

History Jurnal Sebagai Koresponden Author

Nama: Mardison, S.Kom., M.Kom.

E-Mail: mardison@UPIYPTK.AC.ID

Afiliasi: Universitas Putra Indonesia YPTK Padang

1. Jurnal Internasional Bereputasi dan Berfaktor Dampak Terindex Scopus Q3

- Judul: Hybrid DSS for recommendations of halal culinary tourism West Sumatra
- Nama Penulis: Mardison, Agung Ramadhanu, Larissa Navia Rani, Sofika Enggari
- Nama Jurnal: IAES International Journal of Artificial Intelligence (IJ-AI)
- Nama Penerbit: Institute of Advanced Engineering and Science (IAES)
- Hasil Review EDAS:

Full paper review

Relevance and timeliness	Technical content and scientific rigour	Novelty and originality	Quality of presentation	
completed	Good 4	Solid work of notable importance. 4	Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. 3	Well written. 4
Strong aspects	Weak aspects		Recommended changes	
The application of hybrid DSS for tourism recommendations is an interesting approach. The paper is combines a real-world topic with the solid research foundations and mathematics.	Nothing of major importance.		For the published version, I'd recommend to recreate the page-wide graphics of the research method framework (page 3), which is pretty fuzzy in the present form.	
Submission Policy				
Yes				
completed	Good 4	Solid work of notable importance. 4	Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. 3	Unacceptable. 1
Strong aspects	Weak aspects		Recommended changes	
- good and novel studies	- poorly structured and explained - did not follow conference formatting and number of pages requirement - extensive revision needed in all sections		- Abstract need to be strengthened in terms of the methodology, discussion, and conclusion -the paper objective was outlined in the abstract, but not properly outlined in text (Introduction parts) - the acronym should be defined during the first use. some acronym used in the paper is defined later in the paper.	

- some reference was not properly cited
- many sections in literature are not properly cited
- page 2 formatting needs to be checked
- methodology need to concentrate on the tools used and method of analysis
- how research is conducted is poorly explained in the methodology (for example: how Google data is extracted and used")
- some methodology sections were mention in the introduction parts
- most tables presented were not properly explained and elaborated
- elements in Figure 1 needs to be explained (figure 1 is labeled as figure 2)
- many elements in "analysis and results" should be in the method
- blurry image (equation pasted as image with low quality)
- many references but not cited in the text.
- results were not properly discussed

Submission Policy

yes

completed	Good	4	Valid work but limited contribution.	3	Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated.	3	Readable, but revision is needed in some parts.	3
-----------	------	---	--------------------------------------	---	--	---	---	---

Strong aspects

Topic of research is interesting

Weak aspects

Research and results not developed enough

Recommended changes

Style and grammar

Submission Policy

yes

completed	Little	2	Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws.	2	Minor variations on a well investigated subject.	2	Substantial revision work is needed.	2
-----------	--------	---	--	---	--	---	--------------------------------------	---

Strong aspects

This study combines a Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) and AHP method called Hybrid DSS to recommend halal culinary tourism in West Sumatra.
The study is interesting and motivations are good. However, the paper is not well structured; the methodology section is too short and not clear.
The literature review section presents useful cited papers.

I am confident if the authors resubmit the paper by reviewing the methodology, the document would acquire more quality.

Weak aspects

This study combines a Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) and AHP method called Hybrid DSS to recommend halal culinary tourism in West Sumatra.
The study is interesting and motivations are good. However, the paper is not well structured; the methodology section is too short and not clear.
The literature review section presents useful cited papers.

I am confident if the authors resubmit the paper by reviewing the methodology, the document would acquire more quality.

Recommended changes

This study combines a Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) and AHP method called Hybrid DSS to recommend halal culinary tourism in West Sumatra.
The study is interesting and motivations are good. However, the paper is not well structured; the methodology section is too short and not clear.
The literature review section presents useful cited papers.

