



Iwan Setiawan <setiaone.iwan@gmail.com>

ID# 1570636622: Preparing paper for a Scopus indexed journal caliber

1 message

ijeecs.iaes@gmail.com <ijeecs.iaes@gmail.com@edas.info>

Wed, Oct 21, 2020 at 10:28 PM

Reply-To: ijeecs.iaes@gmail.com

To: Winda Pratiwi <windapратиwi544@students.undip.ac.id>, Aghus Sofwan <asofwan@elektro.undip.ac.id>, Iwan Setiawan <setiaone.iwan@gmail.com>

Cc: Humaira Anwer <humairaanwer13@ce.ceme.edu.pk>, Farrukh Arslan <farslan@purdue.edu>, Jose A M Cordeiro <jose.cordeiro@estsetubal.ips.pt>, Abdul Talib Din <talib@utem.edu.my>, Noriko Etani <kerotan@kcn.ne.jp>, Yee Loo Foo <ylfoo@mmu.edu.my>, Sasanko Sekhar Gantayat <drssgantayat@ieee.org>, Hiyam Hatem Jabbar <hiamhatim2005@gmail.com>, Waseem Akhtar Mufti <wmufti@gmail.com>, Tarik A Rashid <tarik.ahmed@ieee.org>, Ahmed Riadh Rebai <rbai_rd@yahoo.fr>, "Nadheer A. Shalash" <eng_n_a_msc@yahoo.com>, Anurag Yadav <anuragcdot@gmail.com>

-- Please refer to: <http://citei.intconference.org/list-of-accepted-papers-and-registration/> and see at "Revisions Required" column. This email is addressed to authors of the papers in this list.

-- Please adhere strictly and use the templates:

-->> IJECS: <http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijeecs.docx> (Word Format)

-->> IJAI: <http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijai.docx> (Word Format)

-->> IJERE: <http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijere.docx> (Word Format)

-- Checklist for preparing your final paper for publication: <http://ijeecs.iaescore.com/index.php/IJECS/about/editorialPolicies#custom-3> or <http://ijai.iaescore.com/index.php/IJAI/about/editorialPolicies#custom-2>

-- Please re-upload your updated paper for publication in one of our Scopus indexed journals

-- before Oct 25, 2020 <<<----- URGENT --- otherwise, we will not proceed your paper

Dear Mrs. Winda Pratiwi,

Congratulations!! Your paper is selected for publication in one of our Scopus indexed journals (see: <http://citei.intconference.org/list-of-accepted-papers-and-registration/>). However, after editorial team meeting and careful re-review, your paper ID #1570636622, entitled "Implementation of Fuzzy Logic Method for Automation of Decision Making of Boeing Aircraft Landing" requires MAJOR REVISIONS before being scheduled for publication in one of Scopus indexed journals. We suggest for extension and improvement on results and analysis of your paper. You are asked to revise your paper seriously & carefully, and do re-submit your updated manuscript according to reviewers' comments, editors' comments, editorial office comments (<http://citei.intconference.org/list-of-accepted-papers-and-registration/>, see comments at "Revisions Required" column) and the guidelines for authors. The editors will re-check whether your updated paper already address the comments and guidelines, and fulfill for a Scopus indexed journal standard. Failing to do proper revisions may lead to delays for publication and/or re-evaluation of your paper. So, please take your attention for the requirements.

The reviews are below or can be found at <https://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1570636622>, using your EDAS login name windapратиwi544@students.undip.ac.id.

Please submit your updated paper through EDAS system before Oct 25, 2020.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Best Regards,
Assoc. Prof. Tole Sutikno, Ph.D.
Editor-in-Chief, Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
General Chair, 2020 1st Conference on Internet of Things and Embedded Intelligence

COMMENTS FROM REVIEWERS:

===== Full paper review 1 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.
Good (4)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: 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.
Solid work of notable importance. (4)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.
Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.
Well written. (4)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

A planned model for the paper.
Results are well established.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

The methodology in "Figure 1. System Design Decision Aircraft Landing" is generic. No new methodology is given

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

The methodology should be changed.
English grammar should be checked again.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

yes.

