Gmail Anuvab Sen <sen.anuvab@gmail.com>

IGARSS 2024: Review Results [Paper #3647]

1 message

IGARSS 2024 <papers@2024.ieeeigarss.org> Sat, Mar 16, 2024 at 1:23 AM
To: Anuvab Sen <sen.anuvab@gmail.com>, Sujith Sai Sripadam <ssujith.sai04@gmail.com>, Chhandak Mallick <chhandak.mallick@icloud.com>, Subhabrata Roy <subhabrata_ece@yahoo.com>

PLEASE only reply to this email if absolutely necessary. Read this email carefully as it probably contains all the information you need!

Dear Anuvab Sen, Sujith Sai Sripadam, Chhandak Mallick, Subhabrata Roy,

The IGARSS 2024 Technical Program Committee has completed the review process, and we are pleased to inform you that your abstract:

#3647, titled 'HBO-DEVIT: VISION TRANSFORMER BASED ATTENTION-GUIDED EVOLUTIONARY ARCHITECTURE FOR SHIP-ICEBERG CATEGORISATION IN ARCTIC SAR IMAGES'

has been ACCEPTED for inclusion as a Poster presentation in the IGARSS 2024 program. Congratulations!

What should you do now?

1) Register for the symposium

The registration will open on 1 April 2024. All the participants with an accepted paper/presentation should register for the in-person symposium by 30 May 2024 to ensure their participation in the program. Please note that this is an in-person event.

For more information about the registration process, fees and cancellation policy, please visit the IGARSS 2024 website (https://2024.ieeeigarss.org/registration.php).

2) Revise your paper

If specific comments about your abstract were received from the reviewers or the technical chair managing your submission, they are provided at the end of this email. Please consider such comments and recommendations when preparing the final 4-page paper, if you are planning on writing one. In addition, we encourage authors to make data and source code available in advance to ensure reproducibility of the results.

As an author of an accepted paper, we encourage you to prepare the best possible presentation to make a successful IGARSS 2024 symposia. All attendees of IGARSS 2024 will receive electronic versions of the 4-page full papers accepted for the technical program. You will have until 25 May 2024 to revise your 4-page manuscript, formatted according to the paper kit (https://2024.ieeeigarss.org/papers/paper_kit.php). Only papers that are presented at IGARSS 2024 will be included in the published Proceedings.

IMPORTANT: During the paper submission process, there was a section to indicate if you wished NOT to publish your paper in the official proceedings. When you submit a revision to your accepted paper, please double-check that you have indicated your desired response. If you indicate a response of “DO NOT PUBLISH manuscript in proceedings,” there will be no way to reverse your decision after 25 May 2024.

3) Check your schedule

A preliminary schedule of technical sessions will be posted soon on the IGARSS 2024 website (https://2024.ieeeigarss.org/). A final program will be published on 17 June 2024.

4) Check the latest travel and visa information

Delegates are responsible for ensuring appropriate visas are obtained for attending the conference. Greece is a member-state of the European Union and has signed the Schengen Treaty. Visas are not required by European citizens from countries that are part of the Schengen Area. For more information, please visit here: https://2024.ieeeigarss.org/visa_information.php.

5) Prepare for your trip

More information on many aspects of IGARSS 2024 (Tutorials, Exhibition, Tours, Social Events) is available now, or will be soon, on the symposium website, https://2024.ieeeigarss.org/

Thank you for submitting your paper to IGARSS. We look forward to welcoming you to IGARSS 2024 in Athens!

Konstantinos Karantzalos, Iphigenia Keramitsoglou, and Nikolaos Stathopoulos
IGARSS 2024 Technical Co-Chairs
https://2024.ieeeigarss.org/

Paper Number: 3647
Paper Password: 700E43E5

---- Comments from the Reviewers ----
Review #3BC9

Topic Relevance: Average

Originality of the Content: Average

Methodology / Research design: Average

Evaluation of results and derived conclusions: Average

References to previous work: Average

Correct English usage: Average

Overall Evaluation: Average

General Comments to Authors
The manuscript presents an HBO-DEViT model designed for the classification of ships and icebergs in SAR images, utilizing a dataset from remote offshore areas, specifically along the East Coast of Canada. Experimental results highlight the model's good performance. The size of the dataset particularly the training and testing set is not clear and it seems there is an overfitting problem.

Review #075D

Topic Relevance: Low

Originality of the Content: Low

Methodology / Research design: Very Low

Evaluation of results and derived conclusions: Very Low

References to previous work: Average

Correct English usage: Low

Overall Evaluation: Low

General Comments to Authors
Important details are missing in the description and the novel contribution is not clearly stated. The algorithm is the result of the science, not the science/knowledege itself. It seems that the main contribution may be proving that the warm-start with HBO makes a significant difference to the convergence and accuracy, or perhaps it is is the differential evolution part? The science would be in understanding what makes the most difference and that is what the paper should be highlighting, experimenting and proving/demonstrating. This work is not very scientifically written/emphasised.
Details of the data-set are unspecified, in particular the actual quantity, scale and unit of the main HH, HV bands. Are they backscatter intensity or amplitude, complex or real, linear or in decibels? All this is important to know how to interpret the results and try to understand the significance of your choices. E.g., taking the average of HH and HV will be quite different if they are in linear or decibel scaling, with the HH usually dominating the HV channel's values.
You may have seen more value from the difference or ratio for the third channel. Is this third channel actually important for the analysis, or only for viewing in RGB?
You show an example "ship" signature in Figure 2., but why don't you also show an equivalent "iceberg" example for comparison? You cropped out the z-axis entirely, which would have given an indication of the quantity and units, e.g. dB or not. Please include all axes labels and units. Moreover, if you use three channels, why not show the third input channel? I suspect you don't because the mean is an unnecessary addition.
Your comparison methods of Chen et al., Taylor et al., Gong et al., and ViT are not described at all. Ideally, we need a quick summary of what they are and, in particular, how they differ from the proposed method, so that we can understand what the difference in scores tells us. Furthermore, if you have performed ten repeat runs for some or all of these methods, then you should put some indication of the standard deviation, or spread of the scores in Table 2. Then we can understand how significant the differences are.
The language and logic could be improved. E.g., Sentence two: "Traditional methods like UAVs..." is grammatically incomplete, since UAVs are instruments not methods. You should say methods of detecting icebergs or surveillance or whatever you meant. The third sentence: "Thus, using SAR..." is also incomplete, as you really mean "from satellites". Take care with the conceptual content and technical/logical construction of your sentences, particularly in the all important Abstract.

Review #2112

Topic Relevance: Average

Originality of the Content: Low

Methodology / Research design: Low

Evaluation of results and derived conclusions: Low

References to previous work: Average

Correct English usage: Average

Overall Evaluation: Low

General Comments to Authors
The reported classification accuracy is impressive. However, the paper does not clearly present technical innovations of the work; relevant formulations and algorithms are not adequately elaborated.

-end-