



[ICITconf'2025] Review for paper #1571172582 completed

From Edas Help <help@edas.info>

Date Tue 8/5/2025 11:02 AM

To Nguyen The Loc <nguyentheloc@humg.edu.vn>

Dear Dr. The-Loc Nguyen,

Thank you for completing the review of the paper #1571172582 ("A Grad-CAM-Enabled Weighted Ensemble Approach for Interpretable Brain Tumor Classification") for ICITconf'2025. Below is a copy of your review.

You can modify the report by going to <https://apc01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fedas.info%2FR.php%3Fr%3D13621608&data=05%7C02%7Cnguyentheloc%40humg.edu.vn%7Ceb61d580434f4e202e3b08ddd3d4daae%7Cc852d62b30324cdc96ab30e4368fabd7%7C0%7C0%7C638899633357685778%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAUMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMlslkFOljoIjIwFpbGlldUljoyfQ%3D%3D%7C4000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=WwC0J%2FdV87BwAOICEdCVmPFWmr5QUyL61j6%2Bf%2FzUWc%3D&reserved=0> up to the due date of Aug 6.

Best regards,
The conference chairs

> *** Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> *** Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

Solid work of notable importance. (4)

> *** Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Well written. (4)

> *** Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Good (4)

> *** Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

- The proposed weighted ensemble model achieves an impressive accuracy of 97.25% , outperforming all individual models used in the study.
- Well-organized tables and figures aid understanding.

> *** Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

- The paper lacks comparison with other state-of-the-art methods, limiting its competitive positioning.
- The paper mentions that after experimenting, unfreezing 35% of the layers was found to be optimal. Providing more detail about this experimentation (e.g., what other percentages were tested and what were their results) would strengthen the scientific rigour of the study.

> *** Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

- Add a comparison table with recent state-of-the-art methods on the same or similar datasets to strengthen the contribution.
- Please add a brief summary of the experiments conducted to determine the 35% layer unfreezing rate. This will enhance the reproducibility and thoroughness of your work.

> *** Comments to the TPC: Confidential comments to the TPC (will be not sent to Authors)

I believe the paper is a good fit for the conference and recommend acceptance.

> *** Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes, it does

> *** Overall Recommendation: Overall Recommendation
Accepted (1)