

**Editor's Comment:**

I checked the process in detail, including the reports of the 5 reviewers, and both original and revised manuscripts.

I noticed that the authors did not signal the modifications in the paper. Moreover, the authors did not implement many reviewer suggestions, while their answers in the reports were of the type "Done", "Okay", "Noted", but no modifications were included many times.

The most critical issues are as follows:

- Grammar errors
- Recent references/more references (the number of references actually diminished)
- Cross references of the figures and tables
- One reviewer asked "Why are the metrics used for feature selection?" This query was not answered
- Poor literature review

In view of these issues, I either recommend to reject the paper right away, or give the authors the opportunity to deal all these issues in detail and resubmit their work.

However, in these cases, from my experience the modus operandi is usually to reject the paper.

**Editor's Details:**

Prof. Raul Duarte Salgueiral Gomes Campilho  
ISEP – School of Engineering, Porto, Portugal.