[IJPEDS'21] #1570681304 has been uploaded

1 message

ijpeds@iaesjournal.com <ijpeds=iaesjournal.com@edas.info>   Wed, Sep 30, 2020 at 9:56 AM
Reply-To: ijpeds@iaesjournal.com
To: Widi Aribowo <widiaribowo@unesa.ac.id>

Dear Mr. Widi Aribowo:

Thank you for uploading your paper 1570681304 (*Improving Neural Network Using A Sine Tree-Seed Algorithm For Tuning Motor DC*) to **International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems (IJPEDS)**. The paper is of type application/msword and has a length of 4664832 bytes.

You can modify your paper at https://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1570681304 and see all your submissions at https://edas.info/index.php?c=27805 using the EDAS identifier

Regards,
Tole Sutikno
Editor-in-Chief,
International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems
http://ijpeds.iaescore.com
email: ijpeds@iaesjournal.com

First screening #1570681304, entitled: Improving Neural Network Using A Sine Tree-Seed Algorithm For Tuning Motor DC

1 message

-- IJPEDS for writing format and style
-- https://iaescore.com/gfa/ijpeds.docx
-- min 25 references primarily to journal papers

Dear Mr. Widi Aribowo,

We have reached an initial screening phase regarding your paper submission #1570681304 entitled "Improving Neural Network Using A Sine Tree-Seed Algorithm For Tuning Motor DC" to "International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems (IJPEDS)". The International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems (IJPEDS), p-ISSN: 2088-8694, e-ISSN 2722-256X is a SCOPUS indexed Journal (https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100258382), SJR Q2 on Electrical and Electronics Engineering, CiteScore: 1.49, SJR: 0.304, and SNIP: 1.088. The scope of the journal includes all issues in the field of Power Electronics and drive systems.

Our decision is: Revisions Required before review process
A high quality paper should has:
(1) a clear statement of the problem the paper is addressing;
(2) the proposed solution(s); and
(3) results achieved. It describes clearly what has been done before on the problem, and what is NEW.

The goal of your first revision is to describe NOVEL technical results.
Please note that there are four (4) types of technical results:
(1) An algorithm;
(2) A system construct: such as hardware design, software system, protocol, etc.;
(3) A performance evaluation: obtained through analyses, simulation or measurements;
(4) A theory: consisting of a collection of theorems.

Your revisions 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;
(3) Identifying the significance of the results: what improvements and impact do they suggest.

The main goal of this stage 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.

Original/Research paper should be presented with IMRaD style/model:
1. Introduction
2. The Proposed Method/Algorithm/Procedure 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. Research Method
4. Results and Discussion
5. Conclusion.

We will usually expect a minimum of 25 to 30 references primarily to journal papers, depending on the length of the paper. You can found our published papers to enrich your references at:
- http://beei.org
- http://ijece.iaescore.com
- http://ijeecs.iaescore.com
- http://journal.uad.ac.id/index.php/telkomnika
- http://ijai.iaescore.com
- http://ijres.iaescore.com

Submit your revised paper within 14 days, and do serious work for updating your paper (upload as new review paper version). Revised paper submission is submitted (as author version) on the same paper ID number through EDAS online system. When your revised paper reached us, it will be sent for single blind peer review by at least three reviewers who will either be members of the Editorial Board or others of similar standing in the field, for contribution, originality, relevance, and presentation. Then, your paper will be judged for final decision of acceptance or rejection.

We look forward to receiving the revised version of your manuscript and are delighted that you chose to send this important work to this journal.

Best Regards,
Tole Sutikno
Editor-in-Chief,
International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems
http://ijpeds.iaescore.com
email: ijpeds@iaesjournal.com

--

[IJPEDS'21] Decision #1570681304 "Improving Neural Network Using A Sine Tree-Seed Algorithm For Tuning Motor DC"

1 message

ijpeds@iaesjournal.com <ijpeds=iaesjournal.com@edas.info>   Sat, Nov 7, 2020 at 3:09 PM
Reply-To: ijpeds@iaesjournal.com
To: Widi Aribowo <widiaribowo@unesa.ac.id>
Cc: Antar Shaddad Hamed Abdul-Qawy <eng.antar2007@gmail.com>, Arvind Dhingra <arvinddhingra@gndec.ac.in>, Fahmizal Fahmi <fahmizal@ugm.ac.id>, Zmnako Mohammed Khurshid <zmnako24@hotmail.com>, Mohammed Yahya Suliman <mohammed.yahya@ntu.edu.iq>, Mehran Taghipour-Gorjikolaie <mtaghipour@birjand.ac.ir>, Paolo Visconti <paolo.visconti@unisalento.it>, Zhenyu Zhou <zhenyu_zhou@ncepu.edu.cn>, Yuqin Zhu <1310729086@qq.com>

-- Please Strictly use and follow to the template Manuscripts
-- (Word Format): http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijpeds.docx
-- Please upload the revised paper within 8 weeks
-- Similarity score of your final manuscript must be less than 25%
==

Dear Mr. Widi Aribowo,

After careful review, your paper ID #1570681304, entitled "Improving Neural Network Using A Sine Tree-Seed Algorithm For Tuning Motor DC" for International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems (IJPEDS), p-ISSN: 2088-8694, e-ISSN 2722-256X, http://ijpeds.iaescore.com requires MAJOR REVISIONS before being accepted for publication in our Scopus indexed journal. You are asked to submit a revised full manuscript, according to the comment from reviewers. The Editors will check whether the revision already address the reviewers' comments. Failing to do proper revision may lead to the rejection of your paper.

