

Scopus  
indexed

ISSN 2089-3191

Vol. 11, No. 01, August 2022

BULLETIN OF  
**ELECTRICAL  
ENGINEERING  
AND INFORMATICS**

<http://ojs.umsida.ac.id>



UMS  
laes

CiteScore 2021  
**2.4**

**Q3**

SJR 2021  
**0.357**

SNIP 2021  
**0.730**

# Editorial Team

---

## Editor-in-Chief:

Prof. Dr. Ir. Tole Sutikno, ASEAN Eng., Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia

## co-Editors-in-Chief:

Dr. Arash Hassanpour Isfahani, University of Texas at Dallas, United States

Prof. Dr. Ilse C. Gebeshuber, Technische Universität Wien, Austria

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Vicente Garcia Diaz, University of Oviedo, Spain

## Associate Editors:

Prof. Dr. Ahmad Hoirul Basori, King Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

Prof. Dr. Attia El-Fergany, Zagazig University, Egypt

Prof. Dr. Eduard Babulak, National Science Foundation, United States

Prof. Dr. Jasvir Singh, Himachal Pradesh University, India

Prof. Dr. Juan Jose Martinez Castillo, Universidad de Málaga, Spain

Prof. Dr. Xiaoguang Yue, European University Cyprus, Cyprus

Prof. Chuan-Ming Liu, National Taipei University of Technology, Taiwan, Province of China

Prof. Dah-Jing Jwo, National Taiwan Ocean University, Taiwan, Province of China

Prof. Francesco Moscato, University of Salerno, Italy

Prof. Gordana Jovanovic Dolecek, National Institute INAOE, Mexico

Prof. Hui Gao, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, China

Prof. João Crisóstomo Weyl, Universidade Federal do Pará, Brazil

Prof. Jun Cheng, Doshisha University, Japan

Prof. Kamran Arshad, Ajman University, United Arab Emirates

Prof. Kui Xu, Army Engineering University of PLA, China

Prof. Mahdi Imani, Northeastern University, United States

Prof. Massimo Vecchio, Fondazione Bruno Kessler, Italy

Prof. Mohammed El Badaoui, University of Lyon, France

[Prof. Muhammad Zubair](#), Information Technology University (ITU) of the Punjab, Pakistan  
[Prof. Nandana Rajatheva](#), University of Oulu, Finland  
[Prof. Nicola Pasquino](#), Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II, Italy  
[Prof. Stavros Ntalampiras](#), University of Milan, Italy  
[Prof. Tao Jiang](#), Harbin Engineering University, China  
[Prof. Tomonobu Senjyu](#), University of the Ryukyus, Japan  
[Prof. Wei Wei](#), Shandong University, China  
[Assoc. Prof. Dr. Denis B. Solovev](#), Far Eastern Federal University (FEFU) and Russian Customs Academy, Russian Federation  
[Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hung-Peng Lee](#), Fortune Institute of Technology, Taiwan  
[Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mu-Song Chen](#), Da-Yeh University, Taiwan, Taiwan, Province of China  
[Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sohrab Mirsaedi](#), Beijing Jiaotong University, China  
[Assoc. Prof. Dr. Yilun Shang](#), Northumbria University, United Kingdom  
[Assoc. Prof. Wg. Cdr. Dr Tossapon Boongoen](#), Aberystwyth University, United Kingdom  
[Asst. Prof. Dr. Amjad Gawanmeh](#), University of Dubai, United Arab Emirates  
[Asst. Prof. Dr. Dinh-Thuan Do](#), Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam  
[Dr. Anna Formica](#), Istituto di Analisi dei Sistemi ed Informatica "Antonio Ruberti" National Research Council, Italy  
[Dr. Arcangelo Castiglione](#), University of Salerno, Italy  
[Dr. B. Justus Rabi](#), Toc H Institute Of Science & Technology, India  
[Dr. Dahaman Ishak](#), Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia  
[Dr. Enrico M. Vitucci](#), University of Bologna, Italy  
[Dr. Farouk Zouari](#), University of Tunis El Manar, Tunisia  
[Dr. Hamid Alinejad-Rokny](#), University of New South Wales (UNSW Sydney), Australia  
[Dr. Haoxiang Wang](#), Cornell University, United States  
[Dr. Hazlee Azil Illias](#), Universiti Malaya, Malaysia  
[Dr. Jens Klare](#), Fraunhofer FHR, Germany  
[Dr. Juan Antonio Martinez](#), University of Murcia, Spain  
[Dr. Luca Di Nunzio](#), University of Rome "Tor Vergata", Italy  
[Dr. Lutfu Saribulut](#), Adana Science and Technology University, Turkey  
[Dr. Ramón Durán](#), University of Valladolid, Spain  
[Dr. Ratheesh Kumar Meleppat](#), University of California Davis, United States  
[Dr. Saad Qaisar](#), National University of Sciences and Technology Pakistan and University of Jeddah, Pakistan  
[Dr. Safdar Hussain Bouk](#), Old Dominion University, United States  
[Dr. Sukumar Senthilkumar](#), Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia  
[Dr. Sunil Jha](#), ICAR-Central Soil Salinity Research Institute, India  
[Dr. T Vijay Muni](#), K L Deemed to be University, India  
[Dr. Taghi Javdani Gandomani](#), Shahrekord University, Iran, Islamic Republic of  
[Dr. Thinagaran Perumal](#), University Putra Malaysia, Malaysia  
[Dr. Tomoaki Nagaoka](#), Japan National Institute of Information and Communications Technology, Japan

---

Dr. Winai Jaikla, King Mongkut's Institute of Technology Ladkrabang, Thailand  
Dr. Xiaojun Li, Gotion Inc., United States  
Dr. Yuchen Jiang, Harbin Institute of Technology, China  
Mr. Yun She, Technical Research Center in Caterpillar, United States  
Ahmed Ah-yasari, University of Babylon, Iraq  
Nuryono Satya Widodo, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia

## Editorial Board:

Prof. Ali Rostami, Tabriz University, Iran, Islamic Republic of  
Prof. Andrea Sciarrone, University of Genoa, Italy  
Prof. Deepti Mehrotra, AMITY School of Engineering and Technology, India  
Prof. Emilio Jiménez Macías, University of La Rioja, Spain  
Prof. Enrico Tronci, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy  
Prof. Hans Dieter Schotten, University of Kaiserslautern, Germany  
Prof. Marco Mugnaini, University of Siena, Italy  
Prof. Marco Mussetta, Politecnico di Milano, Italy  
Prof. Mohamed El-Shimy Mahmoud Bekhet, Ain Shams University, Egypt  
Prof. Mohamed Hadi Habaebi, International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM), Malaysia  
Prof. Mohamed S. Hassan, American University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates  
Prof. Pawel Rozga, Lodz University of Technology, Poland  
Prof. Pedro S. Moura, University of Coimbra, Portugal  
Prof. Priya Ranjan, SRM University, India  
Prof. Saeed Olyaei, Shahid Rajaee Teacher Training University, Iran, Islamic Republic of  
Prof. Sergio Takeo Kofuji, University of São Paulo, Brazil  
Prof. Tapas Kumar Maiti, Dhirubhai Ambani Institute of Information and Communication Technology, Japan  
Prof. Yu Song Meng, National Metrology Centre, A\*STAR, Singapore  
Dr. Afida Ayob, The National University of Malaysia, Malaysia  
Dr. Ahmad Fairuz Omar, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia  
Dr. Ai-ichiro Sasaki, Kindai University, Japan  
Dr. Alessandro Carrega, National Inter-University Consortium of Telecommunications (CNIT), Italy  
Dr. Andrews Samraj, Mahendra Engineering College, India  
Dr. Ankan Bhattacharya, Hooghly Engineering & Technology College, India  
Dr. Arun Sharma, Indira Gandhi Delhi Technical University for Women, India  
Dr. Arvind R Singh, University of Pretoria, India  
Dr. Asan Gani Abdul Muthalif, Qatar University, Qatar  
Dr. Ashraf A. Tahat, Princess Sumaya University for Technology, Jordan  
Dr. Asrulnizam Abd Manaf, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

Dr. Azilah Saparon, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia  
Dr. Baharuddin Ismail, Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Malaysia  
Dr. Chockalingam Aravind Vaithilingam, Taylor's University, Malaysia  
Dr. Christoph Hintermüller, Johannes Kepler University Linzdisabled, Austria  
Dr. Dhananjay Singh, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Korea, Republic of  
Dr. Dheeraj Joshi, Delhi Technological University Delhi, India  
Dr. Donato Impedovo, Università degli Studi di Bari, Italy  
Dr. Emmanouil G. Spanakis, University of Maryland, United States  
Dr. Erwan Sulaiman, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Malaysia  
Dr. Farhan Ahmed Siddiqui, Dickinson College, United States  
Dr. Fazirulhisyam Hashim, University Putra Malaysia, Malaysia  
Dr. Gulivindala R. Suresh, Saveetha School of Engineering, India  
Dr. Guillermo P. Falconí, Technische Universität München, Germany  
Dr. Hamzah Ahmad, University Malaysia Pahang, Malaysia  
Dr. Haytham Elmiligi, Thompson Rivers University, Canada  
Dr. Hemant Kumar Rath, TCS Research and Innovation, Bhubaneswar, India, India  
Dr. Hüseyin Kemal Çakmak, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), Germany  
Dr. Jahariah Sampe, Institute of Microengineering and Nanoelectronics, Malaysia  
Dr. Jing-Sin Liu, Institute of Information Science, Academia Sinica, Taiwan, Province of China  
Dr. João Paulo Barraca, Universidade de Aveiro, Portugal  
Dr. Jose-Luis Sanchez-Romero, Universitat d'Alacant, Spain  
Dr. Kalaivani Chellappan, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia  
Dr. Kandarpa Kumar Sarma, Gauhati University, India  
Dr. Kang Song, Qingdao University, China  
Dr. Khalil Hassan Sayidmarie, Ninevah University, Iraq  
Dr. Lalit Garg, University of Malta, Malta  
Dr. Leo Yi Chen, Newcastle University, United Kingdom  
Dr. Liang-Bi Chen, National Penghu University of Science and Technology, Taiwan, Province of China  
Dr. M. Udin Harun Al Rasyid, Politeknik Elektronika Negeri Surabaya (PENS), Indonesia  
Dr. Mahmoud Hassaballah, South Valley University, Egypt  
Dr. Maaruf Ali, Epoka University, Albania  
Dr. Manar Mohaisen, Northeastern Illinois University, United States  
Dr. Manoj Kumar Taleja, University School of Information, Communication and Technology, India  
Dr. Marco Carratù, Università degli Studi di Salerno, Italy  
Dr. Md. Farhad Hossain, Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology (BUET), Bangladesh  
Dr. Md. Rajibul Islam, Bangladesh University of Business and Technology, Bangladesh  
Dr. Mohamad M. Awad, National Council for Scientific Research, Lebanon  
Dr. Mohammed Abdel-Megeed Mohammed Salem, German University in Cairo, Egypt

Dr. Mohammed Abdel-Megeed Mohammed Salem, German University in Cairo, Egypt  
Dr. Mohammad Lutfi Othman, University Putra Malaysia, Malaysia  
Dr. Mohd Anwar Zawawi, Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Malaysia  
Dr. Mohd Hafizi Ahmad, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia  
Dr. Mohd Khair Hassan, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia  
Dr. Muhammad Haroon Yousaf, University of Engineering and Technology Taxila, Pakistan  
Dr. Muhammad Irfan, Najran University Saudi Arabia, Saudi Arabia  
Dr. Muzamir Isa, Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Malaysia  
Dr. Mritha Ramalingam, Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Malaysia  
Dr. Natarajan Prabakaran, SASTRA Deemed University, India  
Dr. Narottam Das, Central Queensland University, Australia  
Dr. Nasrul Humaimi Mahmood, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia  
Dr. Nico Saputro, Universitas Katolik Parahyangan, Indonesia  
Dr. Norashid Aziz, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia  
Dr. Norizam Sulaiman, Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Malaysia  
Dr. Olympia Nikolaeva Roeva, Institute of Biophysics and Biomedical Engineering, Bulgarian Academy of Science, Bulgaria  
Dr. Omar Alfandi, Zayed University, United Arab Emirates  
Dr. Orhan Ekren, Ege University Solar Energy Institute, Turkey  
Dr. Peyman Kabiri, Iran University of Science and Technology, Iran, Islamic Republic of  
Dr. Pramod Kumar Singh, ABV-Indian Institute of Information Technology and Management, India  
Dr. Pushpendra Singh, JK Lakshmipat University, India  
Dr. Radek Fujdiak, Brno University of Technology, Czech Republic  
Dr. Rahman Dashti, Persian Gulf University, Iran, Islamic Republic of  
Dr. Riccardo Pecori, Mercatorum University, Italy  
Dr. Rodrigo Nava, Luxembourg Institute of Science and Technology, Luxembourg  
Dr. Sanjay Singh, Manipal Institute of Technology, India  
Dr. Siti Anom Ahmad, Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM), Malaysia  
Dr. Shailesh Chaudhari, Samsung Semiconductor, Inc., United States  
Dr. Shao Ying Zhu, Birmingham City University, United Kingdom  
Dr. Shaode Yu, Communication University of China, United States  
Dr. Shibiao Wan, University of Nebraska Medical Center, United States  
Dr. Sobia Baig, COMSATS University Islamabad Lahore Campus, Pakistan  
Dr. Soo Siang Yang, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Malaysia  
Dr. Subhasis Bhattacharjee, Adobe Systems India Private Limited, India  
Dr. Sudhir Routray, CMR Institute of Technology, Bangalore, India  
Dr. Syed Muslim Shah, Capital University of Science and Technology, Pakistan  
Dr. Tanmoy Maitra, Kalinga Institute of Industrial Technology, India

[Dr. Teerapat Sanguankotchakorn](#), Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand  
[Dr. Theofilos Chrysikos](#), University of Patras, Greece  
[Dr. Vicente Ferreira De Lucena](#), Federal University of Amazonas, Brazil  
[Dr. Vivek Kumar Sehgal](#), Jaypee University of Information Technology, India  
[Dr. Vladislav Skorpil](#), Brno University of Technology, Czech Republic  
[Dr. Xin Li](#), University of Florida, United States  
[Dr. Ying-Ren Chien](#), National I-Lan University, Taiwan, Province of China  
[Dr. Zeashan Hameed Khan](#), Bahria University, Pakistan  
[Dr., Eng., Ph.D. Crescenzo Pepe](#), Dipartimento di Ingegneria dell'Informazione, Università Politecnica delle Marche, Italy  
[Ph.D. Juan L. Navarro-Mesa](#), Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain  
[Mr. Cheng-Lian Liu](#), University of Pacific, United States  
[Mr. E Hari Krishna](#), Kakatiya University, India  
[Mr. Kamal Kant Sharma](#), Chandigarh University, India

[Home](#) > [Archives](#) > **Vol 12, No 4**

## Vol 12, No 4

August 2023

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11591/eei.v12i4>

### Table of Contents

<a href="#">A new grid search algorithm based on XGBoost model for load forecasting</a> Ngoc Thanh Tran, Thanh Thi Giang Tran, Tuan Anh Nguyen, Minh Binh Lam	<a href="#">PDF</a> 1857-1866
<a href="#">Influence of natural clouds on the performance of solar cell systems in Iraq</a> Hiba Nadhim Ameen Al-Kaoaz, Omar Sharaf Al-deen Yehya Al-Yozbak	<a href="#">PDF</a> 1867-1880
<a href="#">Control technique for power quality improvement of isolated wind power generation system</a> Goksu Gorel, Inas Fadhil	<a href="#">PDF</a> 1881-1892



