
[IJAIN] Editor Decision

2 pesan

Andri Pranolo <andri.pranolo@tif.uad.ac.id>
Kepada: Ardiansyah Ardiansyah <ardiansyah@tif.uad.ac.id>
Cc: ijain@uad.ac.id

21 Oktober 2018 12.12

Ardiansyah Ardiansyah:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to International Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics, "Analogy-Based Software Project Effort Estimation for Banking Systems".

Our decision is: Accept with Major/Minor Revisions

Please kindly submit the revision before TWO WEEKS after received this notification, and make sure to follow the IJAIN Author guidelines at <http://ijain.org/index.php/IJAIN/about/submissions#authorGuidelines>.

Regards,

Andri Pranolo
(Managing Editor)

Reviewer C:

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?:

Excellent

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:

Excellent

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:
Excellent

Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:
Good

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

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

-

Comments on the minor details of the article:

The paper is well structured and have a good contribution on project estimation.

Reviewer D:

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?:
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:

Fair

Technical (3): Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper:

Fair

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

Fair

Technical (5): Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables:

Good

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:

The abstract needs rephrasing to reflect the paper. Review the paper for grammar and flow. Moreover, the references are inconsistent.

Comments on the minor details of the article:

None

Reviewer F:

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?:

Fair

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:

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:
Good

Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:
Good

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

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

This study aims to investigate the accuracy of software project effort estimation with the Analogy method using three parameters: Euclidean, Manhattan and Minkowski distance. In Section V. the authors only did the experiments based on this three metrics. For the sake of completeness, it should be compared to the results currently published in the literature.

Comments on the minor details of the article:
English should be improved. Many typos should be corrected.

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?:
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?:
Excellent

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:
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:
Good

Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:
Good

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

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

Comments on the minor details of the article:

This study aims to investigate the accuracy of software project effort estimation with the Analogy method using three parameters: Euclidean, Manhattan and Minkowski distance. Although the paper is well-written and clear, there are some changes that can hopefully improve the paper:

All equations should be numbered. For instance after equation (3), one number is missing.

All tables and figures need captions. Fig 2 does not have any.

In caption of table 4 MMRE should be replaced with "mean magnitude of relative error"

Fig. 3, needs axis labels.

Fig 4, needs axis labels. "results comparison" should be written correctly.

All graphs and charts need axis labels.

In the introduction it says: There are two types of approaches for estimating software development effort: algorithmic and machine learning approaches. The machine learning method used to estimate software effort include KNN, Support Vector Machine (SVM) [2], Decision Tree [3], Analogy, Deep Learning [4], Ensemble [5] and Neural Network (NN).

Asa it can be seen there is no citation after neural network. We know that there are many available researches using NN that can be cited in the manuscript. For instance: (<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7407784> or <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artmed.2017.10.002>)

International Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics (IJAIN)

ISSN 2442-6571 (print) | 2548-3161 (online)

<http://ijain.org/index.php/IJAIN>

Email: ijain@uad.ac.id, andri.pranolo@tif.uad.ac.id

Ardiansyah MCs <ardiansyah@tif.uad.ac.id>

21 Oktober 2018 13.20

Kepada: Murein Miksa Mardhia <murein.miksa@tif.uad.ac.id>, Sri Handayaningsih <sriningsih@tif.uad.ac.id>

Alhamdulillah ACCEPTED untuk publish di IJAIN bulan Nopember ini insya Allah.

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

--

Thank you,

Ardiansyah, S.T., M.Cs

Head of IT Training Center (ITTC) UAD

Department of Informatics - Faculty of Industrial Technology

Universitas Ahmad Dahlan

<http://ittc.uad.ac.id>

<http://ardiansyah.tif.uad.ac.id>