

CSCI8380 (Spring 2012): Paper Review Form

Reviewer Name: Mehdi Allahyari

Paper Name: Enrichment and Ranking of the YouTube Tag Space and Integration with the Linked Data Cloud.

Section I. Overview

A. Reader Interest

1. Which category describes this manuscript?
☐ Practice/Application/Case Study/Experience Report
☒ Research/Technology
☐ Survey/Tutorial/How-To

B. Content

1. Please explain how this manuscript advances this field of research and/or contributes something new to the literature.

Answer: *This manuscript describes a framework for semantic enrichment, ranking and integration of web video tags using Semantic Web technologies. It also proposes a novel way to enhance the tag space using semantics.*

C. Presentation

1. Does the introduction state the objectives of the manuscript in terms that encourage the reader to read on?
☒ Yes
☐ Could be improved
☐ No
2. How would you rate the organization of the manuscript? Is it focused? Is the length appropriate for the topic?
☒ Satisfactory
☐ Could be improved
☐ Poor
3. Please rate and comment on the readability of this manuscript.
☒ Easy to read
☐ Readable - but requires some effort to understand
☐ Difficult to read and understand
☐ Unreadable

Section II. Evaluation

Please rate the manuscript. Explain your choice.

___ Award Quality
___ Excellent
☒ Good
___ Fair
___ Poor

Section III. Detailed Comments (provide your thoughts/criticism about the ideas in the paper; not only summarize the paper but have a critical look here)

Answer: In this paper authors presented a framework to explore the contribution of various types of contextual data to the tag space and their relevance in ranking. They also consider linking the enriched tag data to the open Web following the principles envisioned in the Linking Open Data.

Additional Comments:

1. Provide one aspect that you liked the most in this paper.

The idea of using semantics for tagging the videos and connecting with link open data. Additionally using dbpedia as the knowledge base for tag to concept mapping is a very smart choice.

2. Provide one aspect that you disliked the most in this paper.

The evaluations done were not complete and informative.

Section IV. Discussion Points (provide at least 3 discussion topics/questions related to ideas/techniques described in the paper; these will be used for discussions in the class)

1. *What are the advantages of the proposed algorithm for the tag enrichment?*
2. *How does concept to URI matching works?*
3. *What is tag co-occurrence?*