<a href="#">Design and manufacture control system for water quality based on IoT technology for aquaculture in the Vietnam</a> Tran Duc Chuyen, Dien Duc Nguyen, Nguyen Cao Cuong, Vu Viet Thong	<a href="#">PDF</a> 1893-1900
<a href="#">Performance evaluation of microgrid with extreme learning machine based PID controller</a> Isha Rajput, Jyoti Verma, Hemant Ahuja	<a href="#">PDF</a> 1901-1907
<a href="#">Reactive power planning with the help of multi-objective genetic algorithm and flexible AC transmission systems devices</a> Prince Hooda, Mukesh Kumar Saini	<a href="#">PDF</a> 1908-1918
<a href="#">An efficient method for estimating energy losses in distribution's feeder</a> Nur Diana Izzani Masdzarif, Khairul Anwar Ibrahim, Chin Kim Gan, Mau Teng Au, Kyairul Azmi Baharin, Nurul A. Emran, Zaheera Zainal Abidin	<a href="#">PDF</a> 1919-1928
<a href="#">Improve PV-diesel operating management system considering sun availability time</a> Syafii Syafii, Muhardika Muhardika, Heru Dibyo Laksono	<a href="#">PDF</a> 1929-1935
<a href="#">Solar power plant on the rooftop of the Diponegoro University Rectorate: a technical and economic study</a> Jaka Windarta, Asep Yoyo Wardaya, Singgih Saptadi	<a href="#">PDF</a> 1936-1946
<a href="#">Pulse charging based intelligent battery management system for electric vehicle</a> Sunil Somnath Kadlag, Pawan Tapre, Rahul Mapari, Mohan Thakre, Deepak Kadam, Dipak Dahigaonkar	<a href="#">PDF</a> 1947-1959
<a href="#">Optimized ANN-fuzzy MPPT controller for a stand-alone PV system under fast-changing atmospheric conditions</a> Louki Hichem, Omeiri Amar, Merabet Leila	<a href="#">PDF</a> 1960-1981

<a href="#">A Chameleon algorithm for solving economic dispatch problem in microgrid system</a> Younes Zahraoui, Ibrahim Alhamrouni, Saad Mekhilef, Tarmo Korõtko, Awang Jusoh, Tole Sutikno	<a href="#">PDF</a> 1982-1992
<a href="#">Comparative analysis of grid-connected bifacial and standard mono-facial photovoltaic solar systems</a> Nor Hidayah Abdul Kahar, Nurul Hanis Azhan, Ibrahim Alhamrouni, Muhammad Nubli Zulkifli, Tole Sutikno, Awang Jusoh	<a href="#">PDF</a> 1993-2004
<a href="#">Interleaved boost converter voltage regulation using hybrid ANFIS-PID controller for off-grid microgrid</a> Linus Alwal Aloo, Peter Kamita Kihato, Stanley Irungu Kamau, Roy Sam Orege	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2005-2016
<a href="#">Design high voltage gain DC converter based on maximum power point resistance for photovoltaic applications</a> Ibraheem Jawad Billy, Jasim Farhood Hussein	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2017-2031
<a href="#">Performance analysis of wireless power transfer using series-to-series topology</a> Fairul Azhar Abdul Shukor, Ahmed Mohammed Salem Ahmed Alhattami, Nur Ashikin Mohd Nasir, Chockalingam Aravind Vaithilingam	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2032-2040
<a href="#">The one-phase SrMg<sub>2</sub>La<sub>2</sub>W<sub>2</sub>O<sub>12</sub>:Tb<sup>3+</sup>, Sm<sup>3+</sup>, Tm<sup>3+</sup> phosphor and its optical features in multicolor and white-illumination LEDs</a> Ha Thanh Tung, Huu Phuc Dang, Phung Ton That	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2041-2048
<a href="#">Statistical analysis of the predictors of annual electric vehicle mileage</a> Sizhuo Du, Maxim Paliivets, Irina Petunina	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2049-2057
<a href="#">Experimental and simulation investigation for rotor bar fault diagnosis in closed-loop induction motors drives</a> Seddik Tabet, Adel Ghoggal, Hubert Razik, Ishaq Amrani, Salah Eddine Zouzou	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2058-2068

<p><a href="#">An improvement of direct torque controlled PMSM drive using PWM technique and kalman filter</a> Dung Quang Nguyen, Hau Huu Vo, Pavel Brandstetter</p>	<p><a href="#">PDF</a> 2069-2076</p>
<p><a href="#">Advanced optimal GA-PID controller for BLDC motor</a> Hashmia S. Dakheel, Zainab B. Abdullah, Salam Waley Shneen</p>	<p><a href="#">PDF</a> 2077-2086</p>
<p><a href="#">Features selection for estimating hand gestures based on electromyography signals</a> Raghad R. Essa, Hanadi Abbas Jaber, Abbas A. Jasim</p>	<p><a href="#">PDF</a> 2087-2094</p>
<p><a href="#">Distributed formation control for groups of mobile robots using consensus algorithm</a> Ryandika Afdila, Fahmi Fahmi, Arman Sani</p>	<p><a href="#">PDF</a> 2095-2104</p>
<p><a href="#">Modeling and simulation of a pipeline leak detection using smart inspection ball</a> Marwa H. Abed, Wasan A. Wali, Musaab Alaziz</p>	<p><a href="#">PDF</a> 2105-2116</p>
<p><a href="#">SrAlOCl:Bi<sup>3+</sup>@SiO<sub>2</sub> phosphor with broad emission band and its effects on LED optical power and correlated color temperature</a> Ha Thanh Tung, Huu Phuc Dang, Hoang Thinh Nhan</p>	<p><a href="#">PDF</a> 2117-2124</p>
<p><a href="#">Design of CRC circuit for 5G system using VHDL</a> Adham Hadi Saleh, Hayder Khaleel AL-Qaysi, Khalid Awaad Humood, Tahreer Mahmood</p>	<p><a href="#">PDF</a> 2125-2135</p>
<p><a href="#">Detection of lung disease using relative reconstruction method in electrical impedance tomography system</a> Lina Choridah, Riries Rulaningtyas, Lailatul Muqmiroh, Suprayitno Suprayitno, Khusnul Ain</p>	<p><a href="#">PDF</a> 2136-2145</p>

<a href="#">Impulsive noise mitigation based adaptive filtering and Reed Solomon coding for power line communication</a> Asaad Jasim Mohammed, Maher Khudair Mahmoud Al-Azawi	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2146-2155
<a href="#">A novel octagonal slot circular compact ultrawideband antenna with detailed frequency and time-domain analysis</a> Satish Kumar Kannale, Nagashettappa Biradar	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2156-2164
<a href="#">Ultra-wide band antipodal Vivaldi antenna design using target detection algorithm for detection application</a> Sajjad Ahmed, Ariffuddin Joret, Norshidah Katiran, Muhammad Faiz Liew Abdullah, Zahriladha Zakaria, Muhammad Suhaimi Sulong	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2165-2172
<a href="#">A 2.45 GHz microstrip patch antenna design, simulation, and analysis for wireless applications</a> Md. Sohel Rana, Bijoy Kumer Sen, Md. Tanjil-Al Mamun, Md. Shahriar Mahmud, Md. Mostafizur Rahman	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2173-2184
<a href="#">Beampattern optimization techniques using metaheuristic algorithm for collaborative beamforming: a review</a> Najla Ilyana Ab Majid, Nik Noordini Nik Abd Malik, Nor Aini Zakaria	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2185-2192
<a href="#">Reconfigurable graphene-based multi-input multi-output antenna design for THz applications</a> Reem Hikmat Abd, Hussein A. Abdulnabi	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2193-2202
<a href="#">Bandwidth enhancement of millimeter-wave microstrip patch antenna array for 5G mobile communication networks</a> Umar Musa, Suleiman Babani, Suleiman Aliyu Babale, Abubakar Sani Ali, Zainab Yunusa, Sani Halliru Lawan	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2203-2211
<a href="#">Incorrect facemask-wearing detection using image processing and deep learning</a> Zeyad Qasim Habeeb, Imad Al-Zaydi	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2212-2219

<a href="#">Classification of 27 heart abnormalities using 12-lead ECG signals with combined deep learning techniques</a> Atiaf A. Rawi, Murtada Khalafallah Elbashir, Awadallah M. Ahmed	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2220-2235
<a href="#">License plate recognition in slow motion vehicles</a> Qudes Mb Aljelawy, Tariq M. Salman	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2236-2244
<a href="#">Glaucoma classification using a polynomial-driven deep learning approach</a> Krishna Santosh Naidana, Soubhagya Sankar Barpanda	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2245-2261
<a href="#">An algorithm for enhancement of audio content classification</a> Arti V Bang, Radhika G. Purandare, Archana K. Ratnaparkhi	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2262-2268
<a href="#">SiulMalaya: an annotated bird audio dataset of Malaysia lowland forest birds for passive acoustic monitoring</a> Nursuriati Jamil, Ahmad Nazem Norali, Muhammad Izzad Ramli, Ahmad Khusaini Mohd Kharip Shah, Ismail Mamat	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2269-2281
<a href="#">Sentiment analysis from Bangladeshi food delivery startup based on user reviews using machine learning and deep learning</a> Abu Kowshir Bitto, Md. Hasan Imam Bijoy, Md. Shohel Arman, Imran Mahmud, Aka Das, Joy Majumder	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2282-2291
<a href="#">Effect on signal magnitude thresholding on detecting student engagement through EEG in various screen size environment</a> I Putu Agus Eka Darma Udayana, Made Sudarma, I Ketut Gede Darma Putra, I Made Sukarsa	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2292-2301
<a href="#">Feature-based real-time distributed denial of service detection in SDN using machine learning and Spark</a> Sama Salam Samaan, Hassan Awheed Jeiad	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2302-2312

---

<a href="#">New efficient fractal models for MapReduce in OpenMP parallel environment</a> Muslim Mohsin Khudhair, Furkan Rabee, Adil AL_Rammahi	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2313-2327
<a href="#">Use of mobile applications in citizen security</a> Juan Chumbe Chocce, Laberiano Andrade-Arenas, Domingo Hernández Celis, Michael Cabanillas-Carbonell	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2328-2339
<a href="#">Machine learning techniques for accurate classification and detection of intrusions in computer network</a> Mutyalaiiah Paricherla, Mahyudin Ritonga, Sandip R. Shinde, Smita M. Chaudhari, Rahmat Linur, Abhishek Raghuvanshi	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2340-2347
<a href="#">Medication correlation analysis for outbreak prediction</a> Md Mohibullah, Meskat Jahan, Chowdhury Shahriar Muzammel, Fahim Shahriar, Raihan Khan	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2348-2356
<a href="#">Enhanced and authenticated cipher block chaining mode</a> Yasmeen Shaher Alslman, Ashraf Ahmad, Yousef AbuHour	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2357-2362
<a href="#">Segmenting the eating behaviour of university students using the K-means algorithm</a> Lenin Quiñones Huatangari, María Alina Cueva Ríos, Rafaela Teodosia Huerta Camones	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2363-2371
<a href="#">Wind power forecasting model based on linguistic fuzzy rules</a> Mohammed Moujabbir, Khalid Bahani, Mohammed Ramdani, Hamza Ali-Ou-Salah	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2372-2380
<a href="#">Bengali Slang detection using state-of-the-art supervised models from a given text</a> Md. Abdul Hamid, Eteka Sultana Tumpa, Johora Akter Polin, Jabir Al Nahian, Atiqur Rahman, Nurjahan Akther Mim	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2381-2387

---

<a href="#">K-nearest neighbor algorithm analysis for path determination in network simulation using software defined network</a> Ritzkal Ritzkal, Suhadi Suhadi, Rizky Amalia, Yuggo Afrianto, Anggra Triawan, Syafril Syafril, Fety Fatimah	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2388-2400
<a href="#">Handwritten signature identification based on MobileNets model and support vector machine classifier</a> Israa Bashir Mohammed, Bashar Saadoon Mahdi, Mustafa Salam Kadhm	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2401-2409
<a href="#">Development of electrooculogram based human computer interface system using deep learning</a> Radwa Reda Hossieny, Manal Tantawi, Howida Shedeed, Mohamed F. Tolba	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2410-2420
<a href="#">Federated learning security mechanisms for protecting sensitive data</a> Asraa A. Abd Al-Ameer, Wesam Sameer Bhaya	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2421-2427
<a href="#">Lane change decision aid and warning system using LoRa-based vehicle-to-vehicle communication technology</a> Siti Fatimah Abdul Razak, Tee Yee Ren, Sumendra Yogarayan, Noor Hisham Kamis, Ibrahim Yusof	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2428-2437
<a href="#">Using machine learning approach towards successful crowdfunding prediction</a> Sarifah Putri Rafflesia, Dinda Lestarini, Rizka Dhini Kurnia, Dinna Yunika Hardiyanti	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2438-2445
<a href="#">Breast cancer detection: an effective comparison of different machine learning algorithms on the Wisconsin dataset</a> Md. Murad Hossin, F. M. Javed Mehedi Shamrat, Md Rifat Bhuiyan, Rabea Akter Hira, Tamim Khan, Shourav Molla	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2446-2456
<a href="#">Hash algorithm comparison through a PIC32 microcontroller</a> Asmae Zniti, Nabih El Ouazzani	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2457-2463

---

<a href="#">A proposed approach to discover nearest users on social media networks based on users' profiles and preferences</a> Mahmood Shakir Hammoodi, Ahmed Al-Azawei	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2464-2473
<a href="#">Secure two-factor mutual authentication scheme using shared image in medical healthcare environment</a> Husam A. Abdulmalik, Ali A. Yassin	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2474-2483
<a href="#">Group decision support system model to determine supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs</a> M. Miftakul Amin, Adi Sutrisman, Yevi Dwitayanti	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2484-2494
<a href="#">Abnormal heart rate detection through real-time heart monitoring application</a> Umami Namirah Hashim, Lizawati Salahuddin, Umami Rabaah Hashim, Mohd Hariz Naim, Raja Rina Raja Ikram, Fiza Abdul Rahim	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2495-2505
<a href="#">Malaysia coin identification app using deep learning model</a> Dania Qistina Mohd Nazly, Pradeep Isawasan, Khairulliza Ahmad Salleh, Savita K. Sugathan	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2506-2512
<a href="#">Implementation of blended learning approach in teaching introductory computer science course</a> Alaa Obeidat, Rola Yaqbeh	<a href="#">PDF</a> 2513-2520

---



## Group decision support system model to determine supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs

M. Miftakul Amin<sup>1</sup>, Adi Sutrisman<sup>1</sup>, Yevi Dwitayanti<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Engineering, State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Department of Accounting, State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia

### Article Info

#### Article history:

Received Sep 14, 2022

Revised Dec 16, 2022

Accepted Jan 11, 2023

#### Keywords:

Borda

Group decision support system

Weighted product

### ABSTRACT

A group decision support system (GDSS) model was created in this study by implementing the weighted product (WP) method and the borda method to determine prospective assistant or supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs (PKMs) that are routinely carried out every year at the Sriwijaya State Polytechnic. This study applies 5 criteria, including i) education level, ii) academic position, iii) group tenure, iv) lecturer certification, and v) achievement in the field of three pillars of higher education. The decision-makers in this study consisted of the head of the department (DM-1), the secretary of the department (DM-2), and the head of the study program (DM-3) where they carried out the decision-making process in groups. The WP method is used to make preferences independently of the decision-makers to determine the best alternative based on predetermined criteria. The borda method is currently used to aggregate the decision-makers to obtain the final result in the form of an alternative ranking. The results of this study are sufficient to be used as a reference in determining the supervisor lecturer for PKM activities at the Department of Computer Engineering, State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya.

