

[JOSI] Submission Acknowledgement to Jurnal Optimasi Sistem Industri External Kotak Masuk



Hilma Raimona Zadry, PhD -editor_josi@eng.unand.ac.id-
kepada saya

Min, 5 Mar 2023, 08:26 ☆ ↶ ⋮

Sepertiya pesan ini ditulis dalam Inggris ×
[Terjemahkan ke Indonesia](#)

Dear RF Rina Fitriana,

Thank you for submitting the manuscript, "The Quality Improvement of Packaging Product Using Six Sigma and Data Mining" to Jurnal Optimasi Sistem Industri. With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging in to the journal website:

Manuscript URL: <https://josi.ft.unand.ac.id/index.php/josi/authorDashboard/submission/640>
Username: rina_ft_breakti_2021

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering this journal as a venue for your work.

Regards,
Hilma Raimona Zadry, PhD

Jurnal Optimasi Sistem Industri
Gedung Jurusan Teknik Industri
Fakultas Teknik Universitas Andalas
Kampus Limau Manis, Jl. Dr. H. Mohammad Hatta
Padang - West Sumatra - Indonesia
<https://josi.ft.unand.ac.id/>

Contact us at: editor_josi@eng.unand.ac.id

[JOSI] Editorial Decision on Manuscript 640 - Revision Required External Kotak Masuk



Editor JOSI -editor_josi@eng.unand.ac.id-
kepada saya, Anik, RESTY

Jum, 5 Mei 2023, 18:48 ☆ ↶ ⋮

Sepertiya pesan ini ditulis dalam Inggris ×
[Terjemahkan ke Indonesia](#)

Dear Rina Fitriana, Anik Nur Habyba, RESTY AYU RAMADHANI (Author):

I write you in regards to manuscript "The Quality Improvement of Packaging Product Using Six Sigma and Data Mining" to Jurnal Optimasi Sistem Industri. Following careful consideration by the journal's editor and reviewers, we inform the result as follow:

Editorial Decision: Revision Required

Please see evaluation result from at the bottom part of this email for further details about necessary revisions.

To improve the manuscript, you may choose one or both of the following options:

1. Revise/improve the manuscript based on the reviewers' comment, question and/or suggestion. The revisions should be written exactly at the corresponding part/section/sentences. **Any revisions provided should be given a marker (i.e., different font colour, etc.) so that we can easily identify and revision made.**
2. Provide argumentation to disclaim/dispute against the editor's and/or reviewers' comment/suggestion (if, any). In such case, please provide strong arguments accompanied with the valid and sufficient evidences/data. It is written in a separate file (different from revised manuscript file) by putting out comment, question and/or suggestion to be disputed.

Finally, please send the revised manuscript by **May 15, 2023** after which point we will presume that you have withdrawn your submission from our journal.

Best Regard,

JOSI Editor

Desk Evaluation from Editor:

Please fix the following issues:

Desk Evaluation from Editor:

Please fix the following issues:

1. JOSI uses **IEEE reference style**. Author(s) should strictly follow the IEEE reference style. The style should be carefully checked for completeness, accuracy, and consistency. **Include the DOI (whichever apply).**
2. The total number of references should be **at least 25 references**. The use of **the most recent primary references** should be **at least 60%** of the total number of references.
3. Please make sure that you use **Mendeley** to help in referencing. A guide to **using Mendeley as a reference manager** is provided in the JOSI website (<https://josi.ft.unand.ac.id/index.php/josi/refman>)
4. Please send **good quality images/figures**, so that it can be read/seen by readers clearly. You can send the image with a **different file**.

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

1. Is the topic relevant to the journal focus and scope? Is it contemporary and interesting for readers?
Good
2. Are all required components included in the abstract?
Good
3. Does the author utilize relevant literatures? Are the key literatures discussed adequately?
Good
4. Is the purpose of research explicitly stated in the introduction? Is the statement clear and unambiguous?
Good
5. Are methods well-developed and clearly explained?
Weak
6. Does the discussion elaborate the result sufficiently?
Weak
7. Does conclusion relate to the objectives and results? Do you consider them as coherent?
Weak
8. Are tables and figures designed and presented adequately? Are legends and notations clear?
Weak
9. Is the writing clear and understandable?

Weak

10. How is the originality/novelty of the proposed study/research?

Weak

11. Comment

1. Is it OK to display the company name in the article? It is advisable to ask permission first from the company where the case study occurs. Or make initials for the company name.

2. Please provide a more detailed explanation of your research method.

Things that need to be written in the research method:

- Participants: includes demographic location information (percentage, average, standard deviation, etc.), number of respondents, reasons for selecting respondents, etc.
- Design: write down the experimental design (experimental procedures, surveys, interviews, observation characteristics, etc.?)
- Measures: information on how to measure data and measure success performance
- Procedures: Write a complete research procedure

3. All figures/tables presented must be referenced in the body of the text, or All images/tables referred to in the text must have figures/tables. For example, the text does not explain tables 5, 6, 11, etc..

4. Equations must be presented using consecutive numbers starting with (1).

5. Why is the fishbone diagram used to identify the causes of defects only seen from the method, machine, and material factors? What about the human and environmental factors?

6. Results should summarize the findings rather than simply presenting research data in detail.

7. Do not describe the figures (tables/graphs) in detail, but rather present Findings or trends.

8. Lack of discussion: The text presents the research findings but does not provide any discussion or interpretation of these findings, which is supported by previous research.

9. A Good discussion is:

- Usually starts with a statement of findings (don't be redundant if you combine results and discussion)

- Results and Discussion should at least contain: (1) (What/How) Has the data presented been processed (not raw data), written in the form of tables or pictures (choose one), and given easy-to-understand explanations? What are the findings/findings? (2) (Why) In the discussion section, there is a connection between the results obtained and the basic concepts and/or hypotheses? The scientific aspect is here; (3) (What else) Is there any conformity or contradiction with the results of other people's research? (4) It is also recommended to write about the implications of the research results, both theoretical and applied?

10. Conclusions must answer the research objectives or hypotheses. Conclusions must describe innovations or improvements to existing knowledge. It is better to write conclusions not using bullets/numbering, but in paragraph form.]

11. It is strongly recommended to do grammar checking.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

1. Is the topic relevant to the journal focus and scope? Is it contemporary and interesting for readers?

Very Good

2. Are all required components included in the abstract?

Very Good

3. Does the author utilize relevant literatures? Are the key literatures discussed adequately?

Very Good

4. Is the purpose of research explicitly stated in the Introduction? Is the statement clear and unambiguous?

Good

5. Are methods well-developed and clearly explained?

Very Good

6. Does the discussion elaborate the result sufficiently?

Good

7. Does conclusion relate to the objectives and results? Do you consider them as coherent?

Very Good

8. Are tables and figures designed and presented adequately? Are legends and notations clear?

Very good

9. Is the writing clear and understandable?

Very good

10. How is the originality/novelty of the proposed study/research?

Very good

11. Comment

1. Please provide adequate discussion regarding the FMEA method in the Introduction since Figure 1 indicates that it is an essential method in the research.

2. Please ensure there are no unnecessary terms in Bahasa Indonesia within this document. E.g., "Tidak" in Figure 1.

3. In Figure 1, we can't see how Data Mining contributes to the proposed quality improvement methods. Please rearrange and revise the diagram accordingly.

4. Research Methodology Flowchart shows that everything is in a sequence. However, it can't be seen that one part must be completed before the next part. For example, why did the author put Fishbone Diagram after Apriori Algorithm when it can't be seen that the Fishbone Diagram needs input from Apriori Algorithm? Next, the FMEA was put after Fishbone Diagram, etc. Please consider using a combination of parallel and sequential activities appropriately.

5. The author needs to explain the Apriori Algorithm Section in Analyze Stage more clearly. It is not clear The transformation process from one table to the following table.

Editor Jurnal Optimasi Sistem Industri
Gedung Jurusan Teknik Industri
Fakultas Teknik Universitas Andalas
Kampus Limau Manis, Jl. Dr. H. Mohammad Hatta
Padang - West Sumatra - Indonesia

<https://josi.ft.unand.ac.id/>

Universitas Andalas is a public university in Padang, West Sumatra, Indonesia.

This e-mail is confidential and should not be used by anyone who is not the original intended recipient. If you have received this e-mail in error please inform the sender and delete it from your mailbox or any other storage mechanism. Neither Universitas Andalas nor any of its managements accept liability for any statements made which are clearly the sender's own and not expressly made on behalf of Universitas Andalas. Please note that neither Universitas Andalas nor any of its managements accept any responsibility for viruses that may be contained in this e-mail or its attachments and it is your responsibility to scan the e-mail and any attachments.

[Pesan dipotong] [Lihat seluruh email](#)

Satu lampiran • Dipindai oleh Gmail Tambahkan ke Drive





RINA FITRIANA -rinaf@trisakti.ac.id-

kepada Editor

Dear Editor JOSI

This is our revision. We hope it can be accepted. Thank you for your cooperation

Best regards,

Rina Fitriana

2 Lampiran • Dipindai oleh Gmail • Tambahkan semua ke Drive



Sab, 20 Mei 2023, 23:54

No	Komentar	Uraian Perbaikan
1	Consider deleting this heading since there is no section 1.2, or please refer to the JOSI template.	Sudah menghapus subbab "research background"
2	Sigma value of 0.17	Sigma value by 0.17
3	In this long sentence, it is not clear what is the purpose of each approach. It seems that the author only explains the role of data mining. Consider splitting this long sentence up to this point. Then continue with justification for using the two approaches.	Penjelasan masing masing metode dan alasan kombinasi metode: The six sigma method focuses on efforts to reduce defects based on data on defects that occur. Meanwhile, the a priori algorithm in data mining is used to determine the most frequently occurring pattern of defects. Based on this, the combination of the two methods is suitable in this study to formulate the types of defects that affect product quality.
4	Please provide adequate discussion regarding the FMEA method in the Introduction since Figure 1 indicates that it is an essential method in the research.	Based on the type of defects that affect product quality, an analysis using FMEA is carried out to find out and evaluate based on potential failures and the resulting impact. FMEA is a method that can explain what causes problems and measures priority risk numbers for quality improvement
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please ensure there is no unnecessary term in Bahasa Indonesia within this document. E.g., "Tidak" in Figure 1. • In Figure 1, we cannot see how Data Mining contributes to the proposed quality improvement methods. Please rearrange and revise the diagram accordingly. 	Revisi flowchart tertera pada "Figure 1" di dalam jurnal

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Methodology Flowchart shows that everything is in a sequence. However, it can't be seen that one part must be completed before the next part. For example, why did the author put <u>Fishbone Diagram</u> after <u>Apriori Algorithm</u> when it can't be seen that the Fishbone Diagram needs input from <u>Apriori Algorithm</u>? Next, the FMEA was put after <u>Fishbone Diagram</u>, etc. Please consider using a combination of parallel and sequential activities properly. 	
6	Using impurities seems incorrect since the product is <u>packaging</u> , not <u>cosmetic</u> . Consider using <u>contaminations</u> .	There are no <u>contaminations</u> in the product that comes from the production process
7	This is <u>initial</u> condition. Calculation of P Control Chart - Initial Condition	Table 2. Calculation of P Control Chart - Before Correction

8	Which one is the 15th data? Please provide adequate information in Table 2, such as data-id. Alternatively, simply refer to the date.	out of control status that is in <u>data</u> on November 8, 2022.
9	Discarding a data point can only be made if assignable causes are identified. Please use a concise statement, not a hypothesis or opinion.	This condition <u>caused</u> by variations <u>which</u> can be seen by an increase in the number of defective products compared to other data.
10	What correction has been made? This part is simply a Revised Control Chart. Calculation of Revised P Control Chart Please always use standard terms in this field of study.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculation of Revised P Control Chart • Visualization of Revised P Control Chart
11	Wrong Function. It must be $NORMS.INV ((1000,000-DPMO)/1000,000)$ Please correct. Please write: $2.59+1.5 = 4.09$	$= NORMS.INV ((1000,000-DPMO)/1000,000)+1.5$ $= NORMS.INV ((1000,000-4827,8)/1000,000)+1.5$ $= 2.59+1.5$ $= 4.09$ sigma
12	It is unclear how the data in Tables 4, 5, and 6 were obtained. It can't be seen <u>the</u> relationship with the previous data in Table 3 and Figure 4. Please provide enough explanation to make them easier to follow.	(Penambahan tabel data tabular untuk proses perhitungan manual algoritma apriori) Based on the results of identifying the <u>types of defects in the company data</u> , <u>tabular data is generated to collect data on the types of defects that appear per day</u> . Tabular data is the basis for manually calculating <u>the a priori algorithm</u> .

13	<p>Which data? Or the statement is actually "data is <u>eliminate</u> if it has ..."?</p> <p>Please explain or revise accordingly. Please explain every step of the <u>process</u> in this <u>Apriori Algorithm</u> section clearly.</p>	<p>Based on the calculations in Table 5, data is <u>eliminated if it has</u> a support value below the minimum support limit, which is 0.15. It was found that data that did not meet the criteria was in data number 5. The calculation continued with the formation of 2 itemsets by combining the types of defects that match the criteria in iteration 1.</p> <p>Based on the calculation of iteration 2, the data obtained that match the criteria are data 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, and 12. Furthermore, the combination of data in iteration 2 that meets the criteria will form the basis for the formation of iteration 3.</p>
14	<p>of Spotting</p> <p>Please revise all other fishbone diagram titles.</p>	<p>Figure 4. Fishbone Diagram of Spotting</p> <p>Figure 5. Fishbone Diagram of Various Color</p> <p>Figure 6. Fishbone Diagram of Hickies</p>

15	<p>Is the author sure that this alarm specification fits the purpose? There is no explanation regarding the sensors that this alarm has.</p> <p>Please complete the information and change the proposed alarm if necessary.</p>	<p>Usulan alarm yang digunakan tidak menggunakan sensor, sehingga tidak mencantumkan fungsi dan kegunaan sensor alarm.</p> <p>The alarm specification used can help the operator to always check and re-apply ink to the ink rolling on the printing press. This tool is also equipped with a luminous buzzer that attracts the operator's attention to immediately check the printing press.</p>
16	<p>Please increase the resolution of Figures 7 and 8. They are not clear.</p>	<p>Gambar sudah tercantum pada "Figure 7" dan "Figure 8" pada jurnal</p>

RINA FITRIANA rinah@trisakti.ac.id
Kepada Editor

This is our revision. We hope it can be published. Thank you very much.

Best regards,
Rina Fitriana

Satu lampiran • Dipindai oleh Gmail • [Tambahkan ke Drive](#)

640-JOSI-RV01 R...

← Balas → Teruskan