



[ICITconf'2025] Review for paper #1571172980 completed

From Edas Help <help@edas.info>

Date Tue 8/5/2025 12:29 PM

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

Dear Dr. The-Loc Nguyen,

Thank you for completing the review of the paper #1571172980 ("Evaluating Vision Transformers in Medical Imaging: Trends in Accuracy, Generalization and Clinical Relevance") 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%3D13621609&data=05%7C02%7Cnguyentheloc%40humg.edu.vn%7C6753057b8506411b915c08ddd3e10eb1%7Cc852d62b30324cdc96ab30e4368fabd7%7C0%7C0%7C638899685760441956%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAUMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMlslkFOljoIjIwFpbGlldUljoyfQ%3D%3D%7C4000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=%2BNiNeh%2F8lxGU14xr6XeguV4Ptz4liYJ4nPPGkTFIGK4%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.

Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

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

Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

> *** 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 paper is well-organized with a logical flow from introduction and related work to methodology, analysis, discussion, and future directions.

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

- The core analysis is based on only four primary reference studies. While these are used as representative examples, a broader review might have produced more generalizable conclusions.

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

- In the methodology section, briefly elaborate on the rationale for selecting these specific four papers. This would strengthen the justification for the paper's focus.

- Provide a clearer roadmap or framework for future research (e.g., a taxonomy or visual roadmap).

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

This is a well-written review paper on a topic of high interest and relevance to the conference. While this is a review paper, its timeliness and comprehensive coverage make it a valuable resource for the ICIT community. I recommend accepting the paper on the condition that the authors perform the recommended revisions.

> *** 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)