*This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.*



### Corresponding Author:

M. Miftakul Amin

Department of Computer Engineering, State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya

Srijaya Negara Road, Bukit Besar, Palembang, 30139, Indonesia

Email: miftakul\_a@polsri.ac.id

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Higher education is an ever-changing environment, so its sustainability depends on the ability to adapt to these changes [1]. The student creativity program (PKM) is a manifestation of the implementation of the Tridharma of Higher Education launched by the Directorate General of Higher Education in 2021. This program is one of the efforts to grow, accommodate, and realize creative and innovative ideas for students. The impact of this activity is the improvement in student and university achievement in ranking at the Ministry of Education and Culture [2]. To support the activities of the PKM, the Sriwijaya State Polytechnic at the department level appointed several lecturers to assist students in preparing proposals for proposed activities, writing techniques, and implementing activities. For this reason, an objective mechanism in determining the candidate for supervisor lecturers for activities is very much needed to obtain optimal results. Some of the criteria that become the basis for determining suitable lecturer candidates to become activity supervisors include education level, academic position, group tenure, lecturer certification, and the lecturer's achievement in the activities of the three pillars of higher education.

To increase the objectivity of decision-making, the decision-making approach is carried out in groups [3]. The group decision-making process occurs when each individual is characterized by his or her perceptions,

attitudes, and motivations. According to Costa [4] decision making is a fairly complex problem to be solved, and produce a ranking of the selected alternatives [5]. Integration and combination of several models can improve the performance of decision-making systems [6]. This is related to accuracy and computational processing [7]. Decision support systems have been widely applied in various fields, including in the field of education which is used to determine scholarship grantees [8], in the field of human resource management it is used for employee performance appraisal [9], even in the political field, this kind of decision support system used to determine political parties in general elections [10].

Several studies on group decision support systems (GDSS) were conducted by Azmi *et al.* [11] where they developed a GDSS model for supplier selection using a combination of analytic hierarchy process (AHP), technique for order preference by similarity to ideal solution (TOPSIS), and Borda methods. This study sets 6 criteria to determine the best supplier, namely price, quality, delivery, location, inventory, and flexibility. The combination of these 3 methods has resulted in a GDSS model that is quite adequate to determine the best supplier ranking. Another GDSS research was also conducted by Meidelfi *et al.* [12] who combined the SAW and Borda methods to determine the final project's topic. This study sets 4 criteria and 10 topics in model testing. The decision-makers, in this case, consist of 2 lecturers as evaluators of research topics. The research has succeeded in producing a sequential list of recommended research topics.

Research conducted by Saputra *et al.* [13] using the weighted product (WP) method aims to determine the ideal cloud computing service. This study establishes as many as 11 criteria used in the consideration of decision making and 6 alternatives that can be selected in cloud computing services. This research has resulted in the best ranking in determining cloud computing services. The use of the WP method is also used in measuring employee performance by Aminudin *et al.* [14]. In this study, 5 criteria were used, consisting of attendance, behavior, experience, discipline, and teamwork. This study determines 5 alternatives to test the model and produce a ranking in the form of the order of the best employee performance.

The WP method is also used by Arifin and Mintamanis [15] to determine the thesis supervisor. This study sets as many as 10 criteria in determining the decision, while the alternatives used in testing the model are only 3 alternatives. However, this research has succeeded in proving that the WP method can be used in the multiple criteria decision-making model. As the output, this research can produce the best ranking for thesis supervisor candidates. Research conducted by Supriyono and Sari [16] also uses the WP method to determine house selection. This study establishes 11 criteria which are categorized into 2 groups, namely cost, and benefit. The alternatives used in model testing consist of 3 alternatives. This research has produced a list of recommended house rankings.

Decision making with a multicriteria decision making approach has been implemented in a study conducted by Bire *et al.* [17] using a fuzzy AHP and native AHP approach to determine tourist attractions in the city of Kupang. Both of these approaches produce equally good outputs in the decision-making process. However, the fuzzy AHP approach gives better results in calculations. This study uses 9 criteria in determining the best alternative. Likewise, research by Pattnaik *et al.* [18] uses fuzzy multi criteria decision making (MCDM) and TOPSIS approaches to determine alternative life insurance in India. There are 10 criteria used to determine the best alternative. This study also uses a sensitivity analysis approach to ensure the effectiveness of the developed model.

Research conducted by Fanghua and Guanchun [19] developed a fuzzy multi-criteria group decision-making (FMCGDM) model to carry out environmental risk analysis of watersheds. This study conducted tests using 5 criteria and 3 alternatives, and involved 4 decision makers. Research shows optimal results in weight loads. Other research on the topic of multi-criteria decision-making was also carried out by Meshram and Agrawal [20] which places more emphasis on the aspects of risk analysis and the confidence of an attribute being considered. Research conducted by Zou and Qiu [21] implementing fuzzy borda for watershed management. Research on group decisions was also carried out by Dewi *et al.* [22] using the TOPSIS approach and the Borda method. This model is implemented in a mobile application to make it easier for tourists to visit tourist destinations in the city of Malang.

According to research conducted by Lestari *et al.* [23] comparing 2 aggregation methods, namely the Borda method and Copeland, the results show that the Borda method is better than Copeland. Likewise in terms of processing speed, Borda method is faster than Copeland. This research is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the methodology and architecture of model. Section 3 describes the research results, and discussion. Section 4 contains conclusions.

## 2. METHOD

This study aims to build a GDSS model using the WP and Borda methods. Both of these methods are used to improve the quality of the results of decision making. This segment reviews in more detail the two methods.

## 2.1. Architecture system design of group decision support system

Figure 1 is the architecture of the developed model. In this architecture, the GDSS model developed consisted of 3 decision-makers, namely the head of the department (DM-1), the secretary of the department (DM-2), and the head of the study program (DM-3). This modeling stage starts from individual preferences by each decision-maker using the WP method to generate a ranking of alternatives. Furthermore, after the ranking results from each decision-maker are obtained, the ranking is calculated using the Borda points to produce the final ranking of the recommendation process using the GDSS.




Figure 1. System architecture of GDSS

## 2.2. Weighted product method

WP is a method of making multiple criteria decisions that are used to solve cases that have data with many attributes [24]. The WP method uses multiplication to connect attribute ratings where the rating of each attribute must be raised first with the weight of the attribute concerned [3]. In general, several steps to perform calculations using the WP method are as follows:

- Determination of the criteria used as the basis in determining the decision. The criteria are symbolized by  $C_i$ , where  $i$  is the number of criteria determined to be used as a reference in decision making.
- Determine the suitability rating for the criteria. This is done by creating a decision matrix, and ranking the suitability of each criterion.
- Determination of the normalized weight value.

$W$  is the weight of each criterion that will be calculated. The formula for finding the value of  $W$  is:

$$W_j = \frac{w_j}{\sum w_j} \quad (1)$$

After this calculation, the value of  $W$  will be ranged 0 to 1 where the total of all  $W$  is 1. Then,  $W$  is multiplied by 1 for the attribute worth benefit, and  $W$  is multiplied by -1 for the attribute worth the cost.

- Calculating preference values for alternatives as vector  $S$

The preference value for the alternative is calculated based on (2):

$$S_i = \prod_{j=1}^n X_{ij}^{W_j} \quad (2)$$

Description:

$S$  : preference alternative

$w$  : criterion weight

$X$  : criterion value

$i$  : alternative  $i$  to  $n$

$j$  : criterion

- Calculating the relative preference value as vector  $V$

Vector  $V$  is the result of a preference for each alternative. In (3) is the formula used to calculate the value of  $V$ .

$$V_i = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^n x_{ij}^{W_j}}{\prod_{j=1}^n x_{ij}^* W_j} \quad (3)$$

After the value of  $V$  is obtained, then it is sorted by the largest value of  $V$ .

- Ranking the value of the vector  $V$

At this stage, it will be known which alternative has the highest  $V_i$  value which is the result of the decision and is the best alternative.

### 2.3. Borda method

The principle of the Borda method is to do alternative voting by weighting the value on each alternative ranking [23], [25]. The alternative that has the top rank is given the highest score, and so on in descending order where lower values are given to the rank below it until the lowest rank is given a value of 0 (zero) or 1 [26]. The Borda method is one of the aggregation methods that are quite effective in GDSS applications [27]-[30]. Even [23] mentions that the Borda method can be used to rank the sparsity data. On the other hand, according to [31] Borda method is done by sorting all alternatives from the largest value to the smallest value with a value of 0.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this study, the problem discussed in the decision-making to determine the assistant lecturer for PKM activities, at the Sriwijaya State Polytechnic. The following are the steps involved in the decision-making process. The implementation of these two methods will be explained in more detail.

### 3.1. Independent assessment by decision makers using the weighted product method

The stages in performing calculations independently by decision-makers are executed using the WP method. The decision-makers consisted of the DM-1, the DM-2, and the DM-3 at the Computer Engineering Department of the Sriwijaya State Polytechnic. The initial step taken is to determine the criteria and the value of the weight of the criteria as a reference in decision making. Table 1 presents the criteria and the weight of the criteria defined.

Table 1. Criteria and criteria weight

Criteria	Description	Category	Criteria weight
C1	Education level	Benefit	5
C2	Academic position	Benefit	4
C3	Group tenure	Benefit	5
C4	Lecturer certification	Benefit	3
C5	Achievement in the field of three pillars of higher education	Benefit	5

Criteria C1 to C4 will have the same value trend between decision-makers (DM). This is because the data is standard and does not require objective expert judgment from each decision-maker. Meanwhile, the C5 criteria will have varied values from each decision-maker given it will be based on the perceptions of each decision-maker. This variable value depends on the point of view of the decision makers based on the performance achievements of each alternative on the C5 criteria, because there is no standard reference based on certain values such as in criteria C1 to C4, where each criterion has a value that becomes reference.

### 3.2. Determine the criteria scale

The data obtained in this study is qualitative so that it requires a scale value of each criterion to facilitate the calculation process. Table 2 is the scale for the C1 criteria for education level. Table 3 is a criterion scale for lecturers' academic positions. Table 4 is the criteria scale for group tenure, and Table 5 presents the criteria scale for lecturer certification which only contains information on certified and uncertified.

Meanwhile, Table 6 contains information that tends to be subjective from decision-makers whose content depends on the perception of each decision-maker. Table 6 is related to the performance of each lecturer based on higher education tridharma activities. Each lecturer has a different performance in the fields of teaching, research, community service, and supporting activities in higher education. So, there are no

parameters that are set specifically. So that each lecturer is likely to get a varied score, depending on the preferences of the decision makers.

Table 2. Criteria scale of education level

No.	Qualification	Scale
1	S2-Master	1
2	S3-Doctor	2

Table 3. Criteria scale of academic position

No.	Qualification	Scale
1	Instructor	1
2	Lecturers	2
3	Senior Lecturers	3
4	Assoc. Professors	4
5	Professors	5

Table 4. Criteria scale of group tenure

No.	Qualification	Scale
1	0-5 years	1
2	6-10 years	2
3	11-15 years	3
4	16-20 years	4
5	> 20 years	5

Table 5. Criteria scale of lecturer certification

No.	Qualification	Scale
1	Uncertified	1
2	Certified	2

Table 6. Criteria scale of achievement in the field of three pillar's of higher education

No.	Qualification	Scale
1	Very poor	1
2	Poor	2
3	Enough	3
4	Good	4
5	Very good	5

### 3.3. Entering alternative data

Tables 7-9 are the distribution of preference data from decision-makers (DM-1, DM-2, and DM-3). The alternative data tested into the model are 10 alternatives and are distributed for each of the 5 criteria. This data is lecturer data from the D3 computer engineering study program, in the Department of Computer Engineering at the Sriwijaya State Polytechnic. In this model the lecturer's name is not presented in detail using the name, but uses initials in the form of A1, A2, ..., A10.

Table 7. Data preference from DM-1

No.	Alternatives	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
1	A1	1	4	4	2	4
2	A2	1	4	3	2	4
3	A3	1	4	4	2	4
4	A4	1	4	3	2	4
5	A5	1	3	3	2	5
6	A6	1	2	3	2	4
7	A7	1	3	3	2	3
8	A8	2	2	3	1	4
9	A9	1	2	3	2	2
10	A10	1	3	2	2	3

Table 8. Data preference from DM-2

No.	Alternatives	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
1	A1	1	4	4	2	5
2	A2	1	4	3	2	5
3	A3	1	4	4	2	3
4	A4	1	4	3	2	4
5	A5	1	3	3	2	5
6	A6	1	2	3	2	5
7	A7	1	3	3	2	3
8	A8	2	2	3	1	3
9	A9	1	2	3	2	2
10	A10	1	3	2	2	3

Table 9. Data preference from DM-3

No.	Alternatives	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
1	A1	1	4	4	2	5
2	A2	1	4	3	2	5
3	A3	1	4	4	2	4
4	A4	1	4	3	2	5
5	A5	1	3	3	2	4
6	A6	1	2	3	2	4
7	A7	1	3	3	2	3
8	A8	2	2	3	1	4
9	A9	1	2	3	2	3
10	A10	1	3	2	2	4

**3.4. Calculating the normalization weight value**

This weight is calculated using (1) following the weight criteria in Table 1 so that the weight normalization is obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 W &= (5, 4, 3, 3, 5) \\
 W_1 &= 5 / (5 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 5) = 0.25 \\
 W_2 &= 4 / (5 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 5) = 0.20 \\
 W_3 &= 3 / (5 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 5) = 0.15 \\
 W_4 &= 3 / (5 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 5) = 0.15 \\
 W_5 &= 5 / (5 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 5) = 0.25
 \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, it is ensured that the accumulated value of this weight is equal to 1 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 w_1 + w_2 + w_3 + w_4 + w_5 &= 1 \\
 0.25 + 0.20 + 0.15 + 0.15 + 0.25 &= 1
 \end{aligned}$$

Table 10 is the result of the normalization of the weights of the criteria that have been defined in Table 1 obtained by using (1). The normalized value of  $W_j$  also has the same value, because all criteria categories are in the form of benefits, so they are multiplied by 1. If the criteria category is cost, then it is multiplied by -1.

