
Coupons

Familiarity: Novice

Recommendation: Likely accept (top 15% but not top 5%, significant contribution)
* Since I haven't read other papers for review I'm basing this on other papers I've read. The paper was quite solid, however as far as papers that made me go "wow" this is in the top 15%, but not top %5

Strengths: What are the major reasons to accept the paper?
* The idea of incentivizing users to retransmit information is new.
* The authors considered and implemented three schemes for which to test their system and verify it worked.
* The concept was explained incredibly well and considered nearly all the corner-cases that popped into my head while reading (see below).
* Considered malicious behaviour to the protocol.

Weaknesses: What are the major reasons NOT to accept the paper?
Goal number two "overcoming highly variable Internet access" was mentioned in in the abstract and introduction but only mentioned once in the paper (section 2) when referring to simpler schemes. As a goal of the paper it should have been more heavily addressed and the successful accomplishment of these goals should have been reiterated in the conclusion.

There is one out of band malicious behaviour that comes to mind which wasn't addressed. Though prior work [8] describes the simple onion-like based security mechanism prevents malicious attackers from becoming first on the list there is still an issue of a malicious user retrieving coupons at the source, and then out of band (over the internet) sending them to remote locations to be replicated. While the goal of disseminating the information further is reached by out of band communication, this sort of cheating disincentivizes users from participating if they're not likely to receive much reward.

Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will help the TPC assess the paper and help provide feedback to the authors.
This paper presented a novel method of incentivizing users to take advantage of opportunity sharing over wireless networks by rewarding users with the successful retransmission of messages. While the reward is application dependant the example used in this paper was consumer coupons where users who successfully retransmitted the coupon would accumulate a discount or points with the particular store when the coupon is later used to make a purchase.

The paper did a great job of explaining the system and comparing three different retransmission schemes those being: (1) a probabilistic scheme where retransmissions occur at set times according to a fixed probability, (2) a "traffic-based" scheme where retransmissions are delayed when duplicate messages are received, and (3) an ACK-based scheme similar to the "traffic-based" scheme where retransmissions additionally

are delayed when an ACK for a transmission is not received within a certain time interval indicating that it was not a new transmission to anyone in the area.

While any concerns or questions that arouse during a linear read of the paper were eventually addressed, save for one (see weaknesses) the structure could have been slightly modified to address those concerns at the moment they arouse. For instance in introducing the ACK-based scheme the concern of a huge burst of ACK replies coming back (ACK-implosion) popped in my head. The problem was addressed but much later in the paper in the testbed section.

Aside from a few linear reading concerns, quite a few ambiguous "this" references (where this doesn't have a noun that follows, and at least one spelling error ("batter consumption" 1st paragraph 4.1) the paper flowed quite well and didn't lose me despite my novice familiarity status.

Streaming Technology in 3G Mobile Communication Systems
Computer, Volume 34, Issue 9, Sep 2001 Page(s):46 - 52

Familiarity: Novice

Recommendation: Likely accept

* Journal article wasn't flawless thus it's not what I would consider a top 5%.

Strengths: What are the major reasons to accept the paper?

* Article is easy to follow for a novice in the field.
* Stresses standardization in a new frontier.
* Considers challenges both from the consumer side (heterogeneity) and the provider side (content protection)
* Through the proxy server offers a solution to the lossiness of mobile users. This is done through buffering and maintaining the connection with a streaming server whilst ensuring the QoS to the mobile device. On top of this even offers how the proxy server can be used in conjunction with differing billing schemes that a mobile service provider might offer to their clients.

Weaknesses: What are the major reasons NOT to accept the paper?

In the interactive media platform section it wasn't clear that the first second was an introduction to the the following subsections. In particular the paragraph which starts, "Introducing a proxy is necessary..." doesn't explain why it's necessary and furthermore doesn't lead one to believe that the article will later explain why it's necessary (thankfully it did).

The mention of "skins" in the Player application section seems completely unnecessary as it doesn't add anything to the article other than additional text and seems like an attempt to simply incorporate the buzzword.

A few ambiguous "it" references (e.g. "When it receives an RTSP PLAY" -- under Content servers)

The Applications section is incredibly weak. The authors essentially simply said "oh yeah we did this, and it was satisfactory so take our word for it." Maybe that's acceptable for a journal article but a little elaboration would be better.

Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will help the TPC assess the paper and help provide feedback to the authors.

This journal article discusses a solution to challenges dealing with the desire to have streaming media on cellphone devices as more bandwidth becomes available. The article outlines the 3G infrastructure, discusses two primary challenges, end-point heterogeneity and content protection, provides solutions to the challenges through the use of standard protocols and presents their interactive media platform along with the pieces that make up this platform.

The article reads considerably well, and was an interesting read (despite it's age) to a novice in the field. Parts of the article could have been cut, and others elaborated on, however all things considered it was great overall.