

**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: 11

Paper Title: A Distributed Architecture for management and Retrieval of Extended Points of Interest

Authors: Claudio Bettini, Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi, Daniele Riboni

Reviewer1:

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

Contributions

The paper discusses the importance of managing, sharing and searching ePOIs. The relevance of ePOIs is starting to emerge in mobile computing environments to support both the geographical and the virtual location of a resource. The paper contributes to the research field in this area by presenting an integrated middleware for the management of ePOIs, from ePOIs access to ePOIs sharing and searching support.

Strengths and weaknesses

The paper focuses on a topic that is interesting for users exploiting GPS enabled mobile devices. The topic is quite accurately discussed, by providing the description of the integrated middleware to support ePOIs definition, searching and sharing. The paper contains some relevant ideas, but it should outline with more strength and evidence the importance and contribution of the proposed solution .

Detailed public comments

Reviewer2:

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

Contributions

The paper tries to integrate the notions of physical points of reference with the notion of hypertext links. The basic goal is to support the storage and retrieval of bookmarks that include both physical location information (GPS coordinates) and web links that point to information about the place. The authors also propose a middleware peer to peer architecture to allow access from a variety of devices.

Strengths and weaknesses

(Strengths) The ideas proposed by the paper are interesting.

(Weaknesses) The effort is still underway. Several details about the implementation are not described. The only benchmarks provided are about the matching algorithm. No benchmarks are provided about the performance from different devices. Security issues are not even mentioned.

Detailed public comments

The concept of the paper is interesting. Several questions and comments come to mind.

There seems to be no comparison with other work related to location-oriented computing.

Several papers have been published in the UbiComp conference dealing with the issue of “bookmarking” physical locations. There are no benchmarks showing the performance of your system in terms of the client devices and the size of the peer-to-peer network of servers. Also – there are several details that are left out about the peer-to-peer implementation. For example, is the assumption that they are all “connected” (that is, regardless of which ePOI server a user attaches to, will the user be able to access his or her home server)? Finally, no mention is made of security. I presume your system has some notion of a security model.

Reviewer3:

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

Contributions

The paper introduces an architecture for storing and retrieval of points of interest (location links). It is very hard to understand what the novelty is with this paper: the approach seems to introduce different techniques, p2p system, web services, a schema for EPOI (not presented), however the paper fails to indicate the main novelty of the approach.

Strengths and weaknesses

- + the paper shows a prototype and an evaluation
- not well structured paper
- no clear motivation
- unclear mixture of technologies
- no related work

Detailed public comments

I found the paper not well motivated and quite unclear with respect to its real contribution.

The authors have made a definite effort towards an architecture and an implementation, however they use a mixture of technologies which they fail to motivate or compare. So I arrived to the end of the paper and I was still unclear about what is really novel here.

EPOI should be better described and an example should be introduced earlier in the paper for better understanding and motivation. Each of the technology chosen should be justified: why do you think you need a p2p system? Can you learn anything from DB querying techniques? Why is your approach novel in this sense?

I think a big problem in the paper is the mixing of concepts and implementation related details...the two things should be separated.

The paper fails to illustrate related work and therefore it makes it even more difficult to isolate the real contribution of the approach.