

## [BEEI 2021] Your paper #1570691599 ('Revised Web Impact Factor Analysis of Timor Leste University Website during COVID-19 Pandemic')

3 pesan

tole@iaescore.com &lt;tole=iaescore.com@edas.info&gt;

3 April 2021 20.51

Balas Ke: tole@iaescore.com

Kepada: Tenia Wahyuningrum &lt;tenia@ittelkom-pwt.ac.id&gt;

- Please Strictly use & follow to the template Manuscripts: <http://iaescore.com/gfa/bee.docx>
- Number of minimum references for original research paper is 25 references (and minimum 20 recently journal articles).
- Number of minimum references for review paper is 50 references (and minimum 40 recently journal articles).
- Authors MUST upload their Final manuscript through EDAS online system!!

=====

=====

Dear Mrs. Tenia Wahyuningrum,

Congratulations - your paper #1570691599 ('Revised Web Impact Factor Analysis of Timor Leste University Website during COVID-19 Pandemic') for the 2021 Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics has been ACCEPTED with minor revisions. The Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics (BEEI), ISSN: 2089-3191, e-ISSN: 2302-9285, <http://bee.org> is open to submission from scholars and experts in the wide areas of electrical, electronics, instrumentation, control, robotics, telecommunication, computer engineering, computer science, information system, information technology and informatics from the global world. This international journal is ACCREDITED (recognised) by the Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education, Republic of Indonesia (RISTEKDIKTI, Decree No: 60/E/KPT/2016) and indexed by Scopus (Elsevier)/ScimagoJR (SJR), SNIP 2019: 1.358 (SNIP=Source Normalized Impact per Paper measures actual citations received relative to citations expected for the serial's subject field), CiteScore 2019: 1.3, SJR 2019: 0.231; and ACCREDITED (recognised) by the Ministry of Research and Technology/National Agency for Research and Innovation, Republic of Indonesia (Decree No: 60/E/KPT/2016). Beginning with issue 1 of volume 9 (2020), BEEI is published as a bimonthly journal (6 issues/year).

Please make the necessary changes based on reviewers' comments and suggestions. The reviews are below or can be found at <https://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1570691599>. Please prepare your final camera ready paper (in MS Word file format) adheres every detail of the guide of authors (<http://iaescore.com/gfa/bee.docx>), and check it for spelling/grammatical mistakes. The goal of this camera ready paper is to describe NOVEL TECHNICAL RESULTS.

>>> 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).

>>> 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).

For your information, according to international regulations, similarity score of camera-ready paper should be less than 25%. 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 the rejection of your paper.

Authors MUST upload their Final manuscript through EDAS online system for similarity checking by EDAS. You also must submit your final camera ready paper, similarity checking report (by iThenticate or Turnitin software), along with your payment receipt to: [tole@iaescore.com](mailto:tole@iaescore.com) within 5 weeks.

I look forward for your response

Sincerely yours,  
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tole Sutikno  
Editor-in-Chief,  
Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics  
website: <http://beei.org>  
email: [tole@iaescore.com](mailto:tole@iaescore.com), [beei.org@gmail.com](mailto:beei.org@gmail.com)

Submit paper: <https://edas.info/N27818>

Below is the reviews on your papers:

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

> \*\*\* Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?

Borderline Accept (5)

> \*\*\* Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?

Borderline Accept (5)

> \*\*\* Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

Though the pandemic has changed the global arena in education, this study is a support to possible government actions. However, it is better to provide more ways how to improve the learning process and not just focusing on the websites.

> \*\*\* Recommendation: Your overall rating.

Borderline Accept (5)

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

> \*\*\* Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?

Weak Accept (7)

> \*\*\* Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?

Accept (9)

> \*\*\* Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

Manuscript is nicely written.

Methodology is novel.

Has potential and impact.

Results are fair enough.

Experimentation is good enough.

> \*\*\* Recommendation: Your overall rating.

Weak Accept (7)

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

> \*\*\* Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?

Accept (9)

> \*\*\* Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?

Accept (9)

> \*\*\* Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

Good contribution, Impact factor analysis Methodology Model technical description required.

> \*\*\* Recommendation: Your overall rating.

Accept (9)

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

> \*\*\* Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?

Borderline Accept (5)

> \*\*\* Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?

Weak Accept (7)

> \*\*\* Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

1. Rewrite the abstract section as well as the introduction section.
2. Specify what makes this study similar or different from the rest of the studies that are available in the extant literature. Please add more details of the Related Work section as there are too many similar studies found in the extant literature.
3. Research methodology should be improved. Describe the type of the paper.
4. Specify the limitations and constraints of the study.
5. Specify the roadmap or future research work of the study.
6. Importantly, the exposition requires improvement. Also. There are too many grammatical mistakes found on the manuscript, which make the paper vague.
7. Rewrite the conclusion section. It should be based on the findings of the study.
8. Rewrite the reference list. Use the prescribed referencing style.

