TENCON 2017 Review for #1570375988: Modeling ECG Waveform Using Optimal Smoothing Bézier-Bernstein Curves

Review for #1570375988: *Modeling ECG Waveform Using Optimal Smoothing Bézier-Bernstein Curves*

Last auto-saved 8/1/2017, 8:46:27 PM

Name	Affiliation	Country
Rachanart Soontornvorn	Fukuoka Institute of Technology, Japan	Japan
Hiroyuki Fujioka	Fukuoka Institute of Technology, Japan	Japan
Vanvisa Chutchavong	King Mongkut's Institute of Technology Ladkrabang & Faculty of Engineering, Thailand	Thailand
K. Janchitrapongvej	Southeast Bangkok Colleage, Thailand	Thailand

Abstract: This paper considers a problem for modeling mathematically waveform of some Electrocardiogram (ECG) which is the process of measuring and recording the electrical activity of the heart over a period of time. Such a modeling is done by using the smoothing Bézier-Bernstein curves. A concise representation for designing the optimal curves with high precision is derived, which has the additional merit of lending itself to the development of computational procedures in a straightforward manner. The usefulness and effectiveness are demonstrated by some experimental studies.

This paper has a similarity rating of 26.

Type	Show document	Report paper problem	Known paper problems
Review manuscript			

You can decline the review and delegate the review.

Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.
- Excellent
- Good
- Acceptable
- Little
- None

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.
- Excellent work and outstanding technical content.
- Solid work of notable importance.
- Valid work but limited contribution.
- Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws.
- Questionable work with severe flaws.

Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.
- A pioneering piece of work. Striking novel ideas or results.
- Significant original work and novel results.
- Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated.
- Minor variations on a well investigated subject.
- It has been said many times before.

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

- Excellent.
- Well written.
- Readable, but revision is needed in some parts.
- Substantial revision work is needed.
- Unacceptable.

**Familiarity*: Rate the familiarity you are with the topic of this paper.

- Poor (Have minimal familiarity with the topic area)
- Some familiarity (Have general familiarity with the area)
- Good (Know the area well but may not be up to date on the latest literature)
- Expert (Currently work in this area and know the latest literature in the specific domain of this paper)

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

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

Comments to the TPC: Confidential comments to the TPC (will be not sent to Authors)

**Reviewer Independency*: I have had no recent associations with the authors, such as submitting or publishing a joint paper, being coworker, et similia (cf. IEEE Publication Services and Products Board Operations Manual, Sec. 8.2.2.B) (If statement is not true, specify association in "Confidential comments to the TPC").

Best Paper Award: Would you recommended this paper for Best Paper Award? (Yes / No). Why?

*_Reviewer Recommendation_: Overall view and recommendation

- ○ Strong Accept (Award Paper)
- ○ Accept (Solid Conference Paper)
- ○ Weak Accept (minor changes)
- ○ Weak Reject (major changes)
- ○ Reject

Email me a copy of the review

☑

*

Save

* denotes required field