Table 10. Normalization of weight criteria

Criteria	$W_j$	$W_j$ normalized
C1	0,25	0,25
C2	0,20	0,20
C3	0,15	0,15
C4	0,15	0,15
C5	0,25	0,25
$\Sigma$	1,00	

**3.5. Calculating vector S**

Vector S is calculated by referring to (2). In calculating the S vector, the categories of cost and benefit criteria are considered. The cost category will be negative and the benefit value will be positive. Referring to Table 1, it can be seen that all categories are positive so that the normalized  $W_j$  is also positive. Tables 11-13 are the results of the calculation of the S vector from the decision-makers. For example, vector S is obtained by using (2) where the information contained in Table 11 can be described as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_1 &= (1^{0.25}) (4^{0.20}) (4^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (4^{0.25}) = 2.5491 \\
 S_2 &= (1^{0.25}) (4^{0.20}) (3^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (4^{0.25}) = 2.4415 \\
 S_3 &= (1^{0.25}) (4^{0.20}) (4^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (4^{0.25}) = 2.5491 \\
 S_4 &= (1^{0.25}) (4^{0.20}) (3^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (4^{0.25}) = 2.4415 \\
 S_5 &= (1^{0.25}) (3^{0.20}) (3^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (5^{0.25}) = 2.4372 \\
 S_6 &= (1^{0.25}) (2^{0.20}) (3^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (4^{0.25}) = 2.1254 \\
 S_7 &= (1^{0.25}) (3^{0.20}) (3^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (3^{0.25}) = 2.1450 \\
 S_8 &= (2^{0.25}) (2^{0.20}) (3^{0.15}) (1^{0.15}) (4^{0.25}) = 2.2780 \\
 S_9 &= (1^{0.25}) (2^{0.20}) (3^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (2^{0.25}) = 1.7873 \\
 S_{10} &= (1^{0.25}) (3^{0.20}) (2^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (3^{0.25}) = 2.0184
 \end{aligned}$$

Table 11. Preference vector S from DM-1

Alternatives	$C1^{\wedge}W_i$	$C2^{\wedge}W_i$	$C3^{\wedge}W_i$	$C4^{\wedge}W_i$	$C5^{\wedge}W_i$	$S_i$
A1	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.4142	2.5491
A2	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.4415
A3	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.4142	2.5491
A4	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.4415
A5	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.4953	2.4372
A6	1.0000	1.1487	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.1254
A7	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.3161	2.1450
A8	1.1892	1.1487	1.1791	1.0000	1.4142	2.2780
A9	1.0000	1.1487	1.1791	1.1096	1.1892	1.7873
A10	1.0000	1.2457	1.1096	1.1096	1.3161	2.0184
					$\Sigma S_i$	22.7724

Table 12. Preference vector S from DM-2

Alternatives	C1 <sup>W<sub>i</sub></sup>	C2 <sup>W<sub>i</sub></sup>	C3 <sup>W<sub>i</sub></sup>	C4 <sup>W<sub>i</sub></sup>	C5 <sup>W<sub>i</sub></sup>	S <sub>i</sub>
A1	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.4953	2.6954
A2	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4953	2.5815
A3	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.3161	2.3722
A4	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.4415
A5	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.4953	2.4372
A6	1.0000	1.1487	1.1791	1.1096	1.4953	2.2474
A7	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.3161	2.1450
A8	1.1892	1.1487	1.1791	1.0000	1.3161	2.1199
A9	1.0000	1.1487	1.1791	1.1096	1.1892	1.7873
A10	1.0000	1.2457	1.1096	1.1096	1.3161	2.0184
					∑S <sub>i</sub>	22.8457

Table 13. Preference vector S from DM-3

Alternatives	C1 <sup>W<sub>i</sub></sup>	C2 <sup>W<sub>i</sub></sup>	C3 <sup>W<sub>i</sub></sup>	C4 <sup>W<sub>i</sub></sup>	C5 <sup>W<sub>i</sub></sup>	S <sub>i</sub>
A1	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.4953	2.6954
A2	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4953	2.5815
A3	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.4142	2.5491
A4	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4953	2.5815
A5	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.3050
A6	1.0000	1.1487	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.1254
A7	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.3161	2.1450
A8	1.1892	1.1487	1.1791	1.0000	1.4142	2.2780
A9	1.0000	1.1487	1.1791	1.1096	1.3161	1.9779
A10	1.0000	1.2457	1.1096	1.1096	1.4142	2.1689
					∑S <sub>i</sub>	23.4077

**3.6. Calculating vector V**

Based on (3), the V vector is calculated by dividing the value of the S<sub>i</sub> vector by the total number of S<sub>i</sub> vectors. Tables 14-16 are the results of V vector calculations from decision-makers. Looking at the results of the calculations in Table 11, the value of ∑S<sub>i</sub> is 22.7724. The value of V<sub>i</sub> as shown in Table 14 is obtained from:

$$\begin{aligned}
 V_1 &= S_1 / \sum S_i \\
 &= 2.5491 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.111939 \\
 V_2 &= S_2 / \sum S_i \\
 &= 2.4415 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.107211 \\
 V_3 &= S_3 / \sum S_i \\
 &= 2.5491 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.111939 \\
 V_4 &= S_4 / \sum S_i \\
 &= 2.4415 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.107211 \\
 V_5 &= S_5 / \sum S_i \\
 &= 2.4372 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.107024 \\
 V_6 &= S_6 / \sum S_i \\
 &= 2.1254 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.093333 \\
 V_7 &= S_7 / \sum S_i \\
 &= 2.1450 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.094193 \\
 V_8 &= S_8 / \sum S_i \\
 &= 2.2780 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.100032 \\
 V_9 &= S_9 / \sum S_i \\
 &= 1.7873 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.078483 \\
 V_{10} &= S_{10} / \sum S_i \\
 &= 2.0184 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.088635
 \end{aligned}$$

Table 14. Preference's vector v from DM-1

Alternatives	Vi	Ranking
A1	0.111939	1
A2	0.107211	3
A3	0.111939	2
A4	0.107211	4
A5	0.107024	5
A6	0.093333	8
A7	0.094193	7
A8	0.100032	6
A9	0.078483	10
A10	0.088635	9

Table 15. Preference's vector v from DM-2

Alternatives	Vi	Ranking
A1	0.118361	1
A2	0.113362	2
A3	0.104171	5
A4	0.107211	3
A5	0.107024	4
A6	0.098687	6
A7	0.094193	7
A8	0.093090	8
A9	0.078483	10
A10	0.088635	9

Table 16. Preference's vector v from DM-3

Alternatives	Vi	Ranking
A1	0.118361	1
A2	0.113362	2
A3	0.111939	4
A4	0.113362	3
A5	0.101217	5
A6	0.093333	9
A7	0.094193	8
A8	0.100032	6
A9	0.086856	10
A10	0.095244	7

Table 17 is the final result of the decision-makers, in the form of ranking with the highest weight to the lowest weight generated from the WP method. Table 18 is the result of giving Borda points from the preferences of each decision-maker. Furthermore, the final results of ranking in the GDSS in the form of the most recommended alternative order are presented in Table 19. This is indicated by the highest Borda score, as can be seen in Table 19.

Table 17. Decision maker evaluation results

Ranking	DM-1	DM-2	DM-3
A1	A1	A1	A1
A3	A2	A2	A3
A2	A4	A4	A2
A4	A5	A3	A4
A5	A3	A5	A5
A8	A6	A8	A8
A7	A7	A10	A7
A6	A8	A7	A6
A10	A10	A6	A10
A9	A9	A9	A9

Table 18. Borda voting results

Alternatives	DM-1	DM-2	DM-3	Values
A1	9	9	9	27
A2	7	8	8	23
A3	8	5	6	19
A4	6	7	7	20
A5	5	6	5	16
A6	2	4	1	7
A7	3	3	2	8
A8	4	2	4	10
A9	0	0	0	0
A10	1	1	3	5

Table 19. Borda ranking

Ranking	Alternatives	Score
1	A1	27
2	A2	23
3	A4	20
4	A3	19
5	A5	16
6	A8	10
7	A7	8
8	A6	7
9	A10	5
10	A9	0

Based on Table 19, the ranking is obtained in the order A1 has a score of 27, A2 has a score of 23, and so on. The alternative A1 score of 27 is obtained from the score of the Borda model from decision maker 1, decision maker 2, and decision maker 3 of 9 points. Likewise alternative A2 gets a weight of 23 from decision maker 1 of 7, and decision maker 2 and decision maker 3 each of 8. This is an advantage of the developed model, so the best alternative is the result of the aggregation of each decision maker.



The results of the calculation of the weights of the Borda model have provided a single weight from several weights obtained from the decision makers. This can provide a level of confidence in the results of the decision-making process. The selected alternative is the best alternative out of 3 decision makers based on predetermined criteria. Furthermore, the implementation in software using a web-based application obtained the same results as the calculations described in the previous discussion as can be seen in Figure 2. This provides important information that the developed model and the software that is applied to a web-based environment can be used as a tool for management in higher education to determine lecturers to accompany students' creativity programs.

Preference from Decision Maker 1															
DM #	ID.	Alternative	NIP.	Name	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	Total
1	DM1	A1	196607121990031003	YULIAN MIRZA	1.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.4142	2.5491
2	DM1	A10	197611082000031002	ALAN NOVI TOMPUNU	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	1.0000	1.2457	1.1096	1.1096	1.3161	2.0184
3	DM1	A2	196909282005011002	MUSTAZIRI	1.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.4415
4	DM1	A3	197805152006041003	MEIYI DARLIES	1.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.4142	2.5491
5	DM1	A4	197912172012121001	MOHAMMAD MIFTAKUL AMIN	1.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.4415
6	DM1	A5	197310012002122007	ISNAINY AZRO	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.4953	2.4372
7	DM1	A6	198103182008121002	HERLAMBANG SAPUTRA	1.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	1.0000	1.1487	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.1254
8	DM1	A7	197703292001122002	EMA LAILA	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.3161	2.1450
9	DM1	A8	197005232005011004	AZWARDI	2.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	1.1892	1.1487	1.1791	1.0000	1.4142	2.2780

Figure 2. Implementation of GDSS using web based application

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Knowing the results and discussions that have been described, it can be argued that the combination of the WP and Borda methods can be used as a model in making the GDSS. The recommendations generated by the GDSS can be used as a reference by decision-makers in the Computer Engineering Department of the Sriwijaya State Polytechnic, which consists of the DM-1, the DM-2, and the DM-3. This method can be used to determine suitable lecturer candidates to accompany PKM activities. To improve the performance of the GDSS model that has been built, several other methods can be chosen to make preferences independently by decision-makers, as well as aggregation in groups.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS




The authors would like to thank the Directorate General of Vocational Education, Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology for providing research grants for applied research schemes for the 2022 fiscal year.

#### REFERENCES




- [1] P. Laguna-Sánchez, J. Palomo, C. de la Fuente-Cabrero, and M. de Castro-Pardo, "A Multiple Criteria Decision Making Approach to Designing Teaching Plans in Higher Education Institutions," *Mathematics*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 9, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.3390/math9010009.
- [2] D. Belmawa, (in Indonesia: *Buku Pedoman 1 Program Kreativitas Mahasiswa, Pedoman Umum*). Handbook 1 Student Creativity Program, General Guidelines. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2021.
- [3] R. W. S. Kusumadewi, S. Hartati, and A. Harjoko, *Fuzzy Multi-Attribute Decision Making (Fuzzy MADM)*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi Offset, 2006.
- [4] H. G. Costa, "AHP-De Borda: a hybrid multicriteria ranking method," *Brazilian Journal of Operations and Production Management*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 281–287, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.14488/bjopm.2017.v14.n3.a1.
- [5] C.-F. Tsai, Y.-H. Hu, and S.-W., and G. Ke, "A Borda count approach to combine subjective and objective based MIS journal rankings," *Online Information Review*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 469–483, Jun. 2014, doi: 10.1108/oir-11-2013-0253.

- [6] C. H. Primasari, R. Wardoyo, and A. K. Sari, "Integrated AHP, Profile Matching, and TOPSIS for selecting type of goats based on environmental and financial criteria," *International Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 28, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.26555/ijain.v4i1.105.
- [7] F. A. Yulianto, K. Kuspriyanto, and T. N. Suharsono, "DT-MSOF Strategy and its Application to Reduce the Number of Operations in AHP," *Journal of ICT Research and Applications*, vol. 12, no. 3, p. 237, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.5614/itbj.ict.res.appl.2018.12.3.3.
- [8] Humaira, Rasyidah, Junaldi, and I. Rahmayuni, "The Comprehensive Mamdani Inference to Support Scholarship Grantee Decision," *JOIV: International Journal on Informatics Visualization*, vol. 5, no. 2, May 2021, doi: 10.30630/joiv.5.2.449.
- [9] S. G. Fashoto, O. Amaonwu, and A. Afolunsho, "Development of A Decision Support System on Employee Performance Appraisal using AHP Model," *JOIV: International Journal on Informatics Visualization*, vol. 2, no. 4, p. 262, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.30630/joiv.2.4.160.
- [10] S. Aggarwal and S. Sagar, "An Analytical Approach for Decision-Making," *JOIV: International Journal on Informatics Visualization*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 114, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.30630/joiv.2.3.123.
- [11] M. Azmi, Y. Sonatha, and I. Rahmayuni, "GDSS Prototype Model for Supplier Selection at MDM Cooperative," *JOIV: International Journal on Informatics Visualization*, vol. 5, no. 1, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.30630/joiv.5.1.473.
- [12] D. Meidelfi, Yulherniwati, F. Sukma, D. Chandra, and A. H. S. Jonas, "The Implementation of SAW and BORDA Method to Determine the Eligibility of Students' Final Project Topic," *JOIV: International Journal on Informatics Visualization*, vol. 5, no. 2, May 2021, doi: 10.30630/joiv.5.1.447.
- [13] D. Saputra, K. Widiyanto, T. Setiyorini, and I. Alfarobi, "Decision Support System for Cloud Computing Service Selection Using the Weighted Product Method (Case Study: PT. Deptech Digital Indonesia)," *International Journal of Science, Technology and Management*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 78–92, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.46729/ijstm.v2i1.103.
- [14] N. Aminudin *et al.*, "Weighted Product and Its Application to Measure Employee Performance," *International Journal of Engineering and Technology*, vol. 7, no. 2.26, p. 102, May 2018, doi: 10.14419/ijet.v7i2.26.14362.
- [15] S. R. Arifin and J. C. Mintamanis, "Decision Support System for Determining Thesis Supervisor using A Weighted Product (WP) Method," *Jurnal Online Informatika*, vol. 3, no. 2, p. 80, Feb. 2019, doi: 10.15575/join.v3i2.230.
- [16] H. Supriyono and C. P. Sari, "Developing decision support systems using the weighted product method for house selection," in *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 2018, doi: 10.1063/1.5042905.
- [17] C. Bire, D. Kasse, and R. Bire, "Decision support system for selecting tourist attractions using fuzzy analytic hierarchy process," *Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 1252–1261, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.11591/eei.v10i3.3032.
- [18] C. R. Pattnaik, S. N. Mohanty, S. Mohanty, J. M. Chatterjee, B. Jana, and V. G. Diaz, "A fuzzy multi-criteria decision-making method for purchasing life insurance in India," *Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 344–356, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.11591/eei.v10i1.2275.
- [19] H. Fanghua and C. Guanchun, "A Fuzzy Multi-Criteria Group Decision-Making Model Based on Weighted Borda Scoring Method for Watershed Ecological Risk Management: a Case Study of Three Gorges Reservoir Area of China," *Water Resources Management*, vol. 24, no. 10, pp. 2139–2165, Dec. 2009, doi: 10.1007/s11269-009-9544-9.
- [20] C. Meshram and S. S. Agrawal, "Fuzzy Multi-criteria Decision Making associated with Risk and Confidence Attributes," *Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics*, vol. 4, no. 3, Sep. 2015, doi: 10.11591/eei.v4i3.506.
- [21] J. Zou and Z. Qiu, "An Improved Fuzzy Borda Count and its Application to Watershed Management," in *Proceedings of the 2016 4th International Conference on Renewable Energy and Environmental Technology (ICREET 2016)*, 2017, doi: 10.2991/icreet-16.2017.45.
- [22] R. K. Dewi, E. M. A. Jonemaro, A. P. Kharisma, N. A. Farah, and M. F. Dewantoro, "TOPSIS for mobile based group and personal decision support system," *Register: Jurnal Ilmiah Teknologi Sistem Informasi*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 43, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.26594/register.v7i1.2140.
- [23] S. Lestari, T. B. Adj, and A. E. Permanasari, "Performance Comparison of Rank Aggregation Using Borda and Copeland in Recommender System," in *2018 International Workshop on Big Data and Information Security (IWBSI)*, May 2018, doi: 10.1109/iwbsi.2018.8471722.
- [24] R. Ramadiani, S. Adithama, and M. L. Jundillah, "Selecting goldfish broods use the weighted product and simple additive weighting methods," *IAES International Journal of Artificial Intelligence (IJ-AI)*, vol. 11, no. 4, p. 1405, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.11591/ijai.v11.i4.pp1405-1413.
- [25] N. D. Hulkower and J. Neatrou, "Deflecting Arrow by Aggregating Rankings of Multiple Correlated Criteria According to Borda," *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis*, vol. 23, no. 3–4, pp. 75–86, Apr. 2016, doi: 10.1002/mcda.1568.
- [26] W. R. W. Mohd and L. Abdullah, "Aggregation Methods in Group Decision Making: A Decade Survey," *Informatica*, vol. 41, no. 1, Feb. 2017.
- [27] S. Fatimah, A. Laongko, and M. Tombolotutu, "Borda application of selection planning scheduling method in dock engineering consultants in Central Sulawesi province Indonesia," *Corporate Board role duties and composition*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 131–136, 2015, doi: 10.22495/cbv11i1c1art5.
- [28] M. M. Amin and Y. Dwitayanti, "Group decision support system model to determine prospective participants for lecturer strengthening activities," *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology*, vol. 99, no. 20, pp. 4715–4726, 2021.
- [29] T. Abidin and S. Wiyono, "Comparison of Borda and NRF (Normalized Rating Frequency) in Recommender System," *JOMLAI: Journal of Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 1, no. 3, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.55123/jomlai.v1i3.1026.
- [30] P. H. K. Murti, B. Wirjodirdjo, A. Bastari, and A. Ahmadi, "Using of profile matching and borda method in predicting threats country in asean," *JOURNAL ASRO*, vol. 12, no. 01, p. 173, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.37875/asro.v12i01.395.
- [31] M. Santos, T. Silva, C. Gomes, J. Vieira, and R. Walker, "Mapping the Perception of Users as the Usability of Smartphones: Benchmarking Features through the Borda Count Method," in *Lecture Notes in Management and Industrial Engineering*, Springer International Publishing, 2018, pp. 57–64, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-93488-4\_7.




