REVISIONS.md 2024-02-14

Summary of the changes applied to the manuscript

Chapter 1 - Introduction

- Better introduce key elements of gesture interaction for less-initiated readers. Section 1.1
 - Mid-air gestures.
 - ✓ Vision-based vs. radar-based sensors, LMC vs. radar.
- Discuss applications of gesture recognition (healthcare, art, education). Section 1.1
 - Where is gestural interaction appropriate?

Chapter 2 - State of the Art

- Discuss the problem of sensor fusion. Section 2.1.2 / Sensor Limitations
- Discuss the question of using DTW for segmentation and link to dynamic recognition. Section 2.1.2 / Gesture Segmentation
- ☑ Discuss UX challenges of gesture interaction. Section 2.1.2
 - Gesture discoverability and affordance
 - User fatigue (see "Consumed Endurance: A Metric to Quantify Arm Fatigue of Mid-Air Interactions"), mention how to compute the metric of "Gorilla-arm effect"
- Provide a justification for limiting the SLR to the ACM DL (e.g., why not IEEE?). Section 2.2
- Emphasize that the use of point clouds does not require convolutional layers and discuss the impact.

 Section 2.3.2 / Algorithms

Chapter 3 - Facilitating the Development of Gesture-based Applications

Chapter 4 - Streamlining the Evaluation of Gesture Recognizers

No modification.

Chapter 5 - Designing Highly Usable Gesture-based Applications

- Fix formula 5.1: P_1 should be P in the denominator. Formula 5.1
- Explicit the modifications applied to Vatavu's \$P+ recognizer in \$P3+. Section 5.2.2 / Static
 Gestures
- Consider the thinking aloud as a complementary method for evaluation. Section 5.4.2
 - Evaluation protocol is mostly quanti (LSM-EPL style), how about qualitative data? Cross-analyze

Chapter 6 - Addressing the Challenges of Radar-based Gesture Recognition

- \checkmark Fix typo in computational complexity estimation: O(n * k) should be O(n · k). Section 6.2.5
- W Have you studied the effect of angle? It's mentioned "distance d from the radar and is orthogonal to the radar-hand direction". Section 6.2.5

REVISIONS.md 2024-02-14

• In data normalization, discuss the transfer from one sensor to another one (Radar challenges)

Section 6.2.2

Would learned features transfer between radars or models? So many formats: FFT-based,
 Doppler-based, point clouds, etc.

Chapter 7 - Experimenting with Radar-based Gestures

- ✓ Discuss the problem of sensor fusion. Section 7.2.4
- - Chapter 7: Missing citation (shameless plug): "The wearable radar" paper. We used the same training/testing approach as shown in Table 146.
 - Gestures through materials dataset: Any thoughts about how would the results transfer/replicate between studies? See e.g. the Slovenia dataset.

Chapter 8 - Conclusion

Discuss the problem of sensor fusion. Section 8.2

Miscellaneous

- Fix academic name of Luis A. Leiva. Title page
- Formatting improvements
- Added missing references of papers "in press" or just published.
- Fix typos. Everywhere
 - ✓ Introduction
 - State of the Art
 - ✓ Chapter 3
 - o **✓** Chapter 4
 - ✓ Chapter 5
 - o **✓** Chapter 6
 - o ✓ Chapter 7
 - Conclusion
 - Appendices

Suggested modifications not applied to the revised thesis

- Update Table 2.2 with more up-to-date references, since only 1 ref from 2021 was included.
- Explain why JackKnife has 725 LOCs? It's substantailly higher than the rest of recognizers. Was it written in the same programming language?
 - We included the entire JavaScript implementation of Jackknife, which defines multiple
 parameters, parameters, and classes, that can be combined to adapt Jackknife to different use
 cases. A particular configuration of Jackknife could fit in a smaller number of LOCs but would
 require more work to slim down its code than just using it "as is", which is why we decided to
 count all of its LOCs.