

**Review Form: 1st International Workshop on
Services and Infrastructure for the Ubiquitous and Mobile Internet (SIUMI'05)**



SIUMI 2005

WEB MINDS

Columbus, Ohio,
USA, June 6th, 2005

In conjunction with the 25th Int. Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (**ICDCS'05**)

Paper Number: 19

Paper Title: Generating Mobile Agents Securely using MALS

Authors: Tarig

Reviewer1:

Familiarity 4 Rate your familiarity with the topic	1	2	3	4	
	Novice	Some knowledge	Familiar	Expert	
Significance 2 Technical relevance and practicality of ideas in the paper	1	2	3		
	Not significant	Somewhat significant	Highly significant		
Novelty 2 How original the problem and/or solution method is	1	2	3		
	Not novel	Somewhat novel	Highly novel		
Quality of Presentation 1 Writing and presentation style/accuracy	1	2	3		
	Poorly written	Could be improved	Well written		
Overall Recommendation 2	1	2	3	4	5
	Strong reject	Weak reject	Weak accept	Accept	Strong accept

Contributions

A system for generating agents based on a tag languages. Claimed to incorporate security solutions which are not detailed. A high-level not technical presentation of an application.

Strengths and weaknesses

The paper is poor. It is badly written, and does not go into technical details.
What type of security solutions are provided is not clear.

Detailed public comments

It is not the first time I see "markup" languages for agent generations, going back to the work of Danny Lange in 1998. What is the original contribution here? Where is security in your system? This is by no means elaborated. Try to be more technical. Elaborate on issues of technical nature.

Reviewer2:

Familiarity Rate your familiarity with the topic	1	2	3X	4	
	Novice	Some knowledge	Familiar	Expert	
Significance Technical relevance and practicality of ideas in the paper	1	2X	3		
	Not significant	Somewhat significant	Highly significant		
Novelty How original the problem and/or solution method is	1	2X	3		
	Not novel	Somewhat novel	Highly novel		
Quality of Presentation Writing and presentation style/accuracy	1X	2X	3		
	Poorly written	Could be improved	Well written		
Overall Recommendation	1	2X	3	4	5
	Strong reject	Weak reject	Weak accept	Accept	Strong accept

Contributions

Mainstream MA security paper

Strengths and weaknesses

This is a draft paper.

Detailed public comments

Draft needs severe tuning.

Acronyms should be properly introduced. What is SMAG??

Figures will help to understand the concept and architecture.

Screenshots in section 6 don't help much.

No summary/conclusion.