

Editor
2021-04-01 07:11 AM

Subject: [IJAIN] Editor Decision for Paper entitled (On Similarity Measure Fuzzy Soft Set for Phising Detection) [DELETE](#)

Dear Rahmat Hidayat:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to the International Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics, "On Similarity Measure Fuzzy Soft Set for Phising Detection".

Our decision is: Accept with Major Revisions

Please kindly submit the revision within TWO WEEKS after received this notification, and follow the instructions carefully,

1. Do the corrections with track changes.
2. We required 3 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. Upload all files in *.ZIP extension file.
3. Follow IJAIN author guidelines at <http://ijain.org/index.php/IJAIN/about/submissions#authorGuidelines>

Please NOTED that if the author(s) 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
(Managing Editor)

Reviewer A:

Significance:
Good

Originality:
Fair

Quality:
Good

Clarity:
Fair

Relevance:
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:
Good

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:

1. Abstract must be rewritten and must be more focused on contribution of the paper.
2. The spelling of Phising must be corrected.
3. Why this paper does not have literature review? Please include it after introduction.
4. The conclusion must be supportive of figures and not like abstract.
5. I also feel that - author must add the implications of the research after results.

Reviewer D:

Significance:
Good

Originality:
Good

Quality:
Fair

Clarity:
Fair

Relevance:
Excellent

Technical (1): Structure of the paper:
Fair

Technical (2): Standard of English:
Good

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

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:

Good

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

The manuscript needs to be revised so that the material is conveyed properly to the reader and the results of the research are reproducible.

Comments on the minor details of the article:

This article presented a fuzzy soft set as a tool for classifying phishing. However, the authors did not explain clearly the steps of the research method. They explained more about definitions rather than the procedure used in solving the problem. In addition, the authors did not explain the data they used. Therefore the result is not reproducible.

Some comments:

1. Title: "Phising" should be "phishing"

2. Abstract: the main contribution and the results were not clearly stated in the abstract.

3. Introduction:

a. The author did not explain why they choose the fuzzy soft set. I can not find a statement that the fuzzy soft set is appropriate to improve the classification accuracy results, especially for the case they discussed.

b. There was a statement that is not in line with the conclusion. It is stated in the introduction that the authors discussed the use of fuzzy soft sets for phishing classification, not creating an automatic classifier as in conclusion. Perhaps, there were missing statements in the introduction.

4. Research method:

a. I think it would be better if the authors put more emphasis on the procedure used to solve the problem, not just presented definitions and examples.

b. The authors need to double-check the definitions they convey. Please check the references carefully. Many notations/symbols were not written as they should be, therefore changing their meaning. This caused a fatal mistake that shouldn't have happened.

5. Results and Discussion:

a. There is no explanation regarding disadvantages, strengths, and research opportunities in the discussion, even though this was alluded to by the authors in the abstract.

b. There is no explanation regarding the data used. I do not understand when the authors convey the composition of the training and testing data, say 60 and 10, while they say that the data are divided into two parts. How about the rest? Or what is meant here is actually a variation in sample size, but not explained.

c. The titles of the tables and figures do not match what was conveyed.

6. Conclusion: this should be in line with what is written in the abstract and results and discussion.

7. Strictly follow the guidelines for the author.

Reviewer E:

Significance:

Good

Originality:

Good

Quality:

Good

Clarity:

Good

Relevance:

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:

- In the abstract, the author(s) should mention the introduction, method, results, conclusion, and benefits of the research.

- The author should expand the discussion on the results and discussion section.

Comments on the minor details of the article:

-

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

SCOPUS Indexed Journal | SNIP 2019 = 1.4 | CiteScoreTracker 2020 = 1.5 (Last updated on 10 June, 2020)

SCOPUS: <https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100890645>

SJR 2019 = 0.17

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

Subject: [IJAIN] Editor Decision

DELETE

Editor

Rahmat Hidayat:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to the International Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics, "On similarity measure fuzzy soft set for phishing detection".

Our decision is to: Accept Submission

Please keep attention to the copy editing and proofreading process which is the final publicity process on IJAIN Journal. Your paper is scheduled to be published in the upcoming issue after we finished those processes.

Regards,

Andri Pranolo
(Managing Editor)

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

SCOPUS Indexed Journal | SNIP 2019 = 1.4 | CiteScoreTracker 2020 = 1.5 (Last updated on 10 June, 2020)
SCOPUS: <https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100890645>

SJR 2019 = 0.17
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

Close