===== Full paper review 2 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.
Acceptable (3)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: 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.
Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.
Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.
Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

The paper discusses implementing the Fuzzy Logic approach for Aircraft Landing. Four (4) parameters were tested and simulated and based on the said results, comparable to the actual data.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

The said results should not only be reported but also discussed in depth.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

1. Abstract (please arrange your Abstract according to Introduction, Issues/Problem, Aim of the paper/objectives, Methodology, Outstand Results and Implication).
2. The intro part is OK
3. LR - more in-depth writing should be added, as only 2 were discussed.
4. RM is OK. Could add the reason parameters in Table 1 were chosen.
5. Results - OK but no on the Analysis part. Please add to make it more interesting

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Not sure, please double-check.

===== Full paper review 3 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Acceptable (3)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: 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.

Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

Some results have been tabulated and presented

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

Is 14 data sufficient?

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

is not too much difference - It needs to be measured.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

It is weird that the article included "Article history:

Received Sep 9, 2019

Revised May 20, 2020

Accepted Jun 11, 2020", and "Name of Corresponding Author,

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering,

National Chung Cheng University,

168 University Road, Minhsiung Township, Chiayi County 62102, Taiwan, ROC.

Email: corresp-author@mail.com".

===== Full paper review 4 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Good (4)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: 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.

Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Well written. (4)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

A good research

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

Need more details on the literature review and results discussion

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

The linguistic range must be changed (not overlapped)

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Ok..no problem

===== Full paper review 5 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Excellent (5)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: 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.

Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Well written. (4)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

The application is very important.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

Details of implementation and the fuzzy rules are missing.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

The following comments and suggestions are made for the authors of the paper titled "Implementation of Fuzzy Logic Method for automation of Decision Making of Boeing Aircraft Landing":

- 1) It is a very interesting application.
- 2) Specify the motive of this paper in the introduction.
- 3) Specify the contributions of this paper in the introduction.
- 4) Literature Review section is too short and it has two references: I recommend authors divide this section into two subsections:
 - a. Application of Boeing Aircraft Landing.
 - b. Fuzzy Logic

It is preferable to add the following recent work on Fuzzy logic:

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbe.2019.09.004>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2019.106005>

- 5) Add concluding points with analytical discussion to the conclusion section.
- 6) Add future work to the conclusion section.
- 7) Proofreading is needed.

Recommendation: This paper can be accepted after the above comments are considered.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

N/A

===== Full paper review 6 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Good (4)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: 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.

Solid work of notable importance. (4)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Minor variations on a well investigated subject. (2)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

no strong aspects

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

1. Abstract is does not clear the aim of paper. It must clearly show what the authors have proposed? or created new system?
2. Lots of spelling and grammar mistakes. The 6 lines sentence cannot be allowed in a scientific paper, it is repeated on page 2 paragraph 2 and 3.
3. Literature review is too short. Does not clearly define the similar work already done.
4. It is not clear what is Mamdani Logic? is it new proposed/invented?
5. Doe not provide the basic definition of "Fuzzy"? Must show what is the difference between fuzzy data and complete data giving simplest examples that may not take more than a paragraph of 5 to 10 lines.
6. How the pilot's "experience" can be fuzzy? it is always concrete fact.

7. There is possibly some error in Table 2, entries 8 and 9. "careful" must be with entry 9 and "Not feasible" with entry 8. Please check it I am doubtful about it.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

1. Abstract must be focused
2. Spelling and grammar mistakes.
3. Basic definition of Fuzzy.
4. Clear definition of Mamdani logic.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

cannot be confirmed.

===== Full paper review 7 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Acceptable (3)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: 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.

Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

This paper is well presented, ideas are clear, results are presented.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

First, IMHO in international conferences we should avoid using references that are not in English.

Although the research method is clear, I failed to see the rationale for choosing the selected sets and rules. Also, the discussion could be improved by including a comparison to other methods that shows the relevance and contribution of this approach.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

Besides improving the weak aspects, English should be revised. Too long sentences and many repetitive ideas.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Ok, same title and abstract.

===== Full paper review 8 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Good (4)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: 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.

