

## Paper Review Form

**Reviewer Name:** Charulakshmi Vijayagopal

**Paper Name:** Exeuting SPARQL queries over the web of linked data

### 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.

This paper explains a new way to determine how to retrieve more relevant and useful information from web data without having to execute the entire query. Also dereferencing URIs and intermediate results make sure relevant data is not missed from being queried. How to do this in SPARQL is also discussed.

#### 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)

The authors suggested a method to provide more relevant query result without having to execute the entire query in the beginning itself. Every question that arises like how to find the right URI to begin with and when will the iteration stop have been answered by the authors themselves. A very innovative way of implementing such a an idea in SPARQL using the iterator based pipelining has also been explained. Using “Reject” and modifying the “GetNext” to solve unforeseen problems related to querying results are also very smart moves.

Additional Comments:

1. Provide one aspect that you liked the most in this paper.

I liked the core idea of the paper; how they get intermediate results and query them to find more accurate URIs (in turn results) for the actual query and complete the execution of the query with more relevant results.

2. Provide one aspect that you disliked the most in this paper.

While explaining pipelining and non-blocking iterators, I expected some real data as example. They could have shared an actual example they used to test or which example motivated them to improvise their method.

**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. Is there an impact on the memory usage when URI prefetching is used?
2. When they say potentially relevant data might already be available, do they mean results of previous queries? How are they planning to know which data may be useful to store for future use?
3. The degree of relevance that this method guarantees is not mentioned. So could it vary considerably among queries?