



IJTech <ijtech@eng.ui.ac.id>
kepada saya, djoko, Hari ▾

Sen, 21 Sep 2015, 11:59 ☆ ↶ ⋮

🌐 Inggris ▾ > Indonesia ▾ [Terjemahkan pesan](#)

[Nonaktifkan untuk: Inggris](#) ✕

Dear Anak Agung Ngurah Gde Sapteka,

The editorial board is pleased to inform you that your paper entitled
" I-V CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGHLY-DOPED P-I-N DIODES" has been reviewed by referee.

Please find in the attachment referee's comments, and please make a
necessary revision based on the comments. Also please read the submission guidelines.
Any revision of the paper should be submitted to ijtech@eng.ui.ac.id no later than **September 25, 2015**.

It is compulsory to return the revise paper with response comment as attached.
Please state clearly the revision based on reviewer's comment.

We look forward to receiving your revised paper at your earliest convenience.

--

Kind regards,
Secretariat IJTech
International Journal of Technology (IJTech)
ISSN : 2086-9614
<http://www.ijtech.eng.ui.ac.id>



anak agung ngurah gde sapteka <sapteka.71@gmail.com>
kepada IJTech ▾

25 Sep 2015, 20:28 ☆ ↶

Dear Dr. Nyoman Suwartha
Managing Editor
International Journal of Technology (IJTech)
Faculty of Engineering
Universitas Indonesia

We have been made some revisions to improve our paper as expected by the reviewers. Here we attach the revision paper entitled "I-V characteristics of highly-doped I N diodes" and also comment from the reviewers.

Thank you for your kind support. We are waiting for your reply.

Yours sincerely,
A.A.N. Gde Sapteka

**Reviewer's Guide****PART A: Editorial Office Only****SECTION I**

Reviewer's Name:	
E-Mail:	
Manuscript Number:	IJTech-04-132
Title:	I-V CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGHLY-DOPED P-I-N DIODES
Authors:	
Date Expected From Reviewer:	

PART B: Reviewer Only**SECTION II: Comments per Section of Manuscript**

General comment:	Author must clearly explain the main contribution of work
Introduction:	Authors need to explain and elaborate more references related to the work. The state of the art of this work is not clear. Is this paper only review paper for the previous work??
Methodology:	Authors need to explain 'what', 'why' and 'how' in this sub chapter of the paper. What is the main idea and why the author chose the model like in Fig. 1. Author need to explain the mathematical model and the parameter what are to be considered in Fig.1 and Fig 2.
Results:	Authors need to evaluate another performance related to the work so that significantly results of the work can be achieved.
Discussion:	Need more explanation (question word is why)
Bibliography/References:	Authors have to elaborate and add some more references related to the work
Others:	The English need to be improved

SECTION III - Please rate the following: (1 = Poor) (2 = Fair) (3 = Average) (4 = Above Average) (5 = Excellent)

Originality:	3
Technical Quality:	3
Methodology :	3
Readability :	3
Practicability:	3
Organization:	4
Importance:	3

SECTION IV - Recommendation: (Kindly Mark with an X)

Accept As Is:	
Requires Moderate Revision:	Major revision
Reject On Grounds of (Please Be Specific):	

SECTION V: Additional Comments

Please add additional comments, if any:

RETURN OF COMMENTS

Thank you for contributing to International Journal of Technology by completing this review. Please return your comments to:

Dr. Nyoman Suwartha
 Managing Editor
 International Journal of Technology (IJTech)
 Faculty of Engineering
 Universitas Indonesia,
 Kampus UI Depok 16424
 T: +62 (0) 21 78849052
 F: +62 (0) 21 7863506
 E: ijtech@eng.ui.ac.id atau ijtech.eng.ui@gmail.com

Discussion:	Need more explanation (question word is why)
Additional References:	Authors have to elaborate and add more references related to the work
Others:	The English need to be improved

List of Changes

Manuscript: I-V CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGHLY-DOPED P-I-N DIODES

Response and Revision made by Author(s)

Reviewer #1:

No	Comments	Revision/Changes
1	Author must clearly explain the main contribution of work.	The revision has been done
2	Author need to explain and elaborate more references related to the work. The state of the art of work is not clear. Is this paper only review paper for the previous work?	The revision has been done
3	Authors need to explain "what", "why" and "how" in this sub chapter of the paper. What is the main idea of and why author chosed the model like in Fig 1. Author need to explain the matematical model and the parameter what are to be considered in Fig 1 and Fig 2.	The revision has been done
4	Need more explanation (question word is why)	The revision has been done
5	Authors have to elaborate and add some more references related to the work	The revision has been done
6	The English need to be improved	The revision has been done