

===== Review 1 =====

> *** Relevance: Is the paper content appropriate to the conference scope?

Yes (1)

> *** Originality: Does the technical content demonstrate sufficient originality for the conference?

High (2)

> *** Technical Content: Is the technical content of sufficient quality?

High (2)

> *** English: Is the standard of written English acceptable for the conference?

Yes (2)

> *** Writing Style: Is the paper clear and easy to read and understand?

High (2)

> *** Decision: Assign a mark to your decision

Accept (3)

> *** Guidance: Comments and recommendations to the author(s)

Interesting work!

any comment on the responsiveness (accuracy and time) of the proposed technique in a complicated (irregular shape and multiple objects/obstacles) environment?

===== Review 2 =====

> *** Relevance: Is the paper content appropriate to the conference scope?

Yes (1)

> *** Originality: Does the technical content demonstrate sufficient originality for the conference?

High (2)

> *** Technical Content: Is the technical content of sufficient quality?

High (2)

> *** English: Is the standard of written English acceptable for the conference?

Yes (2)

> *** Writing Style: Is the paper clear and easy to read and understand?

High (2)

> *** Decision: Assign a mark to your decision
Accept (3)

> *** Guidance: Comments and recommendations to the author(s)

In general the manuscript is well written and would be acceptable. However, a few typos have been found throughout the paper and carefully proofread the revised version.