

## [ICITconf'2024] Review for paper #1571024963 completed

Edas Help <help@edas.info>

Wed 6/5/2024 3:32 PM

To: Le Van Hung <levanhung@humg.edu.vn>

Dear Dr. Hung Le,

Thank you for completing the review of the paper #1571024963 ("Multi-Objective Optimization for Resource Allocation in Edge Computing: A MOGA-Based Approach") for ICITconf'2024. 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%3D12738717&data=05%7C02%7Clevanhung%40humg.edu.vn%7C1ea4da441dec4048c6d708dc853a1544%7Cc852d62b30324cdc96ab30e4368fabd7%7C0%7C0%7C638531731733440945%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=97F7cPIUQNWXm6kGiE91J6AiT2HMo0I8N%2FUizLLGro0%3D&reserved=0> up to the due date of Jun 11.

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.

Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)

> \*\*\* 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.

Acceptable (3)

> \*\*\* Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

It introduces an of the Multi-Objective Genetic Algorithm (MOGA) to address the complex problem of resource allocation in edge computing environments.

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

The paper has several weaknesses. Firstly, it lacks detailed descriptions of the experimental procedures, particularly in evaluating and selecting solutions. This omission reduces transparency and reproducibility. Specifically, the paper does not clearly explain how the fitness score for each solution is calculated, which is a crucial step in understanding the optimization process. Additionally, the paper fails to detail how optimal solutions are chosen from the Pareto front, leaving a gap in the methodology that makes it difficult to fully assess the effectiveness of the proposed approach. Secondly, the paper does not provide an in-depth error analysis or qualitative assessment of the model's failures, which are essential for identifying limitations and areas needing improvement. Thirdly, while comparisons with other methods are mentioned, they are not comprehensive, lacking detailed descriptions of the implementation and evaluation of alternative methods. Addressing these gaps would enhance the credibility and robustness of the research findings.

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

Firstly, it needs to provide a detailed description of how the fitness score for each solution is calculated, which is crucial for understanding the optimization process. Additionally, the paper should explain the methodology for selecting optimal solutions from the Pareto front. Secondly, an in-depth error analysis and qualitative assessment of the model's failures are essential. This includes discussing scenarios where the model underperforms, such as dynamic workloads, varying network conditions, and security constraints. Lastly, the comparisons with other methods should be more comprehensive, with detailed descriptions of the implementation and evaluation processes.

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

> \*\*\* 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?

No

> \*\*\* Overall Recommendation: Overall Recommendation  
Rejected (0)