

## Validation Paper - Round 2

## Fullpaper Title

"CAMPUS GREENING STRATEGY THROUGH CARBON EMISSION AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY CONTROLLING"

## Abstract

## Review Results

Reviewer 1

No	Question
1	<p><b>Relevance and timeliness:</b> Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research./</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Excellent</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Good</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/> Acceptable</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Little</p> <p><input type="radio"/> None</p>
2	<p><b>Technical content and scientific rigour:</b> Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Excellent work and outstanding technical content.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Solid work of notable importance.</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/> Valid work but limited contribution.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Questionable work with severe flaws.</p>
3	<p><b>Novelty and originality:</b> Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> A pioneering piece of work. Striking novel ideas or results.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Significant original work and novel results.</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/> Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Minor variations on a well investigated subject.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> It has been said many times before.</p>

4 **Quality of presentation:** Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

- Excellent.
- Well written.
- Readable, but revision is needed in some parts.
- Substantial revision is needed.
- Unacceptable.

5 **Recommendation:** How do you rate your recommendation?

- Definite Accept.
- Accept.
- Possible Accept.
- Likely Reject.
- Reject.

---

**Revision File (\*)** [[View File](#)]

**Comments for authors (\*)**

- This paper is longer than 6-page limit
- Highlighted text in Bahasa Indonesia needs to be either deleted or translated into English.

---

Reviewer 2

**No**    **Question**

1 **Relevance and timeliness:** Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research./

- Excellent
- Good
- Acceptable
- Little
- None

2 **Technical content and scientific rigour:** Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

- Excellent work and outstanding technical content.
- Solid work of notable importance.
- Valid work but limited contribution.
- Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws.
- Questionable work with severe flaws.

3 **Novelty and originality:** Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

- A pioneering piece of work. Striking novel ideas or results.
- Significant original work and novel results.
- Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated.
- Minor variations on a well investigated subject.
- It has been said many times before.

4 **Quality of presentation:** Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

- Excellent.
- Well written.
- Readable, but revision is needed in some parts.
- Substantial revision is needed.
- Unacceptable.

5 **Recommendation:** How do you rate your recommendation?

- Definite Accept.
- Accept.
- Possible Accept.
- Likely Reject.
- Reject.

---

#### Revision File (\*)

Tidak ada file revisi.

#### Comments for authors (\*)

Figures if any taken from other publications/ references should include their references. Some spelling error need corrections.

**No**    **Question**

**1**    **Relevance and timeliness:** Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research./

- Excellent
- Good
- Acceptable
- Little
- None

**2**    **Technical content and scientific rigour:** Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

- Excellent work and outstanding technical content.
- Solid work of notable importance.
- Valid work but limited contribution.
- Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws.
- Questionable work with severe flaws.

**3**    **Novelty and originality:** Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

- A pioneering piece of work. Striking novel ideas or results.
- Significant original work and novel results.
- Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated.
- Minor variations on a well investigated subject.
- It has been said many times before.

**4**    **Quality of presentation:** Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

- Excellent.
- Well written.
- Readable, but revision is needed in some parts.
- Substantial revision is needed.
- Unacceptable.

**5**    **Recommendation:** How do you rate your recommendation?

- Definite Accept.
  - Accept.
  - Possible Accept.
  - Likely Reject.
  - Reject.
-

---

**Revision File (\*)**

Tidak ada file revisi.

**Comments for authors (\*)**

The work is comprehensive and excellent

---

**Director Validation Results****Note**

Dear Authors;

You are now in the stage of Final Manuscript Submission. Before submitting your final document, please read the Step by Step Guide for Final Manuscript Submission on the conference website (<https://icsgteis.unud.ac.id/final-manuscript-submission/>). Make sure that you have revised your paper according to the reviewer's comments. Please note also the similarity index of your paper. The acceptable value is 20% and below. In order to reduce the possibility for errors during live day, online participants are requested to provide a pre-recorded presentation video. Please refer to the conference website for further details on this requirement. (<https://icsgteis.unud.ac.id/presentation/>).

Additional notes:

**STATUS :**

**ACCEPTED**

---

**Revised Files** [[View File](#)]

*Note: This file is the last revised file. Click View Revised Paper File to download the Revised file.*

---

Action

 Back