



anita\_desiani unsri &lt;anita\_desiani@unsri.ac.id&gt;

---

## IEEE Access - Decision on Manuscript ID Access-2022-09952

---

**IEEE Access** <onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com>

2 June 2022 at 09:05

Reply-To: calbme@rit.edu

To: erwin@unsri.ac.id

Cc: calbme@rit.edu, anita\_desiani@unsri.ac.id, erwin@unsri.ac.id, bambangs@unsri.ac.id, fildaefriliyanti99@gmail.com, muhammad\_arhami@pnl.ac.id, emysetyaningsih@akprind.ac.id

01-Jun-2022

Dear Dr. erwin:

I am writing to you in regards to manuscript # Access-2022-09952 entitled "VG-DropDNet A Robust Architecture for Blood Vessels Segmentation on Retinal Image" which you submitted to IEEE Access.

Please note that IEEE Access has a binary peer review process. Therefore, in order to uphold quality to IEEE standards, an article is rejected even if it requires minor edits.

Your manuscript has not been recommended for publication in IEEE Access in its current form; however, we do encourage you to address the concerns and criticisms of the reviewers detailed at the bottom of this letter and resubmit your article once you have updated it accordingly.

Please revise your manuscript based on reviewers' feedback and resubmit; elaborate on your points and clarify with references, examples, data, etc. If you do not agree with the reviewers' views, then include your arguments in the updated manuscript. Also, note that if a reviewer suggested references, you should only add ones that will make your article better and more complete. Recommending references to specific publications is not appropriate for reviewers and you should report excessive cases to [ieeeaccessEIC@ieee.org](mailto:ieeeaccessEIC@ieee.org).

Specifically, you should carefully address the critiques raised by Reviewer # 1, as these are the most critical: 1. Rewrite the abstract as it lacks some of the results and write it with technical contributions; 2. Explain in detail about "Function of Activation" and feasibility of equations 10 and 11; 3. Increase the image quality of the figures especially Figure 7, 11, 12 and 13; 4. Explain ROC curve in details; 5. Add recent works and compare with your results. Also, please ensure that you also provide a detailed response to each of these critiques in your Response to Reviewers document and also mention how each of these critiques was addressed in the revised manuscript.

We highly recommend that you review the grammar one more time before resubmitting. IEEE offers a 3rd party service for language polishing, which you may utilize for a fee: <https://www.aje.com/c/ieee> (use the URL to claim a 10% discount).

Please be advised that authors are only permitted to resubmit their article ONCE. If the updated manuscript is determined not to have addressed all of the previous reviewers' concerns, the article may be rejected and no further resubmissions will be allowed.

When resubmitting, please submit as a new manuscript via our submission site, [the IEEE Author Portal](#), and include the following 3 files:

1) A document containing your response to reviewers from the previous peer review. The "response to reviewers" document (template attached) should have the following regarding each comment: a) Reviewer's concern, b) your response to the concern, c) your action to remedy the concern. The document should be uploaded with your manuscript files as a "Supplementary Material for Review."

2) Your updated manuscript with all your individual changes highlighted, including grammatical changes (e.g. preferably with the yellow highlight tool within the pdf file). This file should be uploaded with your manuscript files as a "Supplementary Material for Review."

3) A clean copy of the final manuscript (without highlighted changes) submitted as a Word or LaTeX file, and as a PDF, both submitted as the "Main Manuscript."

We sincerely hope you will update your manuscript and resubmit soon. Please contact me if you have any questions.

For more information on successfully publishing within IEEE Access, please see [https://youtu.be/502WPjDhY\\_0](https://youtu.be/502WPjDhY_0)

Thank you for your interest in IEEE Access.

Sincerely,

Dr. Cristian A. Linte  
Associate Editor, IEEE Access  
[calbme@rit.edu](mailto:calbme@rit.edu)

Reviewers' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Reject (updates required before resubmission)

Comments:

The review of the manuscript (Access-2022-09952) titled "VG-DropDNet A Robust Architecture for Blood Vessels Segmentation on Retinal Image" has been completed.

Rewrite the abstract as it lacks some of the results and write it with technical contributions. Explain in detail about "Function of Activation" and feasibility of equations 10 and 11. Please increase the image quality of the figures especially Figure 7, 11, 12 and 13. Explain ROC curve in details. Add recent works and compare with your results.

Additional Questions:

- 1) Does the paper contribute to the body of knowledge?: Yes
- 2) Is the paper technically sound?: yes
- 3) Is the subject matter presented in a comprehensive manner?: No
- 4) Are the references provided applicable and sufficient?: Need recent works.
- 5) Are there references that are not appropriate for the topic being discussed?: No
- 5a) If yes, then please indicate which references should be removed.:

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Accept (minor edits)

Comments:

The article is well written and is of high quality. The following are the minor edits suggested for authors to incorporate into their manuscript.

- (1) The abstract can be written with proper brief discussion of results like explaining about the ground truth and cohen kappa coefficient results significance.
- (2) Suggesting the authors to rewrite the conclusion of the manuscript with proper significance of the work and proposition for future study.

Additional Questions:

- 1) Does the paper contribute to the body of knowledge?: This article will be of great interest. The quality of the manuscript is good.
- 2) Is the paper technically sound?: The article is technically sound and is of very high quality.
- 3) Is the subject matter presented in a comprehensive manner?: The manuscript is well written, clear and easy to read. I believe that the paper is written in a very comprehensive manner.
- 4) Are the references provided applicable and sufficient?: The references provided in the manuscript are appropriate and well organized.
- 5) Are there references that are not appropriate for the topic being discussed?: No
- 5a) If yes, then please indicate which references should be removed.:

If you have any questions, please contact article administrator: Miss Sweta Satapathy [s.satapathy@ieee.org](mailto:s.satapathy@ieee.org)

---

**2 attachments**

 \* **IEEE-Access-Response-to-Reviewers-template-1.4.22.docx**  
18K

 \* **Resubmission-Checklist.docx**  
207K