



Pratya Nuankaew <nuankaew.p@gmail.com>

[KST-2025] Notification of Review Decision

1 message

kst2025-chairs@edas.info <kst2025-chairs@edas.info>

Wed, Jan 15, 2025 at 11:54 AM

To: Pasawat Srikaew <66011253001@msu.ac.th>, Damrongdet Doenribram <damrongdet.doe@gmail.com>, Chatklaw Jareanpon <chatklaw.j@msu.ac.th>, Preut Thanarat <preut.t@msu.ac.th>, Wongpanya Sararat Nuankaew <wongpanya.nu@up.ac.th>, Pratya Nuankaew <pratya.nu@up.ac.th>

Cc: Krisana Chinnasarn <krisana@buu.ac.th>, Suphakant Phimoltares <suphakant@hotmail.com>, Knowledge Smart Technology <kst@informatics.buu.ac.th>, Waranrach Viriyavit <waranrach.vi@go.buu.ac.th>, Watcharaphong Yookwan <wyookwan@informatics.buu.ac.th>

Dear Mr. Pasawat Srikaew,

We are pleased to inform you that your manuscript, #1571105770 titled ('Depressive disorder classification from Twitter using Transformer algorithms') for KST'2025 has been Accepted with Major Revision.

The reviewers have provided detailed feedback, which is attached to this email. We request that you address their comments and incorporate the necessary revisions to enhance the quality of your manuscript. Please submit the revised version along with a detailed response to the reviewers' comments by January 30, 2025.

The reviews are below or can be found at <https://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1571105770>.

===== KST review 1 =====

> *** Relevance: Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.
Good (3)

> *** Originality: Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.
Limited (2)

> *** Content: Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g. completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.
Good (3)

> *** Presentation: Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.
Good (3)

> *** Strong aspects: Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper?

This study is significant in mental health, focusing on using AI, such as Transformer-based models, to analyze text from Twitter—a platform rich in large-scale data and natural emotional expressions. Integrating DSM-5 criteria to classify text into 9 categories of depressive symptoms enhances the model's clinical relevance and accuracy. Transformer (BERT) outperforms CNN and LSTM, particularly in Recall and F1-Score, making it suitable for analyzing complex language. The research process is systematically presented, covering data collection, preprocessing, model design, and result visualization through clear graphs and tables.

> *** Weak aspects: Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

The study lacks comparison with a variety of models such as RoBERTa, XLNet, or hybrid models, which could better validate the robustness of the selected model. The evaluation does not include comprehensive metrics such as error analysis or real-world scenarios. Additionally, the study does not discuss critical limitations like the impact of imbalanced data or text noise. The synthetic data generated by ChatGPT is limited to 200 samples, which may not be sufficient for testing the model in complex scenarios. The documentation has some flaws, such as including author names in drafts, insufficient review of related works, using mathematical equations without explanation, and relying on outdated references.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes: Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

1. The literature review should include references to more than five related research articles.

2. Cited research must be published within the last five years.
3. Mathematical equations should not be inserted as images but should be properly formatted as text.
4. Section D should start on a new page.
5. The document should be improved by selecting the best examples to support the content.

===== KST review 2 =====

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

Good (3)

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

Limited (2)

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

Limited (2)

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

Good (3)

> *** Strong aspects: Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper?

- The framework for Experiments is sound.
- The topic is interesting even if numerous research has been carried out in this area.
- Comparison among many techniques is useful. Many such works neglect this.

> *** Weak aspects: Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

- The use of 'secondary dataset' is questionable, what is its real purpose ?
- Number of samples in experiment 2 is simply too few (14).
- Experimental 2 is poorly described and does not fit in with experiment 1 or the topic of the paper.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes: Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

- Keywords ought to be listed in alphabetical order.
- Section III, C ; 'Computationally intensive' or 'computationally resource demanding' NOT 'computationally expensive'.
- The title of Table IV should not appear at the bottom of the page.
- Eq. (18) is the usual accuracy and can be expressed more simply as (no. of correctly classify / total number of samples).
- Description of 'Depression' in Section IV, Experiment 2 (Secondary Dataset) is not the same as in Section II.

In overall, inclusion of Experiment 2 and the use of Secondary Dataset are detrimental to the work rather than enhance the quality. It may even be left out and replaced with some relevant facet to the work.

Should you have any questions or require further clarification, feel free to contact us. We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Thank you for your contribution to KST'2025

Best regards,

TPC Chair

Kosin Chamnongthai, KMUTT, Thailand

Athita Onouen, IEEE Thailand Section / BUU, Thailand

Chakchai So-In, IEEE Thailand Section / KKU, Thailand

Krisana Chinnasarn, IEEE Thailand Section / BUU, Thailand

Paramate Horkaew, SUT, Thailand

Ponlawat Chopuk, BUU, Thailand

Suphakant Phimoltares, IEEE Thailand Section / CU, Thailand

Sansanee Auephanwiryakul, IEEE Thailand Section / CMU, Thailand

Supawadee Srikamdee, BUU, Thailand

Taehong Kim, KIOM, Korea

1/18/25, 1:37 PM

Gmail - [KST-2025] Notification of Review Decision

Waranrach Viriyavit, BUU, Thailand
Watcharaphong Yookwan, BUU, Thailand