I am confident if the authors resubmit the paper by reviewing the methodology, the document would acquire more quality.

Submission Policy

This study combines a Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) and AHP method called Hybrid DSS to recommend halal culinary tourism in West Sumatra.
The study is interesting and motivations are good. However, the paper is not well structured; the methodology section is too short and not clear.
The literature review section presents useful cited papers.

I am confident if the authors resubmit the paper by reviewing the methodology, the document would acquire more quality.

completed	Acceptable	3	Valid work but limited contribution.	3	Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated.	3	Well written.	4
-----------	------------	---	--------------------------------------	---	--	---	---------------	---

Strong aspects

Shows an interesting case study of AHP; combine with Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) method carried out the normalization calculation

Weak aspects

Lack of comparison with other existing methods and other feasible approaches; Data scale is not very convictive

Recommended changes

add more comparison experiments; compare with other recommendation system; show some drawbacks and thinking towards AHP on this case study

Submission Policy

comply with the policy

completed	Acceptable	3	Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws.	2	Minor variations on a well investigated subject.	2	Unacceptable.	1
-----------	------------	---	--	---	--	---	---------------	---

Submission Policy

comply with the policy

completed	Acceptable	3	Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws.	2	Minor variations on a well investigated subject.	2	Unacceptable.	1
-----------	------------	---	--	---	--	---	---------------	---

Strong aspects

Nothing to report.

Weak aspects

Two weakest problems that appear from the title to the conclusion: total lack of attention with syntax, semantics and formatting; too much repetition of passages (some in the same paragraph).
Other weak aspects: there are passages antagonistic (such as "SAW method, which is often also known as the term Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP)" and "apply a combination of AHP and SAW" in the introduction section).
In the summary appears "that is precise, accurate, consistent, and validated" about the Hybrid DSS Method that was used during the described study. There almost nothing of these aspects along the text.

Recommended changes

Review the title (Sumatra appears as Sumatera, and HALAL CULINARY TOURISM should be TOURISTIC HALAL CULINARY). Adopt one unique reference style (along the text is one, in the references section is other). Several references are not cited in the text.
What is the complete name of the first author?
The research methodology section should be suppressed. Use just a citation and a reference.
Should be compared the total number of restaurants against the used sample. Something has to be said about the appropriateness of the sample.
A very complete review should be carried on, involving ideas and language.

Submission Policy

Yes it does (with same problems).

completed	Good	4	Valid work but limited contribution.	3	Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated.	3	Well written.	4
-----------	------	---	--------------------------------------	---	--	---	---------------	---

Strong aspects

Well organised and written.
System steps are presented well in results and discussion.

Weak aspects

Research method section lacks details explaining the methodologies and approaches.

Recommended changes

If possible, improvise research method section with addition of approaches/ methodologies and literature review can be considered as separate section.

Submission Policy

Minor variation in abstract

completed	Good	4	Valid work but limited contribution.	3	Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated.	3	Well written.	4
-----------	------	---	--------------------------------------	---	--	---	---------------	---

Strong aspects

Well written
Research method well explained
Calculations also shown

Weak aspects

Theoretical explanation is limited and more focus given on data and its handling

Recommended changes

Rewrite your methodology section developing an analytical model and then talk about data handling

Submission Policy

Please do spell check, show future course of action for this work

completed	Good	4	Valid work but limited contribution.	3	Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated.	3	Well written.	4
-----------	------	---	--------------------------------------	---	--	---	---------------	---

Strong aspects	Weak aspects	Recommended changes
easy to read and to follow. the results were well presented and articulated.	the literature review needs some updates and additions.	see above comments for consideration

Submission Policy
yes

completed	Good	4 Valid work but limited contribution.	3 Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated.	3 Readable, but revision is needed in some parts.
------------------	------	--	--	---

Strong aspects	Weak aspects	Recommended changes
- the scope is in accordance with the journal / conference - this paper has been organized in an easy to follow manner.	- suggested abstracts for rewriting (with clarity and presentation of the proposed method and results in mind) - Poor analysis and presentation of results - It is suggested that conclusions be written briefly	- suggested abstracts for rewriting (with clarity and presentation of the proposed method and results in mind) - It is suggested that conclusions be written briefly Overall, the content is fine and well discussed. Minor corrections to this paper and recommended acceptance at this journal / conference.

