---------------------- REVIEW 1 ---------------------  
PAPER: 42  
TITLE: The Best Search System  
  
OVERALL EVALUATION: 2 (accept)  
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: 5 (expert)  
Relevance to ANONJOURNAL: 4 (highly relevant)  
  
----------- REVIEW -----------  
This is an industry paper. It is sometimes sketchy on the details. For example, they  
write "tokenized using n-grams to allow for abbreviations and misspellings, shingling".  
An experienced information retrieval expert can guess what this means (probably  
sometime of min-hash). It would have been nice to discuss the science a tad more  
explicitly.  
  
The presentation is at times sloppy.  
  
Still, I am a big fan of this paper. It is enjoyable.  
  
  
----------------------- REVIEW 2 ---------------------  
PAPER: 42  
TITLE: The Best Search System  
  
OVERALL EVALUATION: -2 (reject)  
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: 4 (high)  
Relevance to ANONJOURNAL: 3 (fully relevant)  
  
----------- REVIEW -----------  
This paper describes a search system which includes  
the function from document indexing to user search experience.  
  
The system components are described in detail. But the authors need to  
improve (1) structure, (2) proposed method and experiments, and (3) references.  
Especially, no quantitative evaluation make this paper difficult to understand  
whether the proposed approach is effective or not.  
  
The details that the authors need to improve are as follows:  
  
(1) Structure  
In the explanation of Figure 1 (just before Section 3), it is better  
to itemize them like the description about main components in Section 2.  
In addition, the terms in the paragraph and those in Figure 1 is sometimes  
different. For example, "(1) Data model and Import" in the paragraph,  
but "Data Import" in Figure 1. If you assign numbers to each component  
in Figure 1, then explain it with the assigned number, the explanation will  
be well-structured.  
  
This is also the case for Figures 3 and 4. Especially, in Figure 4, if you assign  
numbers like "(1) Data Sources," "(2) Data Acquisition," ..., and then explain  
each module in the body of the paper, you can make your paper well-structured.  
  
  
----------------------- REVIEW 3 ---------------------  
PAPER: 42  
TITLE: The Best Search System  
  
OVERALL EVALUATION: 1 (weak accept)  
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: 3 (medium)  
Relevance to ANONJOURNAL: 4 (highly relevant)  
  
----------- REVIEW -----------  
This paper gives details on how The Best Search System works. The paper provides a good overview of the system and is well written.  The topic is dead-on for ANONJOURNAL. However, the paper is lacking in a few places which is why I did not give it a higher overall rating.  
  
First, the paper does not cite related work except briefly in the introduction.  The conclusion reads: "We developed novel algorithms for entity resolution and for ranking" but the authors do not show how their algorithm is novel or show how it compares to other entity resolution and ranking algorithms. In fact, the paper does not even cite others' work in entity resolution.     
It's difficult for the reader to know exactly what is novel and what is not if she is not an expert in these areas.  
  
Second, there is no evaluation component. This is strongly related to my previous remarks because it is not evaluated against any other algorithms.  The authors could have at least performed a user evaluation testing relevance or performed an analysis of the query logs and result clicks to determine if users were finding what they wanted.  Perhaps some comparison with Google Scholar would be in order.  
  
I still like this paper without these two pieces, but with them this would be a really strong paper.  
  
  
----------------------- REVIEW 4 ---------------------  
PAPER: 42  
TITLE: The Best Search System  
  
OVERALL EVALUATION: -3 (strong reject)  
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: 5 (expert)  
Relevance to ANONJOURNAL: 4 (highly relevant)  
  
----------- REVIEW -----------  
This paper presented an overview of The Best Search System focusing on its data acquisition, entity resolution, and ranking. It is a real world working system which is freely available.  
  
That being said, there are serious missing parts, unsubstantiated claims and many problems with citations. The first is that the claim that other search engines "do not cover many of the significant problems involved". What significant problems is the author referring to? It is assumed this academic search engine was built to correct these.  
  
There is little on evaluation. The paper should provide at least the following: 1) experimental results for their entity resolution and ranking algorithms; 2) statistics of their metadata; and 3) run time performance of concurrent processing. Since the authors claim the system has been running for several years, this data should exist.  
  
Finally, the authors show no comparison between their algorithms and the state-of-the-art.  
Since no evaluation of the entity resolution and ranking algorithms are given, it is difficult to appreciate the effectiveness or efficiency of the proposed system.  
  
The references seem almost random and inappropriate for this paper. Some are wrong. References 1 through 5 are not correct. There are no references to related work on entity extraction or metadata extraction.  
  
  
-------------------------  METAREVIEW  ------------------------  
PAPER: 42  
TITLE: The Best Search System  
  
This paper was appreciated by all the reviews, but the most supported opinions seem to consider it more a description of a service in/for production than of a research work stressing a particular result. This makes it less relevant as a full-paper, but highly recommended as a demonstration.  
Final decision is Reject.