

HASIL REVIEW JURNAL INTERNASIONAL BEREPUTASI

**ELECTRIC POWER SYSTEMS RESEARCH (Q1)**

PENERBIT: ELSEVIER

Close

**View Reviewer Comments for Manuscript**

**EPSR-D-21-01544R1**

**"Optimal Dispatch of Integrated Energy System Considering Integrated Demand Response Resource Trading"**

Click the Reviewer recommendation term to view the Reviewer comments.

	<b>Revision 1</b>	<b>Original Submission</b>
<a href="#">(Reviewer 1)</a>	<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">Minor Revision</a>
<a href="#">Ardiaty Arief, Ph.D. (Reviewer 2)</a>	<a href="#">Minor Revision</a>	<a href="#">Major/Required Revision</a>
<a href="#">Author Decision Letter</a>	<a href="#">Minor Revise</a>	<a href="#">Major Revise</a>

Close

Close

**EPSR-D-21-01544**

**"Optimal Dispatch of Integrated Energy System Considering Integrated Demand Response Resource Trading"  
Original Submission**

**Ardiaty Arief, Ph.D. (Reviewer 2)**

<b>Reviewer Recommendation Term:</b>		Major/Required Revision	
<b>Transfer Authorization</b>	<b>Response</b>		
If this submission is transferred to another journal, do we have consent to share your identity with the receiving journal Editor(s)?	Yes		
If this submission is transferred to another journal, do we have your consent to share your full review with the receiving journal Editor(s)?	Yes		
If this submission is transferred to another publication with "Open Peer Review", do we have your consent to publish your review in a pre-publication history?	Yes		
<b>Manuscript Rating Question(s):</b>		<b>Scale</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Rate scientific content (1 poor, 5 average, 10 excellent)		[1-10]	8
Rate English (1 poor, 2 average, 3 good)		[1-3]	3
Rate originality (1 poor, 3 average, 5 highly original)		[1-5]	5
Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Graphical Abstract is a meaningful and an accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see <a href="http://www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts">www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts</a> .		[1-3]	N/A
Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Highlights are a meaningful and accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see <a href="http://www.elsevier.com/highlights">www.elsevier.com/highlights</a> .		[1-3]	N/A
<b>Comments to Editor:</b>			
1. Is the title appropriate? Yes			
2. Does it contain original work? Yes			
3. Is it clearly presented and well organized? Yes			
4. Does it give adequate references to related work? Yes			
5. Are the conclusions sound and justified? Not yet. The authors need to add more arguments in the simulation section and conclude it into the conclusion as my comment no. 2 to the authors.			
<b>Comments to Author:</b>			
This paper presents a hierarchical trading framework based on blockchain technology and energy management system, and the integrated demand response resources. The reviewer has some questions/comments that might need to be addressed before the manuscript is considered fit for publication:			
1. In the end of the introduction, the authors states "The innovation of this paper is to use blockchain technology combined with energy management system to establish a hierarchical trading framework, which effectively utilizes the market value of IDR resources and promotes the free trading of IDR resources among users. Compared with traditional trading methods, the method adopted in this paper can better utilize IDR resources, reduce the carbon emission of the system and the cost of energy use by users." However, I cannot find in the analysis that the proposed method is better than the traditional method, especially in reducing the carbon emission of the system and the cost of energy use by users. Please add analysis and discussion on comparison between the proposed method and the traditional one in terms of better utilize IDR resources, reduce the carbon emission of the system and the cost of energy use by users to support the above statement and conclude them in the conclusions.			
2. In Section 2, the authors state "Therefore, this paper replaces MAS with Energy Management System (EMS) on the basis of retaining the hierarchical management model, combines the EMS architecture in the reference [29], and uses blockchain technology to build a hierarchical transaction framework to effectively guarantee the privacy of users' energy use during the transaction process, as shown in Figure 2" The authors need to provide explanation about what the MAS weaknesses are that can be improved by the EMS and how the EMS is better than MAS. Maybe add figures and explanation on EMS and its implementation into the research			
3. Fig. 1 and Fig 2 have the same name which are Basic structure of MAS. Adjust one name to differentiate between these 2 figures			
4. Fig. 4 A and B the traditional method curve cannot be seen			
5. Please use Dollar instead of Yuan			



