Evaluation

Relevance to CIKM (\*). How well does this fit with the scope of the conference?

5: excellent

4: good

3: fair

2: poor

1: very poor

Originality of the Work (\*). To what extent is this paper breaking new ground?

5: excellent

4: good

3: fair

2: poor

1: very poor

Technical Soundness (\*). Is the paper technically clear and rigorous?

5: excellent

4: good

3: fair

2: poor

1: very poor

Quality of Presentation (\*). How did you find the structure, writing and diagrams?

5: excellent

4: good

3: fair

2: poor

1: very poor

Impact of Ideas or Results (\*). How important are the results to the community?

5: excellent

4: good

3: fair

2: poor

1: very poor

Adequacy of Citations (\*). How comprehensive is the coverage of the literature?

5: excellent

4: good

3: fair

2: poor

1: very poor

Reproducibility of Methods (\*). To what extent does the presentation support reuse of the method or repetition of experiments?

5: excellent

4: good

3: fair

2: poor

1: very poor

List 3 or more strong points, labelled S1, S2, ... (\*). These should cover things like rigor, significance and originality.

S1. The studied topic of real-time filtering of web pages is generally important.

List 3 or more weak points, labelled W1, W2, ... (\*). These should cover things like rigor, significance and originality.

W1: The motivation of proposing another method for real-time filtering of web pages for education is not clear. In particular, what is the new challenge on education application compared to other web applications? What is the problem of state-of-the-art feature selection to filter web pages in real-time for education? Why does the application for education web pages need a new feature selection method? Without answering these concerns, it is unclear why this study is interesting and necessary.

W2. The contribution of this paper is weak. The proposed methodology is presented in Section 4. As stated in in the first paragraph of Section 4, it is simply “an ensemble of seven

feature-selection methods from the WEKA machine learning suite”, while the ensemble idea is from [6].

W3. The proposed method is not compared with state-of-the-art feature selection and reduction methods. In Section 5, only the basic PCA, Top10-SVM and the straightforward AllFeatures are compared. The huge body of existing studies on feature selection and reduction are totally ignored (see XXX).

Overall Evaluation (\*). Please provide a detailed review, including a justification for your scores. Both the score and the review text are required.

6: I fully champion and expect this to be in the top 10% of papers in this track

3: I half-champion and would accept if someone else is also at least half-championing

-2: I am not championing but if there is a champion then I am fine accepting

-4: I believe this should be rejected

-6: I strongly believe this should not be in the program

Detailed evaluation

D1. In Section 6, it always selects the top-10 features in the ranking (Top10-Rank\_Score, Top10-SVM). There are no comparisons with different top values. One can’t conclude that Top10-Rank\_Score is the best choice. More experimental results on different top values should be reported in the paper.

D2. In section 5.2, the first formula should be followed by ‘,’, not ‘.’.

Do you think this paper should be considered for a best paper award?. Look for top-quality work and presentation that might even be seminal, not just the best paper in your batch.

Yes No

Confidential remarks for the program committee. If you wish to add any remarks intended only for PC members please write them below. These remarks will only be seen by the PC members having access to reviews for this submission. They will not be sent to the authors. This field is optional.

Reviewer's confidence (\*).

5: (expert)

4: (high)

3: (medium)

2: (low)

1: (none)