Assessment 2
Peer Review for Wireless Communication Networks and 3D Computer Vision

Tri Hong Nguyen

November 2019

1 Feedback for wireless communication networks

The author of the assessment got a short description about ethical behaviors coming mainly from the research community instead of expecting to peer reviewers. Thus, the values of the research (i.e truth and impact) are dependent on the trust of the research community.

In the assessment, she/he mentioned several ethical research issues including the connection between industrial and academic requirements where she/he cannot find a way to match the result. However, in my opinion, the discussion is not related to the idea of ethical research. I think it is a problem about the requirements to satisfy the funding of the project (industry) and the thesis (academy).

Next, she/he gave a concern about her/his support for another related research where she/he had helped a her/his colleague to form a formulating research problem, but later she/he did not receive any requirements for experiments or anything else. I think it depends on the context or scenario which she/he did propose a novel idea or just clarify the problem in the research. In addition, since her/his colleague worked by their own work after that, it is quite hard to ask her/his name as a author to this research (to be correct her/his name can be put in an acknowledgement where they often show the gratitude. Nevertheless, if the research is formed by her/his idea, I think a name as the second author is good for both.

Another consideration is about the citation of other researches. I think this is one of the most ethical problems where the research does not obtain the achievement which it should be. My idea for this issue is to form more code of conduct for research where researchers are studied to respect valuable previous research.

Last not but at least, the suggestion of the author is about the meeting where the members in a group can give comments and discusses on issues with positive feedback. However, in some points, I think it is not easy to form public discussion on ethic problems which are related to individual. However, it cannot

say that achieving some comments from seniors or other people are bad idea. I mean it takes time to carefully analyse before making decision related to those ethical issues.

2   Feedback for 3D computer vision

From the assessment from the study of 3D computer vision topic, I witness that the author mentioned on emergent of her/his research from ethical issues through a list of scientific activities. From this perspective, she/he continued discussing on each part of those activities before specifying the ethical issues including the overlap study during the collaboration, "unsure about the novelty of the proposed idea", the wrong experiments and the unclear previous researches. Additionally, as a solution from the author, she/he mentions a clear clarification of stages in research to prove the her/his proposal being the first idea in collaboration. After that a form of publication can be formed to ask contribution from others. Besides, the experiments are discussed as a good way to support late researches

After carefully following the assessment, my opinion is the lack of consideration of the author in several issues. In particular, this assessment considers only the issue related to collaboration, but does not go further in other issues on the data, values and acknowledgment. Moreover, the assessment mentioned quite details on the scientific stages instead of deeply discussing about the ethical issues. In case of solutions, I think in specific contexts the solution can be changed to satisfy consideration as benefits and harms. Thus, it is really hard to say on a way or solution to solve. Therefore, as my consideration, ethical issues need analyses before going through decisions.