

---

**[IAAA'2026] Review for paper #1571275363 completed**

---

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

**Date** Wed 2026-04-29 2:33 PM

**To** Nguyễn Duy Huy <nguyenduyhuy@humg.edu.vn>

Dear Mr. Duy-Huy Nguyen,

Thank you for completing the review of the paper #1571275363 ("Development of Autonomous Flight Controller for Multicopter") for IAAA'2026. Below is a copy of your review.

You can modify the report by going to <https://edas.info/R.php?r=14101296> up to the due date of Apr 28.

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.

Solid work of notable importance. (4)

> \*\*\* 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

- The study successfully demonstrates that a model-free approach can stabilize a platform without requiring a deep understanding of complex aerodynamics.

- The author does not rely solely on simulation; the paper includes results from actual flight tests using a commercial MAV and an indoor navigation system.

- The author honestly identifies the trade-off between tracking performance and oscillation in the x-controller, suggesting practical dampening solutions like reducing the gain or adding a derivative term.

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

- The paper lacks a direct comparison with other modern tuning methods (e.g., Fuzzy PID or MPC mentioned in the literature review) to highlight the specific advantages of IFT in this context.
- While the paper notes that performance at 300mm is worse than at 800mm due to "disturbance near ground," it provides little analytical detail on how the IFT algorithm could be adapted to handle such non-linear disturbances.
- Several core references (Hjalmarsson et al.) are foundational but dated (1994, 1998), and more recent state-of-the-art autonomous tuning literature from 2020-2025 is largely absent.
- The lack of a Conclusion Section in the paper.

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

- Include a table comparing the position error (RMSE) of the IFT-tuned controller versus a standard manually-tuned PID controller.
- Elaborate on why the specific "optimal" values (e.g., ) led to oscillations and clarify the process for the "trade-off" reduction to 0.8.
- Incorporate more recent references regarding autonomous drone control to better situate this work within the 2026 research landscape.
- Complement the Conclusion Section of the paper.

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

This is a solid application-based paper that successfully bridges the gap between control theory (IFT) and practical robotics (AR.Drone). The experimental results are believable, and the methodology is reproducible. It provides a good case study for model-free autonomous tuning in restricted environments.

> \*\*\* 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(s), title, and abstract are the same in the PDF file and EDAS registration.

> \*\*\* Overall Recommendation: Overall Recommendation  
Accepted (1)