**BIOGRAPHIES OF AUTHORS**

**M. Miftakul Amin**    received the Bachelor degree in Informatic Engineering from University of Technology Yogyakarta in 2004, and received Master of Engineering in Informatics Computer System from the Gadjah Mada University in 2010. Currently he is Lecturer in the Department of Computer Engineering at the State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia. He can be contacted at email: [miftakul\\_a@polsri.ac.id](mailto:miftakul_a@polsri.ac.id).



**Adi Sutrisman**    received the Bachelor degree in Informatic Engineering from STMIK Bandung in 2001 and received Master of Computer from the Binadarma University in 2012. Currently he is Lecturer in the Department of Computer Engineering at the State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia. He can be contacted at email: [adisutrisman@polsri.ac.id](mailto:adisutrisman@polsri.ac.id).



**Yevi Dwitayanti**    received the Bachelor degree in Accounting from Indonesian Islamic University in 2004 and received Master of Science in Accounting from the Gadjah Mada University in 2010. Currently she is Lecturer in the Department of Accounting at the State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia. She can be contacted at email: [yevi\\_dwitayanti@polsri.ac.id](mailto:yevi_dwitayanti@polsri.ac.id).

# Group decision support system model to determine supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs

*by Amin M Miftakul*

---

**Submission date:** 04-Apr-2023 05:16PM (UTC+0700)

**Submission ID:** 2055526433

**File name:** termine\_supervisor\_lecturers\_for\_student\_creativity\_programs.pdf (538.42K)

**Word count:** 6267

**Character count:** 29794

## Group decision support model to determine supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs

M. Miftakul Amin<sup>1</sup>, Adi Sutrisman<sup>1</sup>, Yevi Dwitayanti<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Engineering, State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Department of Accounting, State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia

### Article Info

#### Article history:

Received Sep 14, 2022

Revised Dec 16, 2022

Accepted Jan 11, 2023

#### Keywords:

Borda

Group decision support system

Weighted product

### ABSTRACT

A group decision support system (GDSS) model was created in this study by implementing the weighted product (WP) method and the borda method to determine prospective assistant or supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs (PKMs) that are routinely carried out every year at the Sriwijaya State Polytechnic. This study applies 5 criteria, including i) education level, ii) academic position, iii) group tenure, iv) lecturer certification, and v) achievement in the field of three pillars of higher education. The decision-makers in this study consisted of the head of the department (DM-1), the secretary of the department (DM-2), and the head of the study program (DM-3) where they carried out the decision-making process in groups. The WP method is used to make preferences independently of the decision-makers to determine the best alternative based on predetermined criteria. The borda method is currently used to aggregate the decision-makers to obtain the final result in the form of an alternative ranking. The results of this study are sufficient to be used as a reference in determining the supervisor lecturer for PKM activities at the Department of Computer Engineering, State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya.

6

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



### Corresponding Author:

M. Miftakul Amin

Department of Computer Engineering, State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya

Srijaya Negara Road, Bukit Besar, Palembang, 30139, Indonesia

Email: miftakul\_a@polsri.ac.id

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Higher education in an ever-changing environment, so its sustainability depends on the ability to adapt to these changes [1]. The student creativity program (PKM) is a manifestation of the implementation of the Tridharma of Higher Education launched by the Directorate General of Higher Education in 2021. This program is one of the efforts to grow, accommodate, and realize creative and innovative ideas for students. The impact of this activity is the improvement in student and university achievement in ranking at the Ministry of Education and Culture [2]. To support the activities of the PKM, the Sriwijaya State Polytechnic at the department level appointed several lecturers to assist students in preparing proposals for proposed activities, writing techniques, and implementing activities. For this reason, an objective mechanism in determining the candidate for supervisor lecturers for activities is very much needed to obtain optimal results. Some of the criteria that become the basis for determining suitable lecturer candidates to become activity supervisors include education level, academic position, group tenure, lecturer certification, and the lecturer's achievement in the activities of the three pillars of higher education.

To increase the objectivity of decision-making, the decision-making approach is carried out in groups [3]. The group decision-making process occurs when each individual is characterized by his or her perceptions,

attitudes, and motivations. According to Costa [4] decision making is a fairly complex problem to be solved, and produce a ranking of the selected alternatives [5]. Integration and combination of several models can improve the performance of decision-making systems [6]. This is related to accuracy and computational processing [7]. Decision support systems have been widely applied in various fields, including in the field of education which is used to determine scholarship grantees [8], in the field of human resource management it is used for employee performance appraisal [9], even in the political field, this kind of decision support system used to determine political parties in general elections [10].

Several studies on group decision support systems (GDSS) were conducted by Azmi *et al.* [11] where they developed a GDSS model for supplier selection using a combination of analytic hierarchy process (AHP), technique for order preference by similarity to ideal solution (TOPSIS), and Borda methods. This study sets 6 criteria to determine the best supplier, namely price, quality, delivery, location, inventory, and flexibility. The combination of these 3 methods has resulted in a GDSS model that is quite adequate to determine the best supplier ranking. Another GDSS research was also conducted by Meidelfi *et al.* [12] who combined the SAW and Borda methods to determine the final project's topic. This study sets 4 criteria and 10 topics in model testing. The decision-makers, in this case, consist of 2 lecturers as evaluators of research topics. The research has succeeded in producing a sequential list of recommended research topics.

Research conducted by Saputra *et al.* [13] using the weighted product (WP) method aims to determine the ideal cloud computing service. This study establishes as many as 11 criteria used in the consideration of decision making and 6 alternatives that can be selected in cloud computing services. This research has resulted in the best ranking in determining cloud computing services. The use of the WP method is also used in measuring employee performance by Aminudin *et al.* [14]. In this study, 5 criteria were used, consisting of attendance, behavior, experience, discipline, and teamwork. This study determines 5 alternatives to test the model and produce a ranking in the form of the order of the best employee performance.

The WP method is also used by Arifin and Mintamanis [15] to determine the thesis supervisor. This study sets as many as 10 criteria in determining the decision, while the alternatives used in the model are only 3 alternatives. However, this research has succeeded in proving that the WP method can be used in the multiple criteria decision-making model. As the output, this research can produce the best ranking for thesis supervisor candidates. Research conducted by Supriyono and Sari [16] also uses the WP method to determine house selection. This study establishes 11 criteria which are categorized into 2 groups, namely cost, and benefit. The alternatives used in model testing consist of 3 alternatives. This research has produced a list of recommended house rankings.

Decision making with a multicriteria decision making approach has been implemented in a study conducted by Bire *et al.* [17] using a fuzzy AHP and native AHP approach to determine tourist attractions in the city of Kupang. Both of these approaches produce equally good outputs in the decision-making process. However, the fuzzy AHP approach gives better results in calculations. This study uses 9 criteria in determining the best alternative. Likewise, research by Pattnaik *et al.* [18] uses fuzzy multi criteria decision making (MCDM) and TOPSIS approaches to determine alternative life insurance in India. There are 10 criteria used to determine the best alternative. This study also uses a sensitivity analysis approach to ensure the effectiveness of the developed model.

Research conducted by Fanghua and Guanchun [19] developed a fuzzy multi-criteria group decision-making (FMCGDM) model to carry out environmental risk analysis of watersheds. This study conducted tests using 5 criteria and 3 alternatives, and involved 4 decision makers. Research shows optimal results in weight loads. Other research on the topic of multi-criteria decision-making was also carried out by Meshram and Agrawal [20] which places more emphasis on the aspects of risk analysis and the confidence of an attribute being considered. Research conducted by Zou and Qiu [21] implementing fuzzy borda for watershed management. Research on group decisions was also carried out by Dewi *et al.* [22] using the TOPSIS approach and the Borda method. This model is implemented in a mobile application to make it easier for tourists to visit tourist destinations in the city of Malang.

According to research conducted by Lestari *et al.* [23] comparing 2 aggregation methods, namely the Borda method and Copeland, the results show that the Borda method is better than Copeland. Likewise in terms of processing speed, Borda method is faster than Copeland. This research is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the methodology and architecture of model. Section 3 describes the research results, and discussion. Section 4 contains conclusions.

## 2. METHOD

This study aims to build a GDSS model using the WP and Borda methods. Both of these methods are used to improve the quality of the results of decision making. This segment reviews in more detail the two methods.

## 2.1. Architecture system design of group decision support system

Figure 1 is the architecture of the developed model. In this architecture, the GDSS model developed consisted of 3 decision-makers, namely the head of the department (DM-1), the secretary of the department (DM-2), and the head of the study program (DM-3). This modeling stage starts from individual preferences by each decision-maker using the WP method to generate a ranking of alternatives. Furthermore, after the ranking results from each decision-maker are obtained, the ranking is calculated using the Borda points to produce the final ranking of the recommendation process using the GDSS.




Figure 1. System architecture of GDSS

## 2.2. Weighted product method

WP is a method of making multiple criteria decisions that are used to solve cases that have data with many attributes [24]. The WP method uses multiplication to connect attribute ratings where the rating of each attribute must be raised first with the weight of the attribute concerned [3]. In general, several steps to perform calculations using the WP method are as follows:

- Determination of the criteria used as the basis in determining the decision. The criteria are symbolized by  $C_i$ , where  $i$  is the number of criteria determined to be used as a reference in decision making.
- Determine the suitability rating for the criteria. This is done by creating a decision matrix, and ranking the suitability of each criterion.
- Determination of the normalized weight value.

$W$  is the weight of each criterion that will be calculated. The formula for finding the value of  $W$  is:

$$W_j = \frac{w_j}{\sum w_j} \quad (1)$$

After this calculation, the value of  $W$  will be ranged 0 to 1 where the total of all  $W$  is 1. Then,  $W$  is multiplied by 1 for the attribute worth benefit, and  $W$  is multiplied by -1 for the attribute worth the cost.

- Calculating preference values for alternatives as vector  $S$   
The preference value for the alternative is calculated based on (2):

$$S_i = \prod_{j=1}^n X_{ij}^{w_j} \quad (2)$$

Description:

$S$  : preference alternative  
 $w$  : criterion weight  
 $X$  : criterion value  
 $i$  : alternative  $i$  to  $n$

$j$  : criterion

– Calculating the relative preference value as vector  $V$

Vector  $V$  is the result of a preference for each alternative. In (3) is the formula used to calculate the value of  $V$ .

$$V_i = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^n x_{ij} w_j}{\prod_{j=1}^n x_{ij} w_j} \quad (3)$$

After the value of  $V$  is obtained, then it is sorted by the largest value of  $V$ .

– Ranking the value of the vector  $V$

At this stage, it will be known which alternative has the highest  $V_i$  value which is the result of the decision and is the best alternative.

### 2.3. Borda method

The principle of the Borda method is to do alternative voting by weighting the value on each alternative ranking [23], [25]. The alternative that has the top rank is given the highest score, and so on in descending order where lower values are given to the rank below it until the lowest rank is given a value of 0 (zero) or 1 [26]. The Borda method is one of the aggregation methods that are quite effective in GDSS applications [27]-[30]. Even [23] mentions that the Borda method can be used to [37] the sparsity data. On the other hand, according to [31] Borda method is done by sorting all alternatives from the largest value to the smallest value with a value of 0.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this study, the problem discussed in the decision-making to determine the assistant lecturer for PKM activities, at the Sriwijaya State Polytechnic. The following are the steps involved in the decision-making process. The implementation of these two methods will be explained in more detail.

### 3.1. Independent assessment by decision makers using the weighted product method

The stages in performing calculations independently by decision-makers are executed using the WP method. The decision-makers consisted of the DM-1, the DM-2, and DM-3 at the Computer Engineering Department of the Sriwijaya State Polytechnic. The initial step taken is to determine the criteria and the value of the weight of the criteria as a reference in decision making. Table 1 presents the criteria and the weight of the criteria defined.

Table 1. Criteria and criteria weight

Criteria	Description	Category	Criteria weight
C1	Education level	Benefit	5
C2	Academic position	Benefit	4
C3	Group tenure	Benefit	5
C4	Lecturer certification	Benefit	3
C5	Achievement in the field of three pillars of higher education	Benefit	5

Criteria C1 to C4 will have the same value trend between decision-makers (DM). This is because the data is standard and does not require objective expert judgment from each decision-maker. Meanwhile, the C5 criteria will have varied values from each decision-maker given it will be based on the perceptions of each decision-maker. This variable value depends on the point of view of the decision makers based on the performance achievements of each alternative on the C5 criteria, because there is no standard reference based on certain values such as in criteria C1 to C4, where each criterion has a value that becomes reference.

### 3.2. Determine the criteria scale

The data obtained in this study is qualitative so that it requires a scale value of each criterion to facilitate the calculation process. Table 2 is the scale for the C1 criteria for education level. Table 3 is a criterion scale for lecturers' academic positions. Table 4 is the criteria scale for group tenure, and Table 5 presents the criteria scale for lecturer certification which only contains information on certified and uncertified.

Meanwhile, Table 6 contains information that tends to be subjective from decision-makers whose content depends on the perception of each decision-maker. Table 6 is related to the performance of each lecturer based on higher education tridharma activities. Each lecturer has a different performance in the fields of teaching, research, community service, and supporting activities in higher education. So, there are no

*Group decision support system model to determine supervisor lecturers for student ... (M. Mifiakul Amin)*



parameters that are set specifically. So that each lecturer is likely to get a varied score, depending on the preferences of the decision makers.

Table 2. Criteria scale of education level

No.	Qualification	Scale
1	S2-Master	1
2	S3-Doctor	2

Table 3. Criteria scale of academic position

No.	Qualification	Scale
1	Instructor	1
2	Lecturers	2
3	Senior Lecturers	3
4	Assoc. Professors	4
5	Professors	5

Table 4. Criteria scale of group tenure

No.	Qualification	Scale
1	0-5 years	1
2	6-10 years	2
3	11-15 years	3
4	16-20 years	4
5	> 20 years	5

Table 5. Criteria scale of lecturer certification

No.	Qualification	Scale
1	Uncertified	1
2	Certified	2

Table 6. Criteria scale of achievement in the field of the pillar's of higher education

No.	Qualification	Scale
1	Very poor	1
2	Poor	2
3	Enough	3
4	Good	4
5	Very good	5

3.3. Entering alternative data

Tables 7-9 are the distribution of preference data from decision-makers (DM-1, DM-2, and DM-3). The alternative data tested into the model are 10 alternatives and are distributed for each of the 5 criteria. This data is lecturer data from the D3 computer engineering study program, in the Department of Computer Engineering at the Sriwijaya State Polytechnic. In this model the lecturer's name is not presented in detail using the name, but uses initials in the form of A1, A2, ..., A10.

