Computing Science – Student Colloquium – Review of Manuscripts

Title of Manuscript: Context Inconsistency Management in Pervasive Systems

<div align="center">Paper id: 09</div>

Author(s) Samuel Esposito, Alexander Jurjens

Reviewer(s): Sander Kelders

Please note that the paper you are reviewing is sent to you only for the purpose of this evaluation. The paper is to remain confidential until it is actually published in the conference proceedings. You should not pass it on or disclose it to anyone else. Delegation of the reviewing to someone else is not allowed.

Please indicate grade:
5 = excellent ("Definitely accept the paper w.r.t. this point")
4 = good ("I would argue for accepting the paper w.r.t. this point")
3 = neutral ("Not sure, could go either way the paper w.r.t. this point")
2 = bad ("I would argue against accepting the paper w.r.t. this point")
1 = completely unsatisfactory ("Definitely reject the paper w.r.t. this point")

General impression	grade	comment/suggestions
Is the manuscript properly and coherently structured, and 'easy to navigate'? Are all of the required sections (including abstract, references etc.) present and well-positioned, and are subheadings well-chosen?	5	
Is the manuscript clearly and concisely written in a proper tone of voice? (please mark sections, sentences, and phrases that are obscure, too complex, ambiguous, too wordy, too vague, that contain redundancies, or that appear to be irrelevant, and words or phrases that do not conform proper English idiom or scientific discourse) Does the document follow the prescribed style, does it give the necessary details in the references, does it generally maintain the proper form (give examples if not)?	2	Proof read your paper to check for a few spelling errors. Rewrite long sentences (e.g. 1st sentence of section 4). Refrain from using past tense when describing situations or experimental results (e.g. last paragraph section 3). Try to use active sentences instead of passive sentences(e.g. Section 2 2nd paragraph "Even though (…) software engineering"). Do not use contractions (e.g. section 2 2nd paragraph "doesn't"). The use of 'that' to glue sentences together is a dutch approach which should be avoided in English or any writing. The word 'which' or separate sentences are

		preferred.
How would you assess the overall quality of the contribution offered in the manuscript in terms of innovativeness, originality, and independent thinking?	3	The idea is new and is an addition to the field. However it is still only an idea since no actual test results are presented

Framework (initial and final sections)	**grade**	**comment/suggestions**
Do **title** and **abstract** properly cover the content and the argument of the entire manuscript (including results and discussion/conclusion)? (please mark deficiencies in title and abstract)	5	
Does the **introduction** cleverly introduce the topic and its importance? Do the authors briefly describe the current state of knowledge about this topic? Do they clearly state the approach they report, or the research problem they address, or the question they intend to answer in the paper, and its relevance? Do they give a brief overview of the entire document?	3	The topic is introduced as well as the solution bu the relevancy of the topic is not. Add a few examples of what pervasive computing is and why it is a relevant field of research.
Does the concluding section (**summary/conclusion/ discussion**) actually address the approach/problem/question stated in the introduction? Do the authors clearly indicate the significance of their findings for the state of knowledge in the field? Do they assess their own approach to the problem? Do they suggest future directions or directions?	4	The discussion section is more of a summary. You might consider changing the title to summary and writing a separate discussion section. You might want to add the constraints for your algorithm to work such as the transformation algorithm from context model tree to CCT.

Core sections of manuscript	**grade**	**comment/suggestions**
Are the authors clear, complete, concise and coherent in their overview of the current state of knowledge regarding the topic addressed in the manuscript?	5	
Are the authors clear, complete, concise and coherent in their account of their own approach of the topic? Is this approach well-chosen?	4	It is not entirely clear where your own approach starts. Is this at "Fuzzy Ontologies" or already at "From Ontology to CCT"? State clearly where your own addition starts.

Have the authors provided sufficient methodological detail about their approach?	2	The case study is not described extensively enough. It is more of an example than an entire case. Describe the entire case with a context model and perhaps an example of a CCT. A notation is used to describe an observation sequence but the notation is not explained. Add the details of the notation.
Have the authors been fair and explicit in their use and treatment of previous literature and the work of others (including visuals)? Are references in the text mentioned according to the criteria current in the field? Is the list of references complete and correct?	5	
Have the authors made clever and proper use of illustrations?	2	Most figures contain too much information and are too complex. Make your own figures which contain only the information you want to convey. Figure 2 for example shows an entire context model of which you use only a fraction. Add a complete description to every figure. Figure 3 for example can only be understood by reading the text from section 4, not the description.

Acceptance	
What is your overall grade for the paper? Should the paper be accepted for the studColl conference? (encircle what is appropiate)	5 = excellent, "Definitely accept the paper" 4 = good, "I would argue for accepting the paper" 3 = neutral, "Not sure, could go either way" 2 = bad, "I would argue against accepting the paper" 1 = completely unsatisfactory, "Definitely reject the paper" 3

Further comments or suggestions