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

---------------------------- REVIEW 1 ---------------------------
PAPER: 33
TITLE: EntityEngine: Answering Entity-Relationship Queries using Shallow Semantics

OVERALL RATING: 2 (accept)
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: 1 (low)
Relevance for CIKM: 5 (excellent)
Quality of Content: 4 (good)
Significance and impact: 4 (good)
Originality and level of innovativeness: 3 (fair)
Suitability for demonstration: 5 (excellent)
Presentation quality: 5 (excellent)

The paper presents a system for answering entity-relationship queries
over text. The proposed system is interesting as well as implemented;
the paper is well written, although the references are somewhat weak.

---------------------------- REVIEW 2 ---------------------------
PAPER: 33
TITLE: EntityEngine: Answering Entity-Relationship Queries using Shallow Semantics

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

I thoroughly enjoyed reading this paper and look forward to further work in this area!
Sentences are indexed by the entities they refer to (Sentences being the Document unit
and Entities the index). Sentences are searched using a typical VSM for shallow
features (key words) and the results combined in an SQL like fashion.

Wikipedia is used as the test corpus - I sceptical how well this will scale to the web
but is fine as a proof of concept.

Very relevant to CIKM and should make an interesting demo.

---------------------------- REVIEW 3 ---------------------------
PAPER: 33
TITLE: EntityEngine: Answering Entity-Relationship Queries using Shallow Semantics

OVERALL RATING: 2 (accept)
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: 3 (high)
Relevance for CIKM: 4 (good)
Quality of Content: 4 (good)
Significance and impact: 3 (fair)
Originality and level of innovativeness: 3 (fair)
Suitability for demonstration: 4 (good)
Presentation quality: 3 (fair)

This is a fairly well researched area but the authors seem to have assembled a reasonably comprehensive
demo with some original contributions to the field. It's hard to say more without seeing the UI in action
but the snippet given here seems promising. I'd like to see more thought given to realistic task-based
evaluation though.