
[inass] Comment: "Ruri Suko Basuki"

1 message

INASS <wordpress@inass.org>

Reply-To: "\"ijies@inass.org\""" <ijies@inass.org>

To: muljono@dsn.dinus.ac.id

Wed, Nov 5, 2025 at 4:53 PM

New comment on your post "Ruri Suko Basuki"

Author: INASS (IP address: 60.103.255.224, softbank060103255224.bbtec.net)Email: ijies@inass.org

URL:

Comment:

Dear author(s),

Thank you for your interest and support to IJIES.

I am hereby to confirm the delivery of your paper.

It has been sent for reviewing.

Rapid Publication: The notification will be feedback within two weeks.

Appreciate your patiently wait.

If you have any questions, please contact us with your paper ID.

Best regards,

IJIES Editors: ijies@inass.org

Comment Date 2025/11/5/ 18:53:15

You can see all comments on this post here:

<https://inass.org/treatise/ruri-suko-basuki-2/#comments>Permalink: <https://inass.org/treatise/ruri-suko-basuki-2/#comment-68199>

[inass] Comment: "Ruri Suko Basuki"

1 message

INASS <wordpress@inass.org>

Wed, Nov 12, 2025 at 1:00 PM

Reply-To: "\"ijies@inass.org\""" <ijies@inass.org>

To: muljono@dsn.dinus.ac.id

New comment on your post "Ruri Suko Basuki"

Author: INASS (IP address: 150.43.212.58, dhcp212-58.elec.fit.ac.jp)Email: ijies@inass.org

URL:

Comment:

Dear author(s),

Congratulations!

The 1st review for your paper was accepted.

However, we are sorry to inform you that your paper cannot be recommended for publication in IJIES, in its current form.

Please revise your paper according to the attached reviewers' comments.

Please note that if your paper is still not satisfactorily revised or cannot be returned to us within TWO months from the date of this letter, your paper will not be recommended to the journal above.

Thanks for your understanding and cooperation.

Kind Regards,

IJIES Editors: ijies@inass.org

Please download the review result: 20255471

Note: If you are unable to download the review results, please right click on the link above to download it.

Comment Date 2025/11/12/ 15:00:31

You can see all comments on this post here:

<https://inass.org/treatise/ruri-suko-basuki-2/#comments>Permalink: <https://inass.org/treatise/ruri-suko-basuki-2/#comment-68765>

[inass] Comment: "Ruri Suko Basuki"

1 message

INASS <wordpress@inass.org>

Wed, Jan 7, 2026 at 9:59 PM

Reply-To: "IJIES@inass.org" <ijies@inass.org>

To: muljono@dsn.dinus.ac.id

New comment on your post "Ruri Suko Basuki"

Author: INASS (IP address: 60.103.255.224, softbank060103255224.bbtec.net)Email: ijies@inass.org

URL:

Comment:

Dear Author(s),

Since we have not yet received a response from reviewer 3, the editor has decided to accept this paper.

It is our great pleasure to inform you that the submitted paper, for which you are listed as the corresponding author, has been accepted for the 2nd review of the IJIES journal.

Congratulations!

*Important:

Please send your "signed" copyright and the payment proof of your publishing fee within one month.

Otherwise, your paper will be withdrawn.

The payment method will be sent from Paypal. (Please check your mailbox carefully.)

Copyright form: <https://inass.org/publications/pub-docsubmission/>

*Publication fee USD600 : Tentative 14 pages (USD300 + USD50*4 + Extra format fee USD100)

Please read the editor's comments in your review form.

e.g. Newlines before and after equations, Position of figures and tables, reference format, etc.

After we received these documents, the camera-ready version of your paper will be sent to you later.

After your confirmation, the acceptance letter and receipt will be sent to you.

