



Camila Barbosa <camilagomss@gmail.com>

Your SBR-LARS 2017 paper 171960

SBR-LARS 2017 <eduardo.todt@gmail.com>

25 de julho de 2017 11:41

Para: camilagomss@gmail.com

Cc: Orivaldo Santana Jr <orivaldo.santana@ect.ufrn.br>, Bruno da Silva <brunomfs@gmail.com>

Dear Ms. Camila Barbosa:

Congratulations - your paper "An Unsupervised Machine Learning Algorithm for Visual Target Identification in the Context of a Robotics Competition" for SBR-LARS 2017 has been accepted.

The reviews are below or can be found at
<https://jems.sbc.org.br/PaperShow.cgi?m=171960>

TWO IMPORTANT NOTES:

1 - At least one Author must be registered in the event by the deadline of final paper submission. Otherwise, the paper will not be published.
Site of the event: www.robotica.org.br

2 - The final versions of all accepted papers must be submitted on the CPS IEEE web site called "Author's Final Paper Formatting and Submission Instructions Webpage" (Online Author Kit):

http://www.ieeeconfpublishing.org/cpir/authorKit.asp?Facility=CPS_Oct&ERoom=LARS%2DSBR+2017

All final versions also must be adapted and improved following the revisions suggestions and they must attend the following restrictions:

Regular Papers: 6 pages, including all figures, tables, and references.
(NO extra pages allowed)

PAPER DEADLINE: Final paper is due by 12 August 2017.

COPYRIGHT DEADLINE: A signed copyright release form is due by 12 August 2017.

The copyright of the paper will be sent to the CPS IEEE and it must be made online on the CPS IEEE Website.

Congratulations again ! Hope to see you and your colleagues at SBR-LARS 2017 in Curitiba-PR.

Regards,
Conference Chairs

===== Review =====

*** Originality of the work (How do you evaluate the originality of the work presented in this paper ?): 5: Very original 4: Above average originality 3: Average originality 2: Some originality 1: No originality at all

Evaluation=Some originality (2)

*** Contribution to the field (How do you evaluate the paper's contribution to the field?): 5: Major contribution to the field 4: Significant contribution 3: Small but clear contribution 2: Minor contribution 1: No discernable contribution to the field

Evaluation=Minor contribution (2)

*** Technical strength (How do you evaluate the technical strength of the paper?): 5: Excellent 4: Good 3: Average 2: Poor 1: Unacceptable

Evaluation=Average (3)

*** Organization and presentation (How do you evaluate the readability, clarity, and organization of this paper?)

Does the citations and paper format comply with the conference style?): 5: Excellent 4: Good 3: Average 2: Poor 1: Unacceptable

Evaluation=Good (4)

*** Recommendation for this paper (What do you recommend for this paper?): 5: Must Accept - I have strong arguments in favor of acceptance 4: Weak Accept - I will not fight strongly in favour of acceptance 3: Neutral - I'm not sure 2: Weak Reject - I will not fight strongly against it 1: Strong Reject - I have strong arguments against acceptance

Evaluation=Weak Reject - I will not fight strongly against it (2)

*** General comments on the multiple choice review ((Please provide the authors some feedback on the scores you gave for the originality of the work, contribution to the field, technical strength, organization and presentation multiple choice reviews)): The work is well organized but it is not so easy to understand. Although the authors detail the operation of the algorithm, the fact that it is very restrictive is what is recurrent in the reader's mind. That is, the target have only two colors, and be limited to black and white. "Interesting" is a subjective word; avoid using this kind of word. For stability of the camera, it is possible to make a control system that compensates the oscillations of the base. And in the conclusions, it is difficult to accept that "the concepts developed here can be applied to the recognition of other objects" since the algorithm needs a very specific color pattern. It would be appropriate to have demonstrated.

