



Debanjan Mahata &lt;debanjanmahata85@gmail.com&gt;

---

**Review for paper #1570417460 completed**

1 message

**ISSPIT-2017** <isspit-2017-chairs@edas.info>

Thu, Dec 7, 2017 at 10:09 PM

To: Debanjan Mahata &lt;debanjanmahata85@gmail.com&gt;

Dear Dr. Debanjan Mahata,

Thank you for completing the review of the paper #1570417460 ("Simulation and Development of a System for the Analysis of Pressure Ulcers") for ISSPIT-2017. Below is a copy of your review.

You can modify the report by going to <https://edas.info/R.php?r=8920844> up to the due date of Dec 5, 2017 23:59:00 EST.

Best regards,  
The conference chairs

---

&gt; \*\*\* Relevance to ISSPIT Scope: How relevant is this paper to the technical scope of ISSPIT?

5 (5)

&gt; \*\*\* Originality: How original is the work in this paper?

4 (4)

&gt; \*\*\* Technical Contribution: How significant is the technical contribution in this paper?

2 (2)

&gt; \*\*\* Language: How good is the language of this paper?

2 (2)

&gt; \*\*\* Illustrations: How enough, clear, and useful are the illustrations in this paper?

3 (3)

&gt; \*\*\* Clarity of Presentation: Rate the presentation quality of the paper in terms of organization and readability.

2 (2)

&gt; \*\*\* References: Rate how the paper cites previous and/or recent research.

3 (3)

&gt; \*\*\* Comments: Comments to Authors

It would be nice to revisit the following sentences and sections from the viewpoint of readability and grammar.

1. paragraph 1 - Pressure ulcer incidences had a wide range of incidents.
2. Section Aspects to consider in the valuation of the Ulcers. The list of aspects can be made more readable.
3. Section Knowledge of the current market's devices (E-Nose), the previously problem with these devices remains:
4. Section sensors - and the devices iOS
5. Image 1 is not nicely presented. Please make it better. The length and width of the image needs to be adjusted.
6. 4th para section Proposed System - Finally, provided the analyzed ...
7. The text inside the figures are not properly visible.

There are not a lot of details of usability test and the number of participants are very low for making any conclusion. However, there is a need of elaborate discussion of the usability test in order to understand its value and what are the learnings from it.

More elaborate discussions of the results would be appreciated.

&gt; \*\*\* Comments to Chairs: Comments to TPC Chairs (Confidential)

Although I am not an expert in this area. But the paper seems not to have any novelty from the perspective of new techniques being introduced. It is more or less an explanation of a small prototype. There is not much rigor in the scientific experiments being conducted. More importantly the paper is missing some detailed discussion of the results and the usability study, which does not allow the reviewer to understand the true effectiveness and credibility of the experiment. I would go with a weak accept and would suggest any expert on sensors to have a second look before accepting. The paper could also be improved in its presentation and readability.