

## Acknowledge editing support

International publication guidelines such as [ICMJE guidelines](#) state that all non-author contributions, including editing, should be acknowledged.

If you are satisfied with the quality of editing, please acknowledge the editing contribution by adding the following line in the acknowledgements section:

**We would like to thank Editage ([www.editage.cn](http://www.editage.cn)) for English language editing.**

### Let us help you

- Respond to editor comments or send your questions to the editor
- Get your revisions checked before paper submission
- Let us know if you are not satisfied with the job

### Help us know you better

- Give feedback on the job
- Add the editor to your Favorite Editors list
- Let us know if your paper gets accepted by the journal

## Scientific Editing Report

Dear Author,

This document contains an assessment of the manuscript in terms of its language and presentation, content, and submission readiness. Where relevant, I have also provided recommendations for improving the manuscript. Should you have any questions on the report, do let me know.

Best regards,  
Prathamesh Chodankar  
Managing Editor

## Table of Contents

LANGUAGE AND PRESENTATION .....	3
Overview .....	3
Organization and flow .....	3
Formatting.....	4
CONTENT REVIEW .....	5
Title, Abstract, and Keywords .....	5
Literature Review and Research Rationale .....	5
Study Design or Methodology .....	6
Results and Statistical Analyses .....	6
Discussion and Conclusion.....	6
SUBMISSION CHECKLIST .....	8

---

## LANGUAGE AND PRESENTATION

*Notes from the Language Editor*

### Overview

Overall, the manuscript is crisp and short; however, there are several issues with the file in terms of organization and structure.

Title: The title is too wordy and has redundant text. This has been corrected.

### Organization and flow

**Abstract.** Abstract: The abstract does not follow conventional structure (background>>Objective>>Logical gap>>results>>Conclusion) The abstract has several redundant and misplaced text, which had to be revised considerably for logical flow. Unnecessary information has also been provided in the abstract, such as the explanation on the preprocessing techniques that were used.

**Introduction.** The introduction does not follow the funnel structure (Broad background>>narrow background>>objective>>logical gap>>What's done in this study)

Currently, the introduction directly flows into what's being done in the study; although some background is provided, I recommend adding further information.

I also recommend that you add more literature studies related to this. Here, this is currently lacking in your study.

The introduction also does not provide details on the organization of the manuscript.

**Methods.** This has been provided haphazardly.

The experiment section that explains the techniques and the inspection setup had a significant number of redundancies and require restructuring to improve flow.

I have requested that you delete certain paragraphs. Please ensure that this is checked for and these changes are introduced.

The equations have to be provided with an equation editor. Currently, they are provided as text only.

### ***Results.***

This section needs major rework. The text in this section currently only points out what's displayed in the figures without actually providing any specific information.

It is not clear how many tests were run, what was the model of the compressor, how many leakage points were observed, how are they segregated? This information has to also be provided in the results.

### ***Discussion and Conclusion.***

This is yet another short section with repetitive text. The conclusion does not cover important points such as the limitations, future scope, how this study impacts the industry. The conclusion only reiterates what is mentioned in the abstract and introduction.

I recommend rewriting this section.

### **Formatting**

I have formatted the file as per the template suggested by IET Image Processing. Note that some of the sections in your file are too short and will need to be expanded.

I have also added dummy text from the journal template that needs to be revised with your information. Please ensure that you're adding all this information before submission.

I have taken care of all other formatting requirements.

---

## CONTENT REVIEW

### *Notes from the Scientific Reviewer*

#### **Title, Abstract, and Keywords**

The title clarifies what's being done in the study; the abstract makes several promises in explaining what the proposed method is going to do. It states several advantages but does not quantify them. The only quantifiable result provided here is the 95% accuracy rate. However, its not clear what the comparison is with.

**Recommendation 1.** Revise the abstract to talk only about your study and to mention only relevant details. Do not add extra information that is not required in the abstract.

**Recommendation 2.** Discard the points about "speed" and "reliability" as you have not checked for this in your study.

#### **Literature Review and Research Rationale**

The literature review and research rationale, although provided, does not make a convincing argument. The literature review is poor, with only two references provided. Further, the references in itself aren't actually provided, which makes it very difficult to confirm the data provided.

**Recommendation 1.** A more thorough literature review, considering studies that have been published recently. There are several better image processing techniques compared to connected-component labelling and blob analysis that can work in your favor. Please add more references in the literature review.

**Recommendation 2.** Make the introduction denser and discard portions about "speed" and "reliability" Further, clearly indicate why the study is being conducted. Right now, the objective of the study is clear but the motivation is slightly lacking and is unclear.

## **Study Design or Methodology**

A significant amount of detail is oddly not provided; this information would be necessary to replicate your study.

**Recommendation 1.** Add information as suggested in my comments. Add dimensions, figures, model numbers, times, and other parameters that were considered during the study. I recommend clarifying whether a neon light was used to improve feasibility.

**Recommendation 2.** Elaborate on the two techniques presented and explain why they're the most apt for your study.

## **Results and Statistical Analyses**

The result section needs to be reworded and expanded. Currently, this section only covers information about accuracy, and how the leakage was detected.

**Recommendation 1.** Add tables, and more information on parameters that were evaluated, how they were compared, and what the results mean.

**Recommendation 2.** Add a comparison table between your proposed method and previous methods (manual as well as computer vision based).

## **Discussion and Conclusion**

The conclusion is poor and needs to be reworded. Currently, the conclusion only talks about the study (it repeats information from the abstract) and does not provide limitations, future scope and any other impacts to the field.

**Recommendation 1.** Revise the entire conclusion considering the suggestions made.

**Recommendation 2.** Discard points about “accuracy, reliability, and cost.” You have not explained how they are better and how this helps the industry. You end the conclusion stating that the method can be used for other industrial applications, but you do not provide any details on the same.

SAMPLE

---

## SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

### Journal Scope

Section	Assessment	Comments
The paper can be submitted to the target journal	Yes	The paper meets the scope for the journal. However, it is better suited as a short article than a complete paper.
The study conforms to relevant ethical standards	No	More details need to be provided on the models used in the experiment so that the experiment can be replicated. Currently, this is a requirement under the ethics policy, and therefore, the study does not conform to the journal's ethical standard.

### Journal Requirements

Section	Assessment	Comments
The title page contains the title and all author information, including the complete contact details of the corresponding author.	No	Only the title was provided. All other information is missing.
The paper is in the format preferred by the journal (MS Word, PDF, TeX).	Yes	Although the journal prefers Latex Files, Word files are also accepted.
All figures and tables have been prepared in the correct format and in keeping with the journal's requirements.	No	Figures were not provided so I have not commented on this. However, the equations have been provided as images, and this is clearly a problem
In-text citations and references correspond to each other and are	NA	The references were not provided, so I could not verify this for the manuscript.



accurate.

Citations have been  
provided where necessary.

No

Some instances have been  
flagged with the author.

A cover letter has been  
included with the  
manuscript.

Yes

I have provided one for the  
author.

SAMPLE