Review comment:

The experimental results rely solely on the authors' implementation. Including comparisons with existing libraries could help assess whether the performance is competitive.



Evidence 1: ---- SMG

Section 4 Experiments:

The paper mentions ---- workloads like xxx, xxx, and more, but does not include comparisons with established libraries like ---- or ----. The figures only show ----'s performance against baseline methods, lacking comparisons with real-world ---- processing libraries...

Corresponding Reasoning:

Without these comparisons, it is difficult to assess whether ----'s performance is due to its innovative algorithm or simply due to the specific workloads and implementations used in the paper.

Evidence 2:

Section 2 Related Works:

It mentions that existing approaches use XXX algorithms or simple ... but does not directly compare with established libraries ...

Corresponding Reasoning:

Comparing with libraries like ---- or ---- would provide a broader context and show the practical applicability of --- against well-known implementations ...

Evidence 3:

Section 5 Conclusion:

The conclusion highlights ----'s efficiency and speedup ... but again does not mention its performance relative to established libraries ...

Corresponding Reasoning:

Including such comparisons would validate the findings and provide additional evidence that ---- can effectively enhance ---- processing systems in real-world scenarios.

Evidence 4: ---- HBG

Section 4 Experiments (From paper:xxx xxx xxx xxx):

The paper directly compares the proposed method with existing libraries such as ---- and ----, offering a clear, visual comparison of the performance differences. It also analyzes the reasons behind the performance gap, considering factors like algorithmic limitations, xxx and xxx ...

Corresponding Reasoning:

Similar to other works that include such comparisons, this paper could benefit from directly comparing its method with established libraries. By doing so, it would provide a clearer context for evaluating its performance and offer insights into the factors contributing to the observed results. This approach would strengthen the paper's findings and make its contributions more comparable to existing solutions ...

Summary:

The review comment suggests that extending the experimental results section to include comparisons with established libraries would provide a more comprehensive evaluation. Similar to prior works that incorporate such comparisons, this paper could strengthen its credibility by directly benchmarking its method against well-established solutions. Currently, the paper relies on comparisons with baseline methods and specific workloads, which may not fully capture the practical advantages of the proposed approach. Including comparisons with established libraries would offer a clearer understanding of the method's relative performance and the factors contributing to any observed performance gaps, thus enhancing the validity of the findings.