ijies2766: Submission Paper: Cosine K-Nearest Neighbors in Eye Milkfish Classification

9 messages

Kei Eguchi <eguti@fit.ac.jp>
To: Eko Prasetyo <eko@ubhara.ac.id>

31 October 2019 at 12:41

Dear author(s),

Thank you for your interest and support to IJIES.
I am hereby to confirm the delivery of your paper, Paper ID is " ijies2766".
It has been sent for reviewing.
The notification will be feedback within 1 month.
Appreciate your patiently wait.

If you have any question, please contact us with your paper ID.

Best regards,
IJIES Editors

From: Eko Prasetyo <eko@ubhara.ac.id>
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2019 1:23 PM
To: ijies@inass.org
Subject: Submission Paper: Cosine K-Nearest Neighbors in Eye Milkfish Classification

Dear IJIES Editors

I would like to submit my manuscript to IJIES:
My Name (as corresponding author) : Eko Prasetyo
Affiliation: University of Bhayangkara, Surabaya, Indonesia

My manuscript title: Cosine K-Nearest Neighbors in Eye Milkfish Classification
attached in this email with Cover Letter.

The manuscript has not been submitted yet to other publisher.

Thank you

Best Rgds,
Eko Prasetyo

Kei Eguchi <eguti@fit.ac.jp>
To: Eko Prasetyo <eko@ubhara.ac.id>

14 November 2019 at 16:25

Dear author(s),

Congratulations!
The 1st review for your paper was accepted.
However, we are sorry to inform you that your paper cannot be recommended for publication in IJIES, in its current form.
Please revise your paper according to the attached reviewers' comments.

Please note that if your paper is still not satisfactorily revised or cannot be returned to us within TWO months from the date of this letter, your paper will not be recommended to the journal above.

Thanks for your understanding and cooperation.

Kind Regards,
IJIES Editors.

[Quoted text hidden]

📄 **2766.docx**
46K

Eko Prasetyo <eko@ubhara.ac.id>   14 December 2019 at 20:04
To: Kei Eguchi <eguti@fit.ac.jp>

Dear IJIES Editor.

My manuscript title: Cosine K-Nearest Neighbor in Milkfish Eye Classification

I send the following:
1. manuscript after revision
2. Response Letter
Thank you for your attention. Please proceed to the next step.

Best Rgds,
Eko Prasetyo

[Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments

📄 **23. IJIES_Format - CosKNN (revision) (ijies2766).docx**
619K

📄 **17. Response Letter (ijies2766).docx**
26K

Kei Eguchi <eguti@fit.ac.jp>   16 December 2019 at 07:03
To: Eko Prasetyo <eko@ubhara.ac.id>

Dear author(s),

Thank you for your interest and support to IJIES.
We received your revised version.
It has been sent for reviewing.
The notification will be feedback within two weeks.
Appreciate your patiently wait.

If you have any question, please contact us with your paper ID.

Best regards,
IJIES Editors

From: Eko Prasetyo <eko@ubhara.ac.id>
Sent: Saturday, December 14, 2019 10:05 PM
To: 江口 啓 <eguti@fit.ac.jp>
Subject: Re: ijies2766: Submission Paper: Cosine K-Nearest Neighbors in Eye Milkfish Classification

Dear IJIES Editor.

My manuscript title: Cosine K-Nearest Neighbor in Milkfish Eye Classification

I send the following:
1. manuscript after revision

[Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]

Kei Eguchi <eguti@fit.ac.jp>   22 December 2019 at 12:37
To: Eko Prasetyo <eko@ubhara.ac.id>

Dear Author(s),

Paper ID: ijies2766

It is our great pleasure to inform you that the contribution referenced above, for which you are listed as the corresponding author, has been accepted for the 2nd review of the IJIES journal.
Congratulations!

*Important:
Please send your "signed" copyright and the payment proof of your publishing fee within one month.
Otherwise, your paper will be withdrawn.
The payment method will be sent from paypal. (Please check your mailbox carefully.)

*Publication fee: USD400 (tentative: 15 pages, USD150 + USD50*5 = USD400)
Note: The final publication fee is USD350 (We'd like to discount USD50.)

