Gmail Pratya Nuankaew <nuankaew.p@gmail.com>

Acceptance of Your Paper ID 7756 for the ECTI DAMT and NCON 2025 International Conference

1 message

ECTI DAMT and NCON 2025 <ectidamtandncon2025@easychair.org> Thu, Dec 26, 2024 at 3:37 PM
To: Pratya Nuankaew <pratya.nu@up.ac.th>

Dear Pratya Nuankaew,

The decision for the paper ID 7756 entitled Harnessing AI for Agriculture: Plant Pest Detection on Web Application Using Deep Learning is "Accept with Major Revision" for the ECTI DAMT and NCON 2025 and review results are shown below. Please revise and update your manuscript to the system by 30 December 2025, then the review processes will start again.

Please use the conference format on Microsoft Word (A4), available at https://www.icdamt.org/submission/.

If you have any inquiries, please feel free to contact us.

Best Regards,
ECTI DAMT and NCON 2025 Committee

SUBMISSION: 7756
TITLE: Harnessing AI for Agriculture: Plant Pest Detection on Web Application Using Deep Learning

---------- REVIEW 1 ----------
SUBMISSION: 7756
TITLE: Harnessing AI for Agriculture: Plant Pest Detection on Web Application Using Deep Learning
AUTHORS: Wongpanya S. Nuankaew, Yotsapron Yangwattana, Sasikan Kamwaree, Thapanapong Sararat and Pratya Nuankaew

---------- Overall evaluation ----------
SCORE: 0 (major revision)
----- TEXT:
The manuscript from this group doesn't have sufficient dataset explanation or exploration data analysis (EDA) lead to the doubtfulness of experiment results.

Please explain more about your dataset and experiment setup related to this dataset.
1. Number of raw images.
2. Number of augmentation images.
3. How many augmented images per an original image.
4. Are you sure that the validation dataset and test dataset do not include augmented images.

---------- REVIEW 2 ----------
SUBMISSION: 7756
TITLE: Harnessing AI for Agriculture: Plant Pest Detection on Web Application Using Deep Learning
AUTHORS: Wongpanya S. Nuankaew, Yotsapron Yangwattana, Sasikan Kamwaree, Thapanapong Sararat and Pratya Nuankaew

---------- Overall evaluation ----------
SCORE: 1 (minor revision)
----- TEXT:
This research is well-structured, offers valuable insights into the application of AI in agriculture, and provides a working solution. However, further statistical analysis and technical depth in the web application implementation could elevate its impact.

- The results are clear and provide valuable insights into model performance. However, a more in-depth statistical comparison with other studies or pest detection systems would enhance the credibility of the findings.

- The application appears to be a practical and user-friendly solution. However, the paper could provide more technical details on the integration of the models within the web app, including any challenges faced during deployment.

- The conclusion is appropriately reflective and provides clear directions for future improvements. However, the future work section could include more detailed plans for overcoming current limitations.

Formatting:
All figures and tables should be cited in the content.

---------- REVIEW 3 ----------
SUBMISSION: 7756
TITLE: Harnessing AI for Agriculture: Plant Pest Detection on Web Application Using Deep Learning
AUTHORS: Wongpanya S. Nuankaew, Yotsapron Yangwattana, Sasikan Kamwaree, Thapanapong Sararat and Pratya Nuankaew

---------- Overall evaluation ----------
SCORE: 1 (minor revision)
----- TEXT:
Introduction

The first three paragraphs lack citations and should reference relevant sources.
The term "rai," which is specific to Thailand, needs a brief explanation of its size for international readers.
To capture the audience's attention and emphasize the system's importance, the introduction should clearly outline the pest problems in Thailand.

Literature Reviews

Abbreviations like mAP, mAP50, and FPS should be defined before their usage to ensure clarity.

Materials and Methods

The "Use Case Diagram" in Fig. 1 should be accompanied by a detailed description.
Metrics such as mAP_0.5, mAP_0.5_0.95, and IoU need to be explained for readers unfamiliar with these terms.

Results

Captions for figures and tables should summarize their key findings.
Clarify whether the 18 classes mentioned correspond to Issue I and Issue II in the paper.
Fig. 5 is difficult to read and needs a clearer depiction and description.
Figures 6, 7, and 8 are also unclear and should be improved for better readability.
Terms like val_box_loss, val_obj_loss, and val_cls_loss in the tables need to be explained.
Clarify whether mAP@0.5 is the same as mAP_0.5.
For the "User Satisfaction Toward the Application" section, specify the number of participants in the questionnaire and their demographics or roles.