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REVIEWER 1 SUMMARY:

FOCUS:

1. Does the paper clearly identify the problem it is addressing?

Problem is clearly identified. But having the problem statement and its significance will make things better understandable. And also I couldn’t find a formal problem statement. It would be good to see what is the input, output and constraints of this approach.

2. Does the paper clearly explain related work and their limitations?

Related work information is provided well. But referring to the papers would be better rather than providing all the details of the paper in the “Related Work” section itself. I couldn’t see any limitations provided on related work and I think this approach completely being different might have been the reason. But at least providing a bit more details about the most related approach of their work would be better.

3. Does the paper identify its key contributions?

Not explicitly stated but included in the Related Work section. Better to have separate place for the contributions part.

4. Does the paper present any evidence to support the contribution claim?

I couldn’t exactly figure out any evidence. But I think the application will be developed and then do the analysis from there after looking at the data collected automatically.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION:

1. Is the literature survey complete?

As said by the authors, it would be a very wide topic to get specific information from web. But I would suggest looking more into related work close to their idea.
2. Is the work novel relative to the literature? Explain.
The work seems like novel where they are trying to classify the location type.

3. As a reviewer do you agree with the contribution claims? Explain.
I think their proposal and then their application are in sync which would be their contributions.

READABILITY AND ORGANIZATION:

1. Is the paper easy to read and understand to students in this course (Csci 8715)?
I think it is not bad but would be better if more organized. All information is present with them. It’s just putting things into place.

2. Is the paper self-contained?
Yes

3. Is the paper length reasonable?
Yes

4. Does it include sufficient number of figures and tables?
I think including more figures or tables with more information would be good.

STRENGTHS:

1. What are the strengths of this paper?
The problem and approach are clearly stated and they are well compared with the Previous work.

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

1. How can this paper be improved? If you were to rewrite this paper, what revisions would you consider?
Putting things more in place into categories.
Formal Definition of the problem
Including more previous work such as approach and limitations closely related to the work
May be one real world example of the problem and their approach would make it better to understand
REVIEWER 2 SUMMARY:

FOCUS:

Does the paper clearly identify the problem it is addressing?
Yes, it does. It explains in a clear setting the motivation of the problem and the goal of the problem.

Does the paper clearly explain related work and their limitations?
The paper does explain related work quite clearly, specifying the types of approaches they use and whether it is similar to or different from the proposed approach.

Does the paper identify its key contributions?
Not clearly. The authors mention several potential grounds on which their work distinguish itself, but do not explicitly list them as contributions.

Does the paper present any evidence to support the contribution claim?
No.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION:

Is the literature survey complete?
It does not appear so. A simple search with key words “travel diary spatial” returns several related paper/software/application that serves the same purpose but not mentioned in the paper.

Is the work novel relative to the literature? Explain.
It seems to be closely related to the second paper mentioned, but the emphasis is different, so is the exact usage of POI information.

As a reviewer do you agree with the contribution claims? Explain.
As far as I can see, the paper does offer a feasible way to decide on the type of places with limited user input. However, it has not mention anything on extracting useful information given the predicted travel diaries.
READABILITY AND ORGANIZATION:

Is the paper easy to read and understand to students in this course (Csci 8715)?
Yes, it is.

Is the paper self-contained?
For the most part. Travel Diary, although a relatively self-explanatory term, might need to be formally defined.

Is the paper length reasonable?
It might be a little short, but it is still in progress.

Does it include sufficient number of figures and tables?
No.

STRENGTHS:

What are the strengths of this paper?
It explains quite clearly the importance of the problem, and offers a clear solution to it.

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

How can this paper be improved? If you were to rewrite this paper, what revisions would you consider?

- Give a more formal problem statement, specifying the input, output, constraints, etc.
- Specify more explicitly how the proposed approach is different from related work and why it is better, i.e., why the proposed way of portraying the Travel Diary is better.
- Make the contributions more clear to readers
- Formally define the term ‘Travel Diary’
- Do a more extensive literature search
- Give at least one example of a travel diary with figure illustrations