Dear Mr. Irfan Syamsuddin:

Congratulations - your paper #1570769281 ('Selecting ChatBot Platform for Health Enterprise Training: A Fuzzy AHP Approach') submitted for DASA'21 has been accepted with major revisions. Your paper will be reviewed once more after submitting your revised version. You are kindly requested to complete the online copyright form that can be accessed through edas before uploading the final version, and use the reviewers evaluations and comments in preparing the final manuscript of your paper. Your manuscript should be prepared as a two column pdf file without the page numbers using the standard IEEE 2-column paper format that can be found at: http://www.ieee.org/conferences_events/conferences/publishing/templates.html

Please note that according to IEEE xplore publishing Criteria: any paper with high similarity or excessive citation for the used references & self citation must be rejected. Moreover You can download the acceptance/VISA letters from EDAS:
1. Log into EDAS site and find your paper.
2. Toward the bottom of the page, you will find in the properties column the words "visa letter", and beside it, an image.
3. Click on this image, and you will be able to confirm or change your address information reflected in the letter.
4. Then the system will generate the letter for your use.

The reviews are below or can be found at https://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1570769281.

======= Full Review 1 =======

> *** Strengths/Weakness: What are the major reasons to accept/reject the paper? [Be brief.]

This manuscript is not well organised and loses the novelty point therefore, the manuscript needs to handle multi-points
1.   rewrite the abstract from the beginnings by a focus on the "idea, develop points in this method presented by author(s)" and compare the results of this manuscript with other papers as values
2.   multi figures and information appear ambiguous and not clear.
3.   add a new section under the title the hypothesis and limitations of the developed method present by the author(s)
4.   multi-points in this manuscript need justification and prove by the author(s) after each table or figure give a specific description of the result submitted by it described in three into five lines
5.   add a new section discuss the results with details and explain it the main advantages and disadvantages of their method based on the author(s) opinion
6.   the main benefit of previous works is to compare your work with it from points(techniques, preprocessing stage, results or evaluation measures), while the author(s) in this manuscript do not compare their works with the previous works from any points. therefore, must add table the finally the related works analysis the previous work from points "techniques used, preprocessing techniques, type of dataset used, evaluation measures, advantage and disadvantages of that technique).
7.   the manuscript must contain references related to the five last years at least 2/3 from the total number of references also all references must contain doi, in general the following

reference related to your manuscript used it

------ Intelligent forecaster of concentrations (PM2.5, PM10, NO2, CO, O3, SO2) caused air pollution (IFCsAP). Neural Comput & Applic (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-021-06067-7

------ An Innovative synthesis of deep learning techniques (DCapsNet & DCOM) for generation electrical renewable energy from wind energy. Soft Comput 24, 10943-10962 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-020-04905-9

------ A new method for the prediction of air pollution based on intelligent computation. Soft Comput 24, 661-680 (2020) doi:10.1007/s00500-019-04495-1

------A nifty collaborative analysis to predicting a novel tool (DRFLLS) for missing values estimation, Springer, Soft Comput (2020), Volume 24, Issue 1, pp 555-569. DOI 10.1007/s00500-019-03972-x

------(2020) Multi Objectives Optimization to Gas Flaring Reduction from Oil Production. In: Farhaoui Y. (eds) Big Data and Networks Technologies. BDNT 2019. Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems, vol 81. Springer, Cham. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-23672-4_10

------"Mobile Cloud Computing: Challenges and Future Research Directions," IEEE, 2017 10th International Conference on Developments in eSystems Engineering (DeSE), Paris, 2017, pp. 62-67. Doi: 10.1109/DeSE.2017.21

------Synthesis Biometric Materials Based on Cooperative Among (DSA, WOA and gSpan-FBR) to Water Treatment. In: Abraham A. et al. (eds) Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Soft Computing and Pattern Recognition (SoCPaR 2020). SoCPaR 2020. Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, vol 1383. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-73689-7_3