For your information, the International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems is a SCOPUS indexed Journal, SJR Q2 on Electrical and Electronics Engineering, CiteScore: 1.49, SJR: 0.304, and SNIP: 1.088. The scope of the journal includes all issues in the field of Power Electronics and drive systems. Included are techniques for advanced power semiconductor devices, control in power electronics, low and high power converters (inverters, converters, controlled and uncontrolled rectifiers), Control algorithms and techniques applied to power electronics, electromagnetic and thermal performance of electronic power converters and inverters, power quality and utility applications, renewable energy, electric machines, modelling, simulation, analysis, design and implementations of the application of power circuit components (power semiconductors, inductors, high frequency transformers, capacitors), EMI/EMC considerations, power devices and components, sensors, integration and packaging, induction motor drives, synchronous motor drives, permanent magnet motor drives, switched reluctance motor and synchronous reluctance motor drives, ASDs (adjustable speed drives), multi-phase machines and converters, applications in motor drives, electric vehicles, wind energy systems, solar, battery chargers, UPS and hybrid systems and other applications..

The reviews are below or can be found at https://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1570681304, using your EDAS login name widiaribowo@unesa.ac.id.

Please upload the revised paper using EDAS on the "Revision" upload button within 8 weeks.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Best Regards,
Tole Sutikno
Editor-in-Chief,
International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems
http://ijpeds.iaescore.com
email: ijpeds@iaesjournal.com

--

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

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?
Slightly novel (2)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Poorly written (2)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
Could be improved (3)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Borderline (3)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the
paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

The paper presents a new algorithm called STSA as a combination of the existing "Sine Cosine Algorithm" and "Tree
Seed Algorithm" for handling the limitations of the neural network in controlling the DC motor speed. The contribution
and paper presentation are clear enough. However, a number of considerations have to be taken.

1-   The name of the algorithm already exists (maybe in a different context) please check this link:
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0378437119315894.
2-   The English style of writing is very poor. A lot of mistakes are found in the entire paper, even in the abstract, the
authors have to seriously improve the grammar mistakes (e.g., (i) A DC motor greatly applies   The DC motor is
applied, (ii) are key   are keys, (iii) Stabilized speed influenced   Stabilized speed is influenced, () and many more
…).
3-   All the equations included in the paper have been taken as pictures from other papers. The authors should write
these equations with their own understanding. They also may use their own notations and symbols.
4-   Results' discussion on the efficiency of the proposed solutions needs to be improved.

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

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?
Somewhat novel (3)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Could be improved (3)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
Could be improved (3)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Borderline (3)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the
paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

1. "PID", "ANN" should be given the full name when they first appear. Abbreviations should be in upper case and the
author needs to modify them, for example, "The stsa method modifies the ns value so that..." and "Where the number
of seeds is ns..."
2. Mathematical symbols need to be italicized, for example, "Where M is the dimension of a function, A is the amount
of trees." and "Where, t is the current iteration, T is the maximum iterations, and a is a constant. " The author needs to
check and modify the mathematical symbols in the text.
3. The numbers of the titles of the subsections in Section 2 and the numbers of the tables in Section 3 are incorrect,
please check and modify. In THE PROPOSED STSA-NN MODEL, Figure 5 is the flow chart of the STSA - NN hybrid
method, not Figure 4.
4. Lack of analysis of the simulation results shown in Figure 8.
5. There are some grammar mistakes and typos throughout this paper. Some examples are summarized as follows:
1) In page2, "are accommodated. In the early stages,.." should be changed to "are accommodated. in the early
stages,..."
2) Some words should be used in plural form, like in section 2.2, "the following equation" should be "the following
equations".
3) In page3, "Higher ST supply solid local search and accelerate convergence," should be changed to "Higher ST
supplies solid local search and accelerates convergence,"
4) In page7, "Managing control on a DC motor is very interesting research area." should be changed to "Managing
control on a DC motor is a very interesting research area"
5)In Abstract, "Stabilized speed influenced by…" should be "Stabilized speed is influenced by…".
6)There are a lots number of areas having problem of uppercase, such as in SCA of section 2.1, "the location of…"
and in STSA of section 2.1, "stsa".
6. In abstract, the description of "The settling time is 0.125" is strange, it is better to put it in the conclusion.
7. When describing the algorithm, the sentences should use the present tense.

8. This paper introduces the process of proposing the sine tree-seed algorithm, but lacks reasons for proposing the STSA-NN.