Table 7. Data preference from DM-1

No.	Alternatives	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
1	A1	1	4	4	2	4
2	A2	1	4	3	2	4
3	A3	1	4	4	2	4
4	A4	1	4	3	2	4
5	A5	1	3	3	2	5
6	A6	1	2	3	2	4
7	A7	1	3	3	2	3
8	A8	2	2	3	1	4
9	A9	1	2	3	2	2
10	A10	1	3	2	2	3

Table 8. Data preference from DM-2

No.	Alternatives	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
1	A1	1	4	4	2	5
2	A2	1	4	3	2	5
3	A3	1	4	4	2	3
4	A4	1	4	3	2	4
5	A5	1	3	3	2	5
6	A6	1	2	3	2	5
7	A7	1	3	3	2	3
8	A8	2	2	3	1	3
9	A9	1	2	3	2	2
10	A10	1	3	2	2	3

Table 9. Data preference from DM-3

No.	Alternatives	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
1	A1	1	4	4	2	5
2	A2	1	4	3	2	5
3	A3	1	4	4	2	4
4	A4	1	4	3	2	5
5	A5	1	3	3	2	4
6	A6	1	2	3	2	4
7	A7	1	3	3	2	3
8	A8	2	2	3	1	4
9	A9	1	2	3	2	3
10	A10	1	3	2	2	4

**3.4. Calculating the normalization weight value**

This weight is calculated using (1) following the weight criteria in Table 1 so that the weight normalization is obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 W &= (5, 4, 3, 3, 5) \\
 W1 &= 5 / (5 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 5) = 0.25 \\
 W2 &= 4 / (5 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 5) = 0.20 \\
 W3 &= 3 / (5 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 5) = 0.15 \\
 W4 &= 3 / (5 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 5) = 0.15 \\
 W5 &= 5 / (5 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 5) = 0.25
 \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, it is ensured that the accumulated value of this weight is equal to 1 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 w1 + w2 + w3 + w4 + w5 &= 1 \\
 0.25 + 0.20 + 0.15 + 0.15 + 0.25 &= 1
 \end{aligned}$$

Table 10 is the result of the normalization of the weights of the criteria that have been defined in Table 1 obtained by using (1). The normalized value of  $W_j$  also has the same value, because all criteria categories are in the form of benefits, so they are multiplied by 1. If the criteria category is cost, then it is multiplied by -1.

Table 10. Normalization of weight criteria

C <sub>i</sub>	W <sub>j</sub>	W <sub>j</sub> normalized
C1	0.25	0.25
C2	0.20	0.20
C3	0.15	0.15
C4	0.15	0.15
C5	0.25	0.25
Σ	1.00	

**3.5. Calculating vector S**

Vector S is calculated by referring to (2). In calculating the S vector, the categories of cost and benefit criteria are considered. The cost category will be negative and the benefit value will be positive. Referring to Table 1, it can be seen that all categories are positive so that the normalized  $W_j$  is also positive. Tables 11-13 are the results of the calculation of the S vector from the decision-makers. For example, vector S is obtained by using (2) where the information contained in Table 11 can be described as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 S1 &= (1^{0.25} (4^{0.20}) (4^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (4^{0.25}) = 2.5491 \\
 S2 &= (1^{0.25} (4^{0.20}) (3^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (4^{0.25}) = 2.4415 \\
 S3 &= (1^{0.25} (4^{0.20}) (4^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (4^{0.25}) = 2.5491 \\
 S4 &= (1^{0.25} (4^{0.20}) (3^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (4^{0.25}) = 2.4415 \\
 S5 &= (1^{0.25} (3^{0.20}) (3^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (5^{0.25}) = 2.4372 \\
 S6 &= (1^{0.25} (2^{0.20}) (3^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (4^{0.25}) = 2.1254 \\
 S7 &= (1^{0.25} (3^{0.20}) (3^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (3^{0.25}) = 2.1450 \\
 S8 &= (2^{0.25} (2^{0.20}) (3^{0.15}) (1^{0.15}) (4^{0.25}) = 2.2780 \\
 S9 &= (1^{0.25} (2^{0.20}) (3^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (2^{0.25}) = 1.7873 \\
 S10 &= (1^{0.25} (3^{0.20}) (2^{0.15}) (2^{0.15}) (3^{0.25}) = 2.0184
 \end{aligned}$$

Table 11. Preference vector S from DM-1

Alte	C1 <sup>W<sub>j</sub></sup>	C2 <sup>W<sub>j</sub></sup>	C3 <sup>W<sub>j</sub></sup>	C4 <sup>W<sub>j</sub></sup>	C5 <sup>W<sub>j</sub></sup>	Si
A1	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.4142	2.5491
A2	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.4415
A3	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.4142	2.5491
A4	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.4415
A5	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.4953	2.4372
A6	1.0000	1.1487	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.1254
A7	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.3161	2.1450
A8	1.1892	1.1487	1.1791	1.0000	1.4142	2.2780
A9	1.0000	1.1487	1.1791	1.1096	1.1892	1.7873
A10	1.0000	1.2457	1.1096	1.1096	1.3161	2.0184
					ΣSi	22.7724

14 Table 12. Preference vector S from DM-2

Alternatives	C1 <sup>^</sup> W <sub>j</sub>	C2 <sup>^</sup> W <sub>j</sub>	C3 <sup>^</sup> W <sub>j</sub>	C4 <sup>^</sup> W <sub>j</sub>	C5 <sup>^</sup> W <sub>j</sub>	S <sub>i</sub>
A1	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.4953	2.6954
A2	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4953	2.5815
A3	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.3161	2.3722
A4	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.4415
A5	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.4953	2.4372
A6	1.0000	1.1487	1.1791	1.1096	1.4953	2.2474
A7	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.3161	2.1450
A8	1.1892	1.1487	1.1791	1.0000	1.3161	2.1199
A9	1.0000	1.1487	1.1791	1.1096	1.1892	1.7873
A10	1.0000	1.2457	1.1096	1.1096	1.3161	2.0184
					ΣS <sub>i</sub>	22.8457

Table 13. Preference vector S from DM-3

Alternatives	C1 <sup>^</sup> W <sub>j</sub>	C2 <sup>^</sup> W <sub>j</sub>	C3 <sup>^</sup> W <sub>j</sub>	C4 <sup>^</sup> W <sub>j</sub>	C5 <sup>^</sup> W <sub>j</sub>	S <sub>i</sub>
A1	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.4953	2.6954
A2	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4953	2.5815
A3	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.4142	2.5491
A4	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4953	2.5815
A5	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.3050
A6	1.0000	1.1487	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.1254
A7	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.3161	2.1450
A8	1.1892	1.1487	1.1791	1.0000	1.4142	2.2780
A9	1.0000	1.1487	1.1791	1.1096	1.3161	1.9779
A10	1.0000	1.2457	1.1096	1.1096	1.4142	2.1689
					ΣS <sub>i</sub>	23.4077

### 3.6. Calculating vector V

Based on (3), the V vector is calculated by dividing the value of the S<sub>i</sub> vector by the total number of S<sub>i</sub> vectors. Tables 14-16 are the results of V vector calculations from decision-makers. Looking at the results of the calculations in Table 11, the value of ΣS<sub>i</sub> is 22.7724. The value of V<sub>i</sub> as shown in Table 14 is obtained from:

$$\begin{aligned}
 V_1 &= S_1 / \Sigma S_i \\
 &= 2.5491 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.111939 \\
 V_2 &= S_2 / \Sigma S_i \\
 &= 2.4415 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.107211 \\
 V_3 &= S_3 / \Sigma S_i \\
 &= 2.5491 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.111939 \\
 V_4 &= S_4 / \Sigma S_i \\
 &= 2.4415 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.107211 \\
 V_5 &= S_5 / \Sigma S_i \\
 &= 2.4372 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.107024 \\
 V_6 &= S_6 / \Sigma S_i \\
 &= 2.1254 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.093333 \\
 V_7 &= S_7 / \Sigma S_i \\
 &= 2.1450 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.094193 \\
 V_8 &= S_8 / \Sigma S_i \\
 &= 2.2780 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.100032 \\
 V_9 &= S_9 / \Sigma S_i \\
 &= 1.7873 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.078483 \\
 V_{10} &= S_{10} / \Sigma S_i \\
 &= 2.0184 / 22.7724 \\
 &= 0.088635
 \end{aligned}$$

Table 14. Preference's vector v from DM-1

Alternatives	$V_i$	Ranking
A1	0.111939	1
A2	0.107211	3
A3	0.111939	2
A4	0.107211	4
A5	0.107024	5
A6	0.093333	8
A7	0.094193	7
A8	0.100032	6
A9	0.078483	10
A10	0.088635	9

Table 15. Preference's vector v from DM-2

Alternatives	$V_i$	Ranking
A1	0.118361	1
A2	0.113362	2
A3	0.104171	5
A4	0.107211	3
A5	0.107024	4
A6	0.098687	6
A7	0.094193	7
A8	0.093090	8
A9	0.078483	10
A10	0.088635	9

Table 16. Preference's vector v from DM-3

Alternatives	$V_i$	Ranking
A1	0.118361	1
A2	0.113362	24
A3	0.111939	4
A4	0.113362	3
A5	0.101217	5
A6	0.093333	9
A7	0.094193	8
A8	0.100032	6
A9	0.086856	10
A10	0.095244	7

Table 17 is the final result of the decision-makers, in the form of ranking with the highest weight to the lowest weight generated from the WP method. Table 18 is the result of giving Borda points from the preferences of each decision-maker. Furthermore, the final results of ranking in the GDSS in the form of the most recommended alternative order are presented in Table 19. This is indicated by the highest Borda score, as can be seen in Table 19.

41  
Table 17. Decision maker evaluation results

Ranking	DM-1	DM-2	DM-3
A1	A1	A1	A1
A3	20	A2	A3
A2	A4	A4	A2
A4	A5	A3	A4
A5	A3	A5	A5
A8	A6	A8	A8
A7	A7	A10	A7
A6	A8	A7	A6
A10	A10	A6	A10
A9	A9	A9	A9

Table 18. Borda voting results

Alternatives	DM-1	DM-2	DM-3	Values
A1	9	9	9	27
A2	7	8	8	23
A3	8	5	6	19
A4	6	7	7	20
A5	5	6	5	16
A6	2	4	1	7
A7	3	3	2	8
A8	4	2	4	10
A9	0	0	0	0
A10	1	1	3	5

Table 19. Borda ranking

Rank	Alternatives	Score
1	A1	27
2	A2	23
3	A4	20
4	A3	19
5	A5	16
6	A8	10
7	A7	8
8	A6	7
9	A10	5
10	A9	0

Based on Table 19, the ranking is obtained in the order A1 has a score of 27, A2 has a score of 23, and so on. The alternative A1 score of 27 is obtained from the score of the Borda model from decision maker 1, decision maker 2, and decision maker 3 of 9 points. Likewise alternative A2 gets a weight of 23 from decision maker 1 of 7, and decision maker 2 and decision maker 3 each of 8. This is an advantage of the developed model, so the best alternative is the result of the aggregation of each decision maker.

The results of the calculation of the weights of the Borda model have provided a single weight from several weights obtained from the decision makers. This can provide a level of confidence in the results of the decision-making process. The selected alternative is the best alternative out of 3 decision makers based on predetermined criteria. Furthermore, the implementation in software using a web-based application obtained the same results as the calculations described in the previous discussion as can be seen in Figure 2. This provides important information that the developed model and the software that is applied to a web-based environment can be used as a tool for management in higher education to determine lecturers to accompany students' creativity programs.

Preference from Decision Maker 1															
DM #	ID	Alternative	NIP	Name	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	Total
1	DM1	A1	196607121990031003	YULIAN MIRZA	1.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.4142	2.5491
2	DM1	A10	197611082000031002	ALAN NOVI TOMPUNU	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	1.0000	1.2457	1.1096	1.1096	1.3161	2.0184
3	DM1	A2	196909282005011002	MUSTAZIRI	1.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.4415
4	DM1	A3	197805152006041003	MEYI DARLIES	1.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	1.0000	1.3195	1.2311	1.1096	1.4142	2.5491
5	DM1	A4	197912172012121001	MOHAMMAD MIPTAKUL AMIN	1.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	1.0000	1.3195	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.4415
6	DM1	A5	197310012002122007	ISNAINY AZRO	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.4953	2.4372
7	DM1	A6	198103182008121002	HERLAMBANG SAPUTRA	1.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	1.0000	1.1487	1.1791	1.1096	1.4142	2.1254
8	DM1	A7	197703292001122002	EMA LAILA	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	1.0000	1.2457	1.1791	1.1096	1.3161	2.1450
9	DM1	A8	197005232005011004	AZWARDI	2.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	1.1892	1.1487	1.1791	1.0000	1.4142	2.2780

Figure 2. Implementation of GDSS using web based application

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Knowing the results and discussions that have been described, it can be argued that the combination of the WP and Borda methods can be used as a model in making the GDSS. The recommendations generated by the GDSS can be used as a reference by decision-makers in the Computer Engineering Department of the Sriwijaya State Polytechnic, which consists of the DM-1, the DM-2, and DM-3. This method can be used to determine suitable lecturer candidates to accompany PKM activities. To improve the performance of the GDSS model that has been built, several other methods can be chosen to make preferences independently by decision-makers, as well as aggregation in groups.

#### 7 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS




The authors would like to thank the Directorate General of Vocational Education, Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology for providing research grants for applied research schemes for the 2022 fiscal year.

#### REFERENCES




- [1] P. Laguna-Sánchez, J. Palomo, C. de la Fuente-Cabrero, and M. de Castro-Pardo, "A Multiple Criteria Decision Making Approach to Designing Teaching Plans in Higher Education Institutions," *Mathematics*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 9, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.3390/math9010009.
- [2] D. Belmawa, (in Indonesia: *Buku Pedoman 1 Program Kreativitas Mahasiswa, Pedoman Umum*). Handbook 1 Student Creativity Program, General Guidelines. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2021.
- [3] R. W. S. Kusumadewi, S. Hartati, and A. Harjoko, *Fuzzy Multi-Attribute Decision Making (Fuzzy MADM)*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi Offset, 2006.
- [4] H. G. Costa, "AHP-De Borda: a hybrid multicriteria ranking method," *Brazilian Journal of Operations and Production Management*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 281–287, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.14488/bjopm.2017.v14.n3.a1.
- [5] C.-F. Tsai, Y.-H. Hu, and S.-W., and G. Ke, "A Borda count approach to combine subjective and objective based MIS journal rankings," *Online Information Review*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 469–483, Jun. 2014, doi: 10.1108/oir-11-2013-0253.

