ICDE 2014
2014 IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering
March 31 - Apr 4, 2014 , Chicago, IL, USA

Reviews For Paper

Track	Demos
Paper ID	737
Title	GQBE: Querying Knowledge Graphs by Example Entity Tuples

---

Masked Reviewer ID: Assigned_Reviewer_1

Review:

Question

Overall evaluation	Weak Accept
Overall 3 strong points, 3 weak points	strong points: 1) This paper proposed a very useful machanism for querying knowledge graph, this machanism conforms to the analogy thought method of human beings. 2) The interface is very user-friendly, the input format is intuitive, and the system is easy to use. 3) The demonstration plan describes several detailed scenarios to show users how to use this system. weak point: 1) The core algrothim should be described more detailed and professionally. 2) The picture in Fig .4 is not very prominent, the import part should be clearer.
Novelty & Significance: Is the demostrated system unique and novel? Is there a significant issue or problem it addresses?	High
Technical quality: Does the system implementation appear technically sound and system feasible to be implemented as described?	Medium

"Wow" factor: Is the system demonstration amazing for ICDE attendees?	Medium
Readability and style: Is the research contributions of the demonstrated system clear? Does the paper describe clearly what the audience will see and how it can interact with the system?	High
Reviewer's confidence	Medium
Comments to authors	This system is very useful as its machanism is close to human thinking. One question about the system is when the relationship between the input tuples is more than one, how to process the result?

Masked Reviewer ID: Assigned_Reviewer_2

Review:

Question

Overall evaluation	Accept
Overall 3 strong points, 3 weak points	Strong points: 1. original system 2. innovative approach about a challenging topic 3. clear paper Weak point: 1. The dataset that will be used in the demo is not declared 2. The main algorithms used in the paper are not mentioned, described or at least cited with a reference
Novelty & Significance: Is the demostrated system unique and novel? Is there a significant issue	High

or problem it addresses?	
Technical quality: Does the system implementation appear technically sound and system feasible to be implemented as described?	High
"Wow" factor: Is the system demonstration amazing for ICDE attendees?	High
Readability and style: Is the research contributions of the demonstrated system clear? Does the paper describe clearly what the audience will see and how it can interact with the system?	High
Reviewer's confidence	Medium
Comments to authors	The paper proposes a system for querying large knowledge graphs in an intuitive way. The system takes as input one or more entity tuples and returns top-k similar tuples that represent the query intent. I believe the proposed system is interesting and well described and the paper is nicely written and easy to read. There is room for some improvements such as: * the algorithms used in the tool should at least be mentioned (e.g. algorithm for top-k lattice exploration, algorithm for finding maximal query graph ...) * more information should be given about the dataset that will be used in the demo * is there any similar tool already?

Masked Reviewer ID: Assigned_Reviewer_3

Review:

Question	
Overall evaluation	Weak Accept
Overall 3 strong points, 3 weak points	Strong - Writing a query seems simple - Explanation of the results through graph representation Weak - A more detailed explanation of the ranking would be interesting
Novelty & Significance: Is the demostrated system unique and novel? Is there a significant issue or problem it addresses?	Medium
Technical quality: Does the system implementation appear technically sound and system feasible to be implemented as described?	High
"Wow" factor: Is the system demonstration amazing for ICDE attendees?	Medium
Readability and style: Is the research contributions of the demonstrated system clear? Does the paper describe clearly what the audience will see and how it can interact with the system?	High

Reviewer's confidence	Medium
Comments to authors	Try to replace figures with vectorial versions of them when possible (figs 1 and 5 in particular) II first paragraph, 4) is used twice