After we received these documents, the camera-ready version of your paper will be sent to you within a few weeks.
After your confirmation, the acceptance letter and receipt will be sent to you.

Best regards,
IJIES Editors.

-----Original Message-----
From: 江口 啓
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2019 9:04 AM
To: Eko Prasetyo <eko@ubhara.ac.id>
[Quoted text hidden]

📄 **IJIES_Copyright_Form.docx**
22K

Eko Prasetyo <eko@ubhara.ac.id>   3 January 2020 at 10:56
To: eko1979@yahoo.com

[Quoted text hidden]

📄 **IJIES_Copyright_Form.docx**
22K

Kei Eguchi <eguti@fit.ac.jp>   6 January 2020 at 16:06
To: Eko Prasetyo <eko@ubhara.ac.id>

Dear Author(s),

Paper ID: ijies2766

It is our great pleasure to inform you that the contribution referenced above, for which you are listed as the corresponding author, has been accepted for the IJIES journal.
Congratulations!

The camera-ready version of your paper will be sent to you within a few weeks.

P.S.
Please submit your signed copyright form.
[Quoted text hidden]

---

3 attachments

(ijies2766) Acceptance Letter.pdf
60K

(ijies2766) Receipt.pdf
60K

IJIES_Copyright_Form.docx
22K

Eko Prasetyo <eko@ubhara.ac.id>   7 January 2020 at 06:22
To: Kei Eguchi <eguti@fit.ac.jp>

Dear IJIES Editors

I have sent:
1. payment proof of my paper (ijies2766) in attachment.
2. Compile and signed copyright form

for camera-ready, I immediately did

Thank you

Best Rgds,
Eko Prasetyo
[Quoted text hidden]

---

2 attachments

Invoice - 0558.pdf
40K

Copyright form (ijies2766).pdf
447K

Kei Eguchi <eguti@fit.ac.jp>   7 January 2020 at 10:29
To: Eko Prasetyo <eko@ubhara.ac.id>

Dear author(s),

Thank you for your interest and support to IJIES.
We received your signed copyright form.
Thank you!

Please inform the check result of your camera-ready version to us within one week.

If you have any question, please contact us with your paper ID.

Best regards,
IJIES Editors

From: Eko Prasetyo <eko@ubhara.ac.id>
Sent: Tuesday, January 7, 2020 8:23 AM
To: 江口 啓 <eguti@fit.ac.jp>
Subject: Re: ijies2766: Submission Paper: Cosine K-Nearest Neighbors in Eye Milkfish Classification

Dear IJIES Editors

I have sent:
1. payment proof of my paper (ijies2766) in attachment.
2. Compile and signed copyright form

for camera-ready, I immediately did
Thank you
Best Rgds,
Eko Prasetyo

On Thu, 31 Oct 2019 at 12:41, Kei Eguchi <mailto:eguti@fit.ac.jp> wrote:
Dear author(s),

Thank you for your interest and support to IJIES.
I am hereby to confirm the delivery of your paper, Paper ID is " ijies2766".
It has been sent for reviewing.
The notification will be feedback within 1 month.
Appreciate your patiently wait.

If you have any question, please contact us with your paper ID.

Best regards,
IJIES Editors

[Quoted text hidden]

(ijies2766) Reply Form:

Title: Cosine K-Nearest Neighbor in Eye Milkfish Classification (Eko Prasetyo*, Rani Purbaningtyas, Raden Dimas Adityo) *Corresponding author

Reviewer comment to the authors:

[1] English presentation should be further polished. There are so many grammatical and editing problems (spacing problems) in English. e.g. "The initial problem of noise sensitive occur", "ultimatelyaccumulated", "comparisone", "This problem possibly occur", "The features consists of", etc…………. You must check your manuscript before submission.

Answer:
Thank you for your comment.

