

First-Revision Notification for your paper [FSDM3689]

External

Inbox



fsdm

Tue, May 25,
1:50 PM

to me

Dear Dr. Sugiyarto Surono,

Thank you for your submission to FSDM2021.

Here attached the review comments for you to modify your paper [FSDM3689].

Please write the response letters to the comments and the questions from reviewers accordingly. You could put your revised paper, as well as your response letter together in a file named FSDM3689, then turn it to FSDM3689.zip, and upload your single compressed file (.zip) to the submission system no later than June 5, 2021, so that we could get all your files.

If you do not agree with some comments from the reviewer, please also provide the rebuttal.

BTW: if you revise accordingly and smoothly, this paper can be accepted for publication arrangement in the upcoming FSDM2021 conference proceeding next year.

For more information about FSDM conferences, please refer to: <http://www.fsdmconf.org/>

Any other questions, just feel free to contact me (Cindy).

Best regards,

Ms. Cindy Shen

FSDM Conference Secretary

Email: fsdm@fsdmconf.org

Website: www.fsdmconf.org

Tel: +86-18040526485

Wechat: 18040526485 / fsdmconf

Jun 8, 2021,
9:00 AM

fsdm

to me

Dear Dr. Sugiyarto Surono,

Thanks for your kind email.

Here attached the Second review comments for your paper FSDM3689, please kindly revise again.

Thank you very much.

Best regards,

Ms. Cindy Shen

FSDM Conference Secretary

Email: fsdm@fsdmconf.org
Website: www.fsdmconf.org
Tel: +86-18040526485
Wechat: 18040526485 / fsdmconf

Academic <mailgun@auto.academicconf.com>

Sat, Jun 5,
8:57 AM

to me

Dear Assoc. Prof. Sugiyarto Surono,

This is from FSDM2021.

We have received your revised manuscript.

Thank you very much for your patience and cooperation during the review process.

Thank you!

Yours Sincerely,

Senlin Yan

Email: fsdm@fsdmconf.org

FSDM2021

www.fsdmconf.org

FAIA Acceptance Notification for your paper [FSDM3689]

External

Inbox



fsdm

Fri, Jun 11, 3:13 PM (11
days ago)

to me

Dear Dr. Sugiyarto Surono,

Many thanks for your support to FSDM conferences. It's our great pleasure to inform you that your manuscript [FSDM3689] has been accepted to be presented at the 7th International Conference on Fuzzy Systems and Data Mining (FSDM 2021), and will be published on Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications (FAIA).

Attached please find Acceptance Notification and Template.

Please send us the source file of final edited paper in WORD format including PDF version according to the attached template before June 20, 2021.

Authors submitting a manuscript to Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications (FAIA) have the understanding that they have read and agreed to publish the manuscript with Open Access under the Creative Commons BY-NC licence at the site of IOS Press Ebooks (www.ebooks.iospress.nl).

For more information about FSDM2021, please refer to: <http://www.fsdmconf.org/>

Any other questions, you can contact me (Cindy).

Best regards,

Ms. Cindy Shen

FSDM Conference Secretary

Email: fsdm@fsdmconf.org

Website: www.fsdmconf.org

Tel: +86-18040526485

Wechat: 18040526485 / fsdmconf

ACCEPTANCE NOTIFICATION

11 June 2021 We are extremely glad to inform that your paper:

PAPER ID:
FSDM3689

PAPER TITLE:
An Optimization of Several Distance Function on Fuzzy Subtractive Clustering

COMPLETE LIST OF AUTHORS:
SUGIYARTO SURONO, and ANNISA EKA HARYATI, JOKO ELIYANTO

AFFILIATION:
Dept. math. FAST Universitas Ahmad Dahlan Yogyakarta Indonesia

has been accepted for presentation by 7th International Conference on Fuzzy Systems and Data Mining (FSDM2021), October 26-29, 2021, Seoul, South Korea, and is scheduled to be published by IOS Press in the upcoming FSDM2021 conference proceedings in the book series Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications (FAIA).

We are grateful for your contribution to FSDM2021.

We also hope that you will contribute your excellent work to future FSDM conferences.

For more information, please visit our website: <http://www.fsdmconf.org/>

Look forward to meeting you at FSDM2021

Best regards,



www.fsdmconf.org

26-29 October 2021 Seoul, South Korea

Review Report

Manuscript ID: FSDM3689

Title: Optimization of Several Distance Function on Fuzzy Subtractive Clustering.