In conclusion, the paper could be accepted after properly revision and added more references. If not, I am afraid to reject this paper.

> \*\*\* Recommendation: Your overall rating.

Borderline Accept (5)

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

> \*\*\* Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?

Borderline Accept (5)

> \*\*\* Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?

Reject (1)

> \*\*\* Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

The paper addressed a study of web metrics for Timor Leste universities. The methodology seems correctly applied and the results seem very interesting to deal with the impact of the pandemic on online education. However, the section of recommendations is not well sustained. We have the results of the previous section and then the set of recommendations are proposed without major explanation or reference that supports their effectiveness to improve the metrics collected in

the previous section. This needs improvement.

> \*\*\* Recommendation: Your overall rating.  
Weak Reject (3)

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

> \*\*\* Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?  
Accept (9)

> \*\*\* Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?  
Weak Accept (7)

> \*\*\* Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

The issue on this paper is very interesting for researchers.

> \*\*\* Recommendation: Your overall rating.  
Accept (9)

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

> \*\*\* Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?  
Accept (9)

> \*\*\* Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?  
Accept (9)

> \*\*\* Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

review on the font size of the equation<sup>2</sup> such as Equations (1), (2), (3) and (4)

> \*\*\* Recommendation: Your overall rating.  
Accept (9)

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

> \*\*\* Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?  
Weak Reject (3)

> \*\*\* Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?  
Weak Reject (3)

> \*\*\* Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

A comprehensive literature survey and a detailed problem statement needs to be included in the paper. Some of the previous work in this area should be highlighted and discussed in the paper. The analysis should include a comparison of the universities evaluated in this paper with universities from other regions to provide some baseline metrics.

The recommendations provided by the authors needs to be discussed in more detail including the expected impact of implementing the specified recommendations. The advantages of implementing the specified recommendations and the current barriers for implementing them needs to be mentioned.

The paper should be proofread in a thorough manner and revised to correct grammatical errors.

> \*\*\* Recommendation: Your overall rating.

Weak Reject (3)

=====  
Revision review 9  
=====

> \*\*\* Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?

Accept (9)

> \*\*\* Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?

Accept (9)

> \*\*\* Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

1. need more updated references
2. more future work suggestions needed

> \*\*\* Recommendation: Your overall rating.

Accept (9)

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

> \*\*\* Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?

Accept (9)

> \*\*\* Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?

Weak Accept (7)

> \*\*\* Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

The paper propsoes interesting and it contributes to higher education institutions impact factors. The structure of paper is good and the results are interestings. However, please address how the findings can contribute to higher education institutions reputation. First sentence on te second paragraph page 2 : "University websites are a new way for scholars to communicate". I think the sentence should be revised becuase a university website is not only for scholar tosommunicate but for all stakeholders.

> \*\*\* Recommendation: Your overall rating.

Weak Accept (7)

=====  
Revision review 11  
=====

> \*\*\* Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?

Borderline Accept (5)

> \*\*\* Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?

Weak Accept (7)

> \*\*\* Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

The paper needs improvement in the body of knowledge, English language grammar, and references.

> \*\*\* Recommendation: Your overall rating.

Weak Accept (7)

=====  
Revision review 12  
=====

> \*\*\* Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?

Borderline Accept (5)

> \*\*\* Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?

Borderline Accept (5)

> \*\*\* Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

1. All abbreviations should be defined in the first place, e.g., WHO, COVID-19 n introduction. The same acronym in abstract and another part of the paper should be defined in both abstract and another place in the first place.
2. The authors should summarize their contribution and novelty compared to the previous work in the introduction section using some bullets.
3. Before section 2, a paragraph should be added to explain what will be discussed in each of the following sections, e.g., "In section 2, ...".
4. Related work section should be added after introduction but before simulation/result section.
5. All figures and tables should be placed in either top or bottom of the page.
6. The "future work" section should be added after conclusion.

> \*\*\* Recommendation: Your overall rating.

Borderline Accept (5)

=====  
Revision review 13  
=====

> \*\*\* Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?

Accept (9)

> \*\*\* Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?

Accept (9)

> \*\*\* Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

- The language used throughout this paper need to be improved, the author should do some proofreading on it. Give the article a mild language revision to get rid of few complex sentences that hinder readability and eradicate typo errors.
- The author could change the abstract and focus more on the problem domain. Before the paper contributions, the author could precisely include the need of developing the proposed method.
- The author could better explain how "Related works" is actually related to the current study. It is not clear to the reader how the manuscript is similar to or differs from these related works.