Close

**EPSR-D-21-01544R1**

**"Optimal Dispatch of Integrated Energy System Considering Integrated Demand Response Resource Trading"**

**Revision 1**

**Ardiaty Arief, Ph.D. (Reviewer 2)**

<b>Reviewer Recommendation Term:</b>		Minor Revision	
<b>Transfer Authorization</b>	<b>Response</b>		
If this submission is transferred to another journal, do we have consent to share your identity with the receiving journal Editor(s)?	Yes		
If this submission is transferred to another journal, do we have your consent to share your full review with the receiving journal Editor(s)?	Yes		
If this submission is transferred to another publication with "Open Peer Review", do we have your consent to publish your review in a pre-publication history?	Yes		
<b>Manuscript Rating Question(s):</b>		<b>Scale</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Rate scientific content (1 poor, 5 average, 10 excellent)		[1-10]	8
Rate English (1 poor, 2 average, 3 good)		[1-3]	3
Rate originality (1 poor, 3 average, 5 highly original)		[1-5]	5
Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Graphical Abstract is a meaningful and an accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see <a href="http://www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts">www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts</a> .		[1-3]	N/A
Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Highlights are a meaningful and accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see <a href="http://www.elsevier.com/highlights">www.elsevier.com/highlights</a> .		[1-3]	N/A
<b>Comments to Editor:</b>			
1. Is the title appropriate? Yes			
2. Does it contain original work? Yes			
3. Is it clearly presented and well organized? Yes			
4. Does it give adequate references to related work? Yes			
5. Are the conclusions sound and justified? Yes			
<b>Comments to Author:</b>			
The authors have revised the paper based on the reviewers' comments. One more small suggestion is to add a paragraph at the end of section one elaborating the structure of the manuscript.			

Close



Close

### View Reviewer Comments for Manuscript

EPSR-D-21-01737

### "Probabilistic Approach to Study Impact on Voltage Deviation of Distribution System Using Principal Component Analysis"

Click the Reviewer recommendation term to view the Reviewer comments.

	Original Submission
<a href="#">(Reviewer 1)</a>	<a href="#">Major/Required Revision</a>
<a href="#">(Reviewer 2)</a>	<a href="#">Major/Required Revision</a>
<a href="#">Ardiaty Arief, Ph.D. (Reviewer 3)</a>	<a href="#">Reject</a>
<a href="#">(Reviewer 4)</a>	<a href="#">Major/Required Revision</a>
<a href="#">(Reviewer 6)</a>	<a href="#">Reject</a>
<a href="#">Author Decision Letter</a>	<a href="#">Reject after review</a>

Close

Close

**EPSR-D-21-01737**

**"Probabilistic Approach to Study Impact on Voltage Deviation of Distribution System Using Principal Component Analysis"  
Original Submission**

**Ardiaty Arief, Ph.D. (Reviewer 3)**

<b>Reviewer Recommendation Term:</b>		Reject
<b>Transfer Authorization</b>	<b>Response</b>	
If this submission is transferred to another journal, do we have consent to share your identity with the receiving journal Editor(s)?	No	
If this submission is transferred to another journal, do we have your consent to share your full review with the receiving journal Editor(s)?	No	
<b>Manuscript Rating Question(s):</b>	<b>Scale</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Rate scientific content (1 poor, 5 average, 10 excellent)	[1-10]	4
Rate English (1 poor, 2 average, 3 good)	[1-3]	2
Rate originality (1 poor, 3 average, 5 highly original)	[1-5]	3
Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Graphical Abstract is a meaningful and an accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see <a href="http://www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts">www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts</a> .	[1-3]	N/A
Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Highlights are a meaningful and accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see <a href="http://www.elsevier.com/highlights">www.elsevier.com/highlights</a> .	[1-3]	N/A
<b>Comments to Editor:</b>		
1. Is the title appropriate? Yes		
2. Does it contain original work? Yes		
3. Is it clearly presented and well organized? No		
4. Does it give adequate references to related work? Yes		
5. Are the conclusions sound and justified? No		
<b>Comments to Author:</b>		
<p>This paper proposes a method to assess the impact of buses integrated with DG (active bus) on the voltage deviation of the bus which the authors refer to as the observer bus. The developed method that they propose is principal component analysis (PCA) based on the probabilistic voltage sensitivity index (PVSI). They calculated the PVSI values for each active bus from the observer bus and the bus with the highest PVSI value was considered to be the bus that had the most impact on the voltage deviation at the observer bus. I question the urgency of doing this research. Currently, there are various works that observe the optimal location and size of DGs with one of the objectives being to overcome the system voltage constraints. Therefore, with various studies that have been developed, the problem of voltage violations can be overcome or minimized.</p> <p>Next I also question what is the point of having an observer bus? What are the criteria for observer bus? Why assess the voltage deviation from only one observer bus at a time? Any disturbance in the system will result in a voltage deviation across all buses not just the observer bus. I think to evaluate the most impactful bus for any disturbance, we need an overall strategy or method not viewing from just one bus.</p> <p>The author uses 2 systems as case studies; IEEE 33 and IEEE 69 test systems. For bus 33, they chose buses 18, 23 and 33 as observer buses, and for the 69 bus system, bus 5, bus 27 and bus 51 were selected as observer buses and for the three different bus observers they obtain 2 different results. Why were only 3 buses selected as observers? Why are not all buses reviewed as observers? I think the results may vary so much that it's hard to decide which bus has the most impact. In my opinion, the bigger the system, the more complicated the method.</p> <p>The author compares the proposed method with the conventional method. I advise the author for any future work to compare with the recent methods rather than just conventional ones.</p> <p>Then they rated the impacted bus from changes in active power, reactive power, and active-reactive power both, but all the results for the bus ratings were the same. How could that be?</p> <p>Overall the paper is well written. However it raises more questions than it answers.</p>		

