



Andang Sunarto <andang99@gmail.com>

[ICERIA 2020] Your paper #1570666377 ('Performance of FSPAOR Iteration for Solving Space-Fractional Diffusion Equations')

1 pesan

administrator@irsi.or.id <administrator@irsi.or.id@edas.info>

10 September 2020 17.48

Balas Ke: administrator@irsi.or.id

Kepada: Andang Sunarto <andang99@gmail.com>

Dear Mr. ,

After a rigorous review, with pleasure we would like to inform you that your paper with ID/Title: #1570666377 ('Performance of FSPAOR Iteration for Solving Space-Fractional Diffusion Equations') for ICERIA 2020 has been accepted to be presented and published in The Second International Conference on Enhanced Research and Industrial Application 2020 - ICERIA 2020 which will be held in Yogyakarta, Indonesia during 8 October 2020.

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

The reviews are below or can be found at <https://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1570666377>.

Please take some steps below.

1. Please register and make a payment to the conference through the EDAS system within this link: <https://edas.info/r27752>.
2. Please download the e-copyright within this link <http://bit.ly/ecopyrightiop> and fill in that form then submit it to your EDAS account.
3. Please download the Camera-Ready of Full Paper Template via <http://bit.ly/JPCSTemplate>.
4. Please provide Plagiarism Checker using Turnitin or iThenticate with the maximum similarity score has to be less than 20%.

Please email us if you have any questions related to ICERIA 2020.

===== Review 1 =====

> *** Technical Criteria: Rate the technical criteria of the paper. (e.g. Scientific merit: notably scientific rigour, accuracy, and correctness. Clarity of expression; communication of ideas; readability and discussion of concepts. Sufficient discussion of the context of the work, and suitable referencing)
Good (4)

> *** Quality Criteria: Rate the quality criteria of this paper. (eg. Originality: Is the work relevant and novel? Motivation: Does the problem considered have a sound motivation? All papers should clearly demonstrate the scientific interest of the results. Repetition: Have significant parts of the manuscript already been published? Length: Is the content of the work of sufficient scientific interest to justify its length?)
Average (3)

> *** Presentation Criteria: Rate the presentation of this paper.
(eg. Title: Is it adequate and appropriate for the content of the article? Abstract: Does it contain the essential information of the article? Is it complete? Is it suitable for inclusion by itself in an abstracting service?
Diagrams, figures, tables, and captions: Are they essential and clear? Text and mathematics: Are they brief but still clear? If you recommend shortening, please suggest what should be omitted. Conclusion: Does the paper contain a carefully written conclusion, summarizing what has been learned and why it is interesting and useful?)
Average (3)

> *** Recommendation: How do you rate your recommendation?
Accept. (3)

> *** Detailed comments: Please justify your recommendation and suggest improvements in technical content, quality, or presentation criteria.

Is Full-Sweep Preconditioned AOR (FSPAOR) iterative method proposed by authors? or develop?

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

> *** Technical Criteria: Rate the technical criteria of the paper. (e.g. Scientific merit: notably scientific rigour, accuracy, and correctness. Clarity of expression; communication of ideas; readability and discussion of concepts. Sufficient discussion of the context of the work, and suitable referencing)

Good (4)

> *** Quality Criteria: Rate the quality criteria of this paper. (eg. Originality: Is the work relevant and novel? Motivation: Does the problem considered have a sound motivation? All papers should clearly demonstrate the scientific interest of the results. Repetition: Have significant parts of the manuscript already been published? Length: Is the content of the work of sufficient scientific interest to justify its length?)

Good (4)

> *** Presentation Criteria: Rate the presentation of this paper.

(eg. Title: Is it adequate and appropriate for the content of the article? Abstract: Does it contain the essential information of the article? Is it complete? Is it suitable for inclusion by itself in an abstracting service?

Diagrams, figures, tables, and captions: Are they essential and clear? Text and mathematics: Are they brief but still clear? If you recommend shortening, please suggest what should be omitted. Conclusion: Does the paper contain a carefully written conclusion, summarizing what has been learned and why it is interesting and useful?)

Good (4)

> *** Recommendation: How do you rate your recommendation?

Accept. (3)

> *** Detailed comments: Please justify your recommendation and suggest improvements in technical content, quality, or presentation criteria.

The authors investigated the Performance of FSPAOR iteration for solving space-fractional diffusion equations.

Some of the references were not well-cited.

More discussion should be provided with reference to previous study.

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

> *** Technical Criteria: Rate the technical criteria of the paper. (e.g. Scientific merit: notably scientific rigour, accuracy, and correctness. Clarity of expression; communication of ideas; readability and discussion of concepts. Sufficient discussion of the context of the work, and suitable referencing)

Poor (1)

> *** Quality Criteria: Rate the quality criteria of this paper. (eg. Originality: Is the work relevant and novel? Motivation: Does the problem considered have a sound motivation? All papers should clearly demonstrate the scientific interest of the results. Repetition: Have significant parts of the manuscript already been published? Length: Is the content of the work of sufficient scientific interest to justify its length?)

Poor (1)

> *** Presentation Criteria: Rate the presentation of this paper.

(eg. Title: Is it adequate and appropriate for the content of the article? Abstract: Does it contain the essential information of the article? Is it complete? Is it suitable for inclusion by itself in an abstracting service?

Diagrams, figures, tables, and captions: Are they essential and clear? Text and mathematics: Are they brief but still clear? If you recommend shortening, please suggest what should be omitted. Conclusion: Does the paper contain a carefully written conclusion, summarizing what has been learned and why it is interesting and useful?)

Poor (1)

> *** Recommendation: How do you rate your recommendation?

Reject. (0)

> *** Detailed comments: Please justify your recommendation and suggest improvements in technical content, quality, or presentation criteria.

No significant contribution of the authors has been found.

Kind Regards,

2020 2nd ICERIA Admin
(2020 2nd International Conference on Enhanced Research and Industrial Application)
Conference URL: <https://iceria.irsirsi.or.id>
URL: <https://irsirsi.or.id/>
E-mail: administrator@irsirsi.or.id

For Fast Response :
IRSI Admin
Phone/WA: +62 815-7280-9394