# Author’s Response to the Review Comments

***Journal* : Jurnal Elektronika dan Telekomunikasi**

***Title of Paper* : Infinite Latent Feature Selection Technique for Hyperspectral Image Classification**

***Authors* : Tajul Miftahushudur**

We appreciate the time and efforts by the editor and referees in reviewing this manuscript. We have addressed all issues indicated in the review report, and believed that the revised version can meet the journal publication requirements. We have included the line numbers in the revised manuscript to help the reviewers identify our changes.

| **Comment** | **Response** | **Location of Response in Revised Manuscript** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **EDITOR’S COMMENTS** |  |  |
| Example : |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **REVIEWER A COMMENTS** |  |  |
| The introduction should be revised, 3 references appear on the introduction which somehow shows a lack of study. Some references are unclear whether they are from proceedings, journal or books. | We add short introduction about hyperspectral imaging system, and add more references | Section I |
| 1. The authors introduce some abbreviations such as SFS, FCS in the second paragraph of introduction, but leave no explanations about those abbreviations.  2. The name of the feature selection technique presented in [2] should be elaborated, is that GMM?. 3. The reference 3 is about comparison study of three different feature selection techniques. The difference in works with [3] should be well explained. 4. The following sentences should be explained more clearly : The feature selection technique can be divided into 2 types: filter and wrapper [4]. Information gain (IG) [5], chi-square [6], and log like ratio examples of feature selection with the filter types. As for the wrapper type is forward and backward selection [4], relief [7], and infinite latent feature selection.  [8] What makes them are classified as filter or warper should be described 5. The link for dataset source should be provided 6. The units for Fig.5 and 6 should be added, feature number and % accuracy? | 1. done  2. done  3. done  4. repaired  5. done  6. done | 1. section 1, par.3  2. section 1, par.3  3.section 1, par 3  4.section 1, par 3  5. section 3, part A  6. section 4, fig 6 & 7 |
| **REVIEWER B COMMENTS** |  |  |
| Name of x and y axis is not mentioned for both of the presented graphs | done | section 4, fig 6 & 7 |
| what is the standard acceptable for accuracy measurement in feature selection technique of a hyperspectral image? Since the derived results present less than 90% for maximum accuracy | There is no standard accuracy, since the aim of feature selection technique implementation is to reduce dataset dimension without reduce the accuracy |  |
| **REVIEWER C COMMENTS** |  |  |
| 1. The English quality should be significantly improved. Many parts contain a quite great number of grammatical errors and this should be fixed. 2. I would still find the paper lacks in literature survey. I suggest the author to improve the literature survey and adding more related studies to the field. I would also suggest the author to add the rationale of why choosing ILFS and relief as the method.  3. The methods are not clearly describe. I suggest to divide Sec. III into two sections: Proposed method and experimental setup. The method should be explained in more clear way in separate sections. 4. Some figures should be improved. What are the axis in Fig. 5 and 6? The lines should be made different by authors so it is readable when using black and white. The tables should also be made to be more clear. The authors should explain every table. | 1. done,  2. done,  3. done  4. done | 1. all  2. section 1  3. section 2 part B  4. section 4, fig 6&7 |
| 1. The authors do not really proposed new method but basically using an existing method to a new problems. But what concern me more is there is no real reasons why the authors choose these methods. The rationale should be made clear. The authors should also made it more clear on why using SVM for classification and why using RBF kernel with gamma 0.1 for it. There are more than one hyper parameters for RBF kernels and this is not explained by the authors how these parameters is set. I suggest the authors also show the results using various kernels for SVM. \ 2. The authors should clearly explain the results of the paper rather than pointing the results as we can all see that. But what are the causes of such results, can the author explait it further? | 1. done, we have add a reference that stating that these parameter produce best performance in HSI land classification  2. done, we have add an explanation why the propose algorithm give better performance. | 1. section 3. Part b, last paragraph  2. section 4, par 6 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |