Regards,

Dr. Haviluddin Haviluddin
(Section Editor)

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

SCOPUS Indexed Journal | CiteScore 2021 = 2.8 |
CiteScoreTracker 2022 = 2.0 (Last updated on 5 May 2022)
SCOPUS: https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100890645

SJR 2021 = 0.386
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