

=====

TOTAL :  
70

Title and Abstract :  
7

Is the title appropriate :  
The title is appropriate, somewhat generic, although an attempt at originality has been made.

Is there a clear brief overview in the executive summary explaining what you did what algorithms you compared how you are measuring them and what the main results are :  
The abstract gives a very brief overview of what is planned. More than the minimum of two joins are implemented (4+1). Clear information on metrics (running time, number of results) are given from the start.

Is the abstract of appropriate length :  
The abstract is 105 words, so somewhat short (200-250 were recommended).

Does it incite interest in the reader and make the reader want to read on :  
The abstract incites reader's interest somewhat - especially the 'more complex join' and the 'weak power-like relation' - the latter seeming non-intuitive, as well as contradicted in the next sentence (?).

Introduction :  
7

Did introduction set the scene and provide overview :  
The introduction sets the scene well, in the context of the semantic web.

Is the motivation clear and the justification appropriate :  
The reason of why performing join algorithms is not provided.

Is there a clear overall description of what you did what your main contributions are :  
The goals are relatively vague ('some examples of join ..').

Does this description make sense is it fit for purpose :  
It is not clear what is being compared exactly, although some information is given in the abstract.

Are you comparing algorithms and is it clear what why and how you are measuring :  
The two measures are justified to achieve a trend in execution times, which is adequate. The algorithms are not specified here.

Methodology :  
7

Are the descriptions of the algorithms clear Is the selection of algorithms well explained Are there enough details for someone else to repeat the process :

The selection of the data is justified well. It is not clear what 'cases' refers to. It is good however that some real questions with meaning are attempted. Some interesting issues with dbpedia data (missing information) is discussed. The more complicated query could be explained more. It is useful that all types of join are attempted, and graphically illustrated.

Are the measures for the comparison of algorithms well justified as well as explained :

The measure to compare correctness by counting is useful and justified adequately. The rest of the measures are adequate, but not further justified.

Results and and discussion interpretation :

7

Were the results well explained Were they correct :

The results are clear and correct. It is useful that a wrapper was created for multiple executions (here: 10) - supposedly for averaging, although that is not stated.

Did you do a good job of measuring comparing :

The figures do a good comparison, including an attempt at finding the function to map the average execution time.

Is there good explanation interpretation of what you found discussion :

The explanation is minimal.

Is there something new original interesting in your work :

The power-like relation is interesting, although it is not clear to what extent it holds. Indeed more evaluations are necessary for confirming it.

Did you properly consider further steps :

More tests are suggested, which are appropriate, but possibly should have been attempted during the report period. No further steps are mentioned.

Quality of Presentation :

7

Was the report well presented easy to read clear Was the structure appropriate for the purpose i e should there have been more less tables images text code etc :

The report was the required length of 3 pages (with References and code as an extra pages, as allowed). The report is well-structured. It is useful that Figures and Table were used. It is good practice that they had headings, which are referred to in the text. However, tables should not appear as figures. Formatting is also good (e.g. cross-referencing). The English of the report is adequate - although quite a few Grammar errors exist - e.g., 'provide us an unlimited amount of information'. Citations should be within the sentence 'Web. [1]'

Did the report include appropriate references and was referencing well used in the text to argue the points made Were there any extraneous unnecessary references :

Only 1 reference provided. No extraneous references are present.