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Dear Mr. Ma,  
  
Reviewers have now commented on your paper. Some revisions have been suggested. If you are prepared to make the revisions, I would be pleased to consider publication.  
  
The reviewers' comments can be found at the end of this email or can be accessed by following the provided link.  
  
Your username is: shuai.ma  
If you forgot your password, you can click the 'Send Login Details' link on the EM Login page at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/vldb/>  
  
When revising your work, please submit a list of changes or a rebuttal against each point which is being raised when you submit the revised manuscript.  
  
Your revision is due by 07 Jun 2019.  
  
Please make sure to submit your editable source files (i. e. Word, TeX).  
  
To submit a revision, go to the journal's Editorial Manager site and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item called 'Submissions Needing Revision'. You will find your submission record there.   
Yours sincerely  
  
Renée Miller  
Editor-in-Chief  
The VLDB Journal  
  
Reviewers' comments:  
  
**Reviewer 1**  
The scholarship in the paper remains very sloppy and I do not find that R2W1 or R3C1 were addressed adequately in the revision only rather begrudgingly in the response letter. Without this, the paper remains a delta off their PED work [15]. The novelty rests on an adequate justification for SED over PED.  
Too many of the reviewer comments were addressed exclusively in response letter, not in the paper itself (e.g., R3C4-2).

**Reviewer 2**  
  
1. The main contribution is a new technique for trajectory simplification that allows time-based query on the compressed data. **The new algorithm is developed in a gradual pace, which I appreciate very much**. The **approach of using 3-D cone and polygon approximation for circle seems interesting** (although the polygon approximation technique is likely borrowed from other fields).

2. The authors have mostly but not entirely addressed reviewers' comments.

3. My main complaints are the following (based on the revised paper):  
  
a) The reviewers have pointed out that the paper lacks intuition from over-formalization. Reading the revised paper, I still see many places where intuition is missing. - When introducing SED in the introduction (3rd paragraph), instead of defining SED using notation, it would be better to define it using plain English.  
- In Sec. 2.1 (2nd paragraph on Page 4), the author sate "Intuitively..." but what's following is not intuitive at all. - Both are pointed out by R3C2  
  
b) R3C1 pointed out that the example in the introduction is not convincing because it is really difficult to tell the difference between PED and SED. In the response, the authors explained the motivation of SED, however, did not directly address the comment. From the example (Fig. 1), it is still hard to tell the difference. Ideally, I wish the motivating example could illustrate the "unbounded" error of using PED (claimed at the end of 2nd paragraph in Sec. 1), and allow the readers to observe that SED provides a huge improvement over PED.  
  
c) The experiments are comprehensive, however, still seem to lack meaningful discussion. For example, I wish to understand why in Fig. 16, the average error increases with larger m, as this is somewhat counter-intuitive as larger m leads to longer running time (Fig. 20). The discussion in Exp-2.1 does not offer an explanation but simply describes what's in the plot. If applicable, I suggest the authors to remove the pervasive "listings" of numerical results (e.g., "The average errors of algorithms CISED-S and CISED-W are on average (119.3%, 127.7%, 119.9%, 138.0%)"), as they are already given in the plots, and add more in-depth discussion on why the results are what they are by linking back to the algorithms.   
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