Gmail

Compose

Inbox	1,829
Starred	
Snoozed	
Important	
Sent	
Drafts	
All Mail	
Spam	7
Categories	
More	

Labels

[Airmail]
  Done
  Memo
  Send Later
  Snooze
  To Do
conferences
Conversation History
Notes

Mail

Chat

Spaces

Meet

99+

Major/Minor Revision Confirmation TSC-2016-08-0296.R1

Transactions on Services Computing <onbehalfof+c...   Thu, Feb 23, 2017, 5:55 PM
to surya.nepal, me, jian.yang, weiliangzhao.email, weiliang.zhao, cecile.paris

RE: TSC-2016-08-0296.R1, "What and With Whom? Identifying Topics in Twitter Through Both Interactions and Text"
Manuscript Type:
Authors: NUGROHO , ROBERTUS ; Yang, Jian; Zhao, Weiliang; Paris, Cecile; Nepal, Surya

23-Feb-2017

Dear Dr. Nugroho,

Please consider this notification as confirmation that your revision has been received.

You will be notified when we have a decision. As an author, you are responsible for understanding our submission and authorship requirements. For more information, please refer to
http://www.computer.org/mc/tsc/author.htm.

If you find that you have made an error in the revision of your manuscript (eg. downloaded the wrong file or left out one or more files, etc.), please email me. Please do NOT attempt to delete and/or resubmit it into ScholarOne Manuscripts, as this will only produce duplicate entries of the paper.

Please mention the above manuscript ID in all future correspondence or when calling the office for questions. If there are any changes in your street address or e-mail address, please log in to ScholarOne Manuscripts at https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tsc-cs and edit your user information as appropriate.

You can also view the status of your manuscript at any time by checking your Author Center after logging in to https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tsc-cs.

ROBERTUS NUGROHO <robertus.nugroho@students.mq.edu.au>

Decision on TSC-2016-08-0296.R1: Accept as regular paper
7 messages

Transactions on Services Computing <onbehalfof+c.kurzawa+ieee.org@manuscriptcentral.com>
Reply-To: c.kurzawa@ieee.org
To: surya.nepal@csiro.au, robertus.nugroho@students.mq.edu.au, jian.yang@mq.edu.au, weiliangzhao.email@gmail.com, weiliang.zhao@mq.edu.au, cecile.paris@csiro.au

Thu, Apr 6, 2017 at 6:09 PM

RE: TSC-2016-08-0296.R1, "What and With Whom? Identifying Topics in Twitter Through Both Interactions and Text"
Manuscript Type:

06-Apr-2017

Dear Dr. Nugroho,

Congratulations! I am pleased to inform you that your paper has been accepted with no further changes as a regular paper in an upcoming issue of Transactions on Services Computing.

Please submit all final files through the Awaiting Final Files queue in your Author Center on ScholarOne Manuscripts. Please upload all files in a single session, and make sure your final package is correct and complete upon submission. Once you have completed the submission of your final files you will not be able to make any changes until you have received the page proofs from IEEE. A detailed list of the required files is below.

Please be advised that this journal follows a preprint model. This means that the current accepted version we have on file will be downloaded from ScholarOne Manuscripts and will post to IEEE Xplore 5-7 days from when we receive your final materials. Preprint versions are fully citable, and no changes can be made to the accepted version at this time. Any typographical errors can be addressed with the production editor during the proof stage, and your copy-edited version will replace the preprint version online when the paper is published in an issue. In addition, the source files requested below must match the accepted PDF we have on file. Any subsequent PDF files will not be used for production.

If for any reason you would prefer not to have your paper posted as a preprint, please email c.kurzawa@ieee.org prior to submitting your final materials through ScholarOne Manuscripts; otherwise, not responding indicates your acceptance of our policy.

By submitting your final files through ScholarOne Manuscripts, you are acknowledging and agreeing to any applicable page charges this paper may incur. Overlength page charges are mandatory and are not negotiable. If you have any questions about these charges, please contact jarnold@computer.org prior to submitting your files.

