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Section I. Overview

A. Reader Interest

1. Which category describes this manuscript?
   - Practice/Application/Case Study/Experience Report
   - Research/Technology
   - Survey/Tutorial/How-To

B. Content

1. Please explain how this manuscript advances this field of research and/or contributes something new to the literature.
   
   YouTube videos, through certain tags, can be retrieved and classified based on these, since the tags are poorly chosen. The authors here apply semantic web technology to enrich log semantics, log ranking with LOD. This is a new application of semantic web.

C. Presentation

1. Does the introduction state the objectives of the manuscript in terms that encourage the reader to read on?
   - Yes
   - Could be improved
   - No

2. How would you rate the organization of the manuscript? Is it focused? Is the length appropriate for the topic?
   - Satisfactory
   - Could be improved
   - Poor

3. Please rate and comment on the readability of this manuscript.
   - Easy to read
   - Readable - but requires some effort to understand
   - Difficult to read and understand
   - Unreadable

Section II. Evaluation

Please rate the manuscript. Explain your choice.

- Award Quality
  - Excellent
  - Good
  - Fair
  - Poor

The application of this research is not clear. Authors state that this helps in retrieval and categorization of videos, but does not say how this can benefit anyone.
Tag ranking using directed graph & finally linking logs to appropriate URLs using SNoCIE is quite interesting.
Section III. Detailed Comments (provide your thoughts/criticism about the ideas in the paper; not only summarize the paper but have a critical look here)

The paper proposes a new approach to enrich YouTube logs, re-rank the tags & link it to web. Doing so makes categorization of video easy. The method of tag space enrichment in two phases - using title, description, related video tags, geospatial contexts etc. in the 1st phase & by studying tag co-occurrence in 2nd phase is very innovative.

Additional Comments:
1. Provide one aspect that you liked the most in this paper.

Well organised. Explains in details, step by step, what has been done. Discusses about older approaches and how this new approach differentiates. Has an evaluation part which compares the results obtained by the authors.

2. Provide one aspect that you disliked the most in this paper.

- Too long
- Could explain a bit about how this research can help anyone.
- In some sections they have not given enough technical details.

Section IV. Discussion Points (provide at least 3 discussion topics/questions related to ideas/techniques described in the paper; these will be used for discussions in the class)

1. Supervised learning techniques mentioned - does that mean content processing of videos?

2. In sec. 2.1 apart from my/ our vision they talk about "... to augment media with social annotations.

3. In sec. 2.2. - my/our learning approaches where models map relationships between visual features and semantic concepts (for tag ranking). Alternative way is studying tag co-occurrences. These points could have been elaborated more.

4. Does semantic tag space enrichment mean adding new tags after studying the first 5 sources listed in sec. 3.2?

5. Where did they get the direction in the directed graph for tag ranking?

6. How does SINDICE work?