- [6] C. H. Primasari, R. Wardoyo, and A. K. Sari, "Integrated AHP, Profile Matching, and TOPSIS for selecting type of goats based on environmental and financial criteria," *International Journal of Advances in Intelligent Informatics*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 28, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.26555/ijain.v4i1.105.
- [7] F. A. Yulianto, K. Kuspriyanto, and T. N. Suharsono, "DT-MSOF Strategy and its Application to Reduce the Number of Operations in AHP," *Journal of ICT Research and Applications*, vol. 12, no. 3, p. 237, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.5614/itbj.ict.res.appl.2018.12.3.3.
- [8] Humaira, Rasvidah, Junaldi, and I. Rahmayuni, "The Comprehensive Mamdani Inference to Support Scholarship Grantee Decision," *JOIV: International Journal on Informatics Visualization*, vol. 5, no. 2, May 2021, doi: 10.30630/joiv.5.2.449.
- [9] S. G. Fashoto, O. Amaonwu, and A. Afoloruso, "Development of A Decision Support System on Employee Performance Appraisal using AHP Model," *JOIV: International Journal on Informatics Visualization*, vol. 2, no. 4, p. 262, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.30630/joiv.2.4.160.
- [10] S. Aggarwal and S. Sagar, "An Analytical Approach for Decision-Making," *JOIV: International Journal on Informatics Visualization*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 114, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.30630/joiv.2.3.123.
- [11] M. Azmi, Y. Sonatha, and I. Rahmayuni, "GDSS Prototype Model for Supplier Selection at MDM Cooperative," *JOIV: International Journal on Informatics Visualization*, vol. 5, no. 1, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.30630/joiv.5.1.473.
- [12] D. Meidelfi, Yulherniwati, F. Sukma, D. Chandra, and A. H. S. Jonas, "The Implementation of SAW and BORDA Method to Determine the Eligibility of Students' Final Project Topic," *JOIV: International Journal on Informatics Visualization*, vol. 5, no. 2, May 2021, doi: 10.30630/joiv.5.1.447.
- [13] D. Saputra, K. Widianto, T. Setiyorini, and I. Alfarobi, "Decision Support System for Cloud Computing Service Selection Using the Weighted Product Method (Case Study: PT. Deptech Digital Indonesia)," *International Journal of Science, Technology and Management*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 78–92, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.46729/ijstm.v2i1.103.
- [14] N. Aminudin *et al.*, "Weighted Product and Its Application to Measure Employee Performance," *International Journal of Engineering and Technology*, vol. 7, no. 2.26, p. 102, May 2018, doi: 10.14419/ijet.v7i2.26.14362.
- [15] S. R. Arifin and J. C. Mintamanis, "Decision Support System for Determining Thesis Supervisor using A Weighted Product (WP) Method," *Jurnal Online Informatika*, vol. 3, no. 2, p. 80, Feb. 2019, doi: 10.15575/join.v3i2.230.
- [16] H. Supriyono and C. P. Sari, "Developing decision support systems using the weighted product method for house selection," in *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 2018, doi: 10.1063/1.5042905.
- [17] C. Bire, D. Kasse, and R. Bire, "Decision support system for selecting tourist attractions using fuzzy analytic hierarchy process," *Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 1252–1261, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.11591/eei.v10i3.3032.
- [18] C. R. Pattnaik, S. N. Mohanty, S. Mohanty, J. M. Chatterjee, B. Jana, and V. G. Diaz, "A fuzzy multi-criteria decision-making method for purchasing life insurance in India," *Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 344–356, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.11591/eei.v10i1.2275.
- [19] H. Fanghua and C. Guanchun, "A Fuzzy Multi-Criteria Group Decision-Making Model Based on Weighted Borda Scoring Method for Watershed Ecological Risk Management: a Case Study of Three Gorges Reservoir Area of China," *Water Resources Management*, vol. 24, no. 10, pp. 2139–2165, Dec. 2009, doi: 10.1007/s11269-009-9544-9.
- [20] C. Meshram and S. S. Agrawal, "Fuzzy Multi-criteria Decision Making associated with Risk and Confidence Attributes," *Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics*, vol. 4, no. 3, Sep. 2015, doi: 10.11591/eei.v4i3.506.
- [21] J. Zou and Z. Qiu, "An Improved Fuzzy Borda Count and its Application to Watershed Management," in *Proceedings of the 2016 4th International Conference on Renewable Energy and Environmental Technology (ICREET 2016)*, 2017, doi: 10.2991/icreet-16.2017.45.
- [22] R. K. Dewi, E. M. A. Jonemaro, A. P. Kharisma, N. A. Farah, and M. F. Dewantoro, "TOPSIS for mobile based group and personal decision support system," *Register: Jurnal Ilmiah Teknologi Sistem Informasi*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 43, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.26594/register.v7i1.2140.
- [23] S. Lestari, T. B. Adji, and A. E. Permasari, "Performance Comparison of Rank Aggregation Using Borda and Copeland in Recommender System," in *2018 International Workshop on Big Data and Information Security (IWBSI)*, May 2018, doi: 10.1109/iwbsi.2018.8471722.
- [24] R. Ramadani, S. Adithama, and M. L. Jundillah, "Selecting goldfish broods use the weighted product and simple additive weighting methods," *IAES International Journal of Artificial Intelligence (IJ-AI)*, vol. 11, no. 4, p. 1405, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.11591/ijai.v11i4.pp1405-1413.
- [25] N. D. Hulkower and J. Neatrou, "Deflecting Arrow by Aggregating Rankings of Multiple Correlated Criteria According to Borda," *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis*, vol. 23, no. 3–4, pp. 75–86, Apr. 2016, doi: 10.1002/mcda.1568.
- [26] W. R. W. Mohd and L. Abdullah, "Aggregation Methods in Group Decision Making: A Decade Survey," *Informatika*, vol. 41, no. 1, Feb. 2017.
- [27] S. Fatimah, A. Laongko, and M. Tombolotutu, "Borda application of selection planning scheduling method in dock engineering consultants in Central Sulawesi province Indonesia," *Corporate Board role duties and composition*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 131–136, 2015, doi: 10.22495/cbv11i1c1art5.
- [28] M. M. Amin and Y. Dwitayanti, "Group decision support system model to determine prospective participants for lecturer strengthening activities," *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology*, vol. 99, no. 20, pp. 4715–4726, 2021.
- [29] T. Abidin and S. Wiyono, "Comparison of Borda and NRF (Normalized Rating Frequency) in Recommender System," *JOMLAI: Journal of Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 1, no. 3, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.55123/jomlai.v1i3.1026.
- [30] P. H. K. Murti, B. Wirjodirdjo, A. Bastari, and A. Ahmadi, "Using of profile matching and borda method in predicting threats country in asean," *JOURNAL ASRO*, vol. 12, no. 01, p. 173, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.37875/asro.v12i01.395.
- [31] M. Santos, T. Silva, C. Gomes, J. Vieira, and R. Walker, "Mapping the Perception of Users as the Usability of Smartphones: Benchmarking Features through the Borda Count Method," in *Lecture Notes in Management and Industrial Engineering*, Springer International Publishing, 2018, pp. 57–64, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-93488-4\_7.




**BIOGRAPHIES OF AUTHORS**

**M. Miftakul Amin**    received the Bachelor degree in Informatic Engineering from University of Technology Yogyakarta in 2004, and received Master of Engineering in Informatics Computer System from the Gadjah Mada University in 2010. Currently he is Lecturer in the Department of Computer Engineering at the State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia. He can be contacted at email: miftakul\_a@polsri.ac.id.



**Adi Sutrisman**    received the Bachelor degree in Informatic Engineering from STMIK Bandung in 2001 and received Master of Computer from the Binadarma University in 2012. Currently he is Lecturer in the Department of Computer Engineering at the State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia. He can be contacted at email: adisutrisman@polsri.ac.id.



**Yevi Dwitayanti**    received the Bachelor degree in Accounting from Indonesian Islamic University in 2004 and received Master of Science in Accounting from the Gadjah Mada University in 2010. Currently she is Lecturer in the Department of Accounting at the State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia. She can be contacted at email: yevi\_dwitayanti@polsri.ac.id.

# Group decision support system model to determine supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs

## ORIGINALITY REPORT

**21** %  
SIMILARITY INDEX

**16** %  
INTERNET SOURCES

**13** %  
PUBLICATIONS

**6** %  
STUDENT PAPERS

## PRIMARY SOURCES

<b>1</b>	<a href="http://www.jatit.org">www.jatit.org</a> Internet Source	<b>2</b> %
<b>2</b>	M. Mahaputra Hidayat, Rani Pubaningtyas, R. Dimas Adityo, Eka Ramadhana Puriyadi. "Decision Support System for The Selection of Digital Advertising Provider for Car Sales Using Weight Product Method (case Study : Pt. Media Tech Indonesia)", JEECS (Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences), 2023 Publication	<b>1</b> %
<b>3</b>	<a href="http://www.beei.org">www.beei.org</a> Internet Source	<b>1</b> %
<b>4</b>	<a href="http://ejurnal.seminar-id.com">ejurnal.seminar-id.com</a> Internet Source	<b>1</b> %
<b>5</b>	Submitted to University of Basrah - College of Science Student Paper	<b>1</b> %



6	Christa Bire, Daniel Kasse, Rio Bire. "Decision support system for selecting tourist attractions using fuzzy analytic hierarchy process", Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics, 2021 Publication	1 %
7	"Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Electronics, Biomedical Engineering, and Health Informatics", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2021 Publication	1 %
8	<a href="http://eprints.itenas.ac.id">eprints.itenas.ac.id</a> Internet Source	1 %
9	"Group Decision and Negotiation in an Uncertain World", Springer Nature America, Inc, 2018 Publication	1 %
10	<a href="http://worldwidescience.org">worldwidescience.org</a> Internet Source	1 %
11	<a href="http://www.researchgate.net">www.researchgate.net</a> Internet Source	1 %
12	<a href="http://feb.unhas.ac.id">feb.unhas.ac.id</a> Internet Source	<1 %
13	<a href="http://store.econometrics.com">store.econometrics.com</a> Internet Source	<1 %

[journal.universitasbumigora.ac.id](http://journal.universitasbumigora.ac.id)

14

Internet Source

<1 %

---

15

Marwa H. Abed, Wasan A. Wali, Musaab Alaziz. "Modeling and simulation of a pipeline leak detection using smart inspection ball", Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics, 2023

Publication

<1 %

---

16

[www.mdpi.com](http://www.mdpi.com)

Internet Source

<1 %

---

17

[ejournal.unisbablitar.ac.id](http://ejournal.unisbablitar.ac.id)

Internet Source

<1 %

---

18

[assets.publishing.service.gov.uk](http://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk)

Internet Source

<1 %

---

19

Herri Setiawan, Husnawati -, Tasmi -. "Assessment System of Local Government Projects Prototype in Indonesia", International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications, 2021

Publication

<1 %

---

20

Submitted to Institute of Graduate Studies, UiTM

Student Paper

<1 %

---

21

[ejournal.st3telkom.ac.id](http://ejournal.st3telkom.ac.id)

Internet Source

<1 %

---

- |    |  |      |
|----|--|------|
| 22 | Huda Salim Alhasan, Jawad Hasan, Sawsan Alharoon. "The Effect of Pyridostigmine as an Antidote for Botulinum Type A: An Experimental Study on Rabbits", F1000Research, 2022<br>Publication   | <1 % |
| 23 | Sukadji Sarbi, Basri, Muhammad Muslihudin, Winia Waziana, Ria Rukmana. "Fuzzy Multiple Attribute Decision Making Approach for Determining The Best Vocational High School", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2019<br>Publication | <1 % |
| 24 | <a href="http://ejurnal.stmik-budidarma.ac.id">ejurnal.stmik-budidarma.ac.id</a><br>Internet Source  | <1 % |
| 25 | <a href="http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk">etheses.whiterose.ac.uk</a><br>Internet Source  | <1 % |
| 26 | <a href="http://koreascience.kr">koreascience.kr</a><br>Internet Source  | <1 % |
| 27 | <a href="http://www.ctege.info">www.ctege.info</a><br>Internet Source  | <1 % |
| 28 | <a href="http://www.sciencegate.app">www.sciencegate.app</a><br>Internet Source  | <1 % |
| 29 | Biswa Ranjan Senapati, Pabitra Mohan Khilar, Rakesh Ranjan Swain. "Environmental monitoring through Vehicular Ad Hoc   | <1 % |

Network: A productive application for smart cities", International Journal of Communication Systems, 2021

Publication

30

Submitted to Universitas Sebelas Maret

Student Paper

<1 %

31

Submitted to Vietnamese-German University

Student Paper

<1 %

32

[infor.seaninstitute.org](http://infor.seaninstitute.org)

Internet Source

<1 %

33

Submitted to University of Leeds

Student Paper

<1 %

34

[umpir.ump.edu.my](http://umpir.ump.edu.my)

Internet Source

<1 %

35

[journal.binadarma.ac.id](http://journal.binadarma.ac.id)

Internet Source

<1 %

36

John Mourmouris, Thomas Poufinas. "Multi-criteria decision-making methods applied in health-insurance underwriting", Health Systems, 2022

Publication

<1 %

37

Murni Marbun, Muhammad Zarlis, Zulkifli Nasution. "Analysis of Application of the SAW, WP and TOPSIS Methods in Decision Support System Determining Scholarship Recipients at

<1 %

# University", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2021

Publication

38

Robert Junaidi, Abu Hasan, Mustain Zamhari. "Influence the Addition of Lapindo Mud is Calcined to the Quality of Cement Podzoland by Using Electric Furnace", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2019

Publication

<1 %

39

arxiv.org  
Internet Source

<1 %

40

ideas.repec.org  
Internet Source

<1 %

41

journalppw.com  
Internet Source

<1 %

42

mecs-press.net  
Internet Source

<1 %

43

media.neliti.com  
Internet Source

<1 %

44

A Bachriwindi, E K Putra, U M Munawaroh, A T W Almais. "Implementation of Web-Based Weighted Product Use Decision Support System to Determine the Post-Disaster Damage and Loss", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2019

Publication

<1 %

45	Chintia Ananda, Diana Teresia Spits Warnars, Harco Leslie Hendric Spits Warnars. "Chapter 5 Implementation of the Weighted Product Method to Specify scholarship's Receiver", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2022 Publication	<1 %
46	Online Information Review, Volume 38, Issue 4 (2014-09-16) Publication	<1 %
47	ebin.pub Internet Source	<1 %
48	hdl.handle.net Internet Source	<1 %
49	ojs.stmikpringsewu.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
50	penerbitadm.com Internet Source	<1 %
51	www.intechopen.com Internet Source	<1 %
52	Sarifah Putri Raflesia, Dinda Lestarini, Rizka Dhini Kurnia, Dinna Yunika Hardiyanti. "Using machine learning approach towards successful crowdfunding prediction", Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics, 2023 Publication	<1 %

53

Hamdani Hamdani, Retantyo Wardoyo, Khabib Mustofa. "A Method of Weight Update in Group Decision Making to Accommodate the Interests of All the Decision Makers", International Journal of Intelligent Systems and Applications, 2017

Publication

<1 %

---

Exclude quotes Off


Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On






## Dokumen Bukti Korespondensi

### Group decision support system model to determine supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs

https://beei.org/index.php/EEI/author/index/completed



http://beei.org | ISSN 2089-3191, e-ISSN 2302-9285

HOME ABOUT USER HOME SEARCH CURRENT ARCHIVES ANNOUNCEMENTS

Home > User > Author > Archive

## Archive

ACTIVE ARCHIVE

ID	MM-DD SUBMIT	SEC	AUTHORS	TITLE	STATUS
4784	09-14	Information	Amin, Sutrisman, Dwitayanti	GROUP DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM MODEL TO DETERMINE...	Vol 12, No 4: August 2023

1 - 1 of 1 Items

**Start a New Submission**  
CLICK HERE to go to step one of the five-step submission process.

USER

You are logged in as...  
mmiftakulamin

- My Profile
- Log Out

CITATION ANALYSIS

- Dimensions
- Google Scholar
- Scholar Metrics
- Scinapse
- Scopus

QUICK LINKS

- Guide of Authors
- Online Papers Submission

1 - 1 of 1 Items

**Start a New Submission**  
CLICK HERE to go to step one of the five-step submission process.

## Refbacks

ALL NEW PUBLISHED IGNORED

	DATE ADDED	HITS	URL	ARTICLE	TITLE	STATUS	ACTION
<input type="checkbox"/>	2023-03-15	1	https://www.google.com/	Group decision support system model to determine supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs	—	New	EDIT   DELETE
<input type="checkbox"/>	2023-03-17	1	http://beei.org/index.php/EECSI/articleView/107...	Group decision support system model to determine supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs	—	New	EDIT   DELETE
<input type="checkbox"/>	2023-03-25	1	http://www.beei.org/index.php/EECSI/articleView...	Group decision support system model to determine supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs	—	New	EDIT   DELETE
<input type="checkbox"/>	2023-03-28	1	https://beei.org/	Group decision support system model to determine supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs	—	New	EDIT   DELETE
<input type="checkbox"/>	2023-04-01	1	https://scholar.google.com/	Group decision support system model to determine supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs	—	New	EDIT   DELETE