Submission Policy
ok

Hasil Accepted EDAS:

#25 (1570632929): *Hybrid Dss for Recommendations of Halal Culinary Tourism West Sumatera*

[Hide details](#)

DUOTEX

Authors	Mardison Mardison, Agung Ramadhenu, Larissa Rani and Sofika Enggari (Universitas Putra Indonesia YPTK Padang, Indonesia)
Paper title	<i>Hybrid Dss for Recommendations of Halal Culinary Tourism West Sumatera</i> Only the chairs can edit
Conference and track	2020 1st Conference on Internet of Things and Embedded Intelligence - Track I: Internet of Things, Smart Cities & Big Data Analytics (IoT)
Abstract	Only the chairs can edit This study combines a Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) and AHP method called Hybrid DSS to recommend...
Keywords	Simple Additive Weighting (SAW); AHP; Hybrid DSS; Halal Culinary Tourism Only the chairs can edit
Topics	Big data analysis; Big Data Mining and Analytics; Other Only the chairs can edit
Similarity	On May 26, 2020 21:05 America/New_York, docoloc computed a similarity score of 18 for the Final manuscript (Camera Ready Version).
Personal notes	
Roles	You are an author and a presenter for this paper. You have authored an accepted paper in this conference.
Status	Accepted
Revisions	not permitted for role
Presented	by Mardison Mardison (bio)

Komentar Reviewer lewat E-Mail:

Dear Mr. Mardison Mardison,

Congratulations!! Your paper is selected for publication in one of our journals. However, after editorial team meeting and careful re-review, your paper ID #1570632929 entitled "Hybrid Dss for Recommendations of Halal Culinary Tourism West Sumatera" requires MAJOR REVISIONS before being scheduled for publication in one of Scopus indexed journals. We suggest for extension and improvement on results and analysis of your paper. You are asked revise your paper seriously & carefully, and to re-submit your updated manuscript according to reviewers' comments, editors' comments, editorial office comments (<http://citei.intconference.org/list-of-accepted-papers-and-registration/>, see comments at "Revisions Required" column) and the guidelines for authors. The editors will re-check whether your updated paper already address the comments and guidelines, and fulfill for a Scopus indexed journal standard. Failing to do proper revisions may lead to delays for publication and/or re-evaluation of your paper. So, please take your attention for the requirements.

The reviews are below or can be found at <https://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1570632929>, using your EDAS login name mardison@upiyptk.ac.id.

Please submit your updated paper through EDAS system before Oct 20, 2020.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Best Regards,
Assoc. Prof. Tole Sutikno, Ph.D.
Editor-in-Chief, Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
General Chair, 2020 1st Conference on Internet of Things and Embedded Intelligence

COMMENTS FROM REVIEWERS:

===== Full paper review 1 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.
Good (4)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.
Solid work of notable importance. (4)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.
Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.
Well written. (4)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

The application of hybrid DSS for tourism recommendations is an interesting approach. The paper is combines a real-world topic with the solid research foundations and mathematics.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

Nothing of major importance.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

For the published version, I'd recommend to recreate the page-wide graphics of the research method framework (page 3), which is pretty fuzzy in the present form.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes

===== Full paper review 2 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.
Good (4)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.
Solid work of notable importance. (4)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.
Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.
Unacceptable. (1)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

- good and novel studies

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

- poorly structured and explained

- did not follow conference formatting and number of pages requirement

- extensive revision needed in all sections

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

- Abstract need to be strengthened in terms of the methodology, discussion, and conclusion

- the paper objective was outlined in the abstract, but not properly outlined in text (Introduction parts)

- the acronym should be defined during the first use. some acronym used in the paper is defined later in the paper.

