Andang Sunarto, Ph.D <andangs@iainbengkulu.ac.id>

Fwd: [BEEI 20-21] Your paper #1570656181 ('Modified Iterative Method with Red-Black Ordering for Image Composition using Poisson Equation')

1 pesan

AZALI BIN SAUDI - <azali@ums.edu.my>   11 September 2021 11.37
Kepada: Andang Sunarto <andangs@iainbengkulu.ac.id>

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **tole@iaescore.com** <tole=iaescore.com@edas.info>
Date: Tue, Apr 27, 2021, 6:59 AM
Subject: [BEEI 20-21] Your paper #1570656181 ('Modified Iterative Method with Red-Black Ordering for Image Composition using Poisson Equation')
To: Zakariah Aris <zxaris@ums.edu.my>, Nordin Saad <nordin@ums.edu.my>, A'qilah Ahmad Dahalan <a.qilah@upnm.edu.my>, Andang Sunarto <andangs@iainbengkulu.ac.id>, Azali Saudi <azali@ums.edu.my>

-- Please Strictly use & follow to the template Manuscripts: http://iaescore.com/gfa/beei.docx
-- Number of minimum references for original research paper is 25 references (and minimum 20 recently journal articles).
-- Number of minimum references for review paper is 50 references (and minimum 40 recently journal articles).
-- Authors MUST upload their Final manuscript through EDAS online system!!
===
=====================================

Dear Ms. Zakariah Aris,

Congratulations - your paper #1570656181 ('Modified Iterative Method with Red-Black Ordering for Image Composition using Poisson Equation') for the 2020 Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics has been ACCEPTED with minor revisions. The Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics (BEEI), ISSN: 2089-3191, e-ISSN: 2302-9285, http://beei.org is open to submission from scholars and experts in the wide areas of electrical, electronics, instrumentation, control, robotics, telecommunication, computer engineering, computer science, information system, information technology and informatics from the global world. This international journal is ACCREDITED (recognised) by the Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education, Republic of Indonesia (RISTEKDIKTI, Decree No: 60/E/KPT/2016) and indexed by Scopus (Elsevier)/ScimagoJR (SJR), SNIP 2019: 1.358 (SNIP=Source Normalized Impact per Paper measures actual citations received relative to citations expected for the serial's subject field), CiteScore 2019: 1.3, SJR 2019: 0.231; and ACCREDITED (recognised) by the Ministry of Research and Technology/National Agency for Research and Innovation, Republic of Indonesia (Decree No: 60/E/KPT/2016). Beginning with issue 1 of volume 9 (2020), BEEI is published as a bimonthly journal (6 issues/year).

Please make the necessary changes based on reviewers' comments and suggestions. The reviews are below or can be found at https://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1570656181. Please prepare your final camera ready paper (in MS Word file format) adheres every detail of the guide of authors (http://iaescore.com/gfa/beei.docx), and check it for spelling/grammatical mistakes. The goal of this camera ready paper is to describe NOVEL TECHNICAL RESULTS.

>>> For original research paper, there are four (4) types of novel technical results: 1) An algorithm; 2) A system construct: such as hardware design, software system, protocol, etc.; The main goal of your revised paper is to ensure that the next person who designs a system like yours doesn't make the same mistakes and takes advantage of some of your best solutions. So make sure that the hard problems (and their solutions) are discussed and the non-obvious mistakes (and how to avoid them) are discussed; 3) A performance evaluation: obtained through analyses, simulation or measurements; or 4) A theory: consisting of a collection of theorems. Your final camera ready paper should focus on: 1) Describing the results in sufficient details to establish their validity; 2) Identifying the novel aspects of the results, i.e., what new knowledge is reported and what makes it non-obvious; and 3) Identifying the significance of the results: what improvements and impact do they suggest. Number of minimum references for original research paper is 25 references (and minimum 20 recently journal articles).
>>> For review paper, the paper should present a critical, constructive analysis of the literature in a specific field

through summary, classification, analysis and 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 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 includes a description of context (paragraph 1 – 3), motivation for review (paragraph 4, sentence 1) and defines the focus (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 (and minimum 40 recently journal articles).

For your information, according to international regulations, similarity score of camera-ready paper should be less than 25% (current similarity score is 17%). Single author is NOT allowed. The Editor(s) will check whether the final version has been performed and already address the reviewers' comments or not. Failing to do proper revision may lead to the rejection of your paper.

Authors MUST upload their final manuscript through EDAS online system for similarity checking by EDAS. You also must submit your final camera ready paper, similarity checking report (by iThenticate or Turnitin software), along with your payment receipt to: tole@iaescore.com, cc: beei.org@gmail.com within 5 weeks.

