CIKM Camera Ready

No	Issue	Status
1.	Update the experiments results for the correct version of DiVE-Greedy	Done
2.	Add adaptive scheme on cost analysis plot	Done
3.	Update the content	Done
4.	Split section for DiVE schemes without Pruning in Section 4.	Done
5.	General motivation for pruning in section 5	Done
6.	Focus on DiVE-dSwap for discussion	Done
7.	Pruning technique is applicable to be implemented on DiVE-Greedy as well	Done
9.	Humaira's comments mostly similar to the reviewers, one might be considering for the next version is k-regret.	

Reviewer 1

No	Issue	Status
1.	W2 Some figures are too small	
2.	On page 1, what is the meaning of "pressure of the ST segment"?	done
3.	On page 3, <(a_j,g_j),(a_j,g_j)…> should be <(a_1,g_1),(a_j,g_j)…>	done
4.	At the beginning of section 3.3.1, S has not been defined.	done
5.	In the listing of Algorithm 1, there are some glitches: S is a subset of V, whereas in Output it is described as being greater than or equal to V. In Line 4, |S| should not be in italics. In Line 5, there are brackets missing in the argument to argmax.	done
6.	The listing of Algorithm 2 also has some glitches: In Line 6, "j in set S" should be "Sj in set S". There is inconsistent notation used for subscripting e.g. X[i] and X_i	done
7.	In 4.3, what does "is a CPU-bound requires fast operation" mean?	done
8.	In 4.4, "more emphasize" should be "more emphasis" (appears twice)	done
9.	In 4.5, "significantly low" -> "significantly lower"	done
10.	Later on, the two references to the listing of Algorithm 2 have wrong line numbers ("Algorithm 2 line 9", "Algorithm 2 line 10")	done
11.	In Section 5, it is not clear how the totals of 180 and 112 for the two sets of possible views are derived.	done
12.	Figures 6-9 are hard to read. Some lines appear to be missing from some of them (or perhaps they are obscured, due to the small figure size).	

Response:

I have corrected the draft according to the comments from reviewer 1, almost all comments from this reviewer are done. Figure 1 and 2 have been enlarged.

Reviewer 2

No	Issue	status
1.	W1. In context-driven similarity, the distance between visualizations is measured as the distance between the underlying queries. This should be elaborated a little further since one would expect the same data to be potentially visualized in different ways (to convey/highlight different information).	
2.	d1. as in any weighted combination there is the issue of setting an appropriate \lambda. couldn't make sense in this case to consider skyline or k-regret instead of top-k?	
3.	d2. fig. 3 it is not really clear what vertical bars | in the figure represent. In general, the figure deserves some further explanation.	done
4.	d3. presentation of processing techniques in sect 4 is quite talkative	
5.	d4. readability of graphics in the experimental section can be improved.	
6.	In fig. 4 the upper lines are very close and in fig. 7 curves are tangled. Maybe colors could help.	
7.	d5. Proofreading is needed: a few typos need to be fixed. The use of capitalization (in captions, section titles, …) is not uniform.	done
8.	Bibliographic references styles need to be made uniform (full names vs initials, …). Reference 16 lacks the howpublished information.	done
9.	p. 2: e, g,, P(v_i)), importance of the a S fig 3: caption: contex p. 5 last sentence left column: the subject is missing p. 7 more emphasize is given	done

Response:

The main issues based on the comments of reviewer 2 as follows:

1. As expected that reviewer asked the best setting for λ.
2. Same data to be visualized in different way will be considered as the future work.
3. Remaining issues are similar to reviewer 1 (e.g., graph presentation, typos, word consistency)
4. K-regret and skyline instead of only top-k (for future work)

Reviewer 3

No.	Issue	status
1.	W1. The presentation can be improved.	
2.	W2. The effect of the proposed pruning strategies are not clear. The gain of the adaptive methodology is limited.	
3.	W3. The topic is interesting, but there exist similar proposals.	
4.	The motivation to provide a good view by combining diversity and importance is interesting, but the paper may require additional strong features to be a good paper.	
5.	The pruning strategy (max-min) is a reasonable idea - it was confirmed successful in the experiments. The experiments are also in an acceptable level.	

| 6. | I'm very interested in the usefulness of the proposed method. It is not clear that the recommended views are actually useful from the viewpoint of the user. User-oriented evaluation may also be required. | |

Response:

The main issues based on the comments of reviewer 3 as follows:

1. Need improvement for figures presentation same as the previous reviewers.
2. The explanation of pruning methodology especially adaptive pruning is not clear according to reviewer 3.
3. There are several research that propose the combination between relevant and diversity in recommender system. However, as far as I know, there is no previous work that propose diversity in view recommendation especially pruning strategy using the properties of diversity.
4. User-oriented (user-driven approach) will be considered as our future work.