-
- some reference was not properly cited
 - many sections in literature are not properly cited
 - page 2 formatting needs to be checked
 - methodology need to concentrate on the tools used and method of analysis
 - how research is conducted is poorly explained in the methodology (for example: how Google data is extracted and used")
 - some methodology sections were mention in the introduction parts
 - most tables presented were not properly explained and elaborated
 - elements in Figure 1 needs to be explained (figure 1 is labeled as figure 2)
 - many elements in "analysis and results" should be in the method
 - blurry image (equation pasted as image with low quality)
 - many references but not cited in the text.
 - results were not properly discussed

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

yes

===== Full paper review 3 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.
Good (4)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.
Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.
Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.
Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

Topic of research is interesting

Topic of research is interesting

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

Research and results not developed enough

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

Style and grammar

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

yes

===== Full paper review 4 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.
Little (2)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.
Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.
Minor variations on a well investigated subject. (2)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.
Substantial revision work is needed. (2)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

This study combines a Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) and AHP method called Hybrid DSS to recommend halal culinary tourism in West Sumatra.

The study is interesting and motivations are good. However, the paper is not well structured; the methodology section is too short and not clear. The literature review section presents useful cited papers.

I am confident if the authors resubmit the paper by reviewing the methodology, the document would acquire more quality.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

This study combines a Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) and AHP method called Hybrid DSS to recommend halal culinary tourism in West Sumatra.

The study is interesting and motivations are good. However, the paper is not well structured; the methodology section is too short and not clear. The literature review section presents useful cited papers.

I am confident if the authors resubmit the paper by reviewing the methodology, the document would acquire more quality.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

This study combines a Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) and AHP method called Hybrid DSS to recommend halal culinary tourism in West Sumatra.

The study is interesting and motivations are good. However, the paper is not well structured; the methodology section is too short and not clear. The literature review section presents useful cited papers.

I am confident if the authors resubmit the paper by reviewing the methodology, the document would acquire more quality.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

This study combines a Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) and AHP method called Hybrid DSS to recommend halal culinary tourism in West Sumatra.

The study is interesting and motivations are good. However, the paper is not well structured; the methodology section is too short and not clear. The literature review section presents useful cited papers.

I am confident if the authors resubmit the paper by reviewing the methodology, the document would acquire more quality.

===== Full paper review 5 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research. Acceptable (3)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour. Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper. Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references. Well written. (4)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

Shows an interesting case study of AHP; combine with Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) method carried out the normalization calculation

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

Lack of comparison with other existing methods and other feasible approaches; Data scale is not very convictive

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

add more comparison experiments; compare with other recommendation system; show some drawbacks and thinking towards AHP on this case study

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

comply with the policy

===== Full paper review 6 =====

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research. Acceptable (3)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour. Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper. Minor variations on a well investigated subject. (2)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references. Unacceptable. (1)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

Nothing to report.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

Two weakest problems that appear from the title to the conclusion: total lack of attention with syntax, semantics and formatting; too much repetition of passages (some in the same paragraph).

Other weak aspects: there are passages antagonistic (such as "SAW method, which is often also known as the term Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP)" and "apply a combination of AHP and SAW" in the introduction section.

In the summary appears "that is precise, accurate, consistent, and validated" about the Hybrid DSS Method that was used during the described study. There almost nothing of these aspects along the text.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

Review the title (Sumatra appears as Sumatera, and HALAL CULINARY TOURISM should be TOURISTIC HALAL CULINARY).

Adopt one unique reference style (along the text is one, in the references section is other). Several references are not cited in the text.

What is the complete name of the first author?

The research methodology section should be suppressed. Use just a citation and a reference.


Should be compared the total number of restaurants against the used sample. Something has to be said about the appropriateness of the sample.

A very complete review should be carried on, involving ideas and language.

