



Paul Jideani <pcijideani@gmail.com>

SACAIR 2025 notification for paper 125: Accept Springer

4 messages

SACAIR 2025 <sacair2025@easychair.org>
To: Paul Jideani <pcijideani@gmail.com>

Fri, Sep 26, 2025 at 1:32 PM

Dear authors,

Congratulations! Your paper has been selected for publication in the SACAIR Springer CCIS volume (provided that the requirements for final submission, detailed below, are satisfied).

Your submission was meticulously assessed through a rigorous double-blind peer-review process by expert reviewers on our Program Committee. Each submission was appraised by at least two reviewers, with many papers receiving three or more evaluations. Additionally, relevant track chairs provided meta-reviews for numerous papers. Note that we do not have a rebuttal process and all acceptance/rejection decisions are final.

Kindly note that publication is subject to strict compliance with the instructions detailed below.

1. Your paper must be presented, in person, at SACAIR, and at least one of the authors of an accepted full paper must register and pay the SACAIR conference registration fee by 12 October 2025 at <https://2025.sacair.org.za/registration/>. SACAIR has limited financial support available to students to subsidise registration costs. Student authors should urgently apply for this support (application details are at the SACAIR website at <https://2025.sacair.org.za/>).

2. The final paper and associated documents must be submitted to the SACAIR 2025 conference page on EasyChair (<https://easychair.org/conferences?conf=sacair2025>) by 23:59 (South African Standard Time (UTC +2)), 5 October 2025. These documents must include the following a) the camera-ready version of your paper, b) a signed Consent to Publish form, c) a letter detailing your responses to the reviewer comments, and d) all source files. The details are below:

2.1. Your final paper must comply with all the following:

2.1.1. The final, camera-ready PDF version of your paper, must include author names, affiliations, and ORCID IDs (if available). The ORCID ID will be replaced by the ORCID icon, which will link from the eBook to the actual ID in the ORCID database.

2.1.2. The paper has been revised by substantively addressing the reviewers' comments.

2.1.3. The camera-ready file must adhere strictly to the Springer format specifications available at <https://www.springer.com/gp/authors-editors/conference-proceedings/conference-proceedings-guidelines>. We reserve the right to omit your publication from the proceedings if it does not conform, as we are under tight deadlines to submit the volume to Springer.

2.1.4. The final paper must NOT include page numbers. Page numbers will be assigned to the complete proceedings volume.

2.2. A completed and signed Consent to Publish form (attached):

2.2.1. The first page should contain your paper's final title and all authors' full names and details of the corresponding author.

2.2.2. Ensure that the title on the form is the same as that on the paper, and that the author information is accurate. No alterations to the paper's authorship, including adding or removing names or modifying the corresponding author, can be made after the camera-ready submission deadline.

2.2.3. The corresponding author, designated in the paper, may sign on behalf of all authors, provided permission to do so has been obtained from all authors, and that all authors accept the stipulated conditions. The signature should appear on the final page. Currently, Springer does not acknowledge digital signatures on copyright forms.

2.3. A letter, in PDF format, addressed to the SACAIR Technical Committee that details how you have responded to each of the reviewers' comments. This may be a list of edits to the paper, explanations, rebuttals or comments.

2.4. All the source file(s) of your paper, which indicate the documents/file used to generate your paper's final PDF. This is the correctly formatted Word document that was used to create the final PDF OR a zipped archive containing all necessary LaTeX source files for compiling the final PDF, including the main .tex file, all figures and images used (ensuring sufficient quality and resolution), the .bib database file and related style files and specialised fonts. For either source, include the authors' ORCID (www.orcid.org) where applicable.

Failure to meet the deadline or failure to adhere to these requirements could risk your paper's inclusion in the Springer proceedings, as we work with very tight deadlines to ensure our proceedings are available at the conference.

DEADLINE for final revisions is 5 October 2024. We unfortunately cannot guarantee your paper's inclusion into the Springer proceedings if you miss the deadline or if you do not conform to the above requirements.

Note that the DHET accepts the Springer CCIS as an accredited journal output.

Thank you and kind regards
SACAIR chairs.

SUBMISSION: 125

TITLE: An Agentic LLM-Powered Framework for Cholera Risk Prediction and Actionable Insights from Explainable ML and Statistical Insights

----- METAREVIEW -----

There is no metareview for this paper.

----- REVIEW 1 -----

SUBMISSION: 125

TITLE: An Agentic LLM-Powered Framework for Cholera Risk Prediction and Actionable Insights from Explainable ML and Statistical Insights

AUTHORS: Paul Jideani and AURONA GERBER

----- Relevance to SACAIR -----

SCORE: 3 (Yes, the paper is very relevant to the SACAIR community)

----- Significance -----

SCORE: 3 (Yes)

----- Technical Quality and Scholarship -----

SCORE: 3 (Yes, the work is technically sound and uses methods appropriate for this field.)

----- TEXT:

A better grounding in a rigorous explainability framework (https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content/ICCV2021W/RPRMI/html/Palacio_XAI_Handbook_Towards_a_Unified_Framework_for_Explainable_AI_ICCVW_2021_paper.html or similar...) seems useful to me. Also, a clear discussion of trustworthiness requirements in this domain might be beneficial.

