Guide for reviewers & judge

AS REVIEWERS:

Open the **main category/ conference event** by clicking on the event title**.**

For example: Click on the "**[Demo] ☘ International Conference on Artificial Intelligence & Internet of Things (AI & IoT)**" to access the event page.



AS REVIEWERS:

Open the **sub-category/sub-conference event** for the specific series/year

e.g. **International Conference on Artificial Intelligence & Internet of Things 2022**



AS REVIEWERS:

You will be directed to the Conference page. For example:

International Conference on Artificial Intelligence & Internet of Things 2022



AS REVIEWERS:

* Please note that the reviewing page will only be available once you are assigned as a reviewer for the specific abstract or paper

1 FOR **ABSTRACT** REVIEWING:

Reviewers can find the abstract to be reviewed at

Call for Abstract → Reviewing Area

2 FOR **PAPER** REVIEWING:

Reviewers can find the paper to be reviewed at

Paper Peer Reviewing → Reviewing Area



AS REVIEWERS:

STEP FOR REVIEWING ABSTRACT

(Please skip to slide #9 for PAPER REVIEWING)

- Reviewers can find the abstract to be reviewed at

Call for Abstract → Reviewing Area

- Click the '**Review**' button to start reviewing



AS REVIEWERS:

STEP FOR REVIEWING ABSTRACT

(Please skip to slide #9 for PAPER REVIEWING)

AS JUDGE/ TPC (TECHNICAL PROGRAMME COMMITTEE):

Once the REVIEWER submits the review, the JUDGE will make the final decision to accept/reject the abstract





Example review by a reviewer for abstract

- RATING
- COMMENTS

Suggestion to accept/reject

Reviewers can also leave comments here

Reviewers also can change review here. However, once the TPC accepts the review, it can no longer be changed.

AS JUDGE/ TPC (TECHNICAL PROGRAMME COMMITTEE):

For example: JUDGE accepting the abstract after considering the comment/suggestion by the REVIEWER



AS REVIEWERS:

1. To review the paper. Reviewer need to navigate to **Reviewing Area**

2. Click on the title of the paper need to be reviewed



AS REVIEWERS:

A reviewing page will open after reviewer click on the title of the paper.

3 Next, reviewer need to click on the **Review** button to start reviewing the paper.



AS REVIEWERS:

4 Reviewers can write their review (comments & suggestions)

5 For rating question, reviewer can tick the suitable star according to his/her reviews.

6 Propose an action

- Accept *(means no correction required)*
- Reject *(means paper is not suitable/underqualified)*
- To be corrected *(means require **minor/major correction** from authors)*

* Please select “To be corrected” if there is minor/major correction. Otherwise, author cannot reupload the corrected manuscript.





*** Please note that reviewers can submit the review once all questions have been answered (the “Submit review” button will become active)**



FRAPPEHUB
Hub Conference Portal

AS REVIEWERS:

Once author submitted their correction, REVIEWERS can write their review (comments & suggestions)

The correction will be shown as revision #2

If **REVIEWERS unsatisfied** with the correction, REVIEWERS can choose the "**To be corrected**" again for the **AUTHOR** **to do the correction**. Otherwise, reviewer can select **Accept** or **Reject**.



AS JUDGE/TPC (TECHNICAL PROGRAMME COMMITTEE):

Judge need to copy and paste the comments from the reviewer

For example:



The judge needs to copy this

Judge need to make the final decision

ACCEPT / REJECT



AND paste it HERE

AS JUDGE/TPC (TECHNICAL PROGRAMME COMMITTEE):



grammar
improvements).

6 Reviewer's Recommendation: Please provide your recommendation on whether to accept or reject the paper, carefully weighing its strengths and weaknesses. If you think the paper can still be accepted but requires minor or major revisions, please select "To be corrected" in the proposal below and indicate any changes or improvements that should be made to it in the "Reviewer's Comments to Authors." ★★★★☆ 4

7 Recommendation for the Best Paper Award: Would you recommend this paper for the Best Paper Award? No

8 Reviewer's Confidence: Please rate your confidence in your review. ★★★☆☆ 3

H **Haniza Yazid** accepted this paper. · 29 July 2023

[redacted]

Comment

Dear Authors,

Congratulations. Your submission ([redacted]

However, when preparing your revised/camera-ready paper, you are asked to carefully consider the reviewer's comments. You are requested to submit the "Revised/Camera-ready paper" in the Ms-Word file before 31st July 2023.

Reviewer comments:

Reviewer 1: Authors have implemented Unet and Resnet for image segmentation for Osteogenesis Imperfecta (OI) that is a type of genetic bone disease. But authors did not mention how this disease prediction and actual bone fracture is differentiating. Table 2 having images must be align they are not appearing while accessing the manuscript. Conclusion needs more explaination. dataset is very low for training and testing purpose.

Reviewer 2: 1. This paper investigates on tibia bone segmentation from the Osteogenesis Imperfecta images using Deep Convolutional Neural Network (DCNN). 2. The paper seems did not follow IFMBE Conference Proceedings template. Please check back the template and do amendments accordingly. (i) Paper title should be centered and the font size is 14pt bold. (ii) Same goes for 1st heading and 2nd heading as the font is different. (iii) The paper margin also looks different from the given template. 2. Suggest to include a table to explain more clearly on data preparation. 3. Results & Discussion: Suggest to include some discussion on IoU to elaborate more on Table 4. Same for Table 5, suggest including some value of Table 5 (performance results in the discussion section- accuracy, precision, recall, and specificity) 4. The rest are good to proceed.

Example of reviewers' comments copy/paste by JUDGE

FRAPPEHUB
FrappeHub Conference Portal

For further inquiries and assistance, please send an email to

support@frappehub.com