In the study, the author presents an optimization of several distance function on fuzzy subtractive clustering. The acquired clusters is evaluated through the application of Partition Coefficient (PC) method and Davies Bouldin Index (DBI) method. This topic seems to be interesting, but the manuscript needs careful improvement in different sections. Please find the most important comments in the following:

1. The abstract does not have any clarity of concept, and therefore, it looks very confusing. Also, one serious issue is that the title of the paper and the abstract do not have a tune. The abstract should start by explaining, first of all, the title of the paper. The author is advised to re-write the whole abstract, by breaking the lengthy sentences into smaller sentences.
2. What is the motivation behind this work? Is there any illustration behind the problem description?
3. In section 3, there is very less discussion on Performance evaluation. What is the computational complexity? What is the runtime? Please include such discussions. You can also use the big oh notation to show the computation complexity.
4. How do you ensure that the comparison between the proposed method and the comparative methods? Which one is fair?
5. The proposed method might be sensitive to the values of its main controlling parameter. How did you tune the parameters?
6. There is no rigour statistical test to judge about the significance of the method's results. Without such a statistical test, the conclusion cannot be supported.
7. To have an unbiased view in the paper, there should be some discussions on the limitations of the proposed method.
8. There is no justification of the method. Why for this problem area, please discuss? There are many other similar methods in the literature in this area, so such a justification is required.
9. Potential applications of the proposed method should be discussed.
10. The text written in various Figures, particularly Figures 1 - 3, are not clear and hence not readable. Author is suggested to address this problem.
11. Some mathematical notations are not rigorous enough to correctly understand the contents of the paper. The authors are requested to recheck all the definition of variables and further clarify these equations.

12. Please review your keywords - they should be single words or phrases, not descriptions.
13. The presentation of the submitted manuscript is not systematic and clear-cut message. Rather than it is full of ambiguity and non-uniform flow of information. Author is advised to handle this issue.
14. It is hard to understand the novelty of this study with current form of introduction. That is why, I suggest to include a literature matrix to show main novelty parts of the study.
15. It is important to give graphical simulation for the solution.
16. Setting a clear Purpose as well as a detailed Research Methodology is highly recommended.
17. There is no justification of the method. Why for this problem area, please discuss? There are many other similar methods in the literature in this area, so such a justification is required.
18. Author should update the introduction section deeply by stating the gaps of the existing study and then highlights the major results.
19. The literature review should be extended.
20. Mathematical modelling is required to be fully explained. But in this paper, there isn't the mathematical modelling for optimization.
21. Is the formation of Equation (6) unique? I am skeptical. Please provide the derivation process of Equation (6).
22. The conclusion should be the summary and suggestions of the research results, the shortcomings of this study and the future development prospects. Please revise.

Review Report

07 – 06 – 2021

Manuscript ID: FSDM3689 RE

Title: Implementation of Several Distance Function on Fuzzy Subtractive Clustering.

Dear Editor,

The paper is improved, becomes better than the previous form but all comments of mine are not solved. In view of this, I recommend the **major revision of the manuscript**. Author is asked to answer and implement in manuscript all serious issues and deficiencies, and highlight with red colour, otherwise manuscript gets rejected.

Authors should clarify the following comments:

- Novelty not clear. A comprehensive table for literature survey should be presented by the authors to show the literature review based on their assumptions, methods, and results.
- Even though the authors claim a native English speaker has proofread the manuscript, there are still too many grammatical issues in the article. Many expressions and languages used are inappropriate.
- The manuscript is poorly structured. Why is a literature review jam-packed within the introduction and not presented as a standalone section?
- Please point out the comparison criteria for evaluating the performance of applied method.
- In addition, please change the section title of "Conclusion" into "Conclusions" because we usually use "conclusions" title for longer conclusion section with future work.
- Is the formation of Equation (5) unique? I am skeptical. Please provide the derivation process of Equation (5). If this Equation is not your own work; you have copied from some other source. It can't be tolerated. Please mention citation of this Equation.
- Please avoid lumping references as in [7]- [9], [1], [2] etc. Instead, please summarize the main contribution of each referenced paper in separate sentences. The paper is not written very well and logically. The language is not smooth and should be improved very well.
- In introduction – it is not usual to start sentence with references number. Words in sentence can be reordered to resolve this problem. For example, in Introduction section.: “[11] uses subtractive clustering to group..”.
- Many references used are not cited in the text. For example, the reference number [8], and several others are not cited in text in the manuscript. Author is suggested either to cite these references or remove from the reference list.
- The authors should correct the punctuations throughout the manuscript. For example at the end of equation (1), (2),... (9),... put dot.
- The text written in Figures 1-3 are not visible.
