

CS 856 Paper Reviews
W Anthony Young - 20161423
December 3, 2004

Paper Title: Analysis and Application of Passive Peer Influence
Section I. Overview

A. Reader Interest

1. Which category describes this paper?

- ☐ Practice / Application / Case Study / Experience Report
- ☒ Research / Technology
- ☐ Survey / Tutorial / How-To

2. How relevant is this paper to the readers in the area? Please explain your rating under III. Detailed Comments.

- ☐ Very Relevant
- ☒ Relevant
- ☐ Interesting - but not very relevant
- ☐ Irrelevant

B. Content

1. Please explain how this paper advances this field of research and / or contributes something new to the literature. Please explain your answer under III. Detailed Comments.

2. Is the paper technically sound? Please explain your answer under III. Detailed Comments.

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ Appears to be - but didn't check completely
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ No

C. Presentation

1. Are the title, abstract, and keywords appropriate? Please explain your answer under III. Detailed Comments.

☒ Yes

☐ No

2. Does the paper contain sufficient and appropriate references? Please explain your answer under III. Detailed Comments.

☒ References are sufficient and appropriate

☐ Important references are missing; more references are needed

☐ Number of references are excessive

3. Does the introduction state the objectives of the paper in terms that encourage the reader to read on? Please explain your answer under III. Detailed Comments.

☒ Yes

☐ Could be improved

☐ No

4. How would you rate the organization of the paper? Is it focused? Is the length appropriate for the topic? Please explain your answer under III. Detailed Comments.

☐ Satisfactory

☒ Could be improved

☐ Poor

5. Please rate and comment on the readability of this paper. Please explain your answer under III. Detailed Comments.

☐ Easy to read

☐ Readable - but requires some effort to understand

☐ Difficult to read and understand

☒ Unreadable

Section II. Summary and evaluation

A. Summary (provide here a summary of the paper)

This paper presents a method of reducing interdomain peer-to-peer traffic using a passive forwarding peer. The authors begin with a description of the problem motivation as well as some discussion of their proposed solution. The discussion then turns to how the proposed solution can reduce the traffic between domains.

The authors next present a discussion of the Winny network: a file-sharing network that is popular in Japan. The routing architecture is discussed. The authors discuss how the use of a cache at the network border can significantly decrease interdomain peer traffic. A discussion of the filter that is used to restrict traffic flow between domains is presented. The proposed method is successful in reducing the traffic flow between domains by a significant amount.

B. Evaluation

Please rate the paper. Please explain your answer under III Detailed Comments.

- ☐ Award Quality
- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☒ Poor

Section III. Detailed Comments

This paper presents the idea of filtering peer traffic between domains in an attempt to limit the amount of interdomain traffic that an ISP must pay for. It is not written very well, as the grammar, missing words and spelling mistakes make it extremely difficult to follow.

This reader had difficulty determining where the paper was heading during the first five pages as no clear direction was given. As well, it was not until later in the discussion that the author's full method of reducing traffic was presented. As well, the proposed method appears to only work with traffic on the Winny network, which is not terribly popular in North America or many other countries outside Japan.

The introduction were useful in outlining the problem the authors wish to solve. As well, the abstract and title allude to the content of the paper. However, keywords are missing. There is no discussion of future work or related work. As such, I do not have an understanding of how this system is novel or new. The contribution is a framework for reducing interdomain

traffic, but due to the poor readability of this paper, it is difficult to tell how useful it will be.

Paper Title: A Placement Scheme for Peer-to-peer Networks

Section I. Overview

A. Reader Interest

1. Which category describes this paper?

☐ Practice / Application / Case Study / Experience Report

☒ Research / Technology

☐ Survey / Tutorial / How-To

2. How relevant is this paper to the readers in the area? Please explain your rating under III. Detailed Comments.

☐ Very Relevant

☐ Relevant

☐ Interesting - but not very relevant

☐ Irrelevant

B. Content

1. Please explain how this paper advances this field of research and / or contributes something new to the literature. Please explain your answer under III. Detailed Comments.

2. Is the paper technically sound? Please explain your answer under III. Detailed Comments.

☐ Yes

☐ Appears to be - but didn't check completely

☐ Partially

☐ No

C. Presentation

1. Are the title, abstract, and keywords appropriate? Please explain your answer under III. Detailed Comments.

☒ Yes

☐ No

2. Does the paper contain sufficient and appropriate references? Please explain your answer under III. Detailed Comments.

- ☐ References are sufficient and appropriate
- ☐ Important references are missing; more references are needed
- ☐ Number of references are excessive

3. Does the introduction state the objectives of the paper in terms that encourage the reader to read on? Please explain your answer under III. Detailed Comments.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ Could be improved
- ☐ No

4. How would you rate the organization of the paper? Is it focused? Is the length appropriate for the topic? Please explain your answer under III. Detailed Comments.

- ☒ Satisfactory
- ☐ Could be improved
- ☐ Poor

5. Please rate and comment on the readability of this paper. Please explain your answer under III. Detailed Comments.

- ☐ Easy to read
- ☐ Readable - but requires some effort to understand
- ☐ Difficult to read and understand
- ☐ Unreadable

Section II. Summary and evaluation

A. Summary (provide here a summary of the paper)

This paper begins with a brief overview of peer to peer networks and the placement of data in a global peer system. The authors next move to discuss some mathematical background used in the rest of the paper. The authors present the quality measures that they will be using to measure the

performance of their system. A discussion of how the landmarks are generated is also provided.

B. Evaluation

Please rate the paper. Please explain your answer under III Detailed Comments.

- ☐ Award Quality
- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Poor

Section III. Detailed Comments