9. Figure7,8 lack of analysis, and figure8 lacks of description text of coordinate axis.

10. In SCA of section 2.1, the expression of sentence "SCA serves to solve optimization problems with unknown search spaces using the sine and cosine functions" is not clear.

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

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?
Highly novel (4)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Well written (4)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
High quality (4)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Strong Accept (5)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

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

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?
Slightly novel (2)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Poorly written (2)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
Poor quality (2)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Reject (2)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

The scientific work must be improved and enriched with new contents and experimental data, for example with real application tests of the developed system, reporting the results of the tests. In the current state, the reported results are very weak and the scientific content low.

At present, the article must be rejected for a high-level scientific journal as IJPEDS.

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

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?
Somewhat novel (3)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Well written (4)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
High quality (4)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Strong Accept (5)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

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

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?
Slightly novel (2)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Well written (4)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
Could be improved (3)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Reject (2)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the
paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

The main novelty of the paper is improving the performance of ANN for tuning DC motor. Optimizing the feed forward
neural network is not a new idea and many works presented such method in the literatures. Therefore, dear
respected authors should improve their work by following comments:
1- Explain why STSA? and first of all they should explain what is the advantages of STSA in comparison with other
optimization techniques.
2- Why improved version of FFNN? other ANN such as LSTM, RBF, GRN and etcetera.
3- proposed method should be compared with other regression methods, other ANN and optimization algorithms.

We would like your cooperation with the double check of your revised paper:
----
(1) TEMPLATE, Please Strictly use and follow to the template Manuscripts (Word Format): https://iaescore.com/gfa/
ijpeds.docx (or LateX: https://iaescore.com/gfa/ijpeds.rar)

(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 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, 5 references (recently journal
articles) are used in 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. 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 TPC has the right to cancel the paper to be published at International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems (IJPEDS).

(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).

[IJPEDS'21] Decision #1570681304 "Improving Neural Network Using A Sine Tree-Seed Algorithm For Tuning Motor DC"

1 message

ijpeds@iaesjournal.com <ijpeds=iaesjournal.com@edas.info>   Sat, Dec 5, 2020 at 11:06 AM
Reply-To: ijpeds@iaesjournal.com
To: Widi Aribowo <widiaribowo@unesa.ac.id>
Cc: Antar Shaddad Hamed Abdul-Qawy <eng.antar2007@gmail.com>, Arvind Dhingra <arvinddhingra@gndec.ac.in>,
Fahmizal Fahmi <fahmizal@ugm.ac.id>, Sadik Kamel Gharghan <sadik.gharghan@mtu.edu.iq>, Muhammad Herman
Jamaluddin <herman@utem.edu.my>, Zmnako Mohammed Khurshid <zmnako24@hotmail.com>, Mohammed Yahya
Suliman <mohammed.yahya@ntu.edu.iq>, Mehran Taghipour-Gorjikolaie <mtaghipour@birjand.ac.ir>, Paolo Visconti
<paolo.visconti@unisalento.it>, Waqar Waheed <waqarwaheed10@seu.edu.cn>, Zhenyu Zhou
<zhenyu_zhou@ncepu.edu.cn>, Yuqin Zhu <yuqinzhu@xtu.edu.cn>

-- Please Strictly use and follow to the template Manuscripts
-- (Word Format): http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijpeds.docx
-- Please upload the revised paper within 8 weeks
-- Similarity score of your final manuscript must be less than 25%
==

Dear Mr. Widi Aribowo,

After careful review, your paper ID #1570681304, entitled "Improving Neural Network Using A Sine Tree-Seed
Algorithm For Tuning Motor DC" for International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems (IJPEDS), p-ISSN:
2088-8694, e-ISSN 2722-256X, http://ijpeds.iaescore.com requires MAJOR REVISIONS before being accepted for
publication in our Scopus indexed journal. You are asked to submit a revised full manuscript, according to the
comment from reviewers. The Editors will check whether the revision already address the reviewers' comments.
Failing to do proper revision may lead to the rejection of your paper.

For your information, the International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems is a SCOPUS indexed
Journal, SJR Q2 on Electrical and Electronics Engineering, CiteScore: 1.49, SJR: 0.304, and SNIP: 1.088. The scope
of the journal includes all issues in the field of Power Electronics and drive systems. Included are techniques for
advanced power semiconductor devices, control in power electronics, low and high power converters (inverters,
converters, controlled and uncontrolled rectifiers), Control algorithms and techniques applied to power electronics,
electromagnetic and thermal performance of electronic power converters and inverters, power quality and utility
applications, renewable energy, electric machines, modelling, simulation, analysis, design and implementations of the
application of power circuit components (power semiconductors, inductors, high frequency transformers, capacitors),
EMI/EMC considerations, power devices and components, sensors, integration and packaging, induction motor
drives, synchronous motor drives, permanent magnet motor drives, switched reluctance motor and synchronous
reluctance motor drives, ASDs (adjustable speed drives), multi-phase machines and converters, applications in motor
drives, electric vehicles, wind energy systems, solar, battery chargers, UPS and hybrid systems and other
applications..

