

Paper Evaluations

[Web Version](#)

[Return](#)

Conversion ID	Paper Title			
PID97383	Credibility Relationship Management in a Web-Service Integration Environment			
	Reviewer 7904	Reviewer 7905	Reviewer 7911	Reviewer 7912
Relevance: The material is relevant and appropriate to the field	Neutral	Agree	Agree	Neutral
Theory: The theoretical foundation is strong	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
Methodology: The methodology and analytic approaches are appropriate for the research	Disagree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Presentation: The presentation of the material is clear, complete, and well organized	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree
Validity: The conclusions are supported by the analysis	Disagree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
References: Appropriate literature is referenced	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Neutral
Contribution: The paper will likely make a contribution to the field	Disagree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Interest: The paper will likely generate interesting discussions at the conference	Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral
The overall quality of the paper is	Low	High	3 - Neutral	2

Reviewer 7904 Comments to Author:

The paper is written in a very poor english, in case of acceptance I strongly suggest a major revision by an English native speaker. The paper lacks an empirical evaluation of the approach, it is not clear if a prototype of the system has been implemented or if it is only an abstract proposal. The main problema is that it is not clear what the authors consider as a web service: is it a software component whose interface is described with WSDL, or is it something strange, such as every service that involve an automated activity? In section 2 authors talk about web services names, phone/fax numbers etc... I think that service providers have to be distinguished from services.

Reviewer 7905 Comments to Author:

Primarily, I would like to see some evaluation of this approach. Specifically, I would like to know how well this works, and how it compares to other schemes that have been suggested in the past. I would also like to see an eample provided that walks the reader through the computation of credibility using the GTR approach. Section 2 could be cleaned up a bit by separating the related work and the background concepts into two separate subsections. This will streamline the discussion of the approach more accessible by making it clear where to find the "requirements" alluded to in the beginning of section 3. There could be a bit more proofreading done as there are many (minor) grammatical problems and misspellings. positive / strong points: Good argument for the need for goodwill/credibility ratings in the UDDI framework thorough discussion of the work-flow of the various scenarios. issues / how to improve on it: Not clear how the rating agencies (S&P) would be able to add their ratings to the UDDI. More research into the impact on the performance of the UDDI based on the number of updates to company entries as successful transactions are completed. A few grammatical errors that make it harder

to read (last paragraph of page 2, first sentence, there is a "not" that shouldn't be there "information related to credibility level is not absent") novel / advancement Interesting idea to bring into the UDDI registry this missing part of the decision making process. technically sound Other than the performance implications of having constant updates to the UDDI this sounds like it should work evaluations good or? no evaluations presented industrial value purely b2b industrial value

Reviewer 7911 Comments to Author:

Can you define the terms credibility and creditability? Do you use them synonymously? If that is the case you could stay with one term. If it is not, please, clearly define the difference. Goodwill and credibility are not the same. Are you aware of the difference? Do you need this differentiation? Please, check whether Standard & Poors (not Pools (!)) really offers the type of rating you are assuming. Do you see a chance that your suggestion might fit into their business model? If yes, try to give some evidence in favour of your argumentation. Can you include the activities of the ebXML community with respect to credibility rating? Do they have any? If they have, please try to compare your approach to theirs. Some minor comments: Your paper is full of grammar mistakes and typos. Figure 4 & 5 need references ("adapted from []").

Reviewer 7912 Comments to Author:

The solution you proposed should be evaluated in a user-centric fashion, which basically mean that you should try to figure out whether the approach is useful in practice. In a nutshell: evaluation is completely missing. Without evaluation it is difficult to assess the usefulness of the approach at all.

[Return](#)