

# View Reviews

**Paper ID**

1933

**Paper Title**

Enhancing Face Detection in Low-Light Conditions: An Analysis of Noise Types and Denoising Techniques

**Track Name**

Track-1: Emerging Trends and Applications in Machine Learning and Deep Learning

**Reviewer #1****Questions****1. Q1: Is the work within the scope of the conference and relevant to ICIP?**

Scope relevance is marginal

**2. Is the manuscript technically correct?**

Some minor concerns that should be easily corrected without altering the contribution or conclusions.

**3. Is the technical contribution novel?**

Limited novelty, not clearly differentiated from existing methods/concepts

**4. Is the level of experimental validation sufficient?**

Limited but convincing

**5. Is the technical contribution significant?**

Moderate contribution, with the possibility of an impact on the field.

**6. Are the references appropriate, without any significant omissions? (Required)**

Some significant omissions that may have a moderate impact on the novelty of the submission.

**7. Are there any references that do not appear to be relevant?**

All references are directly relevant to the contribution of the manuscript

**8. Is the manuscript properly structured and clearly written?**

Moderate issues of exposition that may require some time to correct, but do not substantially affect the ability to evaluate the technical content

**9. What is your overall evaluation of this paper?**

Marginal accept

**10. How confident are you in your evaluation of this paper?**

Confident

**11. Comments to the Author(s) – please provide a detailed assessment of the manuscript including the strengths and weaknesses of the paper in terms of**

**novelty, technical content, relevance to Conference, quality of references, and experiments.**

The inclusion of the following reference may provide recent insights and strengthen the relevance of your discussion:

1. 10.1109/CONIT59222.2023.10205744
- 2.

Check the organization of the article once and improve the overall organizations. Try to reduce too many bullet or numbering in sections. Rewrite the conclusion in more refined and effective manner.

## Reviewer #2

### Questions

**1. Q1: Is the work within the scope of the conference and relevant to ICIP?**

Clearly within scope

**2. Is the manuscript technically correct?**

Some minor concerns that should be easily corrected without altering the contribution or conclusions.

**3. Is the technical contribution novel?**

Limited novelty, not clearly differentiated from existing methods/concepts

**4. Is the level of experimental validation sufficient?**

Limited but convincing

**5. Is the technical contribution significant?**

Moderate contribution, with the possibility of an impact on the field.

**6. Are the references appropriate, without any significant omissions? (Required)**

Some significant omissions that may have a moderate impact on the novelty of the submission.

**7. Are there any references that do not appear to be relevant?**

Some of the references are clearly irrelevant

**8. Is the manuscript properly structured and clearly written?**

Well-structured and clearly written with no issues of exposition

**9. What is your overall evaluation of this paper?**

Borderline

**10. How confident are you in your evaluation of this paper?**

Less Confident

**11. Comments to the Author(s) – please provide a detailed assessment of the manuscript including the strengths and weaknesses of the paper in terms of novelty, technical content, relevance to Conference, quality of references, and experiments.**

References are not sufficient