

Peer Review

Review of: "From Theory to Practice: A Case Study on EL-MIATTs Framework for Bicycle Lane Segmentation in Street Images"

Bharath Aithal¹

1. Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, Kharagpur, India

General observation: The writing part is complicated. There is too much use of compound sentences. Many terms are used, and they should be explained well. This article needs to be revised.

1. Abstract:

The use of compound sentences is excessive. Please make simple sentences. Also, explain what you have actually done. It is not a very clear abstract.

1. Methodology:

The introductory paragraph should give the flavor of the entire methodology and should also be carefully written. If not possible, avoid writing it.

All the terms (MIATT, LAF, UTR, etc.) should have a distinct explanation, and the significance of each should be clearly explained.

What exactly are you trying to do? Please be clear about that. The writing is trying to tell about multiple things but does not explain them well.

How does the U-Net model benefit from the partially complete outcomes of SAM?

How are FN and LFN different? Or the TP and LTP, or anything that is similar?

1. Experimental results:

Please try to make direct connections with the methodology.

The work shown should have a sufficient number of supporting figures. If the reader cannot relate your work to the figures, then understanding the work would be very difficult, or sometimes it might be misunderstood as well.

How is the accuracy metric calculated? What are the criteria? How is it 1? How are you dealing with the overfitting problem?

You have shown quantitative validation, which is fine. But how about the comparison with ground truth? And also, can you please show whether the test images are homogeneous or not? If yes, then how is robustness achieved?

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.