

Review Form of ICTC 2022

<http://www.ictc.net/>

Paper ID : T42

Paper Title : Sparse signal detection and fingerprint feature recognition based on fast 2D DFRFT

Evaluation:					
	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Outstanding
Originality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Innovation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
technical merit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Presentation and English	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Match to Conference Topic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recommendation to Editors					
	Strongly Reject	Reject	Marginally Accept	Accept	Strong Accept
Recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I. REVIEW

A. Suitability of topic

Is the topic appropriate for publication?

☒ Yes ☐ Perhaps ☐ No

B. Contents

Is the coverage of the topic sufficiently comprehensive and balanced?

☒ Yes
☐ Important Information is missing or superficially treated.
☐ Treatment somewhat unbalanced, but not seriously so.
☐ Certain parts significantly overstressed.

C. Presentation

1. How would you rate the overall organization of the paper?

☒ Satisfactory ☐ Could be improved ☐ Poor

2. Are the title and abstract satisfactory?

☒ Yes ☐ No

3. Is the length of the paper appropriate? If not, recommend how the length of the paper should be amended, including a possible target length for the final manuscript

☒ Yes ☐ No

4. Are symbols, terms, and concepts adequately defined?

☒ Yes ☐ Not always ☐ No

5. How do you rate the list of references?

☐ Satisfactory ☒ Unsatisfactory

II. RECOMMENDATION

- ☐ Publish unaltered
- ☐ Publish in minor, required changes
- ☒ Publish after major required changes
- ☐ Review again after major changes
- ☐ Reject (Paper is not of sufficient quality or novelty to be published in this conference)
- ☐ Reject (A major rewrite is required; encourage resubmission)
- ☐ Reject (Paper is seriously flawed; do not encourage resubmission)

III. COMMENTS

Please state the reason you gave the recommendation above. Please give the author specific guidance regarding revisions, differentiating between optional and mandatory changes. (Within 50-100 words)

Authors need to take into consideration:

- Discuss about the convergence of the model.
- Compare the results from literature to see how they could fill the gap (table 1 is not enough), we need to see several criteria using several existing methods.
- What about fingerprints with error or incomplete data, how does this proposed model work?
- And, reference lists are mostly old!