-----(2021) A Comparative Analysis of DNA Protein Synthesis for Solving Optimization Problems: A Novel Nature-Inspired Algorithm. In: Abraham A., Sasaki H., Rios R., Gandhi N., Singh U., Ma K. (eds) Innovations in Bio-Inspired Computing and Applications. IBICA 2020. Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, vol 1372. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-73603-3_1
-----(2019) 'Evaluation prediction techniques to achievement an optimal biomedical analysis', Int. J. Grid and Utility Computing, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp.512–527.
------ (2020) A Novel Software to Improve Healthcare Base on Predictive Analytics and Mobile Services for Cloud Data Centers. In: Farhaoui Y. (eds) Big Data and Networks Technologies. BDNT 2019. Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems, vol 81. Springer, Cham
•   DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-23672-4_23

8.   Rewrite the Conclusions through extended it also must present complete flowchart or block diagram of the Methodology,
9.   required deep analysis for results because what present not enough this point very important, require from author(s) present more effort to enhance your'manscript.

10. write algorithm represent the detail of proposed method as complete algorithm contain all detials based on the suggest refences in point 7
11. The quality of some figures in this manuscript not accept and need redraw because this is scientific paper not report; where in multi section of this manuscript is appear as report.
12. Finally add the block diagram or flowchart for the flow stage of your 'method pulse the complete algorithm that require in point 10.

> *** Contribution/s & Detailed comments: What are the major issues addressed in the paper? Do you consider them important? Comment on the degree of novelty, creativity and technical depth in the paper. Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as feedback to the authors.

This manuscript is not well organised and loses the novelty point therefore, the manuscript needs to handle multi-points
1. rewrite the abstract from the beginnings by a focus on the "idea, develop points in this method presented by author(s)" and compare the results of this manuscript with other papers as values
2. multi figures and information appear ambiguous and not clear.
3. add a new section under the title the hypothesis and limitations of the developed method present by the author(s)
4. multi-points in this manuscript need justification and prove by the author(s) after each table or figure give a specific description of the result submitted by it described in three into five lines
5. add a new section discuss the results with details and explain it the main advantages and disadvantages of their method based on the author(s) opinion
6. the main benefit of previous works is to compare your work with it from points(techniques, preprocessing stage, results or evaluation measures), while the author(s) in this manuscript do not compare their works with the previous works from any points. therefore, must add table the finally the related works analysis the previous work from points "techniques used, preprocessing techniques, type of dataset used, evaluation measures, advantage and disadvantages of that technique).
7. the manuscript must contain references related to the five last years at least 2/3 from the total number of references also all references must contain doi, in general the following reference related to your manuscript used it

------ Intelligent forecaster of concentrations (PM2.5, PM10, NO2, CO, O3, SO2) caused air pollution (IFCsAP). Neural Comput & Applic (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-021-06067-7

------ An Innovative synthesis of deep learning techniques (DCapsNet & DCOM) for generation electrical renewable energy from wind energy. Soft Comput 24, 10943-10962 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-020-04905-9

------ A new method for the prediction of air pollution based on intelligent computation. Soft Comput 24, 661-680 (2020) doi:10.1007/s00500-019-04495-1

------A nifty collaborative analysis to predicting a novel tool (DRFLLS) for missing values estimation, Springer, Soft Comput (2020), Volume 24, Issue 1, pp 555-569.

DOI 10.1007/s00500-019-03972-x

------(2020) Multi Objectives Optimization to Gas Flaring Reduction from Oil Production. In: Farhaoui Y. (eds) Big Data and Networks Technologies. BDNT 2019. Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems, vol 81. Springer, Cham. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-23672-4_10

------"Mobile Cloud Computing: Challenges and Future Research Directions," IEEE, 2017 10th International Conference on Developments in eSystems Engineering (DeSE), Paris, 2017, pp. 62-67.
Doi: 10.1109/DeSE.2017.21

------Synthesis Biometric Materials Based on Cooperative Among (DSA, WOA and gSpan-FBR) to Water Treatment. In: Abraham A. et al. (eds) Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Soft Computing and Pattern Recognition (SoCPaR 2020). SoCPaR 2020. Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, vol 1383. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-73689-7_3

