UA LITTLE ROCK

Debanjan Mahata <dxmahata@ualr.edu>

ACMMM 2015: Paper 856

1 message

Conference Management Toolkit <cmt@microsoft.com> Fri, Jul 24, 2015 at 12:34 AM
Reply-To: dxmahata@ualr.edu
To: dxmahata@ualr.edu

Debanjan Mahata has uploaded review for Paper ID 856 : A Graph Model for Large Scale Event-based Media Retrieval

-- Review Summary --

Question 1 : OVERALL EVALUATION

reject

Question 2 : REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE

low

Question 3 : RELEVANCE TO GRAND CHALLENGE

good

Question 4 : PAPER PRESENTATION

good

Question 5 : DEMO PRESENTATION

good

Question 6 : ORIGINALITY

poor

Question 7 : CORRECTNESS

poor

Question 8 : SIGNIFICANCE

good

Question 9 : REFERENCES

good

Question 10 : REVIEW

In this paper the authors have mainly relied on a graph ranking model for performing the task.

They took the following approach:

1. The relevant candidate medias are first retrieved by coarse search based on text and time.
2. A graph-ranking algorithm is used for ranking individual media according to its relevance to a given event.
3. The media items with high ranking scores are structured following a chronologically ordered graph layout and the textual metadata are extracted to generate the tag cloud.

Pros: i don't see any pros in this paper.

Cons: There are lots of problems with the techniques used.
I am not sure if the indexing and extraction of textual content is properly done or not?

For example: If we look at the page of "holi" the retrieved media elements have nothing to do with the event. Even the word cloud formed is wrong. Holi is primarily an Indian festival and a festival of colors. Now given the description of the event, I don't see how the authors could come up with such a wrong set of pictures and word cloud.

Even if we look at the samples for olympic games, the photos and word clouds are most often not truly representative.

The graph based technique is used for ranking the individual media for relevance, but how have they tried to diversify the results without compromising the quality? This section has to be seriously considered. Also, the type of graph based ranking technique that has been used might work well for ranking sentences and textual documents in the web, except the social media. Given the way people post irrelevant pictures and sometimes assign wrong tags the reliance on textual and temporal features only is bound to give wrong and low quality results. The method used can hardly combat against the spam posts.

The visualization of the results are certainly not very well done. Simple word clouds and a very uninteractive visualization w.r.t time does not prove anything related to the task, neither they add any novelty.

A lot of attention has to be paid to the intricate details of the problem and the dataset.

Question 11 : CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS FOR THE PROGRAM COMMITTEE

This paper is the weakest one out of all that I reviewed.