

## Coupons

**Familiarity:** Novice (at least in regards to incentive based ad-hoc networks)

**Recommendation:** Definite accept.

**Strengths:** Well explained concept, simple solution, good layout, thorough and it evaluates a broad set of parameters.

**Weaknesses:** I would have liked to see more comparisons to similar previous work. More discussion and evaluation of real-world usage scenarios could also be interesting.

**Detailed Comments:**

Well explained concept, fairly novel solution (even though it is based on previous work), simple solution (strives to keep complexity at a minimum). Good layout. Thorough, includes discussion of malicious nodes. Evaluates a broad set of parameters, such as different broadcast frequency algorithms.

I would have liked to see more comparisons to similar previous work, especially when it comes to the evaluation, even though the paper mentions that this has been done in a previous paper by the same authors. More discussion and evaluation of real-world usage scenarios could also be interesting. *I am having a little difficulty seeing how every paper that comes out can even strive to have a novel evaluation methodology, I would think most papers would use the same basic methodology. Would the methodology in this paper for instance be considered novel in this regard?*

## “My iPod is my Pacifier”: An Investigation on the Everyday Practices of Mobile Video Consumption (from HotMobile 2007)

[http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpl/freeabs\\_all.jsp?arnumber=4389554](http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpl/freeabs_all.jsp?arnumber=4389554)

**Disclaimer:** I chose this paper because I thought it sounded interesting, its not a very technical paper, and its from a workshop. At the moment I think want to work an project related to mobile and/or location. So this is sort of related.

**Familiarity:** Some knowledge

**Recommendation:** Definite reject. (It might be that the criteria for workshops are lower than I think, but I did not think this was a very good paper)

**Strengths:** Easy to understand.

**Weaknesses:** Few participants in the study, and low distribution of types of people in the study. Different types of results intermixed, could be better structured. Would have liked graphs or tables with results.

**Detailed Comments:** This paper just reaffirms what a lot of people already knew, there is nothing really new here in any way. And since there sample size is so low this isn't much better than the anecdotal information we already have. But a bigger and more thought out version of this work could be interesting.