1. I have tried to edit false phrases in manuscript for example:
   - "The initial problem of noise sensitive occur" change to "The initial problem of noise-sensitive occurs" (Section 1 ……………-red font)
   - "ultimatelyaccumulated" change to "ultimately accumulated" (Section 1 ……………-red font)
   - "comparisone" change to "comparison" (Section 1 ……………-red font)
   - "This problem possibly occur" change to "This problem possibly occurs" (Section 1 ……………-red font)
   - "The features consists of" change to "The features consist of" (Section 1 ……………-red font)
   - "The schemes is" change to "The scheme is" (Section 1 line ……………-red font)
   - "the largest weight" change to "the largest weight accumulation" (Section 1, 2nd paragraph ……………-red font)
   - "cosine weight" change to "cosine weight accumulation" (Section 3 ……………-red font)
   - "the greater" change to "the greater" (Section 3 ……………-red font)
   - "Uci" change to "UCI" (Section 4 ……………-red font)
   - "In this study,we" change to "In this study, we" (Section 4 ……………-red font)
2. For your comment…. There are so many grammatical and editing problems (spacing problems) in English ….. I would be happy if you show more specifically the other false editing of words or sentences so I can fix them

Reviewer comment to the authors:

[2] Compare the proposed method with other researchers' methods. In this paper, the comparison was performed between the proposed technique and Refs. [1, 9, 11, 12]. However, Ref. [1, 11, 12] are out of date published more than 8 years ago. (In SCOPUS, the papers published within 3 years are used to calculate CiteScore.)Besides, Ref. [9] is not a journal paper. (I cannot find this article. Is this correct?)

So, the effectiveness of the proposed technique is not clear. You should emphasize the difference with the state-of-the-art technique. Add more comparison data.

<u>Answer:</u>
Thank you for your comment.

1. I have added comparisons with other current research methods in last 3 years journal, i.e General Nearest Neighbor (GNN) [2], and also smallest modified KNN (SMKNN) [8] and largest modified KNN (LMKNN) [8]. (Section 4 ……………-red font)
2. **For your comment "Ref. [9] is not a journal paper. (I cannot find this article. Is this correct?)".**
   Yes right, this ref is not a journal paper, but a conference paper, that is 2nd International Conference on Computing and Applied Informatics 2017, published in <u>Journal of Physics: Conference Series</u> (indexed by Scopus Q3), this is the url of this ref
   <u>https://iopscience.iop.org/issue/1742-6596/978/1</u>
3. **For your comment "You should emphasize the difference with the state-of-the-art technique"**
   I have emphasized the difference in section 1 second paragraph, at the sentence "However, the problem in many KNN refinements using weighting scheme merely involves the testing data and the nearest neighbor. So, the weight gained is actually similar to the inverse of the distance. In this study, we propose a weighting scheme of which weight is not gained from the nearest neighbor individually, but by calculating the weight with the involvement of a pair of nearest neighbors." (Please see Section 1, near the end of paragraph 2 ……………-red font)
4. **For your comment "Add more comparison data"**
   I have added the comparison data. For comparative data from UCI I added the Divorce and Seeds dataset. We also added 6 comparison datasets from the KEEL-repository dataset namely Balance, Banana, Phoneme, Yeast, Ring, Zoo. In addition we also added another comparison method, namely General Nearest Neighbor (GNN) [2], and also smallest modified KNN (SMKNN) and largest modified KNN (LMKNN) [8]. (Please see Section 4.1, 4.3, 4.4 ……………-red font)

<u>Reviewer comment to the authors:</u>

[3] In the Introduction part, strong points of this proposed method should be further stated and organization of this whole paper is supposed to be provided in the end.

<u>Answer:</u>
Thank you for your comment.

1. I have added "strong points of this proposed method" in Introduction part at 4th paragraph as follows.
   "Using weighting scheme involving a pair of nearest neighbors between the testing data and two neighbors. It is possible that the distance of one neighbor to the testing data is closer than the other neighbor to the testing data, or vice versa. The weighting concept we propose is when calculating the weight between a neighbor to the testing data does not only generate the

information between the neighbor with the testing data, but also the information of the distance of other neighbors to the testing data. The use of the cosine concept in weight calculation presents a new perspective that weights are calculated using a scheme involving two simultaneous parties using distance as the length of a right triangle. Thus, the weighting system contribute to the performance accuracy being more optimal in solving noise sensitive, same majority votes class problem and irrelevant class as the prediction result."

