

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



**SIUMI 2005**

**WEB MINDS**

Columbus, Ohio,  
USA, June 6<sup>th</sup>, 2005

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

Paper Number: 10

Paper Title: Proxy –Applications Server

Authors: Grieco, Malandrino, Mazzoni, Scarano, Varriale

**Reviewer1:**

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

**Contributions**

The paper describes the current status of an ongoing project aimed at developing a framework for the deployment of intermediary services on the WWW, with emphasis on efficiency, programmability, deployment, security, and scalability. The approach proposed contains interesting novelties, but the paper does not contain enough technical details to enable one to clearly identify possible problems.

**Strengths and weaknesses**

Strenghts:

- 1) Flexibility and scalability of the proposed architecture
- 2) Potential performance gains due to the use of Apache and mod\_perl
- 3) Programmability of the system

Weakness:

- 1) no actual benchmarking has been performed, so it is hard to be convinced that the proposed approach offers performance better than the alternative ones
- 2) the presentation can be improved, especially in Sec.4, by focusing more on the architecture and less on the implementation, that sometimes make the paper tedious to read

## Detailed public comments

The quality of the presentation is in general acceptable, but there are a few points that deserve further work to improve it:

1) Sec. 4, although entitled “Architecture and Implementation”, focuses too much on the latter, and not enough on the former. In particular, the description of the various modules, and of their interactions, is not clear enough. Please use a running example that explains how a request is processed, that is what is the sequence of modules (in Fig. 1 left) that is activated for a given request

2) In the conclusion it is stated that the proposed approach should result in performance better than alternative systems based on Java. Although you admittedly did not perform a benchmark activity, it would be useful for the reader even a rough estimate of the possible performance benefits

---

## Reviewer2:

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

## Contributions

This paper proposes a new platform that is intended to quickly implement and manage efficient intermediary-based services for the Web.

## Strengths and weaknesses

The list of requirements that the proposed framework should provide is large: programmability combined with efficiency, “horizontal” users’ profiles management primitives, and deployment/undeployment mechanisms. Actually, scalability and high performance seems to represent the main goals and novelty with respect to existing frameworks. The design and implementation choices for reaching these objectives are clear. The level of the details and the profound knowledge of the literature by the authors make this paper a convincing case of interest for the SIUMI participants, although some preliminary experimental results would be expected.

## Detailed public comments

The presentation can be improved. The authors should clarify whether the real contribution of this paper with respect to other frameworks lies mainly in the programmability and robustness or scalability. From the conclusions, it seems that the efficiency is the main novelty because other frameworks already provide similar functions. In either case, it should be important to identify which design and architectural choice allow the authors to achieve the intended goal(s). Moreover, the main contribution should be anticipated to the abstract and clarified in the introduction.

Finally the real state of the project is unclear. There is no motivation about the lack of any experimental results.

---

### **Reviewer3:**

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

### **Contributions**

The paper presented the architecture of an environment to rapidly build and deliver proxy servers.

### **Strengths and weaknesses**

The strength of the paper is that the framework presented is interesting. It consists of several promising features, such as programmability, life cycle support and user profile management.

The weakness is that no benchmarks is conducted.

### **Detailed public comments**

The authors should add some performance study which will increase the credibility of the proposed approach.