===== Review =====

*** Originality of the work (How do you evaluate the originality of the work presented in this paper ?): 5: Very original 4: Above average originality 3: Average originality 2: Some originality 1: No originality at all

Evaluation=Average originality (3)

*** Contribution to the field (How do you evaluate the paper's contribution to the field?): 5: Major contribution to the field 4: Significant contribution 3: Small but clear contribution 2: Minor contribution 1: No discernable contribution to the field

Evaluation=Small but clear contribution (3)

*** Technical strength (How do you evaluate the technical strength of

the paper?): 5: Excellent 4: Good 3: Average 2: Poor 1: Unacceptable

Evaluation=Good (4)

*** Organization and presentation (How do you evaluate the readability, clarity, and organization of this paper?

Does the citations and paper format comply with the conference style?):

5: Excellent 4: Good 3: Average 2: Poor 1: Unacceptable

Evaluation=Good (4)

*** Recommendation for this paper (What do you recommend for this paper?): 5: Must Accept - I have strong arguments in favor of acceptance 4: Weak Accept - I will not fight strongly in favour of acceptance 3: Neutral - I'm not sure 2: Weak Reject - I will not fight strongly against it 1: Strong Reject - I have strong arguments against acceptance

Evaluation=Must Accept - I have strong arguments in favor of acceptance (5)

*** General comments on the multiple choice review ((Please provide the authors some feedback on the scores you gave for the originality of the work, contribution to the field, technical strength, organization and presentation multiple choice reviews)): Acredito que o evento propiciará um excelente forum de apreciação e discussão deste trabalho, podendo contribuir na sua evolução por meio de sugestões e, possíveis, trabalhos conjuntos.

*** What recommendations can you give to improve the paper? ((Please provide the authors some feedback on how they can improve their paper)): Como o trabalho está em desenvolvimento, repito o descrito nos comentários gerais.

===== Review =====

*** Originality of the work (How do you evaluate the originality of the work presented in this paper ?): 5: Very original 4: Above average originality 3: Average originality 2: Some originality 1: No originality at all

Evaluation=Average originality (3)

*** Contribution to the field (How do do you evaluate the paper's contribution to the field?): 5: Major contribution to the field 4: Significant contribution 3: Small but clear contribution 2: Minor contribution 1: No discernable contribution to the field

Evaluation=Small but clear contribution (3)

*** Technical strength (How do you evaluate the technical strength of the paper?): 5: Excellent 4: Good 3: Average 2: Poor 1: Unacceptable

Evaluation=Average (3)

*** Organization and presentation (How do you evaluate the readability, clarity, and organization of this paper?

Does the citations and paper format comply with the conference style?):

5: Excellent 4: Good 3: Average 2: Poor 1: Unacceptable

Evaluation=Good (4)

*** Recommendation for this paper (What do you recommend for this

paper?): 5: Must Accept - I have strong arguments in favor of acceptance
4: Weak Accept - I will not fight strongly in favour of acceptance 3:
Neutral - I'm not sure 2: Weak Reject - I will not fight strongly
against it 1: Strong Reject - I have strong arguments against acceptance

Evaluation=Weak Accept - I will not fight strongly in favour of acceptance (4)

*** General comments on the multiple choice review ((Please provide the authors some feedback on the scores you gave for the originality of the work, contribution to the field, technical strength, organization and presentation multiple choice reviews)): In this paper the authors has presented the tracking of a previously known object based on its visual characteristics. From theoretical point of view, the paper is correct and has presented convincing results about the proposed method.

The main suggestions are the following:

i) The conclusion should be explored better and it needs to contemplate the eventual restrictions of the developed technique to address future works in this area.

ii) Most of the bibliographical references are old (2012 or previous years). This fact raises objections to insert the paper into more current thematic contexts. The authors must then insert more updated papers along the paper, mainly from relevant journals, in order to justify their contributions and advances in relation to those investigations.

*** What recommendations can you give to improve the paper? ((Please provide the authors some feedback on how they can improve their paper)): Please see General comments on the multiple choice review.