3 ?

Close

Close

**View Reviewer Comments for Manuscript**

**EPSR-D-21-01544**

**"Optimal Dispatch of Integrated Energy System Considering Integrated Demand Response Resource Trading"**

Click the Reviewer recommendation term to view the Reviewer comments.

	<b>Original Submission</b>
<a href="#">(Reviewer 1)</a>	<a href="#">Minor Revision</a>
<a href="#">Ardiaty Arief, Ph.D. (Reviewer 2)</a>	<a href="#">Major/Required Revision</a>
<a href="#">Author Decision Letter</a>	<a href="#">Major Revise</a>

Close

Close

**EPSR-D-21-01544**

**"Optimal Dispatch of Integrated Energy System Considering Integrated Demand Response Resource Trading"  
Original Submission**

**Ardiaty Arief, Ph.D. (Reviewer 2)**

<b>Reviewer Recommendation Term:</b>		Major/Required Revision	
<b>Transfer Authorization</b>	<b>Response</b>		
If this submission is transferred to another journal, do we have consent to share your identity with the receiving journal Editor(s)?	Yes		
If this submission is transferred to another journal, do we have your consent to share your full review with the receiving journal Editor(s)?	Yes		
If this submission is transferred to another publication with "Open Peer Review", do we have your consent to publish your review in a pre-publication history?	Yes		
<b>Manuscript Rating Question(s):</b>	<b>Scale</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Rate scientific content (1 poor, 5 average, 10 excellent)	[1-10]	8	
Rate English (1 poor, 2 average, 3 good)	[1-3]	3	
Rate originality (1 poor, 3 average, 5 highly original)	[1-5]	5	
Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Graphical Abstract is a meaningful and an accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see <a href="http://www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts">www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts</a> .	[1-3]	N/A	
Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Highlights are a meaningful and accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see <a href="http://www.elsevier.com/highlights">www.elsevier.com/highlights</a> .	[1-3]	N/A	
<b>Comments to Editor:</b>			
1. Is the title appropriate? Yes			
2. Does it contain original work? Yes			
3. Is it clearly presented and well organized? Yes			
4. Does it give adequate references to related work? Yes			
5. Are the conclusions sound and justified? Not yet. The authors need to add more arguments in the simulation section and conclude it into the conclusion as my comment no. 2 to the authors.			
<b>Comments to Author:</b>			
This paper presents a hierarchical trading framework based on blockchain technology and energy management system, and the integrated demand response resources. The reviewer has some questions/comments that might need to be addressed before the manuscript is considered fit for publication:			
1. In the end of the introduction, the authors states "The innovation of this paper is to use blockchain technology combined with energy management system to establish a hierarchical trading framework, which effectively utilizes the market value of IDR resources and promotes the free trading of IDR resources among users. Compared with traditional trading methods, the method adopted in this paper can better utilize IDR resources, reduce the carbon emission of the system and the cost of energy use by users." However, I cannot find in the analysis that the proposed method is better than the traditional method, especially in reducing the carbon emission of the system and the cost of energy use by users. Please add analysis and discussion on comparison between the proposed method and the traditional one in terms of better utilize IDR resources, reduce the carbon emission of the system and the cost of energy use by users to support the above statement and conclude them in the conclusions.			
2. In Section 2, the authors state "Therefore, this paper replaces MAS with Energy Management System (EMS) on the basis of retaining the hierarchical management model, combines the EMS architecture in the reference [29], and uses blockchain technology to build a hierarchical transaction framework to effectively guarantee the privacy of users' energy use during the transaction process, as shown in Figure 2" The authors need to provide explanation about what the MAS weaknesses are that can be improved by the EMS and how the EMS is better than MAS. Maybe add figures and explanation on EMS and its implementation into the research			
3. Fig. 1 and Fig 2 have the same name which are Basic structure of MAS. Adjust one name to differentiate between these 2 fir 3			
4. Fig. 4 A and B the traditional method curve cannot be seen			
5. Please use Dollar instead of Yuan			

