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Section I. Overview

A. Reader Interest

1. Which category describes this manuscript?
   ___Practice/Application/Case Study/Experience Report
   x_ 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.

   The paper proposed an approach to execute SPARQL queries over the Web of Linked Data. And the paper provided a formal description of the realization of its approach with an iterator-based pipeline which enables an efficient query execution. What is more, this manuscript extended the iterator paradigm, which avoids blocking of the query execution caused by waiting for data from the Web.

C. Presentation

1. Does the introduction state the objectives of the manuscript in terms that encourage the reader to read on?
   x_ 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?
   x_ Satisfactory
   ___Could be improved
   ___Poor

3. Please rate and comment on the readability of this manuscript.
   ___ Easy to read
   x_ 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
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)

Although there are many aspects that are still needed to be improved and taken into consider, it is generally a nice paper which introduced an approach to query the Web of Linked Data. Some ideas behind the algorithms that the paper presents were kind of intuitive, but the simple ideas were those others may simply omit.

Additional Comments:

1. Provide one aspect that you liked the most in this paper.
   The extension to iterator paradigm, which can avoid blocking of the query execution, is the aspect that I like most in this paper. The idea is simple but useful, a ‘Reject’ function converts the normal synchronous iterators into asynchronous ones.

2. Provide one aspect that you disliked the most in this paper.
   The paper compared itself with some related work, but it failed to provide the quantitative comparison, like the execution time, number of accessed servers, etc.

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. Besides the dense network of links and sharing the queried dataset, what else relevant data might be available?
2. Would it be possible to start query without an initial seed, or other initial information?
3. What aspects of other related work, like query federation and data centralization can be used to improve the algorithms that this paper proposed?