# Author’s Response to the Review Comments

***Journal* : Jurnal Elektronika dan Telekomunikasi**

***Title of Paper* : Performance Evaluation of Distribution Node in Case of LEACH Implementation on WSN**

We appreciate the time and efforts by the editor and referees in reviewing this manuscript. We have addressed all issues indicated in the review report, and believed that the revised version can meet the journal publication requirements. We have included the line numbers in the revised manuscript to help the reviewers identify our changes.

| **Comment** | **Response** | **Location of Response in Revised Manuscript** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **EDITOR’S COMMENTS** |  |  |
| Grammatical errors are found in the articles. It is suggested to proofread  before final submission. | We have correct the grammatical error in this paper | Section 1 : Introduction with red font. |
| LEACH protocol in not a new topic in WSN. Previously, researchers  implemented this protocol for energy efficiency. Unfortunately, authors do  not present in detail what people has been done related to this area. It is  recommended to provide a brief review of existing works and define clearly  what the pros of your work | We have provide a brief review of the people has been done related to this area. | Section 1 : Introduction with red font. |
| Contribution should be defined in detail. What the pros of your paper  compared with the existing works since authors mentioned proposing a new  thing | The contribution is described in the end of introduction | Section 1 : Introduction with red font. |
| **REVIEWER 1 COMMENTS** |  |  |
| 1. Is the paper well written enough for evaluation of technical content?  The language should be improved. It will be more readable if the  effective sentences are used instead of long sentences. | We have correct the grammatical error in this paper |  |
| 2. Does the title reflect the contents of the paper?  yes | We have update the title of the paper | The title of the paper |
| 3. Does the abstract describe the essential information in the work?  The contribution is not clearly described. Is "LEACH" algorithm the author's original contribution? or is the implementation of "LEACH" algorithm the original contribution? | We have update the abstract of the paper | Abstract |
| 4. Does the introductory section adequately explain the framework and  problems of the research?  It should be more detail. | We have update the introduction | Section 1 : Introduction with red font. |
| 5. Are the importance and usefulness of this research work clear?  How the research work fill the "gap" from previous work is not clearly explained | We have provide a brief review of the people has been done related to this area. | Section 1 : Introduction with red font. |
| 6. Were the methods adequately described and was the method appropriate to answer the question posed?  No, because the research question is not clear. | We have update |  |
| 7. Are the results presented clearly and discussed satisfactorily?  The result cannot be judged better or not with previous work because there  is no comparison with previous related work. | We have update |  |
| 8. Are conclusions logically derived from the data presented? Are the  figures and tables easily readable, correct and informative?  in order to make a clear conclusion, the objective/or research question  should be clear. | We have update |  |
| 9. Are sufficient references cited for providing a background to the  research?  The references are not new. The new references are important to show that  the author's work is not obsolete. | We have update |  |
| **REVIEWER 2 COMMENTS** |  |  |
| 1. How original and creative are the idea and approach?  The paper is quite interesting because the author performed implementation,  it was not only simulation. But, the work as presented in the paper is not  novel. The LEACH algorithm is not the author's proposal. The authors also do  not explain that their implementation of "LEACH" algorithm is the first  time, no other work has ever performed it. | We have update |  |
| 2. Does the paper contain major or significant contribution adequate to  justify publication?  I don't think so. To show their contribution, the authors should add enough comparison with previous related work. | We have update |  |
| 3. Have any parts of the paper already been published or considered for  other publication?  no idea. |  |  |
| 4. Is the paper scientifically sound and not misleading?  I don't think so. |  |  |
| 5. Does it provide sufficient information and in-depth discussion?  I don't think so. |  |  |