

## Paper Review Form

**Reviewer Name:** Charulakshmi Vijayagopal

**Paper Name:** YAGO: A Core of Semantic Knowledge Unifying WordNet and Wikipedia

### Section I. Overview

#### A. Reader Interest

1. Which category describes this manuscript?  
 Practice/Application/Case Study/Experience Report  
 Research/Technology  
 Survey/Tutorial/How-To

#### B. Content

1. Please explain how this manuscript advances this field of research and/or contributes something new to the literature.

Unlike the state of the art methods, YAGO covers all entities using not just those WordNet but also Wikipedia thus generating an (~100%) accurate Ontology. YAGO is extensible and better than OWL by being decidable.

#### C. Presentation

1. Does the introduction state the objectives of the manuscript in terms that encourage the reader to read on?  
 Yes  
 Could be improved  
 No
2. How would you rate the organization of the manuscript? Is it focused? Is the length appropriate for the topic?  
 Satisfactory  
 Could be improved  
 Poor
3. Please rate and comment on the readability of this manuscript.  
 Easy to read  
 Readable - but requires some effort to understand  
 Difficult to read and understand  
 Unreadable

### Section II. Evaluation

Please rate the manuscript. Explain your choice.

- Award Quality  
 Excellent  
 Good

\_\_\_Fair  
\_\_\_Poor

**Section III. Detailed Comments** (provide your thoughts/criticism about the ideas in the paper; not only summarize the paper but have a critical look here)

YAGO uses WordNet and Wikipedia to find out the entities and derive relationships while building the ontology. Whenever there is a contradiction WordNet overrides Wikipedia and there is a reasonable justification for that. The approach uses synsets in wordnet and the categorical information in Wikipedia to establish the relationships in improving recall and precision and not just one of them

Additional Comments:

1. Provide one aspect that you liked the most in this paper.  
Novel idea of integrating two sources of information, a very smart way of finding relationships and eliminating ambiguities between meanings of the entities.
  
2. Provide one aspect that you disliked the most in this paper.  
No justification was provided why DBpedia was not chosen over Wikipedia. Or is YAGO older than DBpedia? It assumed Wikipedia is the universal set of all information available in the world unlike SOFIE which considered other unstructured sources too.

**Section IV. Discussion Points** (provide at least 3 discussion topics/questions related to ideas/techniques described in the paper; these will be used for discussions in the class)

1. Would it have been better to include DBpedia instead of Wikipedia?
2. For a detailed medical related ontology, would Wikipedia alone suffice? Can PubMed or some relevant source also be included to add variety and richness?
3. Assuming Wikipedia and WordNet cover everything present in the world is not reasonable enough.
4. Also there can be an innovative way to verify the information on Wikipedia like verifying using encyclopedia.com or some other source.