



Universitas Hasanuddin

Muhammad Niswar &lt;niswar@unhas.ac.id&gt;

## [2021 ISMODE] Your paper #1570785415 ('Crab Molting Identification using Machine Learning Classifiers')

1 message

2021 ISMODE (ismode@unkris.ac.id) &lt;ismode=unkris.ac.id@edas.info&gt;

Fri, Jan 21, 2022 at 12:16 PM

Reply-To: 2021 ISMODE &lt;ismode@unkris.ac.id&gt;

To: Runal Rezkiawan Baharuddin &lt;baharuddinrr17d@student.unhas.ac.id&gt;, Muhammad Niswar &lt;niswar@unhas.ac.id&gt;, Amil Ahmad Ilham &lt;amil@unhas.ac.id&gt;

Dear Mr. Runal Baharuddin:

Congratulations - your paper #1570785415 ('Crab Molting Identification using Machine Learning Classifiers') for 2021 ISMODE has been **accepted** to be presented and published in The 2021 International Seminar on Machine Learning, Optimization, and Data Science (ISMODE) - 2021 ISMODE which will be held in Virtual (Jakarta, Indonesia) during 29th January 2022.

The double-blind review process has already been taken from three reviewers and the results are attached to this email. You have to revise your paper aligned with the review results.

The reviews are below or can be found at [1570785415](#).

Please take some steps below.

1. Please register and make a payment to the conference through the EDAS system. (For Local Participant, please contact our representative)
2. Please download the Camera-Ready of IEEE Full Paper A4 Template from the website. <https://www.ieee.org/conferences/publishing/templates.html>
3. Send the revised full paper in the IEEE PDF eXpress format (see Instructions for IEEE PDF eXpress)
4. Please be aware, according to the IEEE regulation the maximum similarity score has to be less than 30% using i-Thenticate.
5. Log in to EDAS, and fill in the Electronics Copyright Form (ECF) and Presenter.
6. Since the global pandemic, the 2021 ISMODE will be conducted as a VIRTUAL conference (online)

Please email us if you have any questions related to 2021 ISMODE.

### Review 1

**Technical content and scientific rigour: Is the paper interesting to the expected audience of this conference? Rate the technical content of the paper. (e.g. completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.**

Good (4)

**Novelty and originality: Does the paper discuss novel topics, new technology or a new approach to established technology? Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.**

Average (3)

**Quality of presentation: Is the technical content accurate? Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.**

Good (4)

**Relevance and timeliness: Will the work have a significant impact on the field or just be an incremental step? Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.**

Average (3)

**Recommendation: How do you rate your recommendation? You are to score the manuscript.**

**(Based on this and other indicators, the TPC and publication chair will make the final judgment.)**

Accept. (3)

**Indicators: The following indicators will help the final judgement of accept/reject.**

**Length of pages: Is the draft over the allotted maximum of 6 pages in the IEEE template? (or is it below the required minimum of 4 pages for extended abstract?)**

**Is the length appropriate?**

**Could be shorter.**

**Could be longer.**

**Please Identify specific areas that can be removed.**

**English writing quality: This is regarding English writing/Grammar issues.**

**Is the writing clear enough to convey the meaning?**

**Grammar issues: This conference does not have the luxury of having staff editors who will collaborate with the authors of accepted papers on the used IEEE template style and organization. So your help is appreciated on this matter.**

**If there are grammar issues, point out at least a few to the authors so that the authors can check the grammar carefully or have the paper checked by someone else.**

**Please contact TPC immediately if the grammar issues hinder the prompt review. (TPC may contact the authors to ask for re-submission of the paper after a quick grammar-only fix if the content seems worthwhile. Of course, if the content does not seem to warrant such handling, we may simply reject the paper.)**

The paper has average english writing quality

**Points to stress: Assuming that the paper is ACCEPTED, please list two (2) points (or more if you would like) that are covered in the draft and you would like the presenter to explain in detail.**

**If you are REJECTing the paper, simply fill in the field with something like "I am rejecting this submission, but EDAS won't let me simply reject it without my writing something in this field. Bah, humbug ....." Also, please list two (2) points (or more if you would like) that are NOT covered in the draft and you would like the presenter to cover if possible.**

**Check list: Optional Check List to help the reviewer**

**Check list: You may want to use the following checklist during review to come up with the indicator values above and your final judgment.**

**This checklist was prepared for FULL paper review, but maybe useful for quick judgment of SHORT paper/extended abstract, too.**

---

**This is optional, and you don't have to check all of the list items.**

**Check List of issues for review**

**Identify and note the type of manuscript (research, tutorial, survey, or case study).**

- - The submission is a novel research result, or novel development result, or both,
- - a survey,
- - a tutorial,
- - a case study - including a work-in-progress report.

