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Review

The reviewers Toufong Vang and Vikram Reddy has done a good job of reviewing the paper "Automatic and Accurate Extraction of Road Intersections from Raster Maps" by Yao-Yi Chen, et al. The review is lucidly written and it does not assume a lot of domain knowledge on the part of the reader. The reader is only expected to know the vocabulary used in the paper. The reviewers did a good job of pointing out the problem statement and the uniqueness of the proposed solution. They have also provided novel thought while arguing against the assumptions that the authors used in their paper.

Having said so, we also felt that the reviewers missed some points and the organization of the review could have been improved. We address the specific improvements in the next section.

Improvements

1. The reviews can point out the fact that although the authors provide performance accuracy of the approaches of the related works, they missed heralding the computational performance of their competitors.

2. The proposed approach achieves a high precision and (relatively) low recall which means that everything returned was a relevant result, but the algorithm might not have found all the relevant items. The reviewers may want to re-phrase the last line of their 3rd paragraph to convey something similar.

3. The reviewers have tried to follow the "6 point approach", but they have had several aberrations from the format we discussed in our lectures.
   
   (a) The reviewers have included the novelty of the work in the "The problem" section.
   
   (b) The reviewers have included the improvement of the proposed approach over its related works in the "Significance of the problem" section.
   
   (c) The authors state why the problem is important and challenging. Due to map coordinates, scales, legend, original vector data, great complexity of maps, unavailability of raster metadata. The reviewers missed that in their summary.
(d) The reviewers did not summarize the "LTM" section. We felt they could have also done a better job in summarizing the 2nd phase of the algorithm.

4. The first point in the assumption section is more of a critique of the approach than an assumption. It will be better suited for the audience if they can take out the point from the assumption section and place it in a critique section.

5. Although the reviewers term the section as "Potential Revisions", a point has been included which is advised to be addressed as a future work. We appreciate the fact that the reviewers pointed this out to the authors, but the reviewers may want to place it in a different subsection/section.

6. It would be appreciable if the reviewers can touch upon the case-study/dataset, the authors used in their paper.