Gmail by Google

Ning Yan <ning.yan.seu@gmail.com>

ACM CIKM 2010 Demo: Reviews for paper 34

ACM CIKM 2010 Demo <acmcikm2010demo@easychair.org> **Thu, Jul 15, 2010 at 3:50 PM**
To: Ning Yan <ning.yan.seu@gmail.com>

Dear Ning,

Following our previous notification email please find attached the reviews for your CIKM Demo paper submission.

Regards,
Cathal Gurrin and Udo Kruschwitz (CIKM 2010 Demonstration Co-Chairs)

========== REVIEWS ==========

---------- REVIEW 1 ----------
PAPER: 34
TITLE: Facetedpedia: Enabling Query-Dependent Faceted Search for Wikipedia

OVERALL RATING: 3 (strong accept)
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: 3 (high)
Relevance for CIKM: 5 (excellent)
Quality of Content: 5 (excellent)
Significance and impact: 4 (good)
Originality and level of innovativeness: 4 (good)
Suitability for demonstration: 5 (excellent)
Presentation quality: 4 (good)

This demonstration gives an interesting system called Facetedpedia, which can enable query- dependent faceted search for Wikipedia. The idea, architecture and implementation of the system are described in the demonstration paper. The demonstration plan is clear. I think the demonstration will attrack many people during the conference time.

---------- REVIEW 2 ----------
PAPER: 34
TITLE: Facetedpedia: Enabling Query-Dependent Faceted Search for Wikipedia

OVERALL RATING: 1 (weak accept)
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: 3 (high)
Relevance for CIKM: 5 (excellent)
Quality of Content: 3 (fair)
Significance and impact: 3 (fair)
Originality and level of innovativeness: 3 (fair)
Suitability for demonstration: 5 (excellent)
Presentation quality: 4 (good)

The authors generate a faceted search interface to Wikipedia articles on the fly.
It looks like it would make an interesting and novel demo and is very relevant
to attendees of CIKM.

---------- REVIEW 3 ----------
PAPER: 34
TITLE: Facetedpedia: Enabling Query-Dependent Faceted Search for Wikipedia

OVERALL RATING: 3 (strong accept)
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: 3 (high)
Relevance for CIKM: 5 (excellent)
Quality of Content: 4 (good)
Significance and impact: 4 (good)
Originality and level of innovativeness: 4 (good)
Suitability for demonstration: 4 (good)
Presentation quality: 4 (good)

Nice original idea, quite ambitious, seems good execution. Id like to see a bit more on evaluation - measuring the quality of facet selection is something quite difficult to do outside of a specific task or context. I'd like the authors to explain a little more about how & why users must choose a domain of interest - this is a crucial step so I think it deserves a bit more analysis / exploration.