UA LITTLE ROCK

Debanjan Mahata <dxmahata@ualr.edu>

ACM MM Grand Challenge on Event Detection and Summarization: Final results

1 message

Conference Management Toolkit <cmt@microsoft.com> Mon, Jul 27, 2015 at 5:21 PM
Reply-To: bthomee@yahoo-inc.com
To: dxmahata@ualr.edu

Dear Debanjan Mahata,

Thank you again for your time and effort in reviewing for the grand challenge. I hope seeing systems in action brought a welcome change to just reading pages of text!

I've aggregated all submitted reviews and generally the opinions were sufficiently similar to make an easy decision, although in some cases we had to weigh the pros and cons that each of you mentioned. Here are the final verdicts:

Paper 854: FLYER: A Yahoo-Flickr YFCC100M Event Summarization System
Reviews: weak accept, weak accept, reject
Recommendation: accept
Why: The reviews indicate that even though the proposed methodology may not be very novel and there is a lack of positioning of the work within the literature, the technical presentation is good and well-justified, albeit rather outdated as one of the reviewer remarks. Further the paper includes a user study and the authors have put together a good demo. The system is really interactive, which would make for a nice demo presentation at the conference. Based on this, the paper is recommended to be accepted. [Raphaël: the others liked the paper sufficiently for it to make it into the conference; In the meta-review I've asked the authors to improve their work as much as possible to make up for some of the good points you raised]

Paper 856: A Graph Model for Large Scale Event-based Media Retrieval
Reviews: borderline, weak accept, reject
Recommendation: reject
Why: The reviews state that the paper is well-presented; this notwithstanding the reviewers indicate that its discussion of the state of the art is weak, that the proposed method is nothing particularly novel, and that the evaluation is very limited. While on paper the actual demo system appears reasonable, there are some problems with the actual implementation; while the word cloud for quick overview of an event was to a certain extent appreciated by the reviewers, it didn't impress them either. Moreover, the system was found to be static, and actually fails to summarize the events correctly for many events, which raises great concerns regarding how effective the proposed technique actually is in detecting and summarizing events. Based on the aforementioned concerns, the paper is suggested to be rejected.

Paper 861: Multimodal Graph-based Event Detection and Summarization in Social Media Streams
Reviews: accept, accept, borderline
Recommendation: accept
Why: The first and second reviewers are very positive about the paper and the system, although the third reviewer raises some concerns. This notwithstanding, the overall sentiment is favorable and as such the paper is suggested to be accepted.

Paper 862: Evento 360: Social Event Discovery from Web-scale Multimedia Collection
Reviews: borderline, accept, accept
Recommendation: accept
Why: The reviewers indicate the proposed technique may not be particularly novel and there is no evaluation. This notwithstanding, the second reviewer is very positive about many aspects of the proposed method (e.g. it is highly multimodal) and the demo (e.g. easy to use); the third reviewer also indicated these points in personal communication. As such the paper is suggested to be accepted.

Paper 864: Unsupervised Latent Sub-events Discovery based on Multi-content and Human Activities Analysis for Diverse Event Summarization
Reviews: weak accept, accept, borderline
Recommendation: accept
Why: The reviewers indicate that the proposed system uses state of the art techniques (e.g. deep features) and is original (e.g. clothing and pose detection). Although it has limited related work / state of the art discussion, and presents the technique with too little detail, giving rise to some questions. Still, the unusual approach will make for a nice demo +

presentation at the conference, and as such the paper is suggested to be accepted.

Ranking of papers:
1. Paper 861
2. Paper 862
3. Paper 864
4. Paper 854
(5. Paper 856)

Thanks again for the hard work, and I'll be looking forward to seeing you in person if you make it to ACM MM this year.

Bart