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Problem Motivation:

The talk is a survey on Spatial Data Warehouses. The motivation of this survey is that the research in field of spatial data warehouse has been on conceptual models, materialization of spatial indexes, aggregation operations and SOLAP. Therefore a survey for the Spatial Data Warehouse could provide an overview of the core concepts in spatial data warehouse and recent advancements in the field.

Problem Statement:

The survey attempts to provide a consolidated classified literature, and identify the future research areas. The input is the related literature and the output is the classified literature. They are clearly listed in the presentation. Since this is a survey paper, the constraints, which are also the challenges, are to compare different approaches.

Challenges:

They are articulated clearly through the graph. The challenges are doing the classification on different approaches, and consolidate the related information. In the presentation, it gives a comprehensive classification for the current research in Spatial Data warehouse, but we can see that it is still really hard to compare the methods proposed in those papers, because the problem in each paper differs a lot. Narrow the research scope can do some help for getting better classification result.

Proposed Approach:

Since this is a survey paper, there is no real “approach”. The talk showed the contribution through the classification table. And there is also a summary table showing the key results and research needs. It also proposed a hierarchy tree to illustrate the relationship of broad concepts. Just as mentioned in the challenge part, it is hard to find a perfect classification between different approaches.

Novel/Better:

The novelty of this paper is that it provides an updated classification of the Spatial Data warehouse. It also proposed the benchmarks for Spatial DW, and make a statement about the future research needs.

Validation:

No real validation method needed for survey paper.

Presentation Critique: Rate the talk on a scale of 0(poor) to 10(excellent) and provide a brief justification (50 Words) while suggesting areas for improvement on the following:

Since the talk is a survey paper, it is trivial and easy to understand. A good way to show the classification result is the key point for this talk. Because not every element available for this kind of talk, therefore, I would like to give 8 for the whole talk.