1 - 5 of 5 Items

[Publish](#) [Ignore](#) [Delete](#) [Select All](#)

02404913 Bulletin of EEI Stats

QUICK LINKS

- Guide of Authors
- Online Papers Submission
- Editorial Boards
- Reviewers
- Abstracting and Indexing
- Publication Ethics
- Visitor Statistics
- DOI Deposit Report
- Contact Us

AUTHOR

Submissions

- Active (0)
- Archive (1)
- New Submission

JOURNAL CONTENT

Search

Search Scope

All

Search

Browse

- By Issue
- By Author
- By Title

INFORMATION

- For Readers
- For Authors
- For Librarians





http://beei.org | ISSN 2089-3191, e-ISSN 2302-9285



- HOME
- ABOUT
- USER HOME
- SEARCH
- CURRENT
- ARCHIVES
- ANNOUNCEMENTS

Home > User > Author > Submissions > #4784 > Summary

## #4784 Summary

SUMMARY REVIEW EDITING

### Submission

Authors	M. Miftakul Amin, Adi Sutrisman, Yevi Dwitayanti
Title	Group decision support system model to determine supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs
Original file	<a href="#">4784-11293-1-SM.DOCX</a> 2022-09-14
Supp. files	None
Submitter	Mr. M. Miftakul Amin
Date submitted	September 14, 2022 - 03:14 AM
Section	Information System
Editor	Juan Jose Martinez Castillo  (Review) Muhammad Qomaruddin  (Review) Yilun Shang  (Review)
Author comments	Please for further processing.
Abstract Views	56

### Status

## Peer Review

### Round 1

Review Version	<a href="#">4784-11294-1-RV.DOCX</a> 2022-09-14
Initiated	2022-09-14
Last modified	2022-11-16
Uploaded file	None
Editor Version	None
Author Version	<a href="#">4784-12510-1-ED.DOCX</a> 2022-11-21 <a href="#">4784-12510-2-ED.DOCX</a> 2022-12-15

### Round 2

Review Version	<a href="#">4784-11294-2-RV.DOCX</a> 2022-12-15
Initiated	2022-12-15
Last modified	2023-01-20
Uploaded file	None

## Editor Decision

Decision	Accept Submission 2022-12-21
Notify Editor	Editor/Author Email Record  2023-01-11
Editor Version	None
Author Version	<a href="#">4784-12510-3-ED.DOCX</a> 2022-12-19 <a href="#">DELETE</a> <a href="#">4784-12510-4-ED.DOCX</a> 2023-01-03 <a href="#">DELETE</a> <a href="#">4784-12510-5-ED.PDF</a> 2023-01-03 <a href="#">DELETE</a> <a href="#">4784-12510-6-ED.PDF</a> 2023-01-03 <a href="#">DELETE</a> <a href="#">4784-12510-7-ED.DOCX</a> 2023-01-11 <a href="#">DELETE</a>

Upload Author Version  No file selected.

02404919 Bulletin of EEI Stats

**USER**

You are logged in as...  
mmiftakulamin

- My Profile
- Log Out

**CITATION ANALYSIS**

- Dimensions
- Google Scholar
- Scholar Metrics
- Scinapse
- Scopus

**QUICK LINKS**

- Guide of Authors
- Online Papers Submission
- Editorial Boards
- Reviewers
- Abstracting and Indexing
- Publication Ethics
- Visitor Statistics
- DOI Deposit Report
- Contact Us

**AUTHOR**

- Online Papers Submission
- Editorial Boards
- Reviewers
- Abstracting and Indexing
- Publication Ethics
- Visitor Statistics
- DOI Deposit Report
- Contact Us

**AUTHOR**

Submissions

- Active (0)
- Archive (1)
- New Submission

**JOURNAL CONTENT**

Search

Search Scope

All


Browse

- By Issue
- By Author
- By Title



**INFORMATION**

- For Readers
- For Authors
- For Librarians

https://beei.org/index.php/EEI/author/submissionEditing/4784



http://beei.org | ISSN 2089-3191, e-ISSN 2302-9285

HOME ABOUT USER HOME SEARCH CURRENT ARCHIVES ANNOUNCEMENTS

Home > User > Author > Submissions > #4784 > Editing

## #4784 Editing

SUMMARY REVIEW EDITING

### Submission

Authors: M. Miftakul Amin, Adi Sutrisman, Yevi Dwitayanti  
 Title: Group decision support system model to determine supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs  
 Section: Information System  
 Editor: Juan Jose Martinez Castillo (Review), Muhammad Qomaruddin (Review), Yilun Shang (Review)

### Copyediting

COPYEDIT INSTRUCTIONS

REVIEW METADATA	REQUEST	UNDERWAY	COMPLETE
1. Initial Copyedit File: None	—	—	—
2. Author Copyedit File: None	—	—	☑

**USER**

You are logged in as...  
mmiftakulamin

- My Profile
- Log Out

**CITATION ANALYSIS**

- Dimensions
- Google Scholar
- Scholar Metrics
- Scinapse
- Scopus

**QUICK LINKS**

- Guide of Authors
- Online Papers Submission
- Editorial Boards
- Reviewers
- Abstracting and Indexing
- Publication Ethics
- Visitor Statistics
- DOI Deposit Report
- Contact Us

**AUTHOR**

Submissions

- Active (0)
- Archive (1)

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/2/#search/beei/FMfcgzGrcFhRkvLdJXvnqVWZJXsDfhp

Compose

Mail: Inbox, Starred, Snoozed, Important, Sent, Drafts (4), Categories, Social, Updates, Forums, Promotions, More

Labels: +

Search: beei

Active

3 of 23

[BEEI Proofreading]4784 External Inbox

beei iaes <iaesbeei@gmail.com>  
to me, adisutrisman, yevi\_dwitayanti, Bulletin

Thu, Jan 19, 3:51PM

Dear Author,

Please find the attached file in PDF format. Please read and check your paper carefully start from title until biographies of authors. Make sure name author is correct (change name of author after published not acceptable) and all author emails are active so that we can send author certificate when your paper has been published. We cannot provide changes to papers that have been published. If you want to make an update, please bookmark it and leave your comments in the attached file below.

Please send a comment paper with replies to all previously sent emails. Please send your confirmation within 3x24 hours. If the deadline has passed, we will consider this paper as a final project.

Your cooperation is highly appreciated.

Thank you

One attachment • Scanned by Gmail

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/2/#search/bee/KtbxLrjKStzZSDgNdklhNlBgDBGjSjTsV

bee

Active

polri

2 of 23

#62-4784 Revision External Inbox x

Miftakul Amin <miftakul\_a@polsri.ac.id> to bee

Tue, Mar 14, 8:02 AM

Dear Editor(s),

we've made the number format dot(.) according to the revision directives. The results of the revision can be seen in the changes in Figure 2.

Thank you.

One attachment - Scanned by Gmail

62-4784-REV.docx

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/2/#search/bee/FMfcgzGslbJhXrKrnSmXRNPdHcRgjqzj

bee

Active

polri

1 of 23

[BEEI] Certificate of Acknowledgement as Author External Inbox x

iaesbee@gmail.com to me, adisutrisman, yevi\_dwitayanti

Fri, Mar 17, 11:14 AM



Dear

Herewith we send a certificate as an acknowledgment for your contribution as author in BEEI Journal. We are very thankful to publish your prestige paper. If there is any inquiry about the certificate do not hesitate to contact us through this email. We hope you will publish more in the future and spread the journal among your community.

Also we insert the link <https://beej.org/index.php/EEI/article/view/4784> for an online PDF of the Vol 12, No 4: August 2023 issue.

We encourage authors to share their published articles on social network and repositories, such as SSRN, arXiv, [academia.edu](http://academia.edu), ResearchGate, RePEc, Google Scholar, Mendeley, Zenodo, Archive, Slideshare, LinkedIn, Facebook, etc.

best regards  
BEEI TEAM  
Editorial Staff on behalf of Editor-in-Chief  
Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics (BEEI)  
Institute of Advanced Engineering and Science (IAES)  
ISSN: 2089-3191  
<http://beej.org>  
email: [iaesbee@gmail.com](mailto:iaesbee@gmail.com)



SCOPUS INDEXING

The screenshot shows the Scopus Sources page. At the top, there is a search bar with the text "Enter title" and a "Find sources" button. Below the search bar, a notification box titled "Improved Citescore" provides information about the updated methodology. The main content area displays "1 result" for the source "Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics". To the left, there are filter and display options.

**Filter refine list**

Apply Clear filters

**Display options**

- Display only Open Access journals
- Counts for 4-year timeframe
- No minimum selected
- Minimum citations

**1 result** [Download Scopus Source List](#) [Learn more about Scopus Source List](#)

All [Export to Excel](#) [Save to source list](#) View metrics for year: 2019

	Source title ↓	CiteScore ↓	Highest percentile ↓	Citations 2016-19 ↓	Documents 2016-19 ↓	% Cited ↓
<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics	1.3	39% 39/64 Computer Science (miscellaneous)	390	312	44

Scopus Preview

Author search Sources ? [Create account](#) [Sign in](#)

## Source details

[Feedback >](#) [Compare sources >](#)

### Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics

Scopus coverage years: from 2017 to Present  
 Publisher: Institute of Advanced Engineering and Science (IAES)  
 ISSN: 2089-3191 E-ISSN: 2302-9285

Subject area: [Computer Science: Computer Science \(miscellaneous\)](#) [Mathematics: Control and Optimization](#) [Engineering: Electrical and Electronic Engineering](#)  
[Computer Science: Computer Networks and Communications](#) [Engineering: Control and Systems Engineering](#) [View all v](#)

[View all documents >](#) [Set document alert](#) [Save to source list](#) [Journal Homepage](#)

CiteScore 2019 **1.3** [Add CiteScore to your site](#)

SJR 2019 **0.231**

SNIP 2019 **1.358**

### 1. SCIMAGO JR

Rank	Journal Name	Journal Type	Q3	Articles	Citations	h-index	g-index	SNIP	SJR	Impact Factor	
20	<a href="#">Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics</a>	journal	0.231 Q3	8	182	130	4072	199	130	1.53	22.37



<https://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21100826382&tip=sid&clean=0>

# Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics

<b>Country</b>	Indonesia - <a href="#">SIR Ranking of Indonesia</a>	<b>8</b> H Index
<b>Subject Area and Category</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computer Science                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computer Networks and Communications</li> <li>Computer Science (miscellaneous)</li> <li>Hardware and Architecture</li> <li>Information Systems</li> </ul> </li> <li>Engineering                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Control and Systems Engineering</li> <li>Electrical and Electronic Engineering</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mathematics                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Control and Optimization</li> </ul> </li> <li>Physics and Astronomy                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instrumentation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>Publisher</b>	Institute of Advanced Engineering and Science (IAES)	
<b>Publication type</b>	Journals	
<b>ISSN</b>	20893191, 23029285	
<b>Coverage</b>	2017-2019	

### Quartiles


	2018	2019
Computer Networks and Communications	Q1	Q2
Computer Science (miscellaneous)	Q1	Q2
Control and Optimization	Q1	Q2
Control and Systems Engineering	Q1	Q2
Electrical and Electronic Engineering	Q1	Q2
Hardware and Architecture	Q1	Q2
Information Systems	Q1	Q2
Instrumentation	Q1	Q2




● Total Cites    ● Self-Cites



2017 2018 2019



2017 2018 2019



**Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and...**

← Show this widget in your own website

Q3 Computer Networks and Communications best quartile

SJR 2019 0.23

powered by scimagojr.com

Just copy the code below and paste within your html code:

```
<a href="https://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21100826382&tip=sid&clean=0">https://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21100826382&tip=sid&clean=0</a>
```

SCOPUS INDEXING

The screenshot shows the Scopus Sources page. At the top, there is a search bar with the text "Enter title" and a "Find sources" button. Below the search bar, a notification box titled "Improved Citescore" provides information about the updated methodology. The main content area displays "1 result" for the source "Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics". To the left, there are filter and display options.

**Filter refine list**

Apply Clear filters

**Display options**

- Display only Open Access journals
- Counts for 4-year timeframe
- No minimum selected
- Minimum citations

**1 result**

Download Scopus Source List Learn more about Scopus Source List

View metrics for year: 2019

	Source title ↓	CiteScore ↓	Highest percentile ↓	Citations 2016-19 ↓	Documents 2016-19 ↓	% Cited ↓
<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics	1.3	39% 39/64 Computer Science (miscellaneous)	390	312	44

Scopus Preview

Author search Sources ? [Create account](#) [Sign in](#)

## Source details

Feedback > Compare sources >

### Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics

Scopus coverage years: from 2017 to Present  
 Publisher: Institute of Advanced Engineering and Science (IAES)  
 ISSN: 2089-3191 E-ISSN: 2302-9285

Subject area: [Computer Science: Computer Science \(miscellaneous\)](#) [Mathematics: Control and Optimization](#) [Engineering: Electrical and Electronic Engineering](#)  
[Computer Science: Computer Networks and Communications](#) [Engineering: Control and Systems Engineering](#) [View all](#) v

[View all documents](#) > [Set document alert](#) [Save to source list](#) [Journal Homepage](#)

CiteScore 2019 **1.3** [Add CiteScore to your site](#)

SJR 2019 **0.231**

SNIP 2019 **1.358**

### 1. SCIMAGO JR

Rank	Journal Name	Journal Type	Q3	Articles	Citations	Journal Score	Journal Rank	Journal Score	Journal Rank	Journal Score	Journal Rank
20	<a href="#">Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics</a>	journal	0.231 Q3	8	182	130	4072	199	130	1.53	22.37



<https://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21100826382&tip=sid&clean=0>

# Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics

<b>Country</b>	Indonesia - <a href="#">SIR Ranking of Indonesia</a>	<b>8</b> H Index
<b>Subject Area and Category</b>	<p>Computer Science</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computer Networks and Communications</li> <li>Computer Science (miscellaneous)</li> <li>Hardware and Architecture</li> <li>Information Systems</li> </ul> <p>Engineering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Control and Systems Engineering</li> <li>Electrical and Electronic Engineering</li> </ul> <p>Mathematics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Control and Optimization</li> </ul> <p>Physics and Astronomy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instrumentation</li> </ul>	
<b>Publisher</b>	Institute of Advanced Engineering and Science (IAES)	
<b>Publication type</b>	Journals	
<b>ISSN</b>	20893191, 23029285	
<b>Coverage</b>	2017-2019	


### Quartiles

	2018	2019
Computer Networks and Communications	Q1	Q2
Computer Science (miscellaneous)	Q1	Q2
Control and Optimization	Q1	Q2
Control and Systems Engineering	Q1	Q2
Electrical and Electronic Engineering	Q1	Q2
Hardware and Architecture	Q1	Q2
Information Systems	Q1	Q2
Instrumentation	Q1	Q2




● Total Cites    ● Self-Cites

2017 2018 2019



2017 2018 2019



**Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and...**

← Show this widget in your own website

Q3 Computer Networks and Communications best quartile

SJR 2019 0.23

powered by scimagojr.com

Just copy the code below and paste within your html code:

```
<a href="https://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21100826382&tip=sid&clean=0">https://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21100826382&tip=sid&clean=0</a>
```

# CERTIFICATE

No. 4784/BEEI/A/03/2023


Bulletin of Electrical Engineering and Informatics (BEEI)

is hereby awarding this certificate to  
M. Miftakul Amin, Adi Sutrisman, Yevi Dwitayanti

in recognition of his/her contribution in this scientific journal  
as *Authors* for paper entitled:

***Group decision support system model to determine supervisor lecturers for student creativity programs***

in Vol. 12, No. 4, August 2023



ISSN 2089-3191  
<http://beei.org>

Yogyakarta, March 17, 2023

  
**Tole Sutikno**  
Managing Director, Journals