I look forward for your response

Sincerely yours,
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tole Sutikno
Editor-in-Chief,
Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics
website: http://beei.org
email: tole@iaescore.com, beei.org@gmail.com

Submit paper: https://edas.info/N26898

Below is the reviews on your papers:
======= Review 1 =======

> *** Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?
Accept (9)

> *** Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?
Accept (9)

> *** Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

I have reviewed the revised manuscript and included my comments best to my knowledge. The paper has well addressed an important problem and the review is critical. However, I have few comments as below:
1. Abstract: The Abstract section needs rewriting; it needs to be more concise and precise. It is better to include a few results so that it can provide some sense of totality of the paper.
2. The manuscript can be reviewed by a native speaker of English. Tense-wise, it can still be improved.
3. Critical analysis, which is the most important part, is missing.
4. References to the figures\Tables are poor and so are the figure\table captions.
5. What are the evaluation criteria and the rationales?
6. What are the potential limitations of the present study?
7. The following references may be considered to draw the relationship with clinical applications:
"Lattice-Boltzmann Interactive Blood Flow Simulation Pipeline," International Journal of Computer Assisted Radiology and Surgery, Springer, vol. 15, pp. 629-639, 2020.
"Heterogeneous System-on-Chip based Lattice- Boltzmann Visual Simulation System," Systems Journal, IEEE, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 1592-1601, 2020.

"Moving Object Tracking in Clinical Scenarios: Application to Cardiac Surgery and Cerebral Aneurysm Clipping," International Journal of Computer Assisted Radiology and Surgery, Springer, vol. 14, no. 12, pp. 2165-2176.
"Real-time Automated Image Segmentation Technique for Cerebral Aneurysm on Reconfigurable System-On-Chip," Journal of Computational Science, Elsevier, vol. 27, pp 35-45.
"Zynq SoC based Acceleration of the Lattice Boltzmann Method," Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience, Wiley, 2019.
10. References are not uniform.

On a minor note, I think this paper still needs improvement.

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating.
Accept (9)

======= Review 2 =======

> *** Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?
Weak Reject (3)

> *** Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?
Weak Reject (3)

> *** Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

This paper presents a work in solving image composition problem employing red-black strategy to speed up the computation by using two acceleration parameters.
The current paper seems similar to the contribution proposed in:
-       Nordin Saad, Andang Sunarto, Azali Saudi. (2020) Accelerated Red-Black Strategy for Image Composition using Laplacian Operator. International Journal of Computing and Digital Systems. ISSN (2210-142X)
Without any comparison between those two papers, it is not possible to evaluate the originality degree of the proposed work. Please state clearly and precisely in the paper what makes this work original. Without any form of qualitative and quantitative comparison, it is next to impossible to become convinced with the merits of a technical paper.
In addition, the discussion on techniques on image composition is currently presented in the introduction section. In order to improve the paper, a distinct section on comparison among the related works needs to be added.
Furthermore, the method and the strategy are not adequately described as it is lacking in several explanations.

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating.
Weak Reject (3)

======= Review 3 =======

> *** Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?
Accept (9)

> *** Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?
Accept (9)

> *** Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

The paper presents a modified method for image composition using the Poisson Equation.
The mathematics of the background theory and the modified method are well analyzed. Six sets of images have been used in order to produce test results.
Overall the presentation is very good. There are however two minor modifications that need to be made:
1) In the experiments and results section, an analytic account must be added to determine the regions dS, F are in each case and generally guide the reader through the interpretation of the result. In their current form, the results given are not easily interpretable.

2) After equation 22 there is an expression 1, which does not make sense and needs to be corrected. In general, the formatting of the mathematical equations might need some more space and maybe some more commenting, given the consise presentation.
If necessary, in order to save space, the literature review section could be shortened, since it is slightly longer than necessary.

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating.
Accept (9)

======= Review 4 =======

> *** Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?
Weak Accept (7)

> *** Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?
Weak Accept (7)

> *** Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

The abstract and conclusion needs correction. Flow chart is needed for the algorithm. equation 1-18 needs more information and justification. Why SSIM is 0.99 for all the data sets?

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating.
Weak Accept (7)

======= Review 5 =======

> *** Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?
Accept (9)

> *** Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?
Accept (9)

> *** Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

The paper offers a comprehensive literature review on the methods available to solve the defined problem. Modified techniques are then explained and compared against established methods.
The paper is a complete presentation of comparative methods and new propositions.

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating.
Accept (9)

======= Review 6 =======

> *** Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?
Weak Accept (7)

> *** Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?
Weak Accept (7)

> *** Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

From the comparison obtained with the seven measurement metrics, it can be observed that all images generated by

the tested methods are identical. This means that the quality of images produced by the proposed methods are almost identical, in which there are no significant differences are noticeable.
This indicate high quality of this study.