The reviews are below or can be found at https://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1570681304, using your EDAS login
name widiaribowo@unesa.ac.id.

Please upload the revised paper using EDAS on the "Revision" upload button within 8 weeks.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Best Regards,
Tole Sutikno
Editor-in-Chief,
International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems
http://ijpeds.iaescore.com
email: ijpeds@iaesjournal.com

--

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

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?

Slightly novel (2)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Poorly written (2)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
Could be improved (3)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Borderline (3)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the
paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

The paper presents a new algorithm called STSA as a combination of the existing "Sine Cosine Algorithm" and "Tree
Seed Algorithm" for handling the limitations of the neural network in controlling the DC motor speed. The contribution
and paper presentation are clear enough. However, a number of considerations have to be taken.

1-   The name of the algorithm already exists (maybe in a different context) please check this link:
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0378437119315894.
2-   The English style of writing is very poor. A lot of mistakes are found in the entire paper, even in the abstract, the
authors have to seriously improve the grammar mistakes (e.g., (i) A DC motor greatly applies   The DC motor is
applied, (ii) are key   are keys, (iii) Stabilized speed influenced   Stabilized speed is influenced, () and many more
…).
3-   All the equations included in the paper have been taken as pictures from other papers. The authors should write
these equations with their own understanding. They also may use their own notations and symbols.
4-   Results' discussion on the efficiency of the proposed solutions needs to be improved.

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

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?
Somewhat novel (3)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Could be improved (3)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
Could be improved (3)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Borderline (3)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the
paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

1. "PID", "ANN" should be given the full name when they first appear. Abbreviations should be in upper case and the
author needs to modify them, for example, "The stsa method modifies the ns value so that..." and "Where the number
of seeds is ns..."
2. Mathematical symbols need to be italicized, for example, "Where M is the dimension of a function, A is the amount
of trees." and "Where, t is the current iteration, T is the maximum iterations, and a is a constant. " The author needs to
check and modify the mathematical symbols in the text.
3. The numbers of the titles of the subsections in Section 2 and the numbers of the tables in Section 3 are incorrect,
please check and modify. In THE PROPOSED STSA-NN MODEL, Figure 5 is the flow chart of the STSA - NN hybrid
method, not Figure 4.
4. Lack of analysis of the simulation results shown in Figure 8.
5. There are some grammar mistakes and typos throughout this paper. Some examples are summarized as follows:
1) In page2, "are accommodated. In the early stages,.." should be changed to "are accommodated. in the early
stages,..."
2) Some words should be used in plural form, like in section 2.2, "the following equation" should be "the following
equations".
3) In page3, "Higher ST supply solid local search and accelerate convergence," should be changed to "Higher ST
supplies solid local search and accelerates convergence,"
4) In page7, "Managing control on a DC motor is very interesting research area." should be changed to "Managing
control on a DC motor is a very interesting research area"
5)In Abstract, "Stabilized speed influenced by…" should be "Stabilized speed is influenced by…".
6)There are a lots number of areas having problem of uppercase, such as in SCA of section 2.1, "the location of…"
and in STSA of section 2.1, "stsa".

6. In abstract, the description of "The settling time is 0.125" is strange, it is better to put it in the conclusion.
7. When describing the algorithm, the sentences should use the present tense.
8. This paper introduces the process of proposing the sine tree-seed algorithm, but lacks reasons for proposing the STSA-NN.
9. Figure7,8 lack of analysis, and figure8 lacks of description text of coordinate axis.
10. In SCA of section 2.1, the expression of sentence "SCA serves to solve optimization problems with unknown search spaces using the sine and cosine functions" is not clear.

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

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?
Highly novel (4)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Well written (4)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
High quality (4)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Strong Accept (5)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

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

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?
Slightly novel (2)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Poorly written (2)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
Poor quality (2)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Reject (2)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

The scientific work must be improved and enriched with new contents and experimental data, for example with real application tests of the developed system, reporting the results of the tests. In the current state, the reported results are very weak and the scientific content low.

At present, the article must be rejected for a high-level scientific journal as IJPEDS.

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

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?
Somewhat novel (3)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Well written (4)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
High quality (4)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Strong Accept (5)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

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

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?
Somewhat novel (3)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Could be improved (3)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
Could be improved (3)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Borderline (3)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the
paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

The work is exciting and worth to be published after the following corrections are completed.
1-The resolution of equations is too poor, author needs to rewrite the equations by using the Microsoft equation or
other equivalent tools.
2-Figures need to be labeled in the correct numbering order.
3-Both subsections "DC MOTOR" and "THE PROPOSED STSA-NN MODEL" in pages 4 and 5 respectively have
same heading number. Make sure to use correct heading numbers for all subsections.
4-In the flowchart in Figure 5, the statement "recent best solution is the best solution" in the process block is unclear
what is that mean.
5-Author needs to provide more details about motor specifications and Simulink model design.
6-Make sure to label X and Y axis in Figure 8.
7-All sentences must begin with a capital letter.
8-Conclusion needs to be improved.

