View Reviews

Paper ID
269

Paper Title
Team Rit's cooking: Cooking Activity Recognition Challenge at ABC2020

Track Name
ABC

Reviewer #1

Questions

1. Contribution to ABC

This paper is written about a detailed model well and it helps to understand well. However, the related works are not written, so I would like you to write reference papers to make readers understand why did you construct that model, how much new model comparing existing methods.

Also, I would like you to mention the discussion. For example, in Figure 2, why right_arm data decrease a lot in the last part comparing to right_arm, why so high accuracy of macro activity classification comparing to micro activity classification. In the future work, which part will you fix in the model to improve that.

Please specify how the evaluation of the training set was conducted. For example, did you use cross-validation, split into two sets o no validation. In case of cross-validation please mention how many groups, and how they were split.

2. Originality

As I said above, I would like you to write related works to show originality.

3. Revision requirements

Please move the description of the table to top of the table.

I feel that appendix sentences are sort, so could you include that contents in the main sentence into properly part?

Reviewer #3

Questions

1. Contribution to ABC

yes

2. Originality

application

3. Revision requirements

"Must change the TITLE. Make a Title that will reflect the method and topic of this paper. It is extremely short paper. MUST need major editing and rechecking as all sections are too tiny to get any overview. Result and Analysis is too short. MUST add a discussion part to mention why this approach on this dataset is good, why it is bad, why the results are not good, how we can improve the results in future, etc. Note that it may be printed as a book chapter in the Springer - so, if someone downloads your chapter, can s/he get enough information and knowledge from this paper? Learn to work further based on this paper? So, you write more analysis, discussion now - which was not possible during the 1st submission due to shorter time. It is important to have strong background work.

So, min. references I prefer to have 15 and all references should be from recent and top journals / conferences - so that the background can be enriched. Major editing is needed.

Sec. 3.1 is meaningless. You refer or merge it to anothe rsubsec. 3.3 after pre-proc. F.2 to 5 -- what are the significance? Why do you need these Figures? Enrich conclusions and add a future work plan. Remove Appendix info and merge these properly in the main text. MUST add 15 references and enrich the paper. I recommend for strong re-checking after resubmission, before accepting it. "

Reviewer #4

Questions

1. Contribution to ABC
In general this is a good paper, but it is very short for publication in the book. The methods are clearly described but a conclusion/discussion is lacking.

2. Originality
n/a

3. Revision requirements
Improve the introduction - you can describe why the chosen approach was considered appropriate, when it has been used before and why you consider cooking activity recognition to be important. Include a conclusion section with main contributions or lessons learned

Reviewer #5

Questions

1. Contribution to ABC
It uses LSTM for both level of macro / micro activities.

2. Originality
The paper should describe how the cross validation (train-validation splitting) was done. Especially, sample-wise, segment-wise, or subject-wise should be clarified.

As a general comment, please check the writing and formatting for a book chapter.

3. Revision requirements
- Add some descriptions in each beginning of (sub)sections.
- Add discussions