



Ni Made Sudarmini <madesudarmini@pnb.ac.id>

[iCAST-SS 2019] Your abstract #1570585480 ('The Strategy to Increase Competitiveness of Wood Craft Products in Ubud District, Gianyar Regency Bali')

1 message

icast-ss2019-chairs@edas.info <icast-ss2019-chairs@edas.info>

Wed, Sep 18, 2019 at 9:27 PM

Reply-To: iCAST-SS 2019 <icast-ss2019-chairs@edas.info>

To: "Made Rai Sukmawati, rai" <maderaisukmawati@pnb.ac.id>, "Ni Made Sudarmini, Darmi" <madesudarmini@pnb.ac.id>, Ni Muliati <kadekmuliati@pnb.ac.id>

Dear Mrs. Made Sukmawati:

Congratulations - your abstract #1570585480 ('The Strategy to Increase Competitiveness of Wood Craft Products in Ubud District, Gianyar Regency Bali') for iCAST-SS 2019 has been accepted and you are asked to submit a full manuscript for review.

The reviews are below or can be found at <https://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1570585480>.

Meta Review 1

Significance: - How important is the work reported? Does it attack an important/difficult problem (as opposed to a peripheral/simple one)? - Does the approach offered advance the state of the art? - Does it involve or synthesize ideas, methods, approaches from multiple disciplines? - Does it have interesting implications for multiple disciplines?*

Good (3)

Originality: - Is this a new issue? Is this a novel approach to an issue? - Is this a novel combination of familiar ideas/techniques/methods/approaches? - Does the paper point out differences from related research? - Does the paper properly situate itself with respect to previous work?

Good (3)

Quality: - Is the paper technically sound? How are its claims backed up? - Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contribution?

Good (3)

Clarity: - Is the paper clearly written? Does it motivate the research? Does it describe clearly the methods employed (e.g., experimental procedures, algorithms, analytical tools), if any? - Are the results, if any, described and evaluated thoroughly? - Is the paper organized in a sensible and logical fashion?

Good (3)

Relevance: - Is the paper closely related to the theme of the conference (broadly conceived)? - Is the content interesting enough to a broad audience? - Is the paper readable in a multi-disciplinary context?

Good (3)

Comments: Comments to the authors

In the paragraphs mentioned table 5.2 even though the table does not exist. Some sentences are very long.

Regards, The conference chairs