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

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?
Slightly novel (2)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Poorly written (2)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
Poor quality (2)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Reject (2)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the
paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

======= Review 8 =======

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?
Not novel at all (1)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Could be improved (3)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
Could be improved (3)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Borderline (3)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

1-Explain more with literature review support
2-section 2.2 not clear
3-The results very little to decide the algorithm
4-Rewrite the conclusion

======= Review 9 =======

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?
Slightly novel (2)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Well written (4)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
Could be improved (3)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Reject (2)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

The main novelty of the paper is improving the performance of ANN for tuning DC motor. Optimizing the feed forward neural network is not a new idea and many works presented such method in the literatures. Therefore, dear respected authors should improve their work by following comments:
1- Explain why STSA? and first of all they should explain what is the advantages of STSA in comparison with other optimization techniques.
2- Why improved version of FFNN? other ANN such as LSTM, RBF, GRN and etcetera.
3- proposed method should be compared with other regression methods, other ANN and optimization algorithms.

======= Revision review 10 =======

> *** Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?
Somewhat novel (3)

> *** Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?
Could be improved (3)

> *** Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.
High quality (4)

> *** Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above
detailed assesment.
Accept (4)

> *** Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

In this paper, a comparison study in diverse techniques to tune for the speed of the DC motor with parameter uncertainties is presented. Also, the paper discusses the application of the feed-forward back propagation neural network which is enhanced by A Sine Tree-Seed Algorithm (STSA). STSA is a hybrid method of the Tree-Seed Algorithm (TSA) and Sine Cosine algorithm. The STSA method aims to improve TSA performance based on the Sine Cosine algorithm (SCA) method. The paper is well organized and understood. The presented method based on optimization algorithm such as STSA is promising. The contribution of the paper is clear. However, the paper needs minor improvement before it is considered for publication in IJPEDS.
1.   The author should clarify why he adopted the FFNN where several types of NN are available.
2.   Several optimization algorithms can be adopted in the current work. The author must be justified in why he adopted the TSA and SCA.
3.   The architecture of the FFNN must be provided, for example, what are the number of neurons in each hidden layer, the type and number of input and output, and the learning rate.
4.   Comparison with other algorithms in terms of the convergence curve (Figure 7) is necessary to confirm the presented method.
5.   In Figure 8, the title of the y-axis is missing.
6.   The result of ANN alone can be added to Table 4 and Table 5 to show the improvement when the STSA-NN is adopted.

7. The table of Performance indices should be Table 5, not Table 4.
8. The English language should be improved.

We would like your cooperation with the double check of your revised paper:
----
(1) TEMPLATE, Please Strictly use and follow to the template Manuscripts (Word Format): https://iaescore.com/gfa/ijpeds.docx (or LateX: https://iaescore.com/gfa/ijpeds.rar)

(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 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, 5 references (recently journal articles) are used in 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. 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 TPC has the right to cancel the paper to be published at International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems (IJPEDS).

(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).

[IJPEDS'21] Decision ID #1570681304 ('Improving Neural Network Using A Sine Tree-Seed Algorithm For Tuning Motor DC')

1 message

ijpeds@iaesjournal.com <ijpeds=iaesjournal.com@edas.info>   Wed, Mar 17, 2021 at 10:58 PM
Reply-To: ijpeds@iaesjournal.com
To: Widi Aribowo <widiaribowo@unesa.ac.id>

-- Single author is NOT allowed

-- Submit your below documents to: ijpeds@iaesjournal.com

-- 1. Final camera ready paper

-- 2. Similarity report (by iThenticate or Turnitin software)

-- 3. Payment evidence

Dear Mr. Widi Aribowo,

Congratulations - your paper #1570681304 ('Improving Neural Network Using A Sine Tree-Seed Algorithm For Tuning Motor DC') for the International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems (IJPEDS) has been ACCEPTED with minor revisions. This is a SCOPUS indexed Journal, SJR Q2 on Electrical and Electronics Engineering, CiteScore: 1.49, SJR: 0.304, and SNIP: 1.088 (https://www.scopus.com/s ourceid/21100258382). The scope of the journal includes all issues in the field of Power Electronics and drive systems. Included are techniques for advanced power semiconductor devices, control in power electronics, low and high power converters (inverters, converters, controlled and uncontrolled rectifiers), Control algorithms and techniques applied to power electronics, electromagnetic and thermal performance of electronic power converters and inverters, power quality and utility applications, renewable energy, electric machines, modelling, simulation, analysis, design and implementations of the application of power circuit components (power semiconductors, inductors, high frequency transformers, capacitors), EMI/EMC considerations, power devices and components, sensors, integration and packaging, induction motor drives, synchronous motor drives, permanent magnet motor drives, switched reluctance motor and synchronous reluctance motor drives, ASDs (adjustable speed drives), multi-phase machines and converters, applications in motor drives, electric vehicles, wind energy systems, solar, battery chargers, UPS and hybrid systems and other applications.

