[2020 2nd ICOST] Paper 1570691529 has been registered

EDAS Conference Manager <help@edas.info>
on behalf of
icost@hemispheres.or.id <icost=hemispheres.or.id@edas.info>
Wed 11/4/2020 11:50 AM

To: Saucha Diwandari <saucha.diwandari@staff.uty.ac.id>

Dear Mrs. Saucha Diwandari:

Thank you for registering your paper 1570691529 (*Comparison of Classification Performance Based on Dynamic Mining of User Interest Navigation Pattern in e-Commerce Websites*) to **Second International Conference on Science & Technology 2020**. You still have to upload your manuscript at https://edas.info/uploadPaper.php?m=1570691529. Your manuscript can be application/pdf, application/msword and application/vnd.openxmlformats-officedocument.wordprocessingml.document.

You can see all your submissions and their status at

https://edas.info/index.php?c=27838

using your EDAS user id **saucha.diwandari@staff.uty.ac.id**.

Once you upload your manuscript, you will receive another email confirmation.

Regards, Kind Regards,

2020 2nd ICOST Admin
(2020 2nd International Conference on Science & Technology)
URL: https://icost.hemispheres.or.id/
E-mail: icost@hemispheres.or.id

For Fast Response :
Mrs. Jay
Phone/WA: +62 812 2911 1215

[2020 2nd ICOST] Your paper #1570691529 ('Comparison of Classification Performance Based on Dynamic Mining of User Interest Navigation Pattern in e-Commerce Websites')

EDAS Conference Manager <help@edas.info>
on behalf of
icost@hemispheres.or.id <icost=hemispheres.or.id@edas.info>
Tue 11/10/2020 10:46 AM
To: Saucha Diwandari <saucha.diwandari@staff.uty.ac.id>; Ahmad Tri Hidayat <ahmadth@staff.uty.ac.id>

Dear Mrs. ,

After a rigorous review, with pleasure we would like to inform you that your paper with ID/Title: #1570691529 ('Comparison of Classification Performance Based on Dynamic Mining of User Interest Navigation Pattern in e-Commerce Websites') for 2020 2nd ICOST has been accepted to be presented and published in The Second International Conference on Science & Technology 2020 - 2020 2nd ICOST which will be held in VIRTUAL CONFERENCE during 28 November 2020.

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

The reviews are below or can be found at https://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1570691529.

Please take some steps below.
1. Please register and make a payment to the conference through the EDAS system within this link: https://edas.info/r27838.
2. Please download the e-copyright within this link http://bit.ly/ecopyrightiop and fill in that form then submit it to your EDAS account.
3. Please download the Camera-Ready of Full Paper Template via http://bit.ly/JPCSTemplate.
4. Please provide Plagiarism Checker using Turnitin or iThenticate with the maximum similarity score has to be less than 20%.

Please email us if you have any questions related to 2020 2nd ICOST.

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

> *** Technical Criteria: Rate the technical criteria of the paper. (e.g. Scientific merit: notably scientific rigour, accuracy, and correctness. Clarity of expression; communication of ideas; readability and discussion of concepts. Sufficient discussion of the context of the work, and suitable referencing)
Average (3)

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

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

> *** Recommendation: How do you rate your recommendation?
Possible Accept. (2)

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

1.   The authors should summarize their contribution and novelty compared to the previous work in the introduction section using some bullets.
2.   Introduction section is short.
3.   All figures and tables should be placed in either top or bottom of the page.
4.   The "future work" section should be added after conclusion.

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

> *** Technical Criteria: Rate the technical criteria of the paper. (e.g. Scientific merit: notably scientific rigour, accuracy, and correctness. Clarity of expression; communication of ideas; readability and discussion of concepts. Sufficient discussion of the context of the work, and suitable referencing)
Average (3)

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

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

> *** Recommendation: How do you rate your recommendation?
Possible Accept. (2)

> *** Detailed comments: Please justify your recommendation and suggest improvements in

technical content, quality, or presentation criteria.

The paper compares three classification algorithms by using the dynamic mining approach of user interest navigation pattern.
 Results showed that the Decision Tree Classifier performed optimally in both the unbalanced data and independent or dependent data models.
The paper could be suitable for publication.

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

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

> *** Quality Criteria: Rate the quality criteria of this paper. (eg. Originality: Is the work relevant and novel? Motivation: Does the problem considered have a sound motivation? All papers should clearly demonstrate the scientific interest of the results. Repetition: Have significant parts of the manuscript already been published? Length: Is the content of the work of sufficient scientific interest to justify its length?)
Good (4)

> *** Presentation Criteria: Rate the presentation of this paper.
(eg. Title: Is it adequate and appropriate for the content of the article? Abstract: Does it contain the essential information of the article? Is it complete? Is it suitable for inclusion by itself in an abstracting service?
Diagrams, figures, tables, and captions: Are they essential and clear? Text and mathematics: Are they brief but still clear? If you recommend shortening, please suggest what should be omitted. Conclusion: Does the paper contain a carefully written conclusion, summarizing what has been learned and why it is interesting and useful?)
Good (4)

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

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

Accept :
1) Adequate references and citations, from 2007 to 2019.
2) Clearly explained the methods used, with adequate tables and figures.

Kind Regards,

2020 2nd ICOST Admin
(2020 2nd International Conference on Science & Technology)

URL: https://icost.hemispheres.or.id/
E-mail: icost@hemispheres.or.id

For Fast Response :
Mrs. Jay
Phone/WA: +62 812 2911 1215