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating.
Weak Accept (7)

======= Review 7 =======

> *** Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?
Accept (9)

> *** Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?
Accept (9)

> *** Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

The paper discusses an important subject. My comments are as follows:
- The main contribution of the paper is not well described in the abstract. The authors need to rewrite the abstract by emphasizing the main contribution more clearly.
- Adding a diagram can help the readability of the paper.
- The format of some the references is not in standard form. These need to be fixed.
- I highly encourage the authors to include some of the recently published papers in their introduction. In particular:
"A machine learning-based method in order to diagnose lumbar disc herniation disease by MR image processing." MedLife Open Access 1.1 (2018): 1.
"Boolean Kalman filter and smoother under model uncertainty." Automatica 111 (2020): 108609
 # "Machine learning in radiology: applications beyond image interpretation." Journal of the American College of Radiology 15.2 (2018): 350-359.

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating.
Accept (9)

======= Revision review 8 =======

> *** Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?
Accept (9)

> *** Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?
Accept (9)

> *** Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

This manuscript uses the red-black strategy to speed up the calculation using two acceleration parameters.
I went through the manuscript carefully. In the detailed level, the following notes are my suggestions:
1) What is the time complexity of the proposed algorithm?
2) I did not understand what exactly is the difference between this research and the following article? The following research seems to be related to this group of authors. It is better to add a description of the manuscript in this case:
- Saad, N., Sunarto, A. and Saudi, A., 2020. Accelerated Red-Black Strategy for Image Composition using Laplacian Operator. International Journal of Computing and Digital Systems, 9, pp.1-11.
3) There are many grammatical and structural flaws in the text.

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating.
Accept (9)

-- EDITOR COMMENTS --
Please pay an attention to double check your final camera ready paper!!
==
(1) TEMPLATE, Please Strictly use and follow to the template Manuscripts (Word Format): http://iaescore.com/gfa/beei.docx or http://iaescore.com/gfa/beei.rar (LaTeX format). If you use LaTeX, submit your LaTeX source files to tole@iaescore.com, cc: beei.org@gmail.com

For original research paper:
(2) Authors are suggested to present their articles with IMRaD sections structure (outline): Introduction - The Proposed Method/Algorithm/Procedure specifically designed (optional) - Research Method - Results and Discussion – Conclusion. 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 section: explain the context of the study and state the precise objective. An Introduction should contain the following three (3) elements:
- 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, 5 references (recently journal articles) are cited to support this section.

(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. This is where the author(s) should explain in words what he/she/they discovered in the research.

(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) Each citation should be written in the order of appearance in the text in square brackets. For example, the first citation [1], the second citation [2], and the third and fourth citations [3,4]. When citing multiple sources at once, the preferred method is to list each number separately, in its own brackets, using a comma or dash between numbers, as such: [1], [3], [5] or [4-8]. It is not necessary to mention an author's name, pages used, or date of publication in the in-text citation. Instead, refer to the source with a number in a square bracket, e.g. [9], that will then correspond to the full citation in your reference list. Examples of in-text citations:
    This theory was first put forward in 1970 [9]."
    Sutikno [10] has argued that...
    Several recent studies [7], [9], [11-15] have suggested that....
    ...end of the line for my research [16].

(9) Please ensure the maximum page of your final paper is 8-page, but still allowed up to 12 pages (required to pay an extra fee).

In order to cover part of the event cost, each accepted paper will be charged: USD 265 (IDR 3700K)
This article publication is to support the cost of wide open access dissemination of research results, to manage the various costs associated with handling and editing of the submitted manuscripts, and the Journal management and publication in general, the authors or the author's institution is requested to pay a publication fee for each article accepted. The USD 265 fee covers the standard eight (8) pages manuscript. For every additional page an extra fee of USD 50 (IDR 700K) per page will be charged.

The payment should be made by bank transfer (T/T):

Bank Account name (please be exact)/Beneficiary: TOLE SUTIKNO
Bank Name: Bank Central Asia (BCA)
Branch Office: Kusumanegara
City: Yogyakarta
Country :Indonesia
Bank Account #: 8465122249
SWIFT Code: CENAIDJAXXX

or through PayPal (as alternative of bank transfer) to email: tole@ee.uad.ac.id

Bank's detailed address :
Bank BCA Kusumanegara
Jl. Kusumanegara No. 18
City: Yogyakarta
Province: D.I. Yogyakarta (DIY)
Country :Indonesia
Post Code: 55165
Indonesia, Phone:+62 274 418896

The Beneficiary's address:
D2, Griya Ngoto Asri, RT 006
Bangunharjo, Sewon
City: Yogyakarta
Province: D.I. Yogyakarta (DIY)
Post Code: 55187
Country: Indonesia