

---

## [ITIS 2020] Paper 1570666195 has been registered

1 message

---

itis2020-chairs@edas.info <itis2020-chairs@edas.info>

4 August 2020 at 18:38

Reply-To: ITIS 2020 <itis2020-chairs@edas.info>

To: Eko Prasetyo <eko@ubhara.ac.id>

Dear Mr. Eko Prasetyo:

Thank you for registering your paper 1570666195 (*Performance Evaluation of Pre-Trained Convolutional Neural Network for Milkfish Freshness*) to **6th Information Technology International Seminar Virtual Conference 2020**. You still have to upload your manuscript at <https://edas.info/uploadPaper.php?m=1570666195>. Your manuscript can be application/pdf.

You can see all your submissions and their status at

<https://edas.info/index.php?c=27161>

using your EDAS user id [eko@ubhara.ac.id](mailto:eko@ubhara.ac.id).

Once you upload your manuscript, you will receive another email confirmation.

Regards, The conference chairs

---

## [ITIS 2020] Your paper #1570666195 ('Performance Evaluation of Pre-Trained Convolutional Neural Network for Milkfish Freshness Classification')

1 message

---

itis2020-chairs@edas.info <itis2020-chairs@edas.info>

23 September 2020 at 02:05

Reply-To: ITIS 2020 <itis2020-chairs@edas.info>

To: Eko Prasetyo <eko@ubhara.ac.id>, Rani Purbaningtyas <raniubhara@gmail.com>, "R. Dimas Adityo" <dimas@ubhara.ac.id>

Dear Mr. Eko Prasetyo:

Congratulations - your paper #1570666195 ('Performance Evaluation of Pre-Trained Convolutional Neural Network for Milkfish Freshness Classification') for ITIS 2020 has been **accepted** and will be presented in the session titled \_\_\_.

The reviews are below or can be found at <https://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1570666195>.

### Meta review 1

#### Originality: The originality of this paper?

Weak Accept (6)

#### Significance of Topic: Significance of Topic

Accept (8)

#### Presentation: Presentation

Accept (8)

#### Familiarity: Familiarity

Familiar (4)

#### Recommendation: Recommendation

Accept (8)

#### Comment: e.g. Major reasons of your overall recommendation

The authors should pinpoint out the future research direction in this research field after such a literature review and summarize why such research directions are important, rather than just listing many methods throughout the manuscript. There are many grammatical and format mistakes in this paper, and I would like to suggest the authors to proofread the manuscript more carefully to avoid such issues. Moreover, the figure and the table, the authors should explain it clearly. Significance: How important is the work reported? Does it attack an important/difficult problem (as opposed to a peripheral/simple one)?

### Meta review 2

#### Originality: The originality of this paper?

Weak Reject (4)

#### Significance of Topic: Significance of Topic

Weak Reject (4)

**Presentation: Presentation**

Accept (8)

**Familiarity: Familiarity**

Familiar (4)

**Recommendation: Recommendation**

Neutral (5)

**Comment: e.g. Major reasons of your overall recommendation**

The main issue of this paper is "It is also not clearly stated the main contribution of the paper." Is it simply a comparison study of pre-trained CNN model? If so, to make a proper conclusion, it is desirable to have higher number of images to support more concrete conclusion. With the current small number of images, it may not be possible to support the contribution of the paper.

In addition, even with transfer learning, the amount of data used for the training is too low. That would be the main reasons why the performance shown in Table 1 is still not high enough to make a proper conclusion. The author might need to consider using SVM or other ANN approaches with some selected features.

It might be better to replace figure 4 with a confusion matrix of each approach. Also it would be desirable to provide some specific reasons why one or two CNN performed better than the others. The current paper explained simple process the authors have taken and the results without proper discussions and concrete conclusion with clear evidence.

**Meta review 3**

**Originality: The originality of this paper?**

Neutral (5)

**Significance of Topic: Significance of Topic**

Accept (8)

**Presentation: Presentation**

Weak Accept (6)

**Familiarity: Familiarity**

Some Knowledge (2)

**Recommendation: Recommendation**

Weak Accept (6)

**Comment: e.g. Major reasons of your overall recommendation**

The paper shows the comparison between different training algorithms for specific data which is "milkfish eye".

The overall presentation is good but it has minimal research or academic contribution because it is not showing "new" or "proposed" algorithm for this kind of data.

Also, from the result the accuracy is considered low (the best of only 0.7786), do you have any idea? why is it happened and how can we improve?

Regards,  
The conference chairs