> \*\*\* Recommendation: Your overall rating.

Accept (9)

=====  
Revision review 14  
=====

> \*\*\* Novelty and Contribution: Rate the degree of scientific contribution provided by this paper. Do the authors offer new findings? Do they give proper explanation and detailed analysis?

Accept (9)

> \*\*\* Paper Presentation: What is your evaluation on the quality of presentation from this paper (e.g. figures, tables, formats, etc.)?

Accept (9)

> \*\*\* Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

sharing knowledge their experiences during pandemic this can be a guidance or lesson to every university

> \*\*\* Recommendation: Your overall rating.

Accept (9)

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/beeel.docx> or <http://iaescore.com/gfa/beeel.rar> (LaTeX format). If you use LaTeX, submit your LaTeX source files to [tole@iaescore.com](mailto:tole@iaescore.com)

For original research paper:

(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 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) Each citation should be written in the order of appearance in the text in square brackets. For example, the first citation [1], the second citation [2], and the third and fourth citations [3,4]. When citing multiple sources at once, the preferred method is to list each number separately, in its own brackets, using a comma or dash between numbers, as such: [1], [3], [5] or [4-8]. It is not necessary to mention an author's name, pages used, or date of publication in the in-text citation. Instead, refer to the source with a number in a square bracket, e.g. [9], that will then correspond to the full citation in your reference list. Examples of in-text citations:

This theory was first put forward in 1970 [9]."

Zadeh [10] has argued that...

Several recent studies [7], [9], [11-15] have suggested that....

...end of the line for my research [16].

(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).

---

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 50 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 Negara Indonesia (BNI)  
Branch Office: UGM Yogya, KCP SARJANA WIYATA  
City: Yogyakarta  
Country: Indonesia  
Bank Account # : 0469076067  
SWIFT Code: BNINIDJAXXX

or as an alternative you can pay it by using PayPal to email: [tole@ee.uad.ac.id](mailto:tole@ee.uad.ac.id)

-----  
Bank's detailed address:

-----  
BNI SARJANA WIYATA  
Jl. Kusumanegara No.121, Muja Muju, Umbulharjo  
City: Yogyakarta  
Province: D.I. Yogyakarta (DIY)  
Post Code: 55167  
Country :Indonesia

The Beneficiary's address:

-----  
D2, Griya Ngoto Asri, Bangunharjo, Sewon  
City: Bantul  
Province: D.I. Yogyakarta (DIY)  
Post Code: 55187  
Country: Indonesia

---

Tenia Wahyuningrum <[tenia@ittelkom-pwt.ac.id](mailto:tenia@ittelkom-pwt.ac.id)>  
Kepada: [tole@iaescore.com](mailto:tole@iaescore.com)

9 April 2021 02.24

[Editor-in-Chief  
Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics]

April 9, 2021

Dear Editor,

We would like to thank you for handling the correspondence with the reviewers for the second's review. We appreciate the valuable comments and suggestions provided by the reviewers. In this second revised manuscript, we have addressed all comments and suggestions very carefully. We trust that addressing the reviewers' comments has resulted in improving the clarity of the manuscript. Our responses to the comments and suggestions including actions taken on the manuscript are provided in this reply letter. Reviewers' comments are shown in *italic*, followed by our response. New sentences, paragraphs as actions taken on the revised manuscript are indicated in blue. We also send proof of payment for articles via PayPal on April 8, 2021.


Best Regards,



[Tenia Wahyuningrum,  
Researcher and Lecturer  
Department of Informatics  
Institut Teknologi Telkom Purwokerto, Indonesia]  
[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

---


## 6 lampiran

 P4	PAYPAL tole	4029357733
**** * 2185		
Jumlah	Rp 4.100.775	
Transaksi dengan	USD 274,31	
Nilai tukar	USD 1,00 = Rp 14.949	
Tanggal transaksi	8 Apr 2021 11:28:08	
ID transaksi	202104080001CTW098862	

**ID#1570691599\_Tenia Payment2.jpeg**  
45K

 **ID #1570691599 Response to Editor 1st round.docx**  
128K

 **ID #1570691599 Response to Editor 2nd round.docx**  
28K

 **ID#1570691599\_Tenia Payment.pdf**  
117K

 **ID#1570691599\_Tenia Plagiarisme Check.pdf**  
208K

 **ID#1570691599\_Tenia Manuscript.doc**  
645K

---

**Tole Sutikno** <tole@iaescore.com>  
Kepada: Tenia Wahyuningrum <tenia@ittelkom-pwt.ac.id>

13 April 2021 02.41

thank  
[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]