View Reviews

Paper ID
93

Paper Title
Skin lesion segmentation using a U-Net and good training strategies

Reviewer #1

Questions

1. What are the strengths of this submission? Please explain to support your final decision.
The authors provide some tips and recipes they use to improve the accuracy of a U-Net like architecture.

2. What are the weaknesses of this submission? Please explain to support your final decision.
The abstract is not particularly informative about best practices and does not show improvement with respect to the current state of the art on a competitive dataset.

3. What is your final recommendation for this submission?
Strong reject

Reviewer #2

Questions

1. What are the strengths of this submission? Please explain to support your final decision.
- application to common biomedical problem
- convincing numerical results

2. What are the weaknesses of this submission? Please explain to support your final decision.
- very limited novelty and mainly ad-hoc solutions
- paper fails to pin-point reasons for different algorithmic and setup choices
- almost no comparisons of proposed "good training strategies"

3. Additional comments to the authors
The abstract discusses skin lesion segmentation with a slight variation of the standard U-Net with a deeper (pre-trained) ResNet34 encoder. In addition the authors claim that their contribution is a number of recent training strategies that help achieve descent results. While the numerical scores are convincing the paper fails to pin-point reasons (or mostly even comparisons) for different algorithmic and setup choices. Hence, the so called "good training strategies" seem rather ad-hoc. Moreover, none of the strategies are novel to image segmentation or classification and combinations of residual connections and feature concatenations have been widely used.

4. What is your final recommendation for this submission?
Reject