Fwd: [P2P 2015] Outcome of paper submission "An Asynchronous Browser-based P2P..."

Shikhar Vashishth <shikharvashishth@gmail.com> Tue, Aug 4, 2015 at 4:11 PM
To: Yash Sinha <mail.yash.sinha@gmail.com>

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: <web@wanlab.poly.edu>
Date: 04-Aug-2015 2:22 am
Subject: [P2P 2015] Outcome of paper submission "An Asynchronous Browser-based P2P..."
To: "Haribabu K" <khari@pilani.bits-pilani.ac.in>, "Shikhar Vashishth" <shikharvashishth@gmail.com>
Cc: "Jay Lorch" <jaylorch@gmail.com>, "Marinho Barcellos" <marinho@inf.ufrgs.br>

Dear authors,

The IEEE International Conference on Peer-to-Peer Computing (P2P 2015) program committee is sorry to inform you that your paper #36 could not be accepted.

Title: An Asynchronous Browser-based P2P Framework for Content Sharing
Authors: Shikhar Vashishth (Birla Institute of Technology and Science, Pilani)
Yash Sinha (Birla Institute of Technology and Science, Pilani)
K Hari Babu (Birla Institute of Technology and Science, Pilani)
Paper site: http://wanlab.poly.edu/p2p2015/hotcrp/paper.php/36?cap=036aqf8xILkl_jg

Out of 33 submissions, 14 papers were accepted.

Reviews and comments on your paper are appended to this email. The submissions site also has the paper's reviews and comments, as well as more information about review scores.

Contact Jay Lorch <jaylorch@gmail.com> and Marinho Barcellos <marinho@inf.ufrgs.br> with any questions or concerns.

- P2P 2015 Submissions

==========

P2P 2015 Review #36A
Updated 22 Jun 2015 2:26:56pm EDT

Paper #36: An Asynchronous Browser-based P2P Framework for Content Sharing

---

Overall merit: 1. Reject
Reviewer expertise: 3. Knowledgeable

===== Paper summary =====

This paper describes a JavaScript framework that implements Chord using WebRTC and NodeJS. It describes the APIs of the framework, internal data structures, and so on.

===== Comments for author =====

As far as I can understand, the goal of the paper is to describe a Web-based framework that provides Chord-like functionalities. However, this does not seem to qualify as a intellectual contribution adequate for academic communities.

First of all, explaining what a system does is necessary, but not sufficient; there has to be more discussions of what problems the system addresses (which the current paper does somewhat of a job, but not quite well), and why the

system is designed that way. The current paper hardly gives any evidence as to why anyone else needs to be interested in knowing more about it. One problem that the paper seems to focus on is the mismatch between the asynchronous programming environment of a browser and the system design itself (Chord). If this is something important, then it has to feature more prominently in the paper. (But I doubt that that's the case; Chord's design is very asynchronous already.)

Second, using WebRTC and NodeJS in some way to implement a well-known system is probably not something that an academic research community wants to hear about unless there's some lesson drawn out of the experience. If the paper re-targets itself as an experience report, people might pay more attention to it.

Third, if the context of the framework is education (which seems to be the case), then there has to be more discussion about student and teaching experiences. Also if that's the case, then the paper might be a better fit for something like SIGCSE rather than a research-oriented conference.

So I think that the paper needs to have more research contributions, be it an experience discussion or more system implementation techniques.

==========

P2P 2015 Review #36B
Updated 25 Jun 2015 6:36:54am EDT

Paper #36: An Asynchronous Browser-based P2P Framework for Content Sharing

---

Overall merit: 1. Reject
Reviewer expertise: 3. Knowledgeable

===== Paper summary =====

This paper presents an implementation of Chord over WebRTC.

===== Comments for author =====

I do not see what is the novelty of this paper. Listing the pseudocode of Chord's main API functions is definitely not a contribution.

==========

P2P 2015 Review #36C
Updated 29 Jun 2015 4:19:39pm EDT

Paper #36: An Asynchronous Browser-based P2P Framework for Content Sharing

---

Overall merit: 1. Reject
Reviewer expertise: 4. Expert

===== Paper summary =====

The article is a low-level, technical, white-paper style document describing a generic framework built on P2P with some guidance on the need of web applications.
The presentation is poor and fairly dry, there is nothing new to the framework itself and there is no evaluation.

===== Comments for author =====

This is not a research paper; you should invest time reading papers in main technical venues (particularly those you are submitting and that your reviewers submit to) not just for
content but for style - what makes a research paper, what areas are interesting, what are your reviewers expecting to see in a submission, what are you actually contributing to
the field? It shouldn't be, it can't be - we built x. It is great you did, but that's not research.

Some other comments I wrote down while reading the paper:

The first sentence of the introduction has almost no information in it; this may be the first line a reviewer/reader reads so you want to clearly define the context of the problem you are addressing.
Your first sentence is basically "Technology is important in education technology".
The rest of the first two paragraphs are similarly light in content and a bit of a wasted opportunity - drive the conversation to your area and the main problem you address as soon as you can.
P2P has been there for over 15 years offering several advantages over centralized alternative in different areas from entertainment to computational science. Interestingly, an area where the benefits of this technology has received little to

no attention is education.
That was based on my assumption about your area problem - what I read in your contribution paragraph is another thing altogether - a general browser-based P2P framework.
Why Chord among DHTs? Why not Kademlia which has proven to be better w/ high churn?
Why web applications, what web applications are we talking about? Enlisting != listing.
The paper is a long set of tables, API descriptions, and other low-level details about the framework design and implementation with nothing really new in either part, no evaluation or use experience.