

---

## [JSMI] Editor Decision

2 messages

---

**Supriyadi Supriyadi** <notif-5@datacenterkilat.in>  
To: Hayati Mukti Asih <hayati.asih@ie.uad.ac.id>

28 September 2023 at 07:07

Hayati Mukti Asih:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Jurnal Sistem dan Manajemen Industri, "Optimizing Lot Sizing Model for Perishable Bread Products using Genetic Algorithm".

Our decision is: Revisions Required

Supriyadi Supriyadi  
Universitas Serang Raya, Banten, Indonesia  
[supriyadi@unsera.ac.id](mailto:supriyadi@unsera.ac.id)

Universitas Serang Raya

---

Reviewer A:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required

---

English language & style

(4) Good

The novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper

(3) Average

The organisation of the manuscript

(2) Below Average

The abstract is written in a clear and easy to capture paper content

(3) Average

Clarity in disclosing the background of the problem, differences with previous activities, and the contribution that will be made

(2) Below Average

Design of problem solving methods and procedures

(2) Below Average

Presentation of results and sharpness of analysis (completeness of the analysis, tables and pictures for easy understanding, feasibility and scientific rigour)

(2) Below Average

The essence of the findings from the research activities carried out and their presentation

(1) Poor

Acknowledgment of the work of others by references, procedures for writing, and reference to the manuscript (all references must be referred to in the manuscript)

(2) Below Average

Detailed comments: Please justify your recommendation and suggest improvements in technical content

[Comment 1] Novelty

[Subcomment 1a] The authors must prove that it is difficult to obtain the closed loop form solution, for the studied problem, while considering that many of such studies exist. Presenting a trustable reference is also acceptable.

[Subcomment 1b] The authors must compare the novelty of their study with the ones of the previous studies in a table, while citing the specific studies and clearly stating the different aspects. The comparison should be related to the discussed problem, the development of the mathematical model and the genetic algorithm.

[Subcomment 1c] The authors must clearly state the basic models for the mathematical model and the genetic algorithm, and mention the parts they proposed by themselves when conducting the study.

[Comment 2] Proposed method

[Subcomment 2a] Before explaining about the steps in the genetic algorithm, the authors must first provide an example of the solution representation with a simple case study, for clarity.

[Subcomment 2b] I do not think that the authors would produce a sufficiently dispersed solutions with the current mutation method. Please state the reference for using such a mutation operator.

[Comment 3] Numerical experiments

Also, the authors must compare the performance of their proposed genetic algorithm with the state-of-the-art methods or with the solutions of the mathematical model.

[Comment 4] Writing quality and clarity

[Subcomment 4a] The size of the texts in the figure must be as large as the main text to ensure readability.

[Subcomment 4b] For an ease understanding, please place comma signs to separate thousand values in all numbers.

[Subcomment 4c] Near optimal terminology (e.g. in Figure 2), is not acceptable in the manuscript, because there is not statement that compares the result with the optimal solution.

Recommendation

Major Revision

-----  
Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Decline Submission  
-----

English language & style

(2) Below Average

The novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper

(1) Poor

The organisation of the manuscript

(2) Below Average

The abstract is written in a clear and easy to capture paper content

(1) Poor

Clarity in disclosing the background of the problem, differences with previous activities, and the contribution that will be made

(1) Poor

Design of problem solving methods and procedures

(2) Below Average

Presentation of results and sharpness of analysis (completeness of the analysis, tables and pictures for easy understanding, feasibility and scientific rigour)

(1) Poor

The essence of the findings from the research activities carried out and their presentation

(1) Poor

Acknowledgment of the work of others by references, procedures for writing, and reference to the manuscript (all references must be referred to in the manuscript)

(3) Average

Detailed comments: Please justify your recommendation and suggest improvements in technical content

The manuscript considers an order planning problem when items are perishable. The authors suggest a genetic algorithm to solve the problem.

First of all, the authors failed to fully describe the details of the problem. It is not possible to understand how perishability is modeled. That is, it is not possible to understand how items deteriorate, and how inventory is affected from perishability. The mathematical model they present needs a lot of explanation. Furthermore, as far as I can see, it does not obey some certain standards of mathematical modeling.

Here are more details on some Major Issues of the manuscript:

-In the formulation there is no relation between  $Y_t^p$  and  $Q_t^p$  or any other variable. So, the minimization will automatically set it to zero.

-In the formulation constraints (4), (6), (7), (8) are equalities on PARAMETERS, i.e., constants. You calculate them beforehand not in the model.

-There is no way to measure the quality of the solutions generated by the GA. Normally we compare such solutions with the solutions obtained by an all purpose optimization solver. The test instances are only 8 period long!!! Those instances may be solved very easily solved by such solvers.

There are further minor issues in the manuscript but they can be discussed only after major issues are solved. In its current form of the manuscript I suggest rejection.

Recommendation

Rejected

-----

-----  
Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

---

English language & style

(3) Average

The novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper

(3) Average

The organisation of the manuscript

(3) Average

The abstract is written in a clear and easy to capture paper content

(3) Average

Clarity in disclosing the background of the problem, differences with previous activities, and the contribution that will be made

(3) Average

Design of problem solving methods and procedures

(3) Average

Presentation of results and sharpness of analysis (completeness of the analysis, tables and pictures for easy understanding, feasibility and scientific rigour)

(3) Average

The essence of the findings from the research activities carried out and their presentation

(3) Average

Acknowledgment of the work of others by references, procedures for writing, and reference to the manuscript (all references must be referred to in the manuscript)

(3) Average

Detailed comments: Please justify your recommendation and suggest improvements in technical content

This paper proposes a lot sizing model for perishable bread products using Genetic Algorithm. The language of the paper needs to be improved. A native should read and edit the paper in my opinion. the contribution of the paper should be stated clearly in the introduction section. The idea is good and the paper seems to have a contribution in the field. I have some comments and questions as follows.

There are various studies focusing on this problem so "what is new here" should be discussed. Maybe, section 4.1.3. Integration with other researches might be omitted and summarized in the introduction section.

Parameter optimization might be needed to see which parameters are appropriate for the problem.

Is the mathematical model proposed by the authors or is it taken from literature? This should be cleared.

Regarding the solutions obtained, the real problem on hand seems a small scale problem. Did the authors try to solve it by a commercial optimization solver like OPL, GAMS etc.?


Recommendation

Major Revision

---

Jurnal Sistem dan Manajemen Industri

---

 **A-Review.pdf**  
102K

---

**Hayati Mukti Asih** <hayati.asih@ie.uad.ac.id>  
To: raden.achmad@upnyk.ac.id

28 September 2023 at 07:57

Terbaru  
[Quoted text hidden]

---

 **A-Review.pdf**  
102K