Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Author Should Prepare A Minor Revision

Comments:

The revised paper has addressed the issues raised by reviewers. There are some remaining issues as follows:

1. Basically, coauthorship order is not always reflecting the contribution - in particular, the corresponding author is a very strong indicator. In my opinion, I think it's better to crawl the corresponding author information from other databases, say IEEEXplore and ACM DL, so that the performance could be improved.

2. In Table 3. The node (author) and edge (coauthor relations) information should be specified.

3. The impact of each paper has been largely ignored. As suggested in the conclusion part, the number of citations should be incorporated.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Author Should Prepare A Minor Revision

Comments:

The authors investigated the collaborator recommendation problem in the so-called Academic Social Networks (ASNs), which are formed by the published papers by different authors. The difficulty or uniqueness of the problem, compared to the friend recommendation in normal social networks, is that preferred collaborator recommendations should be productive and having the similar research interest, or even with strong recent activities.

A random walk with restart technique is exploited in the paper to address the problem. Some interesting results are presented in the paper.

I would suggest to use more generic names in Figure 3, such as Alice, Bob, Charlie, David, Eden, etc.

Figure 6 seems weak. The authors are suggested to come up with a different angle to represent the data, e.g., using a new x-vairiable or merging all three figures into one figure.

The main performance figure which compares the proposed technique with other techniques, figure 9, looks rather weak too. The performance gain over other techniques is small. The authors are suggested to find ways to demonstrate the said strong performance of the proposed technique. In fact, one of the difficulties of researching in ASNs is the evaluation technique: how do we evaluate the performance of different techniques?

Reviewer: 3

Recommendation: Author Should Prepare A Minor Revision

Comments:

The authors present comprehensive evaluation on an real-world data and the experiments are encouraging and promising.

Below are some observation that could help further improve the quality of the manuscript.

1. The precision achieved by MVCWalker is only 18.1% as shown in Fig. 9.

You'd better explain why it is generally so low in the context of academic recommendation.

2. It is necessary to introduce more details on Equation (5) in section 3.3.2 to be well understood.