

Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss., referee comment RC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gi-2021-23-RC1>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on gi-2021-23

Anonymous Referee #1

Referee comment on "Architecture of solution for panoramic image blurring in GIS project application" by Dejan Vasić et al., Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss.,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gi-2021-23-RC1>, 2021

Dear authors,

thank you for handling this important topic, the blurring of mobile mapping images. The article is technical correct and linguistically correct. Up to now, mobile mapping is not much mentioned in scientific literature. Which is not adequate.

Novolty is in scientific publication always a relevant topic. It is hard to decide whether this approach is new, due to two aspects: on the one hand, the description of the used technics is very brief (in section 3). On the other hand, the methodological documentation of an online available service (a lot of companies use this service) is also hard find. They name

He, Kaiming et al. (2018). Mask R-CNN.

as reference, which is not specific for image blurring in mobile mapping. You do not mention this reference, which should be added. A comparison of both approaches would be of importance for the reader. Both approaches rely on Neural Networks. Both learning is done on the COCO dataset.

To my opinion, the described process, the architecture of the process are of most relevance of the paper. This can be named in the four items. The motivation of this structure might be explained more deeply to give the article more impact.

The second aspect of the paper is the evaluation of the algorithm. I cannot see any

dependency of the architecture of the process on the result. The results depend solely on the used detection algorithms. The number of found objects is interesting. Yet, a verification of the found objects would be interesting additionally. I can hardly imagine real life images with more than 20 identified objects per image.

One specific remark: GDPR is not explained/known in the abstract.

Many thanks for your attention!