



## Issue #14 (open): [DECISION] ACCEPT / ENDORSE

@jsndyks on  
Sep 05, 2025 14:46:

[opened]

@jsndyks on  
Sep 05, 2025 14:46:

### Conflicts of interest

- ☒ I declare that I have no known conflicts of interest with the authors.

### Reviewed version

bbb78c9 - bbb78c9cc66e9434f3b84fa6ffd96cf13b77bc20

### Reviews summarized

This is in response to the [MINOR REVISION](#) that we agreed in light of [R1 #11 minor](#), [R2 #10 reject](#) and [R3 #12 minor](#).

### Meta-Review

OK - we asked for â€

- edits** - and got them, *all good*;
- conclusion** - which has been added, and is *OK, but see below*;
- reframing** - which is less evident and *not wholly successful*, but to be honest, the discussion above reframes and repositions pretty well, providing context that justifies publication, so I am less concerned by this. I think we all know what we have here, and I think we agree that itâ€™s useful!

In terms of *framing â€> conclusion* â€ The â€overarching goal is to demonstrate how visualizations can be effective tools for communicating and clarifying complex, abstract conceptsâ€

We asked for a conclusion that tells us â€what do we know, and how well do we know it and what do we need to do nextâ€ and **we donâ€™t really get this**. The conclusion is more of a summary than an assessment of what can be claimed as a result of the work. The key objective stated at the outset is to â€demonstrate how visualizations can be effective tools for communicating and clarifying complex, abstract conceptsâ€ and a critical evaluation of that â€overarching goalâ€, given the work that has been undertaken and the information that has been presented, would be more useful here. Given what we have in the article, which is interesting, and the discussions developed during the open review process, maybe thatâ€™s a job for the readers. I think so.

But â€ and this may seem picky, I want to add that the semantics are important to me here: we probably have some evidence in this paper and perhaps might even claim to know **THAT** â€visualizations can be effective tools â€ which is useful, and shown by the examples. But I donâ€™t think we know â€**HOW** visualizations can be effective tools â€, which is much more useful as it allows knowledge to be transferred or generalised, but requires a more robust methodology. For me, thatâ€™s the difference between an interesting paper (this is interesting, nice ideas and opportunities, well expressed, well explained) and a really useful paper (OK, we know something and can use it). Hopefully this interesting paper will encourage somebody to address the â€HOW?â€ Question with enough rigor to generate reliable transferable results. All good papers result in research questions. But the question that this paper somewhat answers is **THAT** and not **HOW** ... which is fine, but easier and less useful.

Having been picky, I should add that I really like: *Explainer asides, interactive comparison charts* - although these could be explained (where the shaded comparison grid nicely shows that despite

one “outperforming” model scoring better in broad terms than another, it fails to outperform in some instances - it would be great to have some discussion around the nuances and subtleties that the visualization reveals), and hope others will see these as good practice and use them. Nice innovation.

I think the graphics could embrace visualisation more fully. For example, the graphs of the *Label Bias Problem* could effectively and usefully encode the very different probabilities that are presented numerically. This might help with explanation.

And a couple of *finalish* statements: - the authors and uber-editor have been very patient and I appreciate this; - I don’t understand the models or what I would call “the maths” (all those equations and stuff) at all and so have little confidence in any reviewing on my part - the reviewers provided excellent expertise here, but I do think that I can see the high level structure of a paper, possibilities for visualisation contribution and quality of scientific process, hence the focus on those aspects in much of my AEing. This does not seem completely out of order given the nature of the journal, but I acknowledge the bias. For more on my biases - see [my evolving position](#)

**Simple Fix:** I found this phrasing a little clunky: “As a result, we don’t see as drastic of a performance deterioration for longer entities as observed with the HMM”. Try: “As a result, we don’t see the drastic performance deterioration for longer entities observed with the HMM”

---

## Decision

Endorse: I am willing to endorse this paper, with at most minor copyediting.

[@jsndyks](#) on  
Sep 05, 2025 14:48:

[referenced from [#\[DECISION\] Minor Revision - May need more than 1 month and is somewhat dependent on other VISxAI papers & decisions](#)]

[@chatchavan](#) on  
Sep 06, 2025 11:57:

@vuluongj20 I'm checking for the next step of processing/publishing. Meanwhile, please consider the review above and make the fixes.

[@chatchavan](#) on  
Sep 11, 2025 15:25:

@vuluongj20 Could you give a quick confirmation that the current version that appear here shall be the version of record?

<https://www.journalovi.org/2024-luong-graphical-models/>

If there's any minor changes, please do and leave a reply below.

Once we received a confirmation from you, our tech chair will take over and execute the publication.

[@vuluongj20](#) on  
Sep 24, 2025 21:28:

Hi @chatchavan,

I've updated the article to fix the clunky sentence that @jsndyks identified (thank you!), and remove the under review banner. The version at <https://www.journalovi.org/2024-luong-graphical-models/> is now current and can be the version of record.

[@chatchavan](#) on  
Sep 25, 2025 04:03:

@vuluongj20 Thanks! Now Matt (@mjskay) will take over and work with our tech chair to publish it.

---