

Korespondensi / Proses Review

#51 (1570488095): Comparative Analysis of Software Quality Model In The Selection of Marketplace E-Commerce

Property	Change Add	Value																																								
Conference and track		2018 International Conference on Information Technology Systems and Innovation (ICITSI) - ICITSI 2017																																								
Authors		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Drag to change order</th> <th>Name</th> <th>ID</th> <th>Edit</th> <th>Flag</th> <th>Affiliation (edit for paper)</th> <th>Email</th> <th>Country</th> <th>Email</th> <th>Delete</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>⋮</td> <td>Rahma Wahdiniwati</td> <td>1617268</td> <td>✎</td> <td></td> <td>Universitas Komputer Indonesia, Indonesia</td> <td>rahma@unikom.ac.id</td> <td>Indonesia</td> <td>✉</td> <td>✖</td> </tr> <tr> <td>⋮</td> <td>Eko Budi Setiawan</td> <td>1500911</td> <td>✎</td> <td></td> <td>Universitas Komputer Indonesia, Indonesia</td> <td>eko@email.unikom.ac.id</td> <td>Indonesia</td> <td>✉</td> <td>✖</td> </tr> <tr> <td>⋮</td> <td>Deden A Wahab Sya'rani</td> <td>1617269</td> <td>✎</td> <td></td> <td>Universitas Komputer Indonesia, Indonesia</td> <td>wahabs_den@yahoo.com</td> <td>Indonesia</td> <td>✉</td> <td>✖</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Drag to change order	Name	ID	Edit	Flag	Affiliation (edit for paper)	Email	Country	Email	Delete	⋮	Rahma Wahdiniwati	1617268	✎		Universitas Komputer Indonesia, Indonesia	rahma@unikom.ac.id	Indonesia	✉	✖	⋮	Eko Budi Setiawan	1500911	✎		Universitas Komputer Indonesia, Indonesia	eko@email.unikom.ac.id	Indonesia	✉	✖	⋮	Deden A Wahab Sya'rani	1617269	✎		Universitas Komputer Indonesia, Indonesia	wahabs_den@yahoo.com	Indonesia	✉	✖
Drag to change order	Name	ID	Edit	Flag	Affiliation (edit for paper)	Email	Country	Email	Delete																																	
⋮	Rahma Wahdiniwati	1617268	✎		Universitas Komputer Indonesia, Indonesia	rahma@unikom.ac.id	Indonesia	✉	✖																																	
⋮	Eko Budi Setiawan	1500911	✎		Universitas Komputer Indonesia, Indonesia	eko@email.unikom.ac.id	Indonesia	✉	✖																																	
⋮	Deden A Wahab Sya'rani	1617269	✎		Universitas Komputer Indonesia, Indonesia	wahabs_den@yahoo.com	Indonesia	✉	✖																																	
Title		Comparative Analysis of Software Quality Model In The Selection of Marketplace E-Commerce																																								
Abstract		E-commerce system is very helpful for people in buying and selling transactions. Various existing marketplaces have their advantages and disadvantages. Software quality models can provide an assessment of each e-commerce marketplace system. This research analyzes the results of e-commerce selection by using several software quality models that are implemented with the analytical hierarchy process. Each quality model software has different evaluation results from each other. This difference is because the assessment criteria differ between one quality model and another																																								
Keywords		software quality model; analytical hierarchy process; e-commerce																																								
Topics	Only the chairs (icitsi2018-chairs@edas.info) can edit	IT Management and Governance: IT Value, Cyber Security, Forensic and Law: Cyber Society, Social Media.																																								
Presenter(s)		Eko Budi Setiawan (bio)																																								
Registration		Eko Budi Setiawan has registered and paid for authors:2nd batch local students																																								
DOI	Only the chairs (icitsi2018-chairs@edas.info) can edit																																									
Status		Accepted																																								
Copyright form		IEEE; IEEE: Oct 3, 2018 15:40 Asia/Jakarta																																								

#51 (1570488095): Comparative Analysis of Software Quality Model In The Selection of Marketplace E-Commerce

Status		Accepted								
Copyright form		IEEE; IEEE: Oct 3, 2018 15:40 Asia/Jakarta								
Review manuscript	Can upload only until 180 days past deadline.	<p>However, authors cannot upload: more than 180 days past deadline</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Document (show)</th> <th>Pages</th> <th>File size</th> <th>Changed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>1,393,776</td> <td>Oct 10, 2018 13:42 Asia/Jakarta</td> <td>🔄</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Document (show)	Pages	File size	Changed	6	1,393,776	Oct 10, 2018 13:42 Asia/Jakarta	🔄
Document (show)	Pages	File size	Changed							
6	1,393,776	Oct 10, 2018 13:42 Asia/Jakarta	🔄							
Presentation	Can upload only until 180 days past deadline.	<p>However, authors cannot upload: more than 180 days past deadline</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Document (show)</th> <th>Pages</th> <th>File size</th> <th>Changed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>23</td> <td>3,160,024</td> <td>Oct 14, 2018 00:47 Asia/Jakarta</td> <td>🔄</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Document (show)	Pages	File size	Changed	23	3,160,024	Oct 14, 2018 00:47 Asia/Jakarta	🔄
Document (show)	Pages	File size	Changed							
23	3,160,024	Oct 14, 2018 00:47 Asia/Jakarta	🔄							
Final manuscript	Can upload only until 180 days past deadline.	<p>However, authors cannot upload: more than 180 days past deadline</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Document (show)</th> <th>Pages</th> <th>File size</th> <th>Changed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>1,393,776</td> <td>Oct 10, 2018 13:34 Asia/Jakarta</td> <td>🔄</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Document (show)	Pages	File size	Changed	6	1,393,776	Oct 10, 2018 13:34 Asia/Jakarta	🔄
Document (show)	Pages	File size	Changed							
6	1,393,776	Oct 10, 2018 13:34 Asia/Jakarta	🔄							

Personal notes

You are the creator and an author for this paper. You have authored an accepted paper.

Reviews

3 Reviews

Review 1

Relevance and timeliness	Technical content and scientific rigour	Novelty and originality	Quality of presentation
Average (3)	Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)	Minor variations on a well investigated subject. (2)	Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

Detailed comments (Please justify your recommendation and suggest improvements in technical content or presentation.)

Specific research results need to included in the abstract.

Needs professional editing for academic styling. e.g. "For now..."

While obvious, the abbreviation of TKP, LZD, etc. is unnecessary in the text (OK for tables). Why not the fullname and then introduce the abbrev?

Cited source for table1 and table2? <- put in caption

Are Alexa's "dailyTime" and "dailyVisit" value relevant to the paper? Reader will be wondering about its meaning. If not integrate table1 and table2 into one table (rank+rating)

Needs professional editing for academic styling, e.g. "for now..."
While obvious, the abbreviation of TKP, LZD, etc. is unnecessary in the text (OK for tables). Why not the full name and then introduce the abbrev?
Cited source for table1 and table2? <-- put in caption
Are Alexa's "dailyTime" and "dailyVisit" value relevant to the paper? Reader will be wondering about its meaning. If not integrate table1 and table2 into one table (rank+rating)
Non continuous flow in fig1 (missing arrow)
Inefficient use of space in fig3, fig5, fig7, etc <-- edit
"This research also combines several criteria derived from five different quality model software into one hierarchical model structure" <-- where is this presented (table/figure?). Instead of assessment result, focus on the combined model is a more worthy contribution for an academic paper.

Review 2

Relevance and timeliness	Technical content and scientific rigour	Novelty and originality	Quality of presentation
Average (3)	Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)	Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)	Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

Detailed comments (Please justify your recommendation and suggest improvements in technical content or presentation.)
This research analyzes the results of ecommerce selection by using several software quality models that are implemented with the analytical hierarchy process. However, the research problem is not strong formulated. The introduction is too much with poor consistency between paragraphs. Please consider to simplify the content and make it concise. Authors shall consider the consistency and unity among paragraphs.
How do the authors deal with the comparison models? Is there any specific criteria and competencies for the assessors in performing the assessments? What are the mechanism for conducting the assessments?

Review 3

Relevance and timeliness	Technical content and scientific rigour	Novelty and originality	Quality of presentation
Average (3)	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)

Detailed comments (Please justify your recommendation and suggest improvements in technical content or presentation.)
The manuscript is presented quite well and has a contribution to the scientific and practical fields, but some parts need to be improved to make the manuscript better, namely:
1. Problems that are the basis for conducting research have not been clearly stated
2. In the introductory section, the author states "transactions through e-commerce, especially in Indonesia, has increased by 500% in just 5 years". What references are used to corroborate the statement
3. The author should add citations to strengthen the statement "data collected by iPrice"
4. There are still words in Indonesian "lritensi" in table 3
5. This study seems to have not been fully completed, because there are no recommendations for the use of the results of the analysis, therefore the authors need to add further work to utilize the results of the analysis