**Motivation/Result:**

**Is the motivation and result of the topic appropriate and novel for the ISMODE conference?**

**This is important for the research-type submission.**

**Soundness**

**Does the submission contain technically sound and accurate content?**

**Correct errors and misconceptions.**

**Comment on the appropriateness of methods, analyses, results, and conclusions.**

**Appropriateness for ISMODE proceedings**

**Is the topic discussed appropriate for ISMODE conference?**

**Note: This may require an understanding of the nature of the ISMODE conference over the years. TPC Chair will make the final decision. If you are new to the ISMODE conference, you may leave the decision on this matter.**

**[] Clarity of Discussion**

**Is the main idea presented clear and well?**

**Are concepts understandable or defined adequately? Is the discussion easy to follow?**

**Suggest improvements if possible.**

**[] Does this work contain new topics that are not found in the existing works?**

**This is important for the research-type manuscript.**

**This may not be that important if the manuscript is a survey.**

**If the manuscript is a Work-in-Progress report, the point is moot at best.**

**[] Overall structure**

**Pay attention to organization and technical content by commenting on the technical significance and accuracy of the work.**

**Is the overall structure of the presentation good?**

**Balance: Does the manuscript lack some elements? Are some topics discussed in too much detail while others are not discussed well enough?**

**Provide tips that will help the author to organize the material to help the readers to understand the issues presented.**

**[] Is the title appropriate?**

**[] Does the abstract capture the essence of the submission?**

**[] Figures/Tables**

**Are the captions clear and do they describe the essence of the figures and tables?**

**[] References**

**Does the References section list appropriate papers?**

**Does the References section list too many papers?**

**A couple of dozens should suffice usually unless the submission is a survey paper.**

**In "principle", most references should be from refereed periodicals instead of conference proceedings papers with little peer reviews. (But, of course, this is "principle.")**

**[] Text and mathematical formulas**

**Is text clear and simple?**

**Are math formulas clear and understandable?**

**[] Conclusion/Summary**

**Is the Summary/Conclusion section of the paper a good summary of what is presented?**

**Thank you again for your time.**

7th

**Review 2**

**Technical content and scientific rigour: Is the paper interesting to the expected audience of this conference?**

**Rate the technical content of the paper. (e.g. completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.**

Good (4)

**Novelty and originality: Does the paper discuss novel topics, new technology or a new approach to established technology? Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.**

Average (3)

**Quality of presentation: Is the technical content accurate? Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.**

Average (3)

**Relevance and timeliness: Will the work have a significant impact on the field or just be an incremental step? Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.**

Good (4)

**Recommendation: How do you rate your recommendation? You are to score the manuscript.**

**(Based on this and other indicators, the TPC and publication chair will make the final judgment.)**

Accept. (3)

**Indicators: The following indicators will help the final judgement of accept/reject.**

**Length of pages: Is the draft over the allotted maximum of 6 pages in the IEEE template? (or is it below the required minimum of 4 pages for extended abstract?)**

**Is the length appropriate?**

**Could be shorter.**

**Could be longer.**

**Please Identify specific areas that can be removed.**

**English writing quality: This is regarding English writing/Grammar issues.**

**Is the writing clear enough to convey the meaning?**

**Grammar issues: This conference does not have the luxury of having staff editors who will collaborate with the authors of accepted papers on the used IEEE template style and organization. So your help is appreciated on this matter.**

**If there are grammar issues, point out at least a few to the authors so that the authors can check the grammar carefully or have the paper checked by someone else.**

**Please contact TPC immediately if the grammar issues hinder the prompt review. (TPC may contact the authors to ask for re-submission of the paper after a quick grammar-only fix if the content seems worthwhile. Of course, if the content does not seem to warrant such handling, we may simply reject the paper.)**

English writing is good

**Points to stress: Assuming that the paper is ACCEPTED, please list two (2) points (or more if you would like) that are covered in the draft and you would like the presenter to explain in detail.**

