

SIGCSE 2007



**Technical Symposium on Computer Science
Education**

March 7-10,
2007

Northern Kentucky Convention Center and Cincinnati Marriott at RiverCenter
Covington, Kentucky, USA

[Home](#) [Attendees](#) [Authors](#) [Reviewers](#) [Students](#) [Exhibitors and Sponsors](#) [Contact Us](#)

Viewing of Reviewer Ratings and Comments for Authors and Reviewers

[Return to SIGCSE 2007 General Information Page](#)

Paper66: An Easy to Use Distributed Computing Framework

Review Summary

Anonymous Reviewer Code	Technical	Organization	Originality	Significance	Overall Score
A	2	2	2	3	2
B	3	3	4	3	3
C	5	5	5	5	5
D	5	5	4	5	5
E	5	4	6	5	5
Avg. of 5 Revs.	4	3.8	4.2	4.2	4

Author-Recommended Subjects: High-Performance Computing

Reviews from Individual Reviewers Follow

--	--

Reviewer-Recommended Subjects:		Networks Laboratory/Active Learning Information Technology Operating Systems Pedagogy CS Ed Research Web-based Techniques/Services
Technical Score:	2	Comments: Technical quality of the paper is below average. The most of terms, ideas, ... are just put on the heap without any explanation. For example "distributed computing", "extraterrestrial intelligence", and etc. It is not a good approach.
Organization Score:	2	Comments: "Easy" is a very relative term. It is a popular in TV-commercials. "Easy" does not mean GOOD! The Author(s) like(s) TV-terms such as "Extraterrestrial Intelligence".
Originality Score:	2	Comments: There are a lot of similar products and papers. Unfortunately the author(s) did not make any comparison.
Significance Score:	3	Comments: Just Average!
Overall Score:	2	Comments: Overall Recommendation is below average. The References are OK and the best part of the paper. A lot of work but results/outputs are not presented well.
Oral Presentation Comments: N/A		

Reviewer-Recommended Subjects:		Algorithms Curriculum Issues Networks Architecture Pedagogy
Technical Score:	3	Comments: The paper presents some activity by the author (s) and projected additional activities. No case is made that the activities are more important, more valuable, or more central than activities described in other papers.
Organization Score:	3	Comments: two comments: the "blinding" process hid enough of the figures that it made several points in the paper difficult to understand. a list is a list is a list. while one can save space (and keep within the 5 page limit) by doing so, running list items into a paragraph of text (as was done in the second paragraph of section 3.1 and the first paragraph of section 3.2) obscures the points being made
Originality Score:	4	Comments: The idea has merit.
Significance Score:	3	Comments: This is a description of another tool. What is innovative and potentially significant is the taking of topics that curriculum-2001 suggests for AL-4 and CN-4 and including an introduction to them in CS-0 The evaluation is lacking. Authors

		state they used the technique, but do not remark on its efficacy.
Overall Score:	3	Comments: This is a reasonable paper. There is little to place it well above the mean. Likewise, there is little to place it below the mean.
Oral Presentation Comments: examples or a demo would be nice. If even a CS-0 student can do it, then audience people at your session could do it too.		

Reviewer-Recommended Subjects:	CS1/2 High-Performance Computing	
Technical Score:	5	Comments: This is an excellent paper which describes a simple client server model that can be used by novices to set up a cluster and execute distributed applications. The software is compact compared to other systems and appears to be relatively efficient. The authors briefly describe how the system was successfully used in class and this is a section I would like to see expanded. Distributed computing is part of the core material that the ACM recommends is covered in the CS curriculum. As a result, this is an interesting paper as it demonstrates that distributed computing can be examined early in the curriculum and that it has the potential to increase interest in CS from other disciplines and the ability to teach CS majors to apply technology to other domains.
Organization Score:	5	Comments: The paper is well laid out and organized. It is easy to read and it covers a topic that is interesting.
Originality Score:	5	Comments: The paper presents a novel approach to building a distributed system that is geared toward an educational setting. As such it does not have the overheads associated with commercial systems.
Significance Score:	5	Comments: The paper presents an easy to use suite of products to allow novices to build clusters (windows environment only) and to distribute applications across the cluster. It lacks the overhead of existing systems and the authors demonstrate that it can be used by novices who can put a cluster together in 5 minutes. The authors demonstrate that respectable performance is achievable even using machines retired from the student labs.
Overall Score:	5	Comments: An excellent paper that presents material that could easily be adopted by a number of institutions and included in their curriculum.
Oral Presentation Comments: I would have liked more detail and evaluation of the student experience with the system.		

