M Gmail

Addin Aditya <addin@stiki.ac.id>

[SinkrOn] Editor Decision

Muhammad Khoiruddin Harahap <sinkron@polgan.ac.id>   Mon, Apr 26, 2021 at 8:38 PM
To: Oppi Anda Resta <oppi.andar@gmail.com>, Addin Aditya <addin@stiki.ac.id>, Febry Eka Purwiantono
<febry@stiki.ac.id>

Oppi Anda Resta, Addin Aditya, Febry Eka Purwiantono:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Sinkron : jurnal dan penelitian teknik informatika,
"Plagiarism Detection in Students' Theses Using The Cosine Similarity Method".

Our decision is: Revisions Required

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

ARTICLE TITLE:

The maximum length of the Title consists of 14 words

    Good

The relevance of the Title to the contents of the scientific work

    Good

The relevance of the Title to the problem and the purpose

    Good

ABSTRACT

Writing format style according to the template

    Good

The Background, The discussion, The problems, The research methodology, results, and conclusions are contained
in clear sentences

    Fair

WRITING SYSTEM

Writing style format according to the template

    Good

The existence of relevant citations supports the development of scientific work

> Fair

There are ones supporting instrument (algorithm, flowchart, images, graphics, diagrams, prototypes, similarities, and other supports) that are relevant to scientific work

> Fair

Is the bibliography dominant publishing in the last 5-10 years and is a previous study

> Good

SUBSTANCE

There is a brief review of previous research in the background

> Fair

The relevance of the background, the formulation of the problem with the research method and the discussion of scientific work is very clear

> Good

The analysis or the discussion is very well presented which is accompanied by good research methods

> Fair

The Conclusions are explained very clearly and their relevance to the background, problems, objectives, and discussion, formulated briefly and clearly

> Fair

Suggestion for Improvement

> 1. In Abstract, it is stated "it shows that the percentage level of similarity between the training data document and the test data document is 8%.", while in the paper body there is no evident to support this percentage claim. Please add it.
> 2. The reason why the authors choose the Cosine Similarity Method and TF-IDF cannot be found clearly. Please add why the authors follow his approach and show pros and cons of that method compare to the other methods.
> 3. The state of the art and theoretical gap in Literature Review is not clear so that the novelty is difficult to be recognized. Please make it clearer.
> 4. In the discussion section is only showing how to use the system, not discuss the results more detail or how the results compare to existing work or how to improve the method to get the better results or may be how data integration, case folding, tokenizing, stop forward, filtering, stemming happen behind the scene or how scrapping technique is done or how to determine the valid data for training. Please revise the discussion.

Feasibility of this scientific work to be published

> Worth to publish

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

ARTICLE TITLE:

The maximum length of the Title consists of 14 words

> Excellent

The relevance of the Title to the contents of the scientific work

> Excellent

The relevance of the Title to the problem and the purpose

> Excellent

ABSTRACT

Writing format style according to the template

> Very Good

The Background, The discussion, The problems, The research methodology, results, and conclusions are contained in clear sentences

> Excellent

WRITING SYSTEM

Writing style format according to the template

> Excellent

The existence of relevant citations supports the development of scientific work

> Excellent

There are ones supporting instrument (algorithm, flowchart, images, graphics, diagrams, prototypes, similarities, and other supports) that are relevant to scientific work

> Excellent

Is the bibliography dominant publishing in the last 5-10 years and is a previous study

> Very Good

SUBSTANCE

There is a brief review of previous research in the background

Very Good

The relevance of the background, the formulation of the problem with the research method and the discussion of scientific work is very clear

Very Good

The analysis or the discussion is very well presented which is accompanied by good research methods

Very Good

The Conclusions are explained very clearly and their relevance to the background, problems, objectives, and discussion, formulated briefly and clearly

Good

Suggestion for Improvement

Perlu perbaikan judul

Perlu perbaikan menyeluruh terhadap bab DISCUSSSIONS

Penulisan referensi untuk nama tunggal mohon di cek kembali.

selengkapnya lihat lampiran berikut

Feasibility of this scientific work to be published

Worth to publish

SinkrOn (Penelitian dan Jurnal Teknik Informatika)
Politeknik Ganesha Medan
Teknik Informatika Department
Jl. Veteran No. 194, Pasar VI, Labuhan Deli, Deli Serdang
North Sumatera, Indonesia
_____

Sinkron : jurnal dan penelitian teknik informatika

2 attachments

C-10909-Article Text-4202-1-4-20210317.docx
353K

A-10909-Article Text-4202-1-4-20210317 (1).docx
364K

M Gmail

Addin Aditya <addin@stiki.ac.id>

[SinkrOn] Editor Decision

Nurul Khairina <sinkron@polgan.ac.id>   Tue, Apr 27, 2021 at 12:56 PM
To: Oppi Anda Resta <oppi.andar@gmail.com>, Addin Aditya <addin@stiki.ac.id>, Febry Eka Purwiantono
<febry@stiki.ac.id>

Oppi Anda Resta, Addin Aditya, Febry Eka Purwiantono:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Sinkron : jurnal dan penelitian teknik informatika,
"Plagiarism Detection in Students' Theses Using The Cosine Similarity Method".

Our decision is to: Accept Submission

SinkrOn (Penelitian dan Jurnal Teknik Informatika)
Politeknik Ganesha Medan
Teknik Informatika Department
Jl. Veteran No. 194, Pasar VI, Labuhan Deli, Deli Serdang
North Sumatera, Indonesia
_____

Sinkron : jurnal dan penelitian teknik informatika

_____

📄 **D-A-10909-Article Text-4202-1-4-20210317 - revisi.docx**
350K