**Response to Reviewer Comments**

**Paper ID: ICPCSN-995**

**Paper Title**: **Image Understanding of GUI Widgets for Test Reuse.**

**Decision: Accept and Major revision**

**Review Comments: 1**

1. Image understanding of GUI widgets for test reuse is the proposed title of this paper.

2. In what way data extraction is achieved?

The procedure of data extraction has been described in methodology section.

3. How to process the data?

The presence of data and how it is to be taken from the dataset into what form is described in methodology section.

4. Clarity needed for sematic matching model?

Semantic matching model has been discussed in detail in methodology section.

5. Table number is missing.

Table numbers have been added.

6. Literary style of the paper should be improved.

The literary style of paper has been improved.

7. Paper should be prepared as per template prescribed.

Template has been followed for design.

8. Figures are of poor resolution and clarity.

Higher resolution figures have been used.

9. How to improve the interpretability of UI tests?

Graphs and tables have been added and discussed to improve interpretability.

**Review Comments: 2**

1. Image Understanding of GUI Widgets for Test Reuse is the presented research work

title.

2. Authors are suggested to cite relevant references for the discussion given in the intial

sections.

The relevant references have been cited.

3. Objectives should be limited. Whether the authors accomplished all the objectives in

the research work if so it should validated through detailed discussion otherwise

objectives should be revised.

The objective section has been removed and only the primary objective is discussed in the introduction section itself

4. Proposed model discussion should be improved. how semantic matching has been

performed? What are all the techniques incorporated for semantic matching and how

the algorithms are selected? all the above queries should be addressed in the

discussion.

The methodology section has been improved.

5. Summarized pseudocode or algorithm should be included with brief discussion.

Flowcharts have been provided describing the algorithms.

6. Strong interpretation of proposed model experimentation should be included in the

results section

Result section includes strong interpretation of the approach.

7. Authors are suggested to measure the performance of the proposed model through

various metrics and discuss the observations in detail.

Top1 has been added an evaluation metric.

8. The discussion given in section 7 should be revised and improved.

The discussion section has been revised and improved.

9. References should be increased. Authors are suggested to increase the references with

recent research works and discuss the observations in detail.

References have been increased and they have been discussed under related work section.