
Acknowledgement of review of IEEE SMC 2025 submission number 1127

From The PaperCept Conference Manuscript Management System <conf.101@papercept.net>

Date Mon 6/16/2025 11:40 PM

To S M Taslim Uddin Raju <smturaju@uwaterloo.ca>

Message from The PaperCept Conference Manuscript Management System

Message originated by S M Taslim Uddin Raju

The following review of IEEE SMC 2025 submission 1127 was recently submitted

Reviewer: S M Taslim Uddin Raju

Reviewer number: 3

Review ID: 6809

Submitted on: June 16, 2025

If after submitting the review you find a serious omission or mistake in the review then please write to the Associate Editor who invited the review to send you a request to submit a revised review

Authors and title of the submission

Naomi Yagi, Katsuya Nakamura, Shinsuke Nagami, Syoji Kobashi

Data-Driven Aspiration Risk Assessment Based on Swallowing Posture with Future Smartphone Applicability

Submission number: 1127

Under review as: Special Session Papers

To inspect your review and other reviews of the submission online please log in at <https://conf.papercept.net/conferences/scripts/start.pl> using your PIN 97695 and password

Follow the link "Review" for the review with ID 6809

If you do not have your password then follow the link <https://conf.papercept.net/conferences/scripts/pinwizard.pl> to retrieve it

Review data

Confidence in the subject: Not very confident

Originality of concepts: Minor

Methodology: Minor

Thoroughness of results: Good

Clarity of presentation: Minor

Awareness of the literature: Minor

Overall assessment: C

Confidential comments to the editorial staff:

This paper needs huge improvement. It is a lack of proper methodological explanations as well as datasets that are tidy with imbalance.

Comments for the author(s):

1. The study is built on a very small, gender-skewed cohort (68 participants, ~12 % male). Without confidence intervals, power analysis, or an external/stratified test set, the reported AUC lacks credibility and the results cannot be generalized.
2. The paper promises “smartphone applicability,” yet all experiments depend on reflective markers and a lab-grade camera setup. This disconnect between claim and evidence undermines the core contribution.
3. Performance is estimated only with leave-one-out validation from a single site, which is prone to optimistic bias. No baseline comparisons beyond manual angles are provided, and there is no statistical significance testing.
4. Key implementation details are missing: preprocessing steps, class-imbalance handling, and full LightGBM hyper-parameters. Without these, the work is not reproducible, and readers cannot gauge whether simpler models would achieve similar results.