The final items required for publication are:

1) A Latex or Microsoft Word application file. This should include keywords/index terms, and bios and photos if you are including them. The contents of this file should match the accepted PDF. Failure to submit a source file may result in publishing delays.

2) If your figures are not embedded in the source file of your manuscript, you will also need to upload separate figure files. The acceptable formats are Word, eps, ps, tiff, ppt, png and excel. We do NOT accept jpeg files for figures.

NOTE: If you intend to use an image that you didn't create (that is, it originally appeared elsewhere or someone else created it), you will need to provide permission that you're authorized to use that image to the production editor assigned to work with you on your article.

3) Biosketches and photos of all authors. Biosketches should be uploaded at the same time as the other final files, if you plan to include them. These can be included at the end of your Microsoft Word or Latex source file, or submitted as a separate upload. For author photos jpeg files are accepted. NOTE: If one of your authors does not want a photo published, please upload a document explaining this to avoid publication delays with your article.

Please make sure that all files have unique file names in order for them to export successfully to IEEE

Additional information (including our strict size limitation for all accepted articles) can be found by visiting: http://www.computer.org/portal/web/peerreviewjournals/author#final.

Please see the following for information on supplemental material: http://www2.computer.org/portal/web/peerreviewjournals/author#supplemental.

Thank you for your contribution to Transactions on Services Computing. We look forward to seeing your final files soon.

Best wishes,
Miss Christine Kurzawa, on behalf of
James Joshi, EIC
Transactions on Services Computing
c.kurzawa@ieee.org

****

Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor
Comments to the Author:
The authors reviewed the paper following the suggestions of the reviewers.
For the final version I recommend that they follow also the remaining suggestions, in particular from reviewer 3, for improving the quality of the paper.

****
Reviewers' Comments:

Please note that some reviewers may have included additional comments in a separate file. If a review contains the note "see the attached file" under Section III A – Public Comments, you will need to log on to ScholarOne Manuscripts to view the file. After logging in, select the Author Center, click on the "Manuscripts with Decisions" queue and then clicking on the "view decision letter" link for this manuscript. You must scroll down to the very bottom of the letter to see the file(s), if any. This will open the file that the reviewer(s) or the Associate Editor included for you along with their review.

Reviewer: 3

Recommendation: Accept

Comments:
Most of the revision comments are taken care of. I suggest one minor edit.

P. 18, C.2 L. 30: The objective function of the second factorization process min $D(V||W \tilde{H})$ is defined as follows:

...

Rephrase it to:

The objective function of the second factorization process is min $D(V||W \tilde{H})$ where

$D(V||W \tilde{H})$ = ... etc.

Additional Questions:
1. Which category describes this manuscript?: Research

How relevant is this manuscript to the readers? Explain under Public Comments: Very Relevant

1. Please explain how this manuscript advances this field of research and/or contributes something new to the literature. : This article puts forward a topic derivation method using tweet content similarity and interaction measures in which topic derivation is carried out in a two-step approach using tweet relationship matrix and tweet term matrix respectively. The experimental results suggest that the proposed method outperforms other related topic derivation methods.

2. Is the manuscript technically sound? Please explain your answer under Public Comments below.: Yes

1. Are the title, abstract, and keywords appropriate? Please explain under Public Comments below.: Yes

2. Does the manuscript contain sufficient and appropriate references? Please explain under Public Comments below.: References are sufficient and appropriate

3. Does the introduction state the objectives of the manuscript in terms that encourage the reader to read on? Please explain your answer under Public Comments below.: Yes

4. How would you rate the organization of the manuscript? Is it focused? Is the length appropriate for the topic? Please explain under Public Comments below.: Satisfactory

5. Please rate the readability of the manuscript. Explain your rating under Public Comments below.: Easy to read

6. Should the supplemental material be included? (Click on the Supplementary Files icon to view files): Yes, as part of the main paper if accepted (cannot exceed the strict page limit)