----- Clarity and quality of writing -----

SCORE: 3 (The clarity and quality of the writing is acceptable as is.)

----- TEXT:

The paper is clearly structured and written in a well-understandable style.
Sometimes, paragraphs start with a ".?!"

----- Overall evaluation -----

SCORE: 2 (Accept. A good paper overall. I vote for acceptance.)

----- TEXT:

In general, the paper presents a nice example/use case how AI data analysis with explainability goals can be implemented within today's agentic frameworks.

The paper is quite "constructivistic" in the sense that it well describes _what_ has been done, but does not discuss it scientifically against alternative design choices (e.g., through ablation studies).

Also, the agent framework has mainly been used to (technically) structure the implementation as a kind of distributed architecture, but it is made only limited use of potential "agentic power" the community claims (and which might be too strong a claim for domains that have strong trustworthiness requirements).

----- Journal Potential -----

SELECTION: no

----- REVIEW 2 -----

SUBMISSION: 125

TITLE: An Agentic LLM-Powered Framework for Cholera Risk Prediction and Actionable Insights from Explainable ML and Statistical Insights

AUTHORS: Paul Jideani and AURONA GERBER

----- Relevance to SACAIR -----

SCORE: 3 (Yes, the paper is very relevant to the SACAIR community)

----- Significance -----

SCORE: 2 (Mostly)

----- Technical Quality and Scholarship -----

SCORE: 3 (Yes, the work is technically sound and uses methods appropriate for this field.)

----- TEXT:

Relevant papers were cited and discussed as well as compared to the presented work. The results of the paper is technically sound. Conceptual approach is well set out. Claims are well-supported in the paper by theoretical analysis. The framework is well-thought-out. The authors assess the strengths of their approach in the paper.

----- Clarity and quality of writing -----

SCORE: 2 (Minor revision recommended before publication (please list the corrections))

----- TEXT:

The paper is clearly written, and tables, examples and figures are used to explain and answer the research question.

The paper is well organized.

Minor revisions : identify abbreviations in full before using the abbreviations. Figures content are not clear enough. Figures content should be made larger for better reading. On page 10 it should be Table 1 compares these metrics across the four machine learning modules and not Table 1.

On page 10 at section 6.2 is should be Table 3 for the top 8 variables and not Table 2.

At figure 4 on page 11 the Figure 4D was not discussed.

----- Overall evaluation -----

SCORE: 2 (Accept. A good paper overall. I vote for acceptance.)

----- TEXT:

The Research question was answered by framework designed in the paper introduces a new approach that combines the pattern recognition abilities of machine learning, the statistical rigor of traditional methods, and the interpretive strengths of large language models. The framework modular design addresses current challenges in epidemiology by offering both advanced analytical tools and practical accessibility for a wide range of users.

----- Journal Potential -----

SELECTION: no

----- REVIEW 3 -----

SUBMISSION: 125

TITLE: An Agentic LLM-Powered Framework for Cholera Risk Prediction and Actionable Insights from Explainable ML and Statistical Insights

AUTHORS: Paul Jideani and AURONA Gerber

----- Relevance to SACAIR -----

SCORE: 3 (Yes, the paper is very relevant to the SACAIR community)

----- Significance -----

SCORE: 2 (Mostly)

----- Technical Quality and Scholarship -----

SCORE: 3 (Yes, the work is technically sound and uses methods appropriate for this field.)

----- Clarity and quality of writing -----

SCORE: 3 (The clarity and quality of the writing is acceptable as is.)

----- TEXT:

The paper is well written.

The text in the images is quite small and difficult to read - the font size should be increased.

----- Format of paper -----

The paper complies in general to the Springer format.

----- Overall evaluation -----

SCORE: 2 (Accept. A good paper overall. I vote for acceptance.)

----- TEXT:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript. The paper is well structured and the dataset, architecture and findings described clearly and supported with statistical analysis. The utility prototyped is illustrated with images based on an enquiry using the web interface of the AI agent.

Minor aspects that may be attended to include:

- Link to prior work: what specific prior application for cholera or other waterborn illnesses have been attempted and what were the findings. The prior work seem to be more generic about ML, XAI etc. It is also not clear how regional factors may impact and inform e.g. the factors between Africa and Brazil (both present in the data) may drive different aspects?

- Dataset: the dataset only contains 3000 rows and does not seem to be cholera specific? How was this accommodated in the investigation?

- Pre-processing: It is not clear what the outcomes of preprocessing was - was there missing or inconsistent data values resulting from human or computer error? What is the perceived quality of the dataset, making it more reliable? The statement "This process ensured the dataset was cleaned, transformed, and ready for robust modelling, contributing to reliable insights on Cholera risk factors" must therefore be substantiated better.

- Implications of research: the modular design and advantages are presented in detail. The use implications may be expanded upon as this paper suggests and easy to use interface for stakeholders - a key contribution of this investigation.

----- Journal Potential -----

SELECTION: no



SACAIR2025_Consent_to_Publish.docx

53K