Solid work of notable importance. (4)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper. Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

the idea of the paper is novel and very impotent

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

Lack the explanation of research methodology which used to conduct current research.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

Present clearly what is the advantage of your method and what was the improvement of the results if compared to other methods.

There is some advice to improve the current research:

1-To gain the reader's attention ,Please use motivated sentences in beginning of Abstract and give the outline of the RESEARCH METHOD that you used

2- what are the keywords?

3-please give more details about "data from AIRNAV Ahmad Yani Airport Semarang "

4-please show by briefly how you design "Graphical User Interface of Aircraft Landing Decision using Fuzzy Logic Mamdani"

5- In section 2.1 you have to give more explain

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

I accept

===== Full paper review 9 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Good (4)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: 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.

Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper. Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Well written. (4)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

The paper is presented in simple way. All aspects are clearly expressed.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

Some more solid ground for decision making. Algorithm and comparison with manual decision required.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

Some comparison and benefits of automated fuzzy logic over manual decision may be shared

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes

===== Full paper review 10 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.
Acceptable (3)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: 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.
Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.
Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.
Well written. (4)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

The airline's navigation system has a system to select a pilot or co-pilot according to the difficulty of navigation. However, the internal processing of the system is not publicly exposed. It's interesting to discover useful methods in that respect.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

The author should describe how to decide criteria on Table 1. Please explain the validity of the criteria.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

Please describe the future work and usage of this proposed system.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes.

===== Full paper review 11 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.
Good (4)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: 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.
Solid work of notable importance. (4)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

relevant subject and interesting contribution.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

lack of novelty (already such system are embedded with aircraft) and comparison with current deployed technique to justify importance. results and conclusions were badly presented. lack in the literature review coverage of the proposed and current techniques.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

please refer above to paper update and changes.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

yes

===== Full paper review 12 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Acceptable (3)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: 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.

Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Well written. (4)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

presents the proposed fuzzy logic for intelligent aircraft landing decision systems. Several factors that can affect aircraft landing decisions required in this method include wind velocity, wind direction, visibility, and pilot experience.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

the resulted need to verification

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

abstract need to rewriter as a well

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

1. The abstract should matching with title and the conclusion

2. The figures should explain more in Discussion
3. Should send to proofreader English
4. introduction need to add paragraph at end introduction as a rest of paper
5. Many references are not mention and need to arranged the references in paper be series as in references section

COMMENTS FROM EDITORS: GUIDELINES FOR REVISIONS

For ORIGINAL/RESEARCH Paper Type, the paper should be presented with IMRaD model:

1. Introduction (I)
2. The Proposed Method/Algorithm/Procedure/Framework/ ... specifically designed (optional). Authors may present complex proofs of theorems or non-obvious proofs of correctness of algorithms after introduction section (obvious theorems & straightforward proofs of existing theorems are NOT needed).
3. Method (M)
4. Results and Discussion (RaD)
5. Conclusion.

We will usually expect:

- A minimum of 25-30 references primarily to journal papers, depending on the length of the paper (number of minimum references = $2n+10$, n =page length).
- Citations of textbooks should be used very rarely and citations to web pages should be avoided.
- REMOVE ALL LOCAL REFERENCES.
- All cited papers should be referenced within the text of the manuscript.
- Choose ONLY the most important figures and/or tables, and prepare all figures in high quality images.
- Avoid paper with too many Figures and/or Tables. Figures and Tables are each MAX 4 entries.

For REVIEW Paper Type, the paper should present a critical and constructive analysis of existing published literature in a field, through SUMMARY, CLASSIFICATION, ANALYSIS and/or COMPARISON. The function and goal of the review paper is:

- 1) to organize literature;
- 2) to evaluate literature;
- 3) to identify patterns and trends in the literature;
- 4) to synthesize literature; or
- 5) to identify research gaps and recommend new research areas.

The structure of a review paper includes:

1. Title – in this case does not indicate that it is a review article.
 2. Abstract – includes a description of subjects covered.
 3. Introduction should be presented within 3-6 paragraphs, includes a description of context (ex: paragraph 1-3), motivation for review (ex: paragraph 4, sentence 1) and defines the focus (ex: paragraph 4, sentences 2-3)
 4. Body – structured by headings and subheadings
 5. Conclusion – states the implications of the findings and an identifies possible new research fields
 6. References (“Literature Review”) – organised by number in the order they were cited in the text.
- Number of minimum references for review paper is 50 references (included minimum 40 recently journal articles).

