Review of the Project Presentation of Group 12:

Topic of presentation: Emergency Application for Facebook.

Group Members: Lydia Manikonda and Usha Kumar.


Problem Motivation:

The project cannot purely be termed as basic or applied research, as it pertains to building an application on facebook and it uses the spatial concepts in it. It is completely application oriented as it builds an application of spatial databases to real world use case. It does not create a concept or give an optimization solution to this use case, it opens up a new domain by inventing a new software/tool that empowers the users for a new class of functionality than is currently available and the future implications is open to study.

The use case here referred to suggesting lifelines in case of emergency. It also gives insight into giving a preparedness plan in case of emergency. It has a very strong societal significance considering the amount of people using social networks and the need for such a system during emergency.

Problem Statement:

There is no one stop place to get information that guides us in case of emergency. The present application provides such feature.

The application prototype is presented in the class. All the constraints presented are reasonable and practical. The user privacy issue is important here and is addressed. The prototype model with screen shots presented made it easy to appreciate and understand the project.

Challenges:

The few challenges presented are listed are as follows

1) Limited knowledge on evolving Facebook platform
2) User privacy issues
3) Technical difficulties in implementing and
4) UI design

The challenges are mostly related to implementation. They are quite relevant to the particular use case. Since this a fresh new domain of study, there may be future
challenges that are yet to be explored and can become more apparent as the application evolves more in time.

**Proposed Approach:**

The talk explained the key aspects of proposed approach in a clear and easy to understand way.

The aspects that they addresses are

1. Identifying the lifelines

2. Suggesting preparedness plan (In this case they are posting as a update on the wall but it is addressed that they are trying to make this into something more concrete than just a message on the wall).

Some of the aspects are addressed in the future work like

1) Location based recommender for lifelines

2) Location based twitter feeds.

The talk clearly faced the technical challenges of implementing the idea and designing the UI by developing a prototype facebook application tailored for their purpose.

**Suggestion:**

Can add a feature like nominating friends who are possible blood donor and make it change dynamically with the spatial location. Say if person goes from one city to another his blood donors can change. And in case of the need the other friends can look in his profile and find out the blood donor for that instant.

**Novel/Better:**

The application that is being developed is a new one. The existing methods or resources that address the problem are not mentioned here. Since it is not addressing any research problem or betterment of a present system it is hard to articulate novelty relative to the existing literature. But when compared to other applications this seems to a new one.

**Validation:**

It is a new application. The claim is there is no one stop place for getting all directions during emergency and this will provide that. The UI design and the idea they presented does seem to support the above claim. But the real validation for any application comes after a set of users use and gives the feedback.

**Presentation Critique:**
The overall presentation was very good. The slides are clear and connected. The screen shots presented of the model helped in understanding and appreciating the use of the application.

Special mention of the existing resources and how this is better would have helped the listener to appreciate the problem in a better way. The overall rating on the scale on 1-10 would be 8.5

- Was the talk accessible to an "intelligent lay person"? Yes as most of the presentation is dealt with screenshots rather than verbose wording
- Did the talk emphasize a central message that conveys the overall value of the work being executed? Yes. The features mentioned are driven to solve the central message.
- Did the talk attempt to relate to the audience and showed effort in conveying key ideas clearly? Yes. The talk is clear and concise and people are able to relate to that easily.
- Was the speaker's response to questions satisfactory? There was only one question asked. It was answered well.
- How did the talk do on covering the 6 elements? Kindly rate each element separately and include a brief justification for each.
  - **Problem statement:** 9/10. Given clearly. Since it is an application the use and need for the same is given.
  - **Problem motivation:** 10/10. The motivation is given clearly and is easy to understand too.
  - **Proposed approach:** 9/10. This was clearly stated using screenshots of the demo application. All the features are shown clearly.
  - **Challenges:** 8/10. The challenges given are practical and real. But the solution to these challenges can be addressed further
  - **Novelty:** 7/10. They claim is this is one stop resource in case of emergency and can help user in a better way. The claim seems to be supported by the features given and the screenshots shown.
  - **Validation methodology:** 8/10. Since this an application. Users’ feedback on the application once it is used can be used as a validation. The question is better answered at that stage.