Please make the necessary changes based on reviewers' comments and suggestions. The reviews are below or can be found at https://edas.info/showP aper.php?m=1570681304. Please prepare your final camera ready paper (in MS Word file format) adheres every detail of the guide of authors (http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijpeds.d ocx), and check it for spelling/grammatical mistakes. We will usually expect a minimum 25 references primarily to journal papers. The goal of this camera ready paper is to describe NOVEL TECHNICAL RESULTS.

For your information, according to international regulations, similarity score of camera-ready paper should be less than 25% (current similarity score is %). 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 delays for publication of your paper.

Please submit your final camera ready paper along with your payment receipt to: ijpeds@iaesjournal.com within 4 weeks.

I look forward for your response

Sincerely yours,

Tole Sutikno
Editor-in-Chief,
International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems
http://ijpeds.iaescore.com
email: ijpeds@iaesjournal.com

Below is the reviews on your papers:

Review 1

Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?

Slightly novel (2)

Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?

Poorly written (2)

Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.

Could be improved (3)

Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above detailed assesment.

Borderline (3)

Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

The paper presents a new algorithm called STSA as a combination of the existing "Sine Cosine Algorithm" and "Tree Seed Algorithm" for handling the limitations of the neural network in controlling the DC motor speed. The contribution and paper presentation are clear enough. However, a number of considerations have to be taken.

1- The name of the algorithm already exists (maybe in a different context) please check this link: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0378437119315894 . 2- The English style of writing is very poor. A lot of mistakes are found in the entire paper, even in the abstract, the authors have to seriously improve the grammar mistakes (e.g., (i) A DC motor greatly applies   The DC motor is applied, (ii) are key   are keys, (iii) Stabilized speed influenced   Stabilized speed is influenced, () and many more …). 3- All the equations included in the paper have been taken as pictures from other papers. The authors should write these equations with their own understanding. They also may use their own notations and symbols. 4- Results' discussion on the efficiency of the proposed solutions needs to be improved.

Review 2

Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?

Somewhat novel (3)

Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?

Could be improved (3)

Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.

Could be improved (3)

Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above detailed assesment.

Borderline (3)

Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

1. "PID", "ANN" should be given the full name when they first appear. Abbreviations should be in upper case and the author needs to modify them, for example, "The stsa method modifies the ns value so that..." and "Where the number of seeds is ns..."
2. Mathematical symbols need to be italicized, for example, "Where M is the dimension of a function, A is the amount of trees." and "Where, t is the current iteration, T is the maximum iterations, and a is a constant. " The author needs to check and modify the mathematical symbols in the text.
3. The numbers of the titles of the subsections in Section 2 and the numbers of the tables in Section 3 are incorrect, please check and modify. In THE PROPOSED STSA-NN MODEL, Figure 5 is the flow chart of the STSA - NN hybrid method, not Figure 4.
4. Lack of analysis of the simulation results shown in Figure 8.

5. There are some grammar mistakes and typos throughout this paper. Some examples are summarized as follows:

    1. In page2, "are accommodated. In the early stages,.." should be changed to "are accommodated. in the early stages,..."
    2. Some words should be used in plural form, like in section 2.2, "the following equation" should be "the following equations".
    3. In page3, "Higher ST supply solid local search and accelerate convergence," should be changed to "Higher ST supplies solid local search and accelerates convergence,"
    4. In page7, "Managing control on a DC motor is very interesting research area." should be changed to "Managing control on a DC motor is a very interesting research area" 5)In Abstract, "Stabilized speed influenced by…" should be "Stabilized speed is influenced by…". 6)There are a lots number of areas having problem of uppercase, such as in SCA of section 2.1, "the location of…" and in STSA of section 2.1, "stsa".

6. In abstract, the description of "The settling time is 0.125" is strange, it is better to put it in the conclusion.
7. When describing the algorithm, the sentences should use the present tense.
8. This paper introduces the process of proposing the sine tree-seed algorithm, but lacks reasons for proposing the STSA-NN.
9. Figure7,8 lack of analysis, and figure8 lacks of description text of coordinate axis.
10. In SCA of section 2.1, the expression of sentence "SCA serves to solve optimization problems with unknown search spaces using the sine and cosine functions" is not clear.

Review 3

Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?

Highly novel (4)

Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?

Well written (4)

Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.

High quality (4)

Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above detailed assesment.

Strong Accept (5)

Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

Review 4

Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?

Slightly novel (2)

Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?

Poorly written (2)

Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.

Poor quality (2)

Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above detailed assesment.

Reject (2)

Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

The scientific work must be improved and enriched with new contents and experimental data, for example with real application tests of the developed system, reporting the results of the tests. In the current state, the reported results

are very weak and the scientific content low.

At present, the article must be rejected for a high-level scientific journal as IJPEDS.

Review 5

Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?

Somewhat novel (3)

Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?

Well written (4)

Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.

High quality (4)

Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above detailed assesment.

Strong Accept (5)

Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

Review 6

Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?

Somewhat novel (3)

Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?

Could be improved (3)

Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.

Could be improved (3)

Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above detailed assesment.