2. And also supported in the next section. e.g. Section 3 at 2rd paragraph, end part of section 3, and at section conclusion.

Reviewer comment to the authors:

[4] To help readers' understanding, make a space around equations

Answer:
Thank you for your comment.

1. I have added a space around each equation. (Eq (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) , (6) , (7) , (8) , (9) , (10) , (11) , (12) , (13) , (14)
2. The number of equation in previous version is 6. Because of addition 8 equations in **new Section 2**, so the equation (1) (before revision) change to (9) (after revision), so is the next number (6) change to (14)

Reviewer comment to the authors:

[5] In sentences/equations, mathematical expressions must be Italic font.Unify the font style

Answer:
Thank you for your comment.

1. I have revised the mathematical expressions to be Italic.
   (Section 2.1, section 2.4, section 2.6 part 7 and 8, and section 3 ……. red font)

Reviewer comment to the authors:

[6] The explanation about the mathematical formula (6) is not enough. Furthermore, the meaning of the function is not clear. Readers will be confused.

Answer:
Thank you for your comment.

1. Now formula (6) has changed to formula (14) because I added an explanation of some KNN-based method theories. Then I've given an explanation of the formula right below it, as follows.

"In which this equation will generate the highest value of $Sum of Coss(R, c_r)$ among class P as prediction result of c_R. The class with the highest value is given from this equation as a predicted result."

(Please see Section 3, below Equation 14 ……………. red font)

Reviewer comment to the authors:

[7] Do not insert the title into figures. It's redundant

Answer:
Thank you for your comment.

1. I have deleted the title in each picture. E.g. All picture in Figure 3, 4, 5 (Please see Section 4, Figure 3,4,5 …………….)
2. I added Figure 5 to present the test results on 6 datasets from KEEL-dataset repository. (Please see Section 4.4 ……………. red font)

Reviewer comment to the authors:

[8] This paper lacks in-depth discussions in Sect.3. The impact is lost by a short discussion of the findings. Readers will fail to understand the scientific contribution of this research. Show the theoretical reason why the proposed technique is better than existing techniques, because there is no theoretical explanation about compared existing techniques in previous sections. These existing techniques appeared suddenly in comparison. For example, the authors quoted the existing techniques as [11, 12]. What's the difference of these techniques? Explain the detail of the existing technique in previous sections.

Answer:
Thank you for your comment.

1. For your comment "**lacks in-depth discussions**"
   I have added a deeper discussion to each test result with detailed analysis. Our tests also added the latest methods such as General Nearest Neighbor (GNN) [2], and also smallest modified KNN (SMKNN) [8] and largest modified KNN (LMKNN) [8]. Testing with the UCI repository was also added with 2 more datasets. We also added testing with 6 datasets from KEEL-dataset repository. (Please see Section 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5 ……………. red font)
2. For your comment "**Show the theoretical reason why the proposed technique is better than existing technique**"
   For the reason that the proposed method is better, I have added a theoretical explanation of the previous KNN-based methods and included the reasons why the previous method was less than optimal. So I added new Section 2 as Literature Review. (The theoretical reason is

explained after explaining the method theory in the Section 2, e.g. at Section 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6)

3. For your comment "**What's the difference of these techniques? Explain the detail of the existing technique in previous sections.**"
   I also added the difference between our proposed and existing method after each explanation of existing method at Section 2. (The difference of these techniques is also explained in Section 2, e.g. at Section 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6)

Reviewer comment to the authors:

[9] Please improve the reference format. **This is very important for indexing service**. If you did not follow the following format, your paper will be rejected automatically.

Answer:
Thank you for your comment.

1. I have improved the format of writing all of my references following the IJIES template, both journal paper and conference proceeding
   * in the case:
      a. Do not use "et al." in author names.
      b. Note: e.g. In the case of the author name:"John Doe", express as "J. Doe". ("John" is the first name and "Doe" is the family name.)
2. I also added 3 references in the paper, so that it changed from 15 (before) to 18 (after).
      a. Inserted Ref [16] as a rule of UCI Machine learning repository
      b. Inserted Ref [17] and [18] as a rule of KEEL-dataset repository