Best regards,

IJIES Editors: ijies@inass.org

Comment Date 2026/1/7/ 23:59:17

You can see all comments on this post here:

<https://inass.org/treatise/ruri-suko-basuki-2/#comments>Permalink: <https://inass.org/treatise/ruri-suko-basuki-2/#comment-73537>

Intelligent Networks and Systems Society

Review Form

International Journal of Intelligent Engineering and Systems (IJIES)

Paper ID	20255471
Paper Title	AutoLabel-ABSA: A Comparative Study of Transformer Embeddings and Clustering Algorithms for Automatic Text Labeling and Aspect-Based Categorization

Recommendation for Publication

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Accept | ☐ Accept after Minor Revision |
| ☒ Accept after Major Revision | ☐ Reject |

1st Reviewer's comment:

The paper's core idea is the systematic comparison of transformer embeddings and clustering algorithms for unsupervised pseudo-label generation in ABSA-style categorization. Its main strength lies in empirical completeness and reproducibility. The weaknesses include limited theoretical interpretation of the results and insufficient computational analysis. While methodologically sound, the novelty is moderate since similar comparisons have been explored in prior unsupervised text clustering research.

1. To help readers understand, the authors should explain the structure of the entire paper at the end of the introduction part.
2. Due to general research survey, the problem definition of this work is not clear. In Sect. 2, the drawbacks of each conventional technique should be described one by one. The authors should emphasize the difference with other methods to clarify the position of this work further.
3. The presentation of figures is not professional. In figures, letters are small and blurry. The authors should enlarge or redraw figures. See Fig. 3, 4, 5, etc. The proposed presentation does not respect the elementary rules of a scientific writing.
4. Enforcing K to equal the known number of classes for K-Means/Agglomerative/Spectral while letting HDBSCAN remain unconstrained injects oracle information into an ostensibly unsupervised setup, biases external metrics, and undermines the claim of fair comparison. This design decision compromises validity and may inflate scores for fixed-K methods on datasets with clear class structure. Replace oracle K with data-driven selection (e.g., eigengap, stability, silhouette without labels) and report both fixed-K and native-mode results, clearly separating any oracle analyses as diagnostic upper bounds.
5. The text asserts HDBSCAN has the best Silhouette/NMI across datasets, yet Table 1 lists implausible silhouettes (e.g., negative for Spectral on 20NG and higher silhouettes for K-Means/Agglomerative than HDBSCAN), which appears inconsistent with the narrative and raises credibility concerns. Recompute metrics under a single preprocessing and distance regime, add AMI/ARI with confidence intervals or bootstrap variability, and ensure tables and text align. Release code, random seeds, and cluster-size distributions so readers can replicate numbers and understand noise handling.
6. The paper states performance degradation is within 2–4% of previous supervised works, but there are no controlled, same-split baselines, matched preprocessing/tokenization, or statistical tests. Literature numbers vary by split and pipeline, so such comparisons can mislead. Train strong supervised baselines under identical conditions and report mean±std over multiple runs with paired significance tests; if citing literature, precisely match dataset versions and note caveats..
7. Although recent works are cited, there is no quantitative, same-split comparison against modern weakly supervised/LLM-assisted labeling or ABSA pipelines from 2024 onward, leaving the contribution's position

Review Form

unclear. Add side-by-side results for at least two recent baselines using public code/checkpoints; if reimplementing is infeasible, standardize preprocessing and report metrics with clear disclaimers.

2nd Reviewer's comment:

This paper introduces AutoLabel-ABSA, a comparative framework that integrates transformer-based text embeddings (BERT, RoBERTa, BigBird) with multiple clustering algorithms (K-Means, Agglomerative, Spectral, HDBSCAN) for automatic text labeling and aspect-based categorization. The authors evaluate the proposed method on three benchmark datasets—IMDB, AG News, and 20 Newsgroups—and find that RoBERTa with HDBSCAN yields the most coherent clusters, while BERT demonstrates stable downstream performance. The study concludes that unsupervised clustering of contextual embeddings can effectively approximate human annotations, achieving classification accuracy within 2–4% of supervised baselines.

1. The paper presents a well-structured and thorough experimental comparison; however, it lacks a deeper theoretical justification of why certain transformer-clustering pairs outperform others. The authors should incorporate a more analytical discussion on embedding space geometry and clustering sensitivity, possibly supported by ablation studies.
2. The evaluation currently relies mainly on Silhouette and NMI metrics. To strengthen the evidence, external metrics like purity or adjusted mutual information, along with a statistical significance test, should be added to confirm the robustness of observed differences.
3. The conclusions about the efficiency and applicability of the proposed method would benefit from including computational cost analysis and time-performance trade-offs across the three embeddings. This would make the framework more practical for readers interested in scalability.

From Editor:

* * Please send your revised manuscript with the response letter for the 2nd review. (Please highlight modifications and additions inside the paper by red font.)

Please set the font size of all sentences to 11pt and the font size of all tables to 10pt.

For wide figures, please use a one-column format.

Please do not place two figures side by side in one column.

Please add "Conflicts of Interest" and "Author Contributions". (see the IJIES format.docx)

Conflicts of Interest (Mandatory)

Declare conflicts of interest or state "The authors declare no conflict of interest." Authors must identify and declare any personal circumstances or interest that may be perceived as inappropriately influencing the representation or interpretation of reported research results.

Author Contributions (Mandatory)

For research articles with several authors, a short paragraph specifying their individual contributions must be provided. The following statements should be used as follows: "conceptualization, XXX and YYY; methodology, XXX; software, XXX; validation, XXX, YYY, and ZZZ; formal analysis, XXX; investigation, XXX; resources, XXX; data curation, XXX; writing—original draft preparation, XXX; writing—review and editing, XXX; visualization, XXX;

Review Form

supervision, XXX; project administration, XXX; funding acquisition, YYY”, etc. Authorship must be limited to those who have contributed substantially to the work reported.

Please check the format of your manuscript according to the following:

Format Check Point

1. The Standard number of pages is 8. Please extend your manuscript further if your manuscript is less than 8 pages. Otherwise, we never publish your paper.
2. Do not use the abbreviation in authors' name and affiliations. Do not use acronym.
3. Do not use the same affiliation repeatedly.
4. Delete title, such as Dr. etc., in Affiliations and Author names.
5. Do not use figures instead of tables/equations. Furthermore, all tables/equations must be original.
6. In figures/tables, unify the font size of letters (more than 10pt). If the letters small, redraw the figure/table.
7. Do not insert (a), (b), (c), etc. into figures.
8. In equations, unify the font size to 11pt.
9. All figures must be clear. The blurred image is not acceptable. Furthermore, all figures must be original.
10. Do not put borders around the outside of your figures.
11. Figures (refer with: Fig. 1, Fig. 2, ...) and Tables (refer with: Table 1, Table 2, ...) should be presented as part of the text, leaving enough space so that the caption will not be confused with the text.
12. Figures and tables must be located in the top or bottom of each column.
13. Do not rotate the sheet.
14. Do not use vertical writing.
15. Do not divide figure/tables into 2 pages.
16. Equations (refer with: Eq. (1), Eq. (2), ...) should be indented 5 mm. There should be one line of space above the equation and one line of space below it before the text continues.
17. Align equation numbers.
18. In sentences/equations, mathematical expressions must be Italic font.
19. Don't use equation environment such as Microsoft Math environment in sentences.
20. Don't use “*” in equations. Distinguish mathematical expression from programming code.
21. When you cite some references in sentences, please give numbers, such as [1]. Two or more references at a time must be put in one set of brackets [2-4].
22. Improve the reference format. This is very important for indexing service. If the authors do not follow the following rule, we never publish the papers.
e.g.
[1] R. Ruskone, S. Airault, and O. Jamet, “Vehicle Detection on Aerial Images”, International Journal of Intelligent Engineering and Systems, Vol.1, No.1, pp.123-456, 2009.
(In the case of Journal Papers)
[2] R. Ruskone, L. Guigues, S. Airault, and O. Jamet, “Vehicle Detection on Aerial Images”, In: Proc. of International Conf. On Pattern Recognition, Vienna, Austria, pp.900-904, 1996.
(In the case of Conference Proceedings)

*Note: e.g. In the case of the author name: "John Doe", express as "J. Doe". ("John" is the first name and "Doe" is the family name.)

(IJIES-20255471) Reply form:

Dear Respected reviewers,

We appreciate your useful comments and kind guidance. We will answer your questions below.

Reviewers' comments to the authors:

1. To help readers understand, the authors should explain the structure of the entire paper at the end of the introduction part.

Answer

We revised the problem formulation by explicitly separating the **problem definition** and the **limitations of conventional approaches** in the Introduction. The revised text clarifies why manual labeling and traditional topic modeling methods are inadequate for large-scale text corpora and motivates the need for an unsupervised, transformer-based labeling framework (Section II, Parts A–B).

Reviewers' comments to the authors

2. Due to general research survey, the problem definition of this work is not clear. In Sect. 2, the drawbacks of each conventional technique should be described one by one. The authors should emphasize the difference with other methods to clarify the position of this work further

Answer

This section has been reorganized for clarity. The discussion of transformer-based text embeddings is now presented as a dedicated subsection following the problem formulation. We explicitly describe how contextual embeddings are generated and why they are suitable for downstream clustering (Section II-C).

Reviewers' comments to the authors

3. The presentation of figures is not professional. In figures, letters are small and blurry. The authors should enlarge or redraw figures. See Fig. 3, 4, 5, etc. The proposed presentation does not respect the elementary rules of a scientific writing.

Answer

All clustering and classification figures have been revised to improve readability. Font sizes, axis labels, and layout have been adjusted, and figures are now presented at appropriate resolution and scale. The revised figures follow IJIES formatting guidelines and are referenced consistently in the text (Figures 3–20).

Reviewers' comments to the authors

4. Enforcing K to equal the known number of classes for K-Means/Agglomerative/Spectral while letting HDBSCAN remain unconstrained injects oracle information into an ostensibly unsupervised setup, biases external metrics, and undermines the claim of fair comparison. This design decision compromises validity and may inflate scores for fixed-K methods on datasets with clear class structure. Replace oracle K with data-driven

selection (e.g., eigengap, stability, silhouette without labels) and report both fixed-K and native-mode results, clearly separating any oracle analyses as diagnostic upper bounds

Answer

We clarified the evaluation protocol by distinguishing between **data-driven unsupervised clustering** and **diagnostic oracle-K settings**. The manuscript now explicitly states that all primary evaluations are based on data-driven K selection to avoid oracle information leakage, with oracle-K results used only for diagnostic comparison (Section D).

Reviewers' comments to the authors

5. The text asserts HDBSCAN has the best Silhouette/NMI across datasets, yet Table 1 lists implausible silhouettes (e.g., negative for Spectral on 20NG and higher silhouettes for K-Means/Agglomerative than HDBSCAN), which appears inconsistent with the narrative and raises credibility concerns. Recompute metrics under a single preprocessing and distance regime, add AMI/ARI with confidence intervals or bootstrap variability, and ensure tables and text align. Release code, random seeds, and cluster-size distributions so readers can replicate numbers and understand noise handling.

Answer

We expanded the discussion to explain performance differences across clustering algorithms, emphasizing dataset characteristics such as topic granularity and semantic overlap. These explanations are supported by both empirical results and theoretical analysis added in a dedicated section (Sections D and G).

Reviewers' comments to the authors

6. The paper states performance degradation is within 2–4% of previous supervised works, but there are no controlled, same-split baselines, matched preprocessing/tokenization, or statistical tests. Literature numbers vary by split and pipeline, so such comparisons can mislead. Train strong supervised baselines under identical conditions and report mean $\pm$ std over multiple runs with paired significance tests; if citing literature, precisely match dataset versions and note caveats.

Answer

All identified typographical errors and notation inconsistencies have been corrected. Mathematical symbols and variable definitions are now used consistently throughout the manuscript.

Reviewers' comments to the authors

7. Although recent works are cited, there is no quantitative, same-split comparison against modern weakly supervised/LLM-assisted labeling or ABSA pipelines from 2024 onward, leaving the contribution's position unclear. Add side-by-side results for at least two recent baselines using public code/checkpoints; if reimplementing is infeasible, standardize preprocessing and report metrics with clear disclaimers.

Answer

We strengthened the connection between clustering quality and downstream classification by explicitly discussing how semantically coherent clusters contribute to effective pseudo-label generation. This relationship is analyzed in the **Classification Results** section, supported by accuracy results and learning dynamics (Section E).

Reviewers' comments to the authors

8. The paper lacks deeper theoretical justification of why certain transformer clustering pairs outperform others. Add analytical discussion on embedding space geometry and clustering sensitivity, possibly supported by ablation studies.

Answer

We added a new section entitled “**Theoretical Analysis of Embedding–Clustering Behavior**” (Section G). This section discusses the geometric properties of transformer embeddings, including anisotropy and high-dimensional structure, and explains how these properties interact with density-based and centroid-based clustering algorithms. The analysis provides theoretical grounding for the observed empirical trends.

Reviewers' comments to the authors

9. Evaluation currently relies mainly on Silhouette and NMI. Please add external metrics like purity or AMI, along with statistical significance tests

Answer

We extended the quantitative evaluation by incorporating **Purity**, **Adjusted Mutual Information (AMI)**, and **Adjusted Rand Index (ARI)** as external clustering metrics. These metrics complement Silhouette and NMI by quantifying cluster–label alignment while correcting for chance agreement. The revised results are reported consistently across datasets in Section D and the associated tables.

Reviewers' comments to the authors

10. Evaluation currently relies mainly on Silhouette and NMI. Please add external metrics like purity or AMI, along with statistical significance tests

Answer

We added a dedicated section entitled “**Computational Cost and Scalability Analysis**” (Section F). This section provides a qualitative discussion of the computational characteristics of the proposed framework, covering transformer-based embedding extraction and clustering stages, as well as relative scalability trade-offs among clustering methods. The discussion improves the practical perspective of the work without introducing hardware-dependent runtime benchmarks.

Invoice from International Journal of Intelligent Engineering and Systems (3209)

1 message

International Journal of Intelligent Engineering and Systems <service-jp@paypal.com>
Reply-To: International Journal of Intelligent Engineering and Systems <eguti@fit.ac.jp>
To: "muljono@dsn. dinus. ac. id" <muljono@dsn.dinus.ac.id>

Wed, Jan 7, 2026 at 10:05 PM

Hello, muljono@dsn.dinus.ac.id

Here's your invoice

**International Journal of Intelligent Engineering and
Systems sent you an invoice for \$600.00**



Due on Feb 6, 2026



**International Journal of Intelligent
Engineering and Systems**

✉ eguti@fit.ac.jp

📅 You've paid this seller 1 time(s) in the last year.

Amount due**\$600.00****Invoice number**

3209

[View and Pay Invoice](#)

Visit paypal.com/invoice to create your own professional invoices.

This email was sent from eguti@fit.ac.jp. If you think it is spam, you can [report abuse to PayPal](#).

PayPal is committed to preventing fraudulent emails. Emails from PayPal will always contain your full name.
[Learn to identify phishing](#)

PayPal Pte. Ltd. is a Singaporean company registered with the Financial Services Agency of Japan as a (1) Funds Transfer Business Operator with Registration No. 00026 issued by the Director-General of the Kanto Local Finance Bureau and (2) Third Party-type Issuer of Prepaid Payment Instruments with Registration No. 00705 issued by the Director-General of the Kanto Local Finance Bureau.

PayPal RT002947:en_US(en-JP):1.1.0:f89971581c1f7