**If you are REJECTing the paper, simply fill in the field with something like "I am rejecting this submission, but EDAS won't let me simply reject it without my writing something in this field. Bah, humbug ....." Also, please list two (2) points (or more if you would like) that are NOT covered in the draft and you would like the presenter to cover if possible.**

**Check list: Optional Check List to help the reviewer**

**Check list: You may want to use the following checklist during review to come up with the indicator values above and your final judgment.**

**This checklist was prepared for FULL paper review, but maybe useful for quick judgment of SHORT paper/extended abstract, too.**

---

**This is optional, and you don't have to check all of the list items.**

**Check List of issues for review**

**Identify and note the type of manuscript (research, tutorial, survey, or case study).**

- - The submission is a novel research result, or novel development result, or both,
- - a survey,
- - a tutorial,
- - a case study - including a work-in-progress report.

**Motivation/Result:**

**Is the motivation and result of the topic appropriate and novel for the ISMODE conference?**

**This is important for the research-type submission.**

**Soundness**

**Does the submission contain technically sound and accurate content?**

**Correct errors and misconceptions.**

**Comment on the appropriateness of methods, analyses, results, and conclusions.**

**Appropriateness for ISMODE proceedings**

**Is the topic discussed appropriate for ISMODE conference?**

**Note: This may require an understanding of the nature of the ISMODE conference over the years. TPC Chair will make the final decision. If you are new to the ISMODE conference, you may leave the decision on this matter.**

**[] Clarity of Discussion****Is the main idea presented clear and well?****Are concepts understandable or defined adequately? Is the discussion easy to follow?****Suggest improvements if possible.****[] Does this work contain new topics that are not found in the existing works?****This is important for the research-type manuscript.****This may not be that important if the manuscript is a survey.****If the manuscript is a Work-in-Progress report, the point is moot at best.****[] Overall structure****Pay attention to organization and technical content by commenting on the technical significance and accuracy of the work.****Is the overall structure of the presentation good?****Balance: Does the manuscript lack some elements? Are some topics discussed in too much detail while others are not discussed well enough?****Provide tips that will help the author to organize the material to help the readers to understand the issues presented.****[] Is the title appropriate?****[] Does the abstract capture the essence of the submission?****[] Figures/Tables****Are the captions clear and do they describe the essence of the figures and tables?****[] References****Does the References section list appropriate papers?****Does the References section list too many papers?****A couple of dozens should suffice usually unless the submission is a survey paper.****In "principle", most references should be from refereed periodicals instead of conference proceedings papers with little peer reviews. (But, of course, this is "principle.")****[] Text and mathematical formulas****Is text clear and simple?****Are math formulas clear and understandable?****[] Conclusion/Summary****Is the Summary/Conclusion section of the paper a good summary of what is presented?****Thank you again for your time.**

8th

**Review 3****Technical content and scientific rigour: Is the paper interesting to the expected audience of this conference?****Rate the technical content of the paper. (e.g. completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.**

Average (3)

**Novelty and originality: Does the paper discuss novel topics, new technology or a new approach to established technology? Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.**

Average (3)

**Quality of presentation: Is the technical content accurate? Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.**

Average (3)

**Relevance and timeliness: Will the work have a significant impact on the field or just be an incremental step? Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.**

Average (3)

**Recommendation: How do you rate your recommendation? You are to score the manuscript.**

**(Based on this and other indicators, the TPC and publication chair will make the final judgment.)**

Possible Accept. (2)

**Indicators: The following indicators will help the final judgement of accept/reject.**

**Length of pages: Is the draft over the allotted maximum of 6 pages in the IEEE template? (or is it below the required minimum of 4 pages for extended abstract?)**

**Is the length appropriate?**

**Could be shorter.**

**Could be longer.**

**Please Identify specific areas that can be removed.**

The length of the paper is appropriate (six pages).

**English writing quality: This is regarding English writing/Grammar issues.**

**Is the writing clear enough to convey the meaning?**

**Grammar issues: This conference does not have the luxury of having staff editors who will collaborate with the authors of accepted papers on the used IEEE template style and organization. So your help is appreciated on this matter.**

**If there are grammar issues, point out at least a few to the authors so that the authors can check the grammar carefully or have the paper checked by someone else.**

**Please contact TPC immediately if the grammar issues hinder the prompt review. (TPC may contact the authors to ask for re-submission of the paper after a quick grammar-only fix if the content seems worthwhile. Of course, if the content does not seem to warrant such handling, we may simply reject the paper.)**

The paper is readable, but proofreading is suggested.

