View Reviews

Paper ID
3
Paper Title
2^B3^C: 2 Box 3 Crop of Facial Image for Gender Classification with Convolutional Networks

REVIEWER #1

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Quality of Theoretical and/or Experimental Contribution (select as appropriate):
Needs Major Work (please explain in your comments)

2. Novelty (select as appropriate):
Slightly Novel

3. Presentation Quality (select as appropriate):
Needs Major Work

4. Reproducibility (select as appropriate):
Partially Reproducible

5. Overall Rating (select as appropriate):
Reject

6. Detailed Comments and Justification: Please explain your ratings. If the paper is so unclear that it should be rejected, please explain that. If the paper is not novel please explain but citing the work that makes it so. Please also mention whether this paper has fairly cited the prior work or not. You should also comment on the correctness of the paper and 'experimental evaluation'. A paper that is definitely correct has well-designed and executed experiments. Minor technical errors or experimental design and execution count against a paper, but it might have redeeming features (which you should explain). If a paper has major theoretical problems, it should be rejected.
The paper describes a CNN based gender classifier that uses an existing face detector, a novel face cropping strategy, and an existing CNN classifier with fine-tuning. The classifier is tested on LFW and Adience data sets.

Three significant negatives:
1. The only novelty in this paper is the cropping strategy.
2. The experimental results are not presented well (LFW results described verbally; Adience gets a table; no LFW comparison with other methods) and do not (at least in the table) appear to improve the state of the art.
3. The paper is not well written; there are many grammatical errors.

REVIEWER #3

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Quality of Theoretical and/or Experimental Contribution (select as appropriate):
Needs Minor Work (please explain in your comments)

2. Novelty (select as appropriate):
Slightly Novel

3. Presentation Quality (select as appropriate):

Good

---

4. Reproducibility (select as appropriate):
Partially Reproducible

---

5. Overall Rating (select as appropriate):
Reject

---

6. Detailed Comments and Justification: Please explain your ratings. If the paper is so unclear that it should be rejected, please explain that. If the paper is not novel please explain but citing the work that makes it so. Please also mention whether this paper has fairly cited the prior work or not. You should also comment on the correctness of the paper and 'experimental evaluation'. A paper that is definitely correct has well-designed and executed experiments. Minor technical errors or experimental design and execution count against a paper, but it might have redeeming features (which you should explain). If a paper has major theoretical problems, it should be rejected.

This paper addresses the problem in gender recognition. The proposed method is developed based on VGG-16 CNN. LFW dataset is used for experiments and the results are good, but not as good as [45]. The paper is well-written and well-organized.

My major concerns on this paper are:

1. The novelty of the proposed method is limited.
2. Just one dataset is used for experiments.

REVIEWER #2

REVIEW QUESTIONS

---

1. Quality of Theoretical and/or Experimental Contribution (select as appropriate):
Needs Major Work (please explain in your comments)

2. Novelty (select as appropriate):
Not Novel

3. Presentation Quality (select as appropriate):
Unacceptable

4. Reproducibility (select as appropriate):
Partially Reproducible

5. Overall Rating (select as appropriate):
Reject

---

6. Detailed Comments and Justification: Please explain your ratings. If the paper is so unclear that it should be rejected, please explain that. If the paper is not novel please explain but citing the work that makes it so. Please also mention whether this paper has fairly cited the prior work or not. You should also comment on the correctness of the paper and 'experimental evaluation'. A paper that is definitely correct has well-designed and executed experiments. Minor technical errors or experimental design and execution count against a paper, but it might have redeeming features (which you should explain). If a paper has major theoretical problems, it should be rejected.

The paper presents a novice approach for gender classification using CNN.The CNN model does not have any novelty and experimental are shoddy. Further, the paper violates double-blind review process. While it is ok to put the paper on arxiv but declaring that it is under review in CVPR2018 Biometrics Workshop violates the double-blind review policy. Here are the details:

Vandit Gajjar. 2^B3^C: 2 Box 3 Crop of Facial Image for Gender Classification with Convolutional Networks. (Under review in Biometrics workshop in conjunction with CVPR 2018) - https://vanditgajjar.wordpress.com/ and https://arxiv.org/pdf/1803.02181.pdf

The CNN model is not novel - it is standard VGG model. Database specific engineering tricks are used and termed as "2 Box 3 Crop". All the details are 2Box3Crop algorithms is very specific to these databases (Line 400-420) - therefore the algorithm is not generalizable.

"squeezed and rescaled" -> you do not squeeze images.

Gender classification is a two class classification problem therefore, ROC curves should have been included. Experimental results are not convincing and ablation study is missing.

References are all in the weird format - the authors should pay attention to the formatting details. The language of the paper looks more like a course project report - a well-written paper is always preferred over shoddy writing.