2. Jurnal Nasional Terakreditasi Dikti Sinta 2

- Judul: Prediction of Scholarship Recipients Using Hybrid Data Mining Method with Combination of K-Means and C4.5 Algorithms
 - Nama Penulis: Mardison, Sarjon Defit, Shaza Alturki
 - Nama Jurnal: International Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research (IJAIR)
 - Nama Penerbit: STMIK Dharma Wacana
- Hasil Review E-mail:

[IJAIR] Editor Decision Eksternal Kotak Masuk x

 **Heri Nurdiyanto** internationaljournalair@gmail.com lewat ijair.id
kepada saya, Sarjon ▾ Sel, 27 Apr 2021, 12.06 ☆ ↶ ⋮

🌐 Inggris ▾ > Indonesia ▾ [Terjemahkan pesan](#) Nonaktifkan untuk: Inggris x

Mr. Mardison Mardison:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to International Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research, "Prediction of Scholarship Recipients Using Hybrid Data Mining Method with Combination of K-Means and C4.5 Algorithms".

Our decision is: Revisions Required

Heri Nurdiyanto
STMIK Dharma Wacana
Phone +6285766661199
internationaljournalair@gmail.com

Reviewer D:

Reviewer D:

Significance: - How important is the work reported? Does it attack an important/difficult problem (as opposed to a peripheral/simple one)? - Does the approach offer to advance the state of the art? - Does it involve or synthesize ideas, methods, approaches from multiple disciplines? - Does it have interesting implications for multiple disciplines?*:
Good

Originality: - Is this a new issue? Is this a novel approach to an issue? - Is this a novel combination of familiar ideas/techniques/methods/approaches? - Does the paper point out differences in related research? - Does the paper properly situate itself with respect to previous work? **:
Good

Quality: - Is the paper technically sound? How are its claims backed up? - Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contribution?*:
Excellent

Clarity: - Is the paper clearly written? Does it motivate the research? Does it describe clearly the methods employed (e.g., experimental procedures, algorithms, analytical tools), if any? - Are the results, if any, described

Clarity: - Is the paper clearly written? Does it motivate the research? Does it describe clearly the methods employed (e.g., experimental procedures, algorithms, analytical tools), if any? - Are the results, if any, described and evaluated thoroughly? - Is the paper organized in a sensible and logical fashion? **:

Good

Relevance: - Is the paper closely related to the theme of the journal (broadly conceived)? - Is the content interesting enough to a broad audience? - Is the paper readable in a multi-disciplinary context **:

Good

Explanations for the above ratings and other general comments on major issues **:

The main problem in this research is good and can be solved according to the direction and objectives of the research.

Comments on the minor details of the article:

The recommend adding a reference.

Komentar Accepted lewat Email:

Mr. Mardison Mardison:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to International Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research, "Prediction of Scholarship Recipients Using Hybrid Data Mining Method with Combination of K-Means and C4.5 Algorithms".

Our decision is to: Accept Submission

Article processing charges (APCs) / Article Publication Fee: 200.00 (USD)

This journal charges the article publication fee for supporting the cost of wide-open access dissemination of research results, managing 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 fee covers :

The standard of the first twelve (12) pages manuscript. For every additional page, an extra fee of 10 USD per page will be charged.

DOI registration for each paper.,

Checking the article similarity by iThenticate; the final result will be sent to authors (by request).

Layout Editing according to template and journal standard.

Cost sent to the account. IJAR Manager:

The standard of the first twelve (12) pages manuscript. For every additional page, an extra fee of 10 USD per page will be charged.

DOI registration for each paper.,

Checking the article similarity by iThenticate; the final result will be sent to authors (by request).

Layout Editing according to template and journal standard.

Cost sent to the account. IJAR Manager:

a.n. Heri Nurdiyanto

Mandiri Bank,

No. Account: 114-00-1009514-2

To facilitate identification, please confirm and send proof of transfer to email: herinurdiyanto04@gmail.com with Subject: Journal Fee + Journal Title

