

EMAIL – 3

From: **Jestec** <Jestec@taylors.edu.my>

Date: Wed, Aug 11, 2021 at 9:09 AM

Subject: Review process is completed: paper (EE20383) is accepted for publication /formatting, proofreading, payment/

To: Kusrini Kusrini <kusrini@amikom.ac.id>

Dear Author

I am glad to advise that the review process is completed and your paper has been accepted for publication without modification. The reviewers have no more comments and are satisfied with the revised paper.

Your paper has been scheduled to be published in **June 2022, Volume 17 Issue 3**

Attached please find the acceptance letter.

Next, you are kindly asked to

1. Check the format of the paper according to the instructions for authors and JESTEC template (attached).
 - a. Please take note that our citation style and format of the references are unique. We do not follow any standard citation styles. Attached find the instructions how to prepare the references in terms of the style and format.
 - b. A special attention is also to be paid for list of symbols used. Please follow the sample shown in the template. Each symbols must be written in italic mode and fully defined with its SI units, where applicable.
 - c. Kindly take note that we will not publish your manuscript until it is correctly and completely formatted according to JESTEC template and there are no technical mistakes and/or missing part.
 - d. Also refer to this link: <http://jestec.taylors.edu.my/instructions.html> for more instructions.
2. Fill in the JESTEC-Copyright transfer form (use this link to download <http://jestec.taylors.edu.my/Copyright%20transfer%20ver%20190818.doc> and send to the journal.
3. Payment of the publication is needed before the paper is published online. Kindly refer to the attached sample of the invoice and amend it (Red text only) according to your up-to-date and accurate information for the purpose of payment. Once submitted we will send you an official tax invoice with all details to make safe payment.

*Kindly note that you have only **two weeks** to submit the above.*

We thank you very much for your interest in JESTEC and looking forward for new contribution.

Best regards

JESTEC Editor

<http://jestec.taylors.edu.my>

From: **Jestec** <Jestec@taylor.edu.my>
Date: Tue, Jul 13, 2021 at 5:06 PM
Subject: Paper ID EE20383 /Review of a paper, First Round Result/
To: Kusrini Kusrini <kusrini@amikom.ac.id>

Dear Author

The first round of the review process has been completed.

I am glad to advise that your paper has been conditionally accepted for publication with

No modification Minor corrections Major modification.

Attached herewith, please find

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 reviewers' reports.

Please notice the following:

1. Address all the concerns/recommendations of the reviewers
2. All amendments made are to be highlighted in red colour in the revised paper.
3. Send an outlining following the instructions using the attached template on how you address the concern/recommendations of all reviewers.
4. To complete the review process on time, we highly appreciate it if we can receive the revised paper **three weeks** from today.
5. Please note that your revised manuscript may be rejected if the corrections and the revision are not satisfactory.
6. In case that you will need more time to complete the revision, please indicate how much time you need via email so we can get approval from the Editorial Board.

Please note that the paper's final acceptance depends on the Review Panel's final decision and after the paper successfully passed all the review rounds.

Best Regards

JESTEC Editor
<http://jestec.taylor.edu.my>

REVIEW FORM

Title of paper:

For sections A & B, please tick a number from 0 to 5, where 0 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

A. Technical aspects

- 1. The paper is within the scope of the Journal. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 2. The paper is original. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 3. The paper is free of technical errors. 0 1 2 3 4 5

B. Communications aspects

- 1. The paper is clearly readable. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 2. The figures are clear & do clearly convey the intended message. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 3. The length of the paper is appropriate. 0 1 2 3 4 5

C. Comments to the authors (You may use another sheet of paper.)

Computation time of the algorithm if possible can be included in the work

Whether the results can be compared with classical techniques like SVM

Conclusion can be strengthened

D. Recommendation (Tick one)

- 1. Accepted without modifications.
- 2. Accepted with minor corrections.
- 3. Accepted with major modification.
- 4. Rejected.

E. Comments to the editors (These comments will not be sent to the authors)



REVIEW FORM

Title of paper:

A Deep-Learning Framework For Accurate and Robust Detection of Adult Content

For sections A & B, please tick a number from 0 to 5, where 0 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

A. Technical aspects

- 1. The paper is within the scope of the Journal. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 2. The paper is original. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 3. The paper is free of technical errors. 0 1 2 3 4 5

B. Communications aspects

- 1. The paper is clearly readable. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 2. The figures are clear & do clearly convey the intended message. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 3. The length of the paper is appropriate. 0 1 2 3 4 5

C. Comments to the authors (You may use another sheet of paper.)

Very well-written article, however, some comments on improvement has been highlighted in the returned article.