We would like also your cooperation with the double check of your revised paper:

-
- (1) TEMPLATE- Please Strictly use and follow to the template Manuscript:
 - IJECS: <http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijeecs.docx> (Word Format)
 - IJAI: <http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijai.docx> (Word Format)
 - IJERE: <http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijere.docx> (Word Format)

(2) Authors may present complex proofs of theorems or non-obvious proofs of correctness of algorithms after introduction section (obvious theorems & straightforward proofs of existing theorems are NOT needed).

(3) Introduction

* For Research article:

Introduction section should be presented within 3-6 paragraphs: explain the context of the study and state the precise

objective. An Introduction should contain the following three (3) parts:

- Background: Authors have to make clear what the context is. Ideally, authors should give an idea of the state-of-the-art of the field the report is about.
 - The Problem: If there was no problem, there would be no reason for writing a manuscript, and definitely no reason for reading it. So, please tell readers why they should proceed reading. Experience shows that for this part a few lines are often sufficient.
 - The Proposed Solution: Now and only now! - authors may outline the contribution of the manuscript. Here authors have to make sure readers point out what are the novel aspects of authors work.
- Authors should place the paper in proper context by citing relevant papers. At least, 15 references (recent journal articles) are cited in this section to explain gap of analysis and to support your state of the art.

* For Review article:

Introduction section for review paper should accomplish three things:

- Introduce your topic: It may sound redundant to "introduce" your topic in the introduction, but often times writer's fail to do so. Let the reader in on background information specific to the topic, define terms that may be unfamiliar to them, explain the scope of the discussion, and your purpose for writing the review.
- State your topic's relevance: Think of your review paper as a statement in the larger conversation of your academic community. Your review is your way of entering into that conversation and it is important to briefly address why your review is relevant to the discussion. You may feel the relevance is obvious because you are so familiar with the topic, but your readers have not yet established that familiarity.
- Reveal your thesis to the reader: The thesis is the main idea that you want to get across to your reader. your thesis should be a clear statement of what you intend to prove or illustrate by your review. By revealing your thesis in the introduction the reader knows what to expect in the rest of the paper.

(4) Method section: the presentation of the experimental methods should be clear and complete in every detail facilitating reproducibility by other scientists.

(5) Results and discussion section: The presentation of results should be simple and straightforward in style. This section report the most important findings, including results of statistical analyses as appropriate and comparisons to other research results. Results given in figures should not be repeated in tables. This is where the author(s) should explain in words what he/she/they discovered in the research. It should be clearly laid out and in a logical sequence. This section should be supported suitable references.

(6) (URGENT)!!! About Figures & Tables in your manuscript:

- Because tables and figures supplement the text, all tables and figures should be REFERENCED in the text. Authors MUST EXPLAIN what the reader should look for when using the table or figure. Focus only on the important point the reader should draw from them, and leave the details for the reader to examine on her own.
- Tables are to be presented with single horizontal line under: the table caption, the column headings and at the end of the table. All tables are produced by creating tables in MS Word. Captured tables are NOT allowed.
- All figures MUST in high quality images

(7) Conclusion section: Summarize sentences the primary outcomes of the study in a paragraph. Are the claims in this section supported by the results, do they seem reasonable? Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and to earlier research? Does the article support or contradict previous theories? Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward?

(8) Most importantly, please ensure the similarity score is less than 25%. You can refer to EDAS to see the similarity score of your paper. Any paper with a similarity score of more than 25% will be dropped. Please make sure your revised paper follow this rule. If the similarity score of final version is more than 25%, the Editors has the right to cancel the paper to be published in one of our Scopus indexed journals.

(9) Please ensure the maximum page of your final paper is 8-page, but still allowed up to 12 pages (for research article) and 14 pages (for review article), but required to pay an extra fee after 8 pages (USD50 per page).