Feedback from the Reviewers

    *
A. Contribution and Clarity:
importance of scope ------------ [3 - Minor]
original result ---------------- [3 - Minor]
application oriented ----------- [2 - Questionable]
clear and concise ------------- [2 - Questionable]
B. Recommendations to TPC ---------- [2 - Last resort]
C. Suggested form of presentation -- [P - Poster session]

Comments: The HECOPS Location algorithm is not clearly explained, with
particular reference to Confidence calculation and usage and to checking of
a node to discover if it's in the same direction of another one related to
a sending node (How can it know its distance to node B and verifying it is
lower than the half of the distance to A? It knows its position or it
simply checks if 0.5RSSI(B)>RSSSI(A)? It is well known that this
latter methods does not work properly). Figures 1 and 2 refer to a
praticular test bed? How can they be generalized? In section 3 authors
propose a 3x3 sensor grid and then results are related to a 10x10 sensor
grid. Authors assume models RSSIxd^n=constant that do not take in accout
reflections and obstacle; the experimental environment is not described
(free space?) so it is not possible to evaluate results. The new
calibration approach should be better described and novelty highlighted.
Related works (Section 5) should be described in the introduction
motivating the need and the novelty of the proposed approach.

    *
A. Contribution and Clarity:
importance of scope ------------ [4 - Significant]
original result ---------------- [1 - None or Not Suitable]
application oriented ----------- [2 - Questionable]
clear and concise ------------- [3 - Minor] B.
B. Recommendations to TPC ---------- [0 - Reject definitely]
C. Suggested form of presentation -- [P - Poster session]

Comments: The paper presents some information on the implementation and
tentative adaptations of an already published ditributed location algorithm
based on RSSI measurements. The introduction adequately presents the
problem. Section 2 describes to some extent the algorithm. Section 3
reports the RSSI measurements taken in the field and used in the
simulations of different improvement to the algorithm, in particular a less
irrealistic propagation model and RSSI filtering. Section 4 suggest a new
calibation technique and section 5 mentions a few related publications. The
paper cannot be accepted for the following reasons: - the models and
techniques you use are outdated. Please read recent documents such
as:Patwari, N. Location Estimation In Sensor Networks, Doctoral Thesis in
the University of Michigan 2005. - there is no comparison with other
techniques - there is no validation of the algorithm in real situations

*

A. Contribution and Clarity:
importance of scope ------------ [4 - Significant]
original result ---------------- [4 - Significant]
application oriented ----------- [4 - Significant]
clear and concise -------------- [4 - Significant]
B. Recommendations to TPC ---------- [4 - Should be included]
C. Suggested form of presentation -- [P - Poster session]

Comments: You have made a good proposal for improvement of a triangulation
method in a rather well explored field. It would improve the paper a lot if
experimental results that support the simulations could be included. The
results regarding error in distance (e.g fig 11 and 12) are unclear as it
is difficult to realize how well the position of each node is determined.