Borderline (3)

Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

The work is exciting and worth to be published after the following corrections are completed. 1-The resolution of equations is too poor, author needs to rewrite the equations by using the Microsoft equation or other equivalent tools. 2-Figures need to be labeled in the correct numbering order. 3-Both subsections "DC MOTOR" and "THE PROPOSED STSA-NN MODEL" in pages 4 and 5 respectively have same heading number. Make sure to use correct heading numbers for all subsections. 4-In the flowchart in Figure 5, the statement "recent best solution is the best solution" in the process block is unclear what is that mean. 5-Author needs to provide more details about motor specifications and Simulink model design. 6-Make sure to label X and Y axis in Figure 8. 7-All sentences must begin with a capital letter. 8-Conclusion needs to be improved.

Review 7

Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?

Slightly novel (2)

Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?

Poorly written (2)

Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.

Poor quality (2)

Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above detailed assesment.

Reject (2)

Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

Review 8

Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?

Not novel at all (1)

Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?

Could be improved (3)

Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.

Could be improved (3)

Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above detailed assesment.

Borderline (3)

Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

1-Explain more with literature review support 2-section 2.2 not clear 3-The results very little to decide the algorithm 4-Rewrite the conclusion

Review 9

Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?

Slightly novel (2)

Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?

Well written (4)

Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.

Could be improved (3)

Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above detailed assesment.

Reject (2)

Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

The main novelty of the paper is improving the performance of ANN for tuning DC motor. Optimizing the feed forward neural network is not a new idea and many works presented such method in the literatures. Therefore, dear respected authors should improve their work by following comments: 1- Explain why STSA? and first of all they should explain what is the advantages of STSA in comparison with other optimization techniques. 2- Why improved version of FFNN? other ANN such as LSTM, RBF, GRN and etcetera.
3- proposed method should be compared with other regression methods, other ANN and optimization algorithms.

Review 10

Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?

Somewhat novel (3)

Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?

Could be improved (3)

Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.

Could be improved (3)

Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above detailed assesment.

Accept (4)

Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

The contribution of this research is to present intelligent control skills based on the sine tree-seed algorithm hybrid method and the neural network. The validation and effectiveness of the proposed method will be compared with the PID method. The paper has been well written and the study is meaningful. But the reviewer has the following questions and suggestions:

1. Compared with the recent prior arts, what's the main advantages of the proposed method.
2. Why this paper has two "section 2.2"?
3. In Table 1, the detailed DC motor parameters aren't given in this paper.
4. some new related results about neural network control in motor drive should be added in references, like Neural network-based command filtered control for induction motors with input saturation, Neural network-based finite-time command filtering control for switched nonlinear systems with backlash-like hysteresis.
5. The two "Table. 4" are suggested to be combined, then the compare results can be easily found by readers.
6. The equations in this paper are too vague to identify.

Revision review 11

Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?

Somewhat novel (3)

Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?

Well written (4)

Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.

High quality (4)

Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above detailed assesment.

Accept (4)

Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

Paper can be Published in the Journal

Revision review 12

Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?

Somewhat novel (3)

Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?

Could be improved (3)

Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.

High quality (4)

Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above detailed assesment.

Accept (4)

Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

In this paper, a comparison study in diverse techniques to tune for the speed of the DC motor with parameter uncertainties is presented. Also, the paper discusses the application of the feed-forward back propagation neural network which is enhanced by A Sine Tree-Seed Algorithm (STSA). STSA is a hybrid method of the Tree-Seed Algorithm (TSA) and Sine Cosine algorithm. The STSA method aims to improve TSA performance based on the Sine Cosine algorithm (SCA) method. The paper is well organized and understood. The presented method based on optimization algorithm such as STSA is promising. The contribution of the paper is clear. However, the paper needs minor improvement before it is considered for publication in IJPEDS.

1. The author should clarify why he adopted the FFNN where several types of NN are available.
2. Several optimization algorithms can be adopted in the current work. The author must be justified in why he adopted the TSA and SCA.
3. The architecture of the FFNN must be provided, for example, what are the number of neurons in each hidden layer, the type and number of input and output, and the learning rate.
4. Comparison with other algorithms in terms of the convergence curve (Figure 7) is necessary to confirm the presented method.
5. In Figure 8, the title of the y-axis is missing.
6. The result of ANN alone can be added to Table 4 and Table 5 to show the improvement when the STSA-NN is adopted.
7. The table of Performance indices should be Table 5, not Table 4.
8. The English language should be improved.

Revision review 13

Novelty: How original the problem and/or solution method is?

Highly novel (4)

Quality of Presentation: How well the paper is written?

Well written (4)

Quality of Research: Quality and thoroughness of research methodology.

High quality (4)

Recommendation: Your overall rating of the paper. This should reflect the above detailed assesment.

Accept (4)

Comments or suggestion: Provide comments or suggestion that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as useful feedback to the authors. Please attempt to avoid generic comments.

1. Some equations are missing, kindly include the same .
2. Explanation for acquisition of datasets needed
3. training and testing data needs to be segregated and implied. The training and testing data should differ.
4. Kindly include the extent of enormous data implied, as limited data generally doesnt produce very promising results. The differences in the improvizations appears to be marginally less
5. Some more fine tuning works for promising result can be done.
6. The papers need a total fine tuning for better improvisation and can be rewritten to the best of it, and the format needs to be taken care of!!!