**Points to stress: Assuming that the paper is ACCEPTED, please list two (2) points (or more if you would like) that are covered in the draft and you would like the presenter to explain in detail.**

**If you are REJECTing the paper, simply fill in the field with something like "I am rejecting this submission, but EDAS won't let me simply reject it without my writing something in this field. Bah, humbug ....." Also, please list two (2) points (or more if you would like) that are NOT covered in the draft and you would like the presenter to cover if possible.**

The writing structure is well organized, but there are still minor revisions:

1. Abstract section, add quantitative results from each machine learning model implemented.
2. Make the introduction section into several paragraphs. Add an arrangement of paper sections.
3. Where are the datasets taken from? The link?
4. Clarify Fig. 1, 9, and Fig. 10 for readability.
5. Make the table center to the left uneven.
6. Arrange table VII. do not cross the paragraph limit.
7. Write the table in line with the description, do not move the line.
8. Analyze the model why get such accuracy results so that it doesn't just display the evaluation results.

**Check list: Optional Check List to help the reviewer**

**Check list: You may want to use the following checklist during review to come up with the indicator values above and your final judgment.**

**This checklist was prepared for FULL paper review, but maybe useful for quick judgment of SHORT paper/extended abstract, too.**

---

**This is optional, and you don't have to check all of the list items.**

**Check List of issues for review**

**[ ] Identify and note the type of manuscript (research, tutorial, survey, or case study).**

- - The submission is a novel research result, or novel development result, or both,
- - a survey,
- - a tutorial,
- - a case study - including a work-in-progress report.

**[ ] Motivation/Result:**

**Is the motivation and result of the topic appropriate and novel for the ISMODE conference?**

**This is important for the research-type submission.**

**[] Soundness**

**Does the submission contain technically sound and accurate content?**

**Correct errors and misconceptions.**

**Comment on the appropriateness of methods, analyses, results, and conclusions.**

**[] Appropriateness for ISMODE proceedings**

**Is the topic discussed appropriate for ISMODE conference?**

**Note: This may require an understanding of the nature of the ISMODE conference over the years. TPC Chair will make the final decision. If you are new to the ISMODE conference, you may leave the decision on this matter.**

**[] Clarity of Discussion**

**Is the main idea presented clear and well?**

**Are concepts understandable or defined adequately? Is the discussion easy to follow?**

**Suggest improvements if possible.**

**[] Does this work contain new topics that are not found in the existing works?**

**This is important for the research-type manuscript.**

**This may not be that important if the manuscript is a survey.**

**If the manuscript is a Work-in-Progress report, the point is moot at best.**

**[] Overall structure**

**Pay attention to organization and technical content by commenting on the technical significance and accuracy of the work.**

**Is the overall structure of the presentation good?**

**Balance: Does the manuscript lack some elements? Are some topics discussed in too much detail while others are not discussed well enough?**

**Provide tips that will help the author to organize the material to help the readers to understand the issues presented.**

**[] Is the title appropriate?**

**[] Does the abstract capture the essence of the submission?**

**[] Figures/Tables**

**Are the captions clear and do they describe the essence of the figures and tables?**

**[] References**

**Does the References section list appropriate papers?**

**Does the References section list too many papers?**

**A couple of dozens should suffice usually unless the submission is a survey paper.**

**In "principle", most references should be from refereed periodicals instead of conference proceedings papers with little peer reviews. (But, of course, this is "principle.")**

**[] Text and mathematical formulas**

**Is text clear and simple?**

**Are math formulas clear and understandable?**

**[] Conclusion/Summary**

**Is the Summary/Conclusion section of the paper a good summary of what is presented?**

**Thank you again for your time.**

8th

Regards,

ISMODE Admin

2021 International Seminar on Machine Learning, Optimization, and Data Science (ISMODE)

URL: <https://ismode.unkris.ac.id/>

Universitas Krisnadwipayana

Address : Jalan Raya Jatiwaringin, Pondok Gede, Kota Bekasi, Jawa Barat, Indonesia 13077

E-mail: [ismode@unkris.ac.id](mailto:ismode@unkris.ac.id)

For Fast Response:

Mr. Ade

WhatsApp: +62 815-7280-9394

<https://wa.me/6281572809394>

