



Firman Noor Hasan <firman.noorhasan@uhamka.ac.id>

[JCBD] Decision on Your Submission

Fifi Syafrina <fifisyafina@delitekno.co.id>

Mon, Jul 6, 2026 at 8:27 AM

To: Bagas Ramadhan <bagasramadhan52@gmail.com>, Rudolf Januar <113q05009@stud.sju.edu.tw>, Firman Noor Hasan <firman.noorhasan@uhamka.ac.id>

Dear Bagas Ramadhan, Rudolf Januar, Firman Noor Hasan,

We are writing to inform you that after careful evaluation, the decision regarding your submission titled "Analysis of Sales Transaction Patterns Using the Fp-Growth Algorithm in MSMEs (Case Study: Kedai Mie Rahma)" to Journal of Computers and Digital Business is to request **Revisions Required**.

While your manuscript shows promise, certain aspects need to be revised before it can move forward in the publication process. We kindly ask you to address the required changes as per the detailed feedback provided, and resubmit your revised manuscript for further consideration.

If you have any questions or require additional clarification regarding the revisions, please feel free to reach out. We appreciate your efforts and look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Best regards,
Editor

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Title Appropriateness

Fair

Abstract Appropriateness

Fair

Introduction Appropriateness

Fair

Research Methodology Appropriateness

Fair

Results and Discussion Appropriateness

Fair

Conclusion Appropriateness

Fair

References Appropriateness

Fair

Reviewer Comments and Suggestions

Title:

1. The title conveys method and case study well but implies no scientific contribution or novelty beyond routine application.
2. The "Case Study" framing narrows generalizability; consider foregrounding the MSME decision-support angle.
3. The original title is purely method-application and promises no contribution; revising it to "Association Rule Mining with FP-Growth for Cross-Selling Recommendation in a Culinary MSME: A Case Study" is advised to tie the method to a decision output and move the case-study frame into the subtitle.

Abstract:

1. The abstract reads as a proposal "The expected results are..." signals an unfinished study rather than reporting actual findings.
2. No concrete result figures (top Support/Confidence/Lift) are reported in the abstract.
3. Novelty is not stated; FP-Growth on culinary MSMEs is heavily precedented.
4. The 180–200 word requirement must be verified against the final version.

Introduction:

1. No literature review establishing a specific gap; FP-Growth-vs-Apriori superiority claims are asserted without verifiable citations.
2. The problem statement yields no testable research question or hypothesis.
3. Novelty is not articulated the work merely replicates a standard pipeline on a new dataset.

Methodology:

1. Fatal: Confidence uses inconsistent denominators B1 uses 180 (Table 6) yet B1's frequency never appears in Table 5, making figures non-reproducible.
2. Fatal: Equations (1)–(4) are referenced but not shown; Lift Ratio is even expressed as a percentage (">100%"), misusing the metric's definition.
3. Threshold values (min Support, min Confidence) are never stated numerically, so rule selection is irreproducible.
4. Coding scheme is inconsistent: Table 2 defines A1,B1,B2,C1,D1 (no E1/F1/F2), yet E1, F1, F2 are used extensively in results.
5. RapidMiner usage lacks version, parameters, or any validation procedure.

Results & Discussion:

1. Fatal: Lift arithmetic is broken Table 7 pastes the Confidence formula into the Lift column ("605/845=71.5%"), then a separate Lift value (0.984) appears with no shown computation.
2. Fatal: Table 9 ("Before vs After") presents operational-impact claims with zero measured data this is narrative fabrication, not empirical evidence.
3. Rule conclusions contradict the data: the text calls $E1 \Rightarrow A1$ "certain" though its Lift is 0.984 (<1 , negative/random association).
4. Recommended bundle (A1,E1,F2) includes F2, which never appears as a validated antecedent in any rule.
5. A1,E1 Support (24.2%) checks out, but $E1 \Rightarrow A1$ Confidence uses 845 as base antecedent/consequent direction appears inverted and needs clarification.

Conclusion:

1. The conclusion claims operational-efficiency gains and stockout/food-waste reduction with no supporting metric.
2. The "very successful" claim is disproportionate given 2 of 3 rules barely exceed the Lift threshold and 1 fails.
3. No limitations or future-work directions are stated.

PT. Delitekno Media Mandiri, Deli Serdang, Sumatera Utara, Indonesia



A-Bagas Ramadhan-review1.docx

292K