D. Recommendation (Tick one)

- 1. Accepted without modifications.
- 2. Accepted with minor corrections.
- 3. Accepted with major modification.
- 4. Rejected.

E. Comments to the editors (These comments will not be sent to the authors)

The paper needs very minor corrections. Ask the author to perform that corrections and this paper can be published.



REVIEW FORM

Title of paper: A DEEP-LEARNING FRAMEWORK FOR ACCURATE AND ROBUST DETECTION OF ADULT CONTENT

For sections A & B, please tick a number from 0 to 5, where 0 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

A. Technical aspects

- 1. The paper is within the scope of the Journal. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 2. The paper is original. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 3. The paper is free of technical errors. 0 1 2 3 4 5

B. Communications aspects

- 1. The paper is clearly readable. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 2. The figures are clear & do clearly convey the intended message. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 3. The length of the paper is appropriate. 0 1 2 3 4 5

C. Comments to the authors (You may use another sheet of paper.)

The authors proposed two deep-learning-based methods for detecting adult contents in videos, namely by using fully-connected-layer CNN and LSTM.

I consider the paper sound, interesting, well-written with clear and strong contributions. The following are the key strength of the paper:

- 1. The authors provide a clear and well-argued motivation of the problems they are solving.
- 2. The novelty and the contribution of the paper is strong and clear. The authors have shown the superiority of their proposed method to similar deep-learning-based methods in the field.
- 3. I really appreciate the literature review, which has successfully highlighted comprehensive previous work in the field and provided a clear context for the current research reported in this paper.

I recommend that the paper is accepted for publication after the following issues are addressed:

- 1. The main weakness of the paper, in my opinion, is Section 3 (Deep Learning for Adult Content Recognition), in which the authors lay out their proposed methods. I think the authors have not managed to provide all the necessary details of the proposed methods such that a reader can fully replicate the methodology and the experiments. Many facets of the methods are left unspecified or underspecified. The authors may consider these to

be obvious or clear from the context. However, clear specification is always beneficial. The authors need to be verbose, comprehensive, and exhaustive in this section. Among aspects that need further explanation are:

- a. How are the key frames selected? Randomly or with a particular pattern? When the authors select only two frames from the video, which frames do they select? I do think that correct selection really influences the performance of the methods. Have the authors performed experiments related to the selection methodology of the frames?
 - b. $(1 \times (n * 2048))$; what is n ? Why do the authors use this notation in FCL and use a different notation (namely $(x * 2048)$) in LSTM? Why use x and $*$ at the same time?
 - c. How do the authors convert input feature vectors $(1 \times (n * 2048))$ to the first layer of the FCL, which from the figure consists of 512 nodes? Similarly, how do the authors convert input feature vectors $(n * 2048)$ to the first layer of the LSTM, which from the figure consists of 128 nodes?
 - d. I do think the authors provide more detailed and structured description of the feature extraction method they employ.
 - e. The authors need to provide the specifications of the videos they experiment on. These include the size (the number of frames), the resolution, color depth, etc.
2. Although the paper is well-written, there are still many typographical and grammatical errors throughout the paper. I recommend careful rereading. These includes "et. al." (supposed to be "et al."), "...after the successful of deep ...", "... which the accuracy is reached 93.8%."
 3. Please pay attention to the number of the sections. Deep Learning for Adult Content Recognition is supposed to be Section3, Result and Discussion is supposed to be Section 4.
 4. The authors provide only straightforward experimental results and discussion and did not try to look deeply into more variety of the problem. This results in a single-dimensional result. There are many ways the authors can enrich their results and discussion. These includes finding and measuring the influence of the frame selection method. The authors can also look deeper into the results based on the classes in Table 4. How is the performance of the proposed methods in each class and what can be concluded from it?

D. Recommendation (Tick one)

1. Accepted without modifications.
2. Accepted with minor corrections.
3. Accepted with major modification.
4. Rejected.

E. Comments to the editors (These comments will not be sent to the authors)

-



