

---

**[IAAA'2026] Review for paper #1571274569 completed**

---

**From** Edas Help <help@edas.info>

**Date** Thu 4/23/2026 10:01 AM

**To** Nguyen The Loc <nguyentheloc@humg.edu.vn>

Dear Dr. The-Loc Nguyen,

Thank you for completing the review of the paper #1571274569 ("Machine Learning for Forest Cover Type Classification: A Leakage-Free Comparative Study on UCI Covertype") for IAAA'2026. Below is a copy of your review.

You can modify the report by going to <https://edas.info/R.php?r=14101289> up to the due date of Apr 25.

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.

Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

> \*\*\* 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.

Good (4)

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

- Clear problem statement and practical motivation.
- Good emphasis on avoiding data leakage in preprocessing and resampling.
- Comprehensive use of evaluation metrics beyond accuracy.
- Includes computational cost analysis and cross-validation.

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

- Limited novelty and mainly benchmark-style comparison.
- Uses standard algorithms on a well-known dataset.
- Experimental design is weakened by subsampling and inconsistent dataset sizes across models.
- Presentation quality needs improvement due to formatting and language issues.

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

- Fix formatting, grammar, and broken-word issues throughout the manuscript.
- Complete missing/incomplete sentences and improve section numbering consistency.
- Provide fairer experimental comparisons, especially for SVM.
- Include hyperparameter tuning or explain why default/manual parameters were used.
- Clarify the novelty beyond standard best-practice ML pipeline construction.

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

The paper may be produced by less-experienced researchers or students. It demonstrates good understanding of ML evaluation and leakage prevention, but lacks novelty and stronger baselines.

> \*\*\* 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?

The author names, title, and abstract in the PDF appear consistent with the EDAS submission.

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