Dear Dr. Natalita Maulani Nursam,

Thank you for the opportunity to re-submit our manuscript entitled "**Nearly Real-time Energy Analytics Model for Smart Building using Open IoT Platforms**".

We appreciate the time and efforts by the editor and reviewers for their thorough reading of our manuscript, giving comments and suggestions that helped us improve the manuscript.

As indicated below, we have tried to do our best to respond to all the points raised. After this revision, we feel the paper quality is much improved and hope you agree.

To make the revision easy to be tracked, we made all the significant changes in the blue color. Please normalize their color then.

We look forward to receiving your further communications.

Yours sincerely,

Muhammad Nasar

Electrical Engineering Dept., University of Muhammadiyah Malang

Editor/Author Correspondence

Editor
2019-12-16
09:42
AM

Subject: [JET] Editor Decision
The following message is being delivered on behalf of Jurnal Elektronika dan Telekomunikasi.
_____

Dear Authors,

After careful evaluation of the manuscript and reviewers' comments, we have reached a decision regarding your submission to Jurnal Elektronika dan Telekomunikasi, "Nearly Real-time Energy Analytics Model for Smart Building using Open IoT Platforms".

Our decision is: Revisions Required

Please see the attached reviewer comments for further details about necessary revisions and fill up the attached form to explain your revisions and respond to the reviewers' and editor's comments. You should respond to each comment whether or not you implement changes in the manuscript.

For comments those you choose not to implement, please include a detailed reason why you think a change is inappropriate. Submit this form, along with your revised version of your manuscript once it finished. You can submit this form by click on ADD A

SUPPLEMENTARY FILE in Summary Page.
Please submit your revision version through tab "REVIEW" > "editor decision">
"upload author version". We would like to receive your revision as soon as possible, by
23-Dec-2019 at the latest.

I look forward to receiving your re-submission.

Best regards,

Dr. Natalita Maulani Nursam
Indonesian Institute of Science
Phone +6232504660
Fax +6232504661
natalita.maulani.nursam@lipi.go.id

Reviewer A:

Presentation and organization
 (Title, Abstract, Introduction, Method, Results and Discussion, Conclusion, Language)
• Is the paper well written enough for evaluation of technical content?
• Does the title reflect the contents of the paper?
• Does the abstract describe the essential information in the work?
• Does the introductory section adequately explain the framework and problems of the
research?
• Are the importance and usefulness of this research work clear?
• Were the methods adequately described and was the method appropriate to answer the
question posed?
• Are the results presented clearly and discussed satisfactorily?
• Are conclusions logically derived from the data presented? Are the figures and tables
easily readable, correct and informative?
• Are sufficient references cited for providing a background to the research?
Please provide your detailed comments to the Author(s) on the following.
:
The manuscript is quite written enough for the evaluation of technical content and the
title more or less reflects the contents.

the abstract describes the essential information however some un-common abbreviation
has been used in it. My suggestions, avoid using that.
Thank you for the suggestion. We have replaced the uncommon aberrations and made
some improvements to the abstract. This includes:
"IoT" to be "Internet of Things"
"ICT Building of UMM Campus" to be "our office building"

"PZEM004T…." to be "An electronic module named PZEM004T…"

"an ESP8266 node" to be "a microcontroller ESP8266"

The author has explained well the framework and problems of the research even the main idea to monitor real-time the consumption of electricity in a building is not new at all, a lot of similar paper has been published with the various approach.

Thank you for the critic. We realize that the energy monitoring system has been studied a lot. But here we tried to present a simple, low cost, and accurate solution based on the latest stable and open-source technologies we can use. Responding to this issue, we propose to add the phrase "**A Simple …** " to the title and delete the word "**Nearly**" for simplicity. Overall, we want to make some contribution to accelerating smart energy and collecting big data from it as the implementation of smart meters is, in fact, still the issue especially in Indonesia.

The importance and usefulness of the research pretty much clear even the degree of it not so significant and the methods which have been described reflect such uncomplete work without a specific algorithm to analyze and execute based on monitored data.

Thank you for this constructive comment. We have added a feature of power anomaly detection, we explain it in the next response.

References cited for providing a background to the research is ok.

Originality, scientific sound of the paper and its contribution to the field
• How original and creative are the idea and approach?
• Does the paper contain major or significant contribution adequate to
justify publication?
• Have any parts of the paper already been published or considered for other
publication?
• Is the paper scientifically sound and not misleading?
• Does it provide sufficient information and in-depth discussion?
Please provide your detailed comments to the Author(s) on the following.:

As I mentioned before that the main idea just only to monitor electricity consumption in a real-time actually is not new

Without adding some algorithm which may enable any kind of building to become "smart" refer to complete loop: monitor, obtained the data, analyze and execute, so I guess this manuscript has medium contribution to justify publication

We added a power anomaly detection feature using the Interquartile Range method that we think applicable to address that issue. As a consequence, we also added or modified some paragraphs, phrases, words, pictures, and citations.

There are found some un consistent figure presentation format, so I suggest the author

follow the template and standard of this journal.

We also have replaced them and we see they are much better now. Thank you very much.

Reviewer B:

Presentation and organization
 (Title, Abstract, Introduction, Method, Results and Discussion, Conclusion, Language)
• Is the paper well written enough for evaluation of technical content?
• Does the title reflect the contents of the paper?
• Does the abstract describe the essential information in the work?
• Does the introductory section adequately explain the framework and problems of the research?
• Are the importance and usefulness of this research work clear?
• Were the methods adequately described and was the method appropriate to answer the question posed?
• Are the results presented clearly and discussed satisfactorily?
• Are conclusions logically derived from the data presented? Are the figures and tables easily readable, correct and informative?
• Are sufficient references cited for providing a background to the research?
Please provide your detailed comments to the Author(s) on the following.
:
1. The paper is well written but the English improvement is strongly suggested, some typos (double the), and singular plural words are found.

Thank you for the thorough reading. We have deleted the double "the" on the abstract and corrected other grammatical issues.

2. The title reflects the paper content
3. The abstract is good.
4. Yes, the introduction, methods, results and conclusion contents are good and cite from good adequate references.

Originality, scientific sound of the paper and its contribution to the field
• How original and creative are the idea and approach?
• Does the paper contain major or significant contribution adequate to justify publication?
• Have any parts of the paper already been published or considered for other publication?
• Is the paper scientifically sound and not misleading?
• Does it provide sufficient information and in-depth discussion?
Please provide your detailed comments to the Author(s) on the following.:
1. The manuscript should be well prepared. The chart such as in Fig. 7 and 8 are not scientifically standard. The charts have to contain X and Y axes remark and it´s units.

Especially in Fig. 7, there are two Y axes left and right, each Y axes lack remark and units, then which color belongs to the right Y-axis and which color belongs to right Y-axis ?

Thank you for the suggestion. We have reproduced the graphs and they both have X-Y axes remark/unit now.

2. The English quality is standard, but still typos and grammatical errors are found, such as which nouns should be plural or singular. Proofreading is suggested.

Thank you. Yes, we have corrected the grammatical issues as we realized.

3. The resolution quality of Fig. 1 is suggested to be improved.

Thank you. We have reproduced the Fig. 1 as well with better resolution.

The reviewer suggested the revision of the manuscript.

_____