The research paper which I have chosen is MYSQL spatial and POSTGIS- implementations of spatial data standards written by Adam Piorkowski. Spatial data is the type of data which is used to represent a geographical area or location and spatial database is the enhancement of a general-purpose database to include spatial data. The author here is trying to bring to light the fact that there are very few sophisticated spatial databases present in the world. The author starts off the research paper by pointing out that there is no standardization of major spatial databases. Then the author shifts focus towards OPENGIS and SQL/MM. OPENGIS is the standard for relational databases which includes features such as objects, format of recording and indexing etc. The standard SQL/MM does have some features such as curves and better integration but, is more scattered and is even more non-standardised (depending on the version being used). The focus is then shifted towards two commercial databases (POSTGRE SQL and MYSQL) and their two standards namely: - POSTGIS and MYSQL Spatial. These spatial libraries are integrated after the base bundle of these databases have already been installed on the system. Both have their own merits and demerits. While the installation of MYSQL spatial and easy and in some cases, it comes in the bundle of the database off the bag whereas the installation of POSTGIS into POSTGRE SQL is often slow and cumbersome. The author then moves to describe the benefits and drawbacks of the POSTGIS and MYSQL spatial and in the process explains how the functions of these spatial extensions are difficult to standardize into a single frame. The first thing is the naming conventions which are quite different but is still something that standardization could work around but when it comes to the implementation of these spatial databases, it is quite evident that while creating the table containing spatial parameters is easier in the MYSQL spatial, POSTGIS provides more ways to create the spatial features. The two ways described for creating tables containing spatial columns for POSTGRE are: - using a combination of create + select statement and the use of plpgsql language scripts. But this is where the advantage of MYSQL spatial ends. The usage of functions such as length and glength yield same results as they are just working on singular rows, but, when functions working on objects and spatial data are encountered, then there are some wrong results being published by MYSQL pointing towards potential bugs and glitches in the spatial library of MYSQL. This is also illustrated in the research paper by using functions “intersects” and “disjoint” which produce wrong results for MYSQL but correct for POSTGRE SQL. Although, developments are being made to improve these functionalities of MYSQL spatial functions and library (using MBRs which are minimum bounding rectangles and are used to find the maximum extents of a 2-D object), at this point, POSTGRE handles spatial data better. The better functionality of POSTGRE is further exacerbated by the explanations given for reduction functions (where the accuracy of POSTGRE POSTGIS is more than the MYSQL spatial) , aggregation of data (where POSTGRE allows use of arrays, unions and other data collection structures whereas MYSQL does not have support for any of these data structures) and availability of spatial operators in POSTGRE (convex hull, Difference etc). At the end, after careful observations, the author concludes that while portability and unification are maintained by both OGC and SQL/MM spatial, the level of integration and implementation is quite different for both of them. While MYSQL spatial is better integrated than POSTGRE’s POSTGIS, it does not work well after 2 dimensions whereas POSTGIS, which initially did not work well with more than 2-Dimensional objects has gradually improved and is now providing a better reference set for spatial objects than the MYSQL Spatial. Overall, both have their shortcomings and advantages and this comparison only strengthens the argument that there is still a lot of work that needs to be done in the standardization of both these spatial databases.