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/ ijpeds.d ocx or http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijpeds.ra r (LaTeX format). If you use LaTeX, submit your LaTeX source files to ijpeds@iaesjournal.com

--For original research paper:--

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).

(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 be prepared by yourself 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) 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).

--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).

In order to cover part of the event cost, each accepted paper will be charged: 265.00 (USD) 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 265 USD fee covers the standard eight (8) pages manuscript. For every additional page an extra fee of 45 USD 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 an alternative of bank transfer) to email: ijpeds@iaesjournal.com

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

Banguharjo, Sewon

City: Bantul

Province: D.I. Yogyakarta (DIY)

Post Code: 55164

Country: Indonesia

Document for paper ID #1570681304

3 messages

Widi Aribowo <widiaribowo@unesa.ac.id>   Tue, Mar 23, 2021 at 11:17 AM
To: ijpeds@iaesjournal.com

Dear editor..

here I attach the completeness file of the paper ID # 1570681304

Kind regards

2 attachments

📄 **Turnitin paper ID # 1570681304.pdf**
2364K

📄 **Final paper ID # 1570681304.doc**
6159K

IJPEDS Editor <ijpeds@iaesjournal.com>   Tue, Mar 23, 2021 at 11:17 AM
To: widiaribowo@unesa.ac.id

-- IJPEDS paper submission: **http://ijpeds.iaescore.com** --
----

Dear Authors and Reviewers,

We confirm that your email reached us.

Policies

- Focus and Scope
- Section Policies
- Peer Review Process
- Open Access Policy
- Archiving

- Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement
- Abstracting and Indexing
- IJPEDS Guide for Authors and Template
- Withdrawal of Manuscripts
- Checklist for preparing your paper for publication

Submissions

- Online Submissions
- Author Guidelines
- Copyright Notice
- Privacy Statement
- Author Fees

Please submit your papers ONLY through our online system.
To make a submission, you must have a user account and **be enrolled as an Author**. User accounts can either be created by the Journal Manager or you can register yourself (this journal policy allow you create user account by your self as a Reader, an Author and/or a Reviewer). All fields with an asterisk beside them (Username; Password; Repeat Password; First Name; Last Name; Email) are mandatory. Your username and your email address must be unique; furthermore, while you can change your email address at a later date, you will be unable to change your username. If you want to register in another role within the same journal (for example, if you are already a Reader, but also want to become an Author) you can log in; go to Edit My Profile (under My Account on your User Home page); and check off the checkboxes next to any available roles, near the bottom of the page. Once you have an account, log in to the journal site and select the role of Author.

Online Submissions

Already have a Username/Password for International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems (IJPEDS)?
Go to Login

Need a Username/Password?
Go to Registration

Registration and login are required to submit items online and to check the status of current submissions.

Registration and login are required to submit items online and to check the status of current submissions.

Your cooperation is very appreciated.

Best Regards,
IJPEDS Editorial Office

IMPORTANT:
- **Introduction section:** explain the context of the study and state the precise objective.
The authors also should describe the real problem existing (supported by the important or most recent references) in order to satisfy the criteria of this scientific journal which has to introduce any novelties, improvement etc from the research work prior to the problem solving done or proposed by the author as a significant contribution.
- **Results and discussion section**: The presentation of results should be simple and straightforward in style. You should improve your analyzing and also present the comparison between performance of your approach and other researches. Results given in figures should not be repeated in tables. This section report the most important findings, including results of statistical analyses as appropriate. It is very important to prove that your manuscript has a significant value and not trivial.

"OUR OPEN ACCESS & FREE OF CHARGE JOURNALS"
- http://ijaas.iaescore.com
- http://ijres.iaescore.com
- http://ijict.iaescore.com
- http://ijra.iaescore.com
- http://ijape.iaescore.com
- http://iaesprime.com/index.php/csit

IJPEDS Editor <ijpeds@iaesjournal.com>   Fri, Mar 26, 2021 at 8:28 AM
To: Widi Aribowo <widiaribowo@unesa.ac.id>

Thank you

[Quoted text hidden]

Thank you

[IJPEDS'21] Your paper #1570681304 ('Improving Neural Network Using A Sine Tree-Seed Algorithm For Tuning Motor DC')

1 message

ijpeds@iaesjournal.com <ijpeds=iaesjournal.com@edas.info>   Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 11:04 PM
Reply-To: ijpeds@iaesjournal.com
To: Widi Aribowo <widiaribowo@unesa.ac.id>

Dear Mr. Widi Aribowo:

Congratulations - your paper #1570681304 ('Improving Neural Network Using A Sine Tree-Seed Algorithm For Tuning Motor DC') for IJPEDS'21 has been published.

Regards, Best Regards,
Tole Sutikno
Editor-in-Chief,
International Journal of Power Electronics and Drive Systems
http://ijpeds.iaescore.com
email: ijpeds@iaesjournal.com