CS848 Paper Submission Site

Go To CS848 Site

Submit or Update A Review For Paper #16

Go To CS848 Submissions

It is currently Wednesday 06th of October 2004 10:31:25 PM EDT

Paper # 16 (Download paper of type application/pdf, 1699192 bytes)	
Title:	Optimization of Large Join Queries
Abstract:	

You have already finalized your review for this paper.
You can no longer modify it, but you may view it.

If you made a mistake in your review and you want it "unfinalized", you may send mail to the program chair asking them to unfinalize it

Send yourself this review by email

Attribute	Value
Are you finished with this review?	Finalize, I am done editing
Provide a short summary of the paper	This paper presents several methods of optimizing queries with large numbers of joins. The authors apply some methods from the area of combinatorics and optimization to the problem domain. The paper begins with an overview of current query processing algorithms, and why they are not very useful when a large number of joins need to be performed. The authors then present a "definite criterion to evaluate [join processing algorithms]". Continuing with a description of the problem, the authors present a definition of what constitutes a large join query. Some performance evaluation of older methods for performing joins is presented. The authors then move into a discussion of several different combinatorial optimization techniques that can be applied to this problem, including Perturbation Walk, Simulated Annealing and Iterative Improvement. Algorithms for many of the techniques are presented along with a brief discussion of how they work. After discussion of how the presented techniques can be applied to the

	optimization of large join queries, the authors move into the analysis and comparison of techniques. After presenting a thorough analysis of the presented techniques, the authors make some remarks about how well algorithms perform relative to each other, and how they perform individually over time. The paper concludes with a brief summary of the concepts and data presented in the paper.
What is the strength of the paper? (1-3 sentences)	This paper attempts to present some new ways of optimizing large join queries that have not been tested before. Concise overviews of the algorithms are presented, along with a critical analysis of their performance.
What is the weakness of the paper? (1-3 sentences)	The concepts in this paper are presented too technically and are hard to follow. The authors explanation of their performance analysis is hard to understand, and the performance analysis itself appears flawed.
Your qualifications to review this paper	I know the material, but am not an expert
Writing Quality	Average
Relevance to query processing?	I do not think this paper is relevant to query processing
Experimental Methodology	**Poor**
Novelty of paper	This is a new contribution to an established area
Overall paper merit	**The paper is a novel or new contribution with average/weak methodology, or an incremental contribution that has good methodology. Someone in the area should read it**
In your opinion, will this paper be important over time?	Good
Provide additional detailed comments to the author	Your paper presents an interesting way to apply old concepts to a new problem. I believe it will be very useful. However, I have several serious problems with your presentation: -Your overviews are too brief, sometimes glossing over specific details. -Your overviews are far too technical in nature. I do not believe that they have been presented at an appropriate reading level. Not every one will be able to follow them. -I do not believe that your performance evaluation is very well thought out. Have you considered how long an average large join query takes to optimize with old methods? If so, are you testing your presented algorithms with that timeframe in mind? I am not convinced that your time slices of 1 - 30 minutes for query optimization have any basis, or are useful for comparison if joins typically take longer to optimize.
Additional comments to PC (not seen by author)	**While this paper presents some new ideas, I believe that some rough spots need to be fixed up before this paper is suitable for publishing. The overviews miss some important details and are far too technical in nature. As well, I am not convinced that the presented performance evaluation was well thought out or based on empirical data.**