P9: Summary of Revisions and Comments from the Reviewers

The below points summarize the feedback we got from the groups and the changes we made to our survey paper to incorporate the feedback. The feedback we got was valuable and we thank the groups for taking the time to do the review:

- **Figures numbering and Organization – Group 2**

  The comment was to not to include figure 0 and start from figure 1. Also, the figure order was wrong in one place. We feel that this is appropriate and the readability of the paper would increase if the feedback was incorporated and figures were arranged and numbered in the suggested way. We have corrected the numbering and organized it in a way so that it is easy to refer to the figures. We have also included description texts referring the figure explaining the actual figure.

- **Table presented in Figure 0 is better to be visualized as hierarchy tree and use the algorithms name or the regular referencing style – Group 2**

  The point raised was apt and did motivate us to make some changes to our way of representation. Though we did not modify the table apart from incorporating the regular referencing style we have also included a hierarchy tree for the concepts which could be represented in that form. The reason why we could not represent the whole table in a hierarchy tree is because it will become unnecessarily large. Also, there are some very generic papers we have read and classified which include algorithms etc as such. They are just a discussion on spatial data warehouses or the issues etc.

We are still awaiting feedback from Group 3.