-----(2021) A Comparative Analysis of DNA Protein Synthesis for Solving Optimization Problems: A Novel Nature-Inspired Algorithm. In: Abraham A., Sasaki H., Rios R., Gandhi N., Singh U., Ma K. (eds) Innovations in Bio-Inspired Computing and Applications. IBICA 2020. Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, vol 1372. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-73603-3_1
-----(2019) 'Evaluation prediction techniques to achievement an optimal biomedical analysis', Int. J. Grid and Utility Computing, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp.512–527.
------ (2020) A Novel Software to Improve Healthcare Base on Predictive Analytics and Mobile Services for Cloud Data Centers. In: Farhaoui Y. (eds) Big Data and Networks Technologies. BDNT 2019. Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems, vol 81. Springer, Cham
•   DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-23672-4_23

8.   Rewrite the Conclusions through extended it also must present complete flowchart or block diagram of the Methodology,
9.   required deep analysis for results because what present not enough this point very important, require from author(s) present more effort to enhance your'manscript.
10.   write algorithm represent the detail of proposed method as complete algorithm contain all detials based on the suggest refences in point 7
11.   The quality of some figures in this manuscript not accept and need redraw because this is scientific paper not report; where in multi section of this manuscript is appear as report.
12.   Finally add the block diagram or flowchart for the flow stage of your 'method pulse the complete algorithm that require in point 10.

> *** Originality: New or Novel contribution
Weak Accept (6)

> *** Significance of Topic: Relating to knowledge contribution
Weak Accept (6)

> *** Presentation: Clarity and Organisation of Content
Weak Accept (6)

======= Full Review 2 =======

> *** Strengths/Weakness: What are the major reasons to accept/reject the paper? [Be brief.]

The paper is of adequate technical quality; however, its presentation needs to be enhanced.

> *** Contribution/s & Detailed comments: What are the major issues addressed in the paper? Do you consider them important? Comment on the degree of novelty, creativity and technical depth in the paper. Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as feedback to the authors.

1. In the second line of the abstract, correct the spelling of the word "Chabot" to "Chatbot".

2. In the Abstract, the authors mentioned that: "It is finally recommended to use Carik platform to deliver in-house training in the corporation." Hence in order that their recommendation be precise and not over-claimed, they should also mention the names of the three Chatbot technologies considered in their work.

3. At the end of the first paragraph of Subsection II.B., the reference should be to Figure 2 not Figure 1.

4. Similarly, in the first paragraph on Page 3, I think that the reference should be to Figure 4 not Figure 3.

5. Considering figures 5, 6, and 7, first of all, the authors did not mention them within the text (This should be before their appearance in the paper). Secondly and most importantly, I do not think that they are necessary as they only show the name of the three considered platforms. Thus, they can be deleted without affecting the paper quality.

6. On pages 4 and 5, I suggest the following: Firstly, authors need to consider the correction and making of proper referencing to all tables and figures before their appearance in the paper. Secondly, most of the figures are only a duplication of the same results shown by the tables. Hence, they seem to be not necessary and they just increasing the size of the paper.

7. It is recommended to enhance this paper by better clarifying and enhancing the presentation of the work methodology.

> *** Originality: New or Novel contribution
Weak Accept (6)

> *** Significance of Topic: Relating to knowledge contribution
Accept (8)

> *** Presentation: Clarity and Organisation of Content
Weak Accept (6)

======= Full Review 3 =======

> *** Strengths/Weakness: What are the major reasons to accept/reject the paper? [Be brief.]

Relevant concept handling a healthcare challenge.

> *** Contribution/s & Detailed comments: What are the major issues addressed in the paper? Do you consider them important? Comment on the degree of novelty, creativity and technical depth in the paper. Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the TPC for assessing the paper, as well as feedback to the authors.

The work is good.
I have two main remarks:
1. Comparing paper results is crucial especially with recent works (for example, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2021.08.011).
2. Similarity rate is almost 20% which is high. It's required to be less than 15%.

> *** Originality: New or Novel contribution
Weak Accept (6)

> *** Significance of Topic: Relating to knowledge contribution
Accept (8)

> *** Presentation: Clarity and Organisation of Content
Weak Accept (6)

Regards,
{chairs}