7. If yes to 6, should it be accepted: As is

Please rate the manuscript. Explain your choice.: Excellent

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Accept

Comments:
Authors have addressed all questions. thanks

Additional Questions:
1. Which category describes this manuscript?: Research

How relevant is this manuscript to the readers? Explain under Public Comments: Relevant

1. Please explain how this manuscript advances this field of research and/or contributes something new to the literature. : This papers deals with the problem of topic derivation in twitter, which typically based on semantic features of tweet contents. The novelty of this proposal for topic derivation is that besides the tweet contents, the approach takes into account several types of interactions amongst tweets (replies, re-tweets, mentioning). As experimental results show the proposed solution outperforms other existing topic derivation methods.

2. Is the manuscript technically sound? Please explain your answer under Public Comments below.: Appears to be - but didn't check completely

1. Are the title, abstract, and keywords appropriate? Please explain under Public Comments below.: Yes

2. Does the manuscript contain sufficient and appropriate references? Please explain under Public Comments below.: References are sufficient and appropriate

3. Does the introduction state the objectives of the manuscript in terms that encourage the reader to read on? Please explain your answer under Public Comments below.: Yes

4. How would you rate the organization of the manuscript? Is it focused? Is the length appropriate for the topic? Please explain under Public Comments below.: Satisfactory

5. Please rate the readability of the manuscript. Explain your rating under Public Comments below.: Easy to read

6. Should the supplemental material be included? (Click on the Supplementary Files icon to view files): Does not apply, no supplementary files included

7. If yes to 6, should it be accepted:

Please rate the manuscript. Explain your choice.: Good

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:
The paper has significantly improved. The following minor revisions are still needed:

- The abstract has to be rewritten to eliminate the first few generic lines and mention the breadth of testing (data samples, number of tweets on which precision and recall are calculated) and main results (improvement in precision-recall with respect to other methods in the literature.

- The authors mention that 10 k tweets have been manually tagged in each dataset. Although this represents a significant amount of human work, it also means that the approach is actually tested on a fraction of the two reference datasets. This should be explicitly mentioned in the conclusions as a limitation and threat to validity of the proposed approach.

- Have the baseline methods been implemented by this paper's authors? If so, the implementation details should be provided to guarantee that implementation choices do not affect the performance of methods (this needs to be thoroughly discussed).

Additional Questions:
1. Which category describes this manuscript?: Technology

How relevant is this manuscript to the readers? Explain under Public Comments: Relevant

1. Please explain how this manuscript advances this field of research and/or contributes something new to the literature. : The paper describes a method to extract topics from Tweets based on content as well as social relationships among authors (mentions and retweets). This represents a novelty in that the most common approach in the literature is content-based classification.

2. Is the manuscript technically sound? Please explain your answer under Public Comments below.: Yes

1. Are the title, abstract, and keywords appropriate? Please explain under Public Comments below.: Yes

2. Does the manuscript contain sufficient and appropriate references? Please explain under Public Comments below.: References are sufficient and appropriate

3. Does the introduction state the objectives of the manuscript in terms that encourage the reader to read on? Please explain your answer under Public Comments below.: Could be improved

4. How would you rate the organization of the manuscript? Is it focused? Is the length appropriate for the topic? Please explain under Public Comments below.: Satisfactory

5. Please rate the readability of the manuscript. Explain your rating under Public Comments below.: Readable - but requires some effort to understand

6. Should the supplemental material be included? (Click on the Supplementary Files icon to view files): Does not apply, no supplementary files included

7. If yes to 6, should it be accepted: As is

Please rate the manuscript. Explain your choice.: Good

Jian Yang <jian.yang@mq.edu.au>   Thu, Apr 6, 2017 at 6:14 PM
To: Ext-FSE Surya Nepal <surya.nepal@csiro.au>, "robertus.nugroho@students.mq.edu.au"
<robertus.nugroho@students.mq.edu.au>, "weiliangzhao.email@gmail.com" <weiliangzhao.email@gmail.com>, William Zhao
<weiliang.zhao@mq.edu.au>, Ext-FSE Cecile Paris <cecile.paris@csiro.au>

Congratulations, guys!

Prof Jian Yang

Director of Research

Department of Computing

Macquarie University

Sydney, Australia

Office: E6A 384

Email: jian.yang@mq.edu.au

Tel: 02 9850 9584

From: onbehalfof+c.kurzawa+ieee.org@manuscriptcentral.com <onbehalfof+c.kurzawa+ieee.org@manuscriptcentral.com> on behalf of Transactions on Services Computing <onbehalfof+c.kurzawa+ieee.org@manuscriptcentral.com>
Sent: 06 April 2017 21:09:23
To: Ext-FSE Surya Nepal; robertus.nugroho@students.mq.edu.au; Jian Yang; weiliangzhao.email@gmail.com; William Zhao; Ext-FSE Cecile Paris
Subject: Decision on TSC-2016-08-0296.R1: Accept as regular paper

[Quoted text hidden]

ROBERTUS NUGROHO <robertus.nugroho@students.mq.edu.au>   Thu, Apr 6, 2017 at 6:17 PM
To: Jian Yang <jian.yang@mq.edu.au>
Cc: Ext-FSE Cecile Paris <cecile.paris@csiro.au>, Ext-FSE Surya Nepal <surya.nepal@csiro.au>, William Zhao <weiliang.zhao@mq.edu.au>, Weilliang Zhao <weiliangzhao.email@gmail.com>

Dear all,

Thank you for your support. Congratulations.

Cheers,
R
[Quoted text hidden]

Surya.Nepal@data61.csiro.au <Surya.Nepal@data61.csiro.au>   Fri, Apr 7, 2017 at 5:41 AM
To: robertus.nugroho@students.mq.edu.au, jian.yang@mq.edu.au
Cc: Cecile.Paris@data61.csiro.au, weiliang.zhao@mq.edu.au, weiliangzhao.email@gmail.com

Well done!

Robertus, can you prepare the final version addressing the AE's comments and sent to me?

Regards,

Surya

[Quoted text hidden]

ROBERTUS NUGROHO <robertus.nugroho@students.mq.edu.au>   Fri, Apr 7, 2017 at 6:56 AM
To: Surya.Nepal@data61.csiro.au

Cc: Jian Yang <jian.yang@mq.edu.au>, Cecile.Paris@data61.csiro.au, William Zhao <weiliang.zhao@mq.edu.au>, Weilliang Zhao <weiliangzhao.email@gmail.com>

Hi Surya,

Thanks, sure. It says in the first paragraph of the letter that no further changes is required. Is it OK still to modify the paper based on the final reviews?

Kind regards,
Robertus

[Quoted text hidden]

Surya.Nepal@data61.csiro.au <Surya.Nepal@data61.csiro.au>   Fri, Apr 7, 2017 at 8:08 AM
To: robertus.nugroho@students.mq.edu.au
Cc: jian.yang@mq.edu.au, Cecile.Paris@data61.csiro.au, weiliang.zhao@mq.edu.au, weiliangzhao.email@gmail.com

The first paragraph is a standard letter. The AE has recommended us to address reviewer 3's comments as below (we should do it!):

Associate Editor

Comments to the Author:

The authors reviewed the paper following the suggestions of the reviewers.

For the final version I recommend that they follow also the remaining suggestions, in particular from reviewer 3, for improving the quality of the paper.

Regards,

[Quoted text hidden]

ROBERTUS NUGROHO <robertus.nugroho@students.mq.edu.au>   Fri, Apr 7, 2017 at 8:29 AM
To: Surya.Nepal@data61.csiro.au
Cc: William Zhao <weiliang.zhao@mq.edu.au>, Cecile.Paris@data61.csiro.au, weiliangzhao.email@gmail.com, jian.yang@mq.edu.au

Hi Surya,

Yes, you are right. I just have a discussion with Dr. Zhao and Prof. Yang on how to address the comments.
I will prepare it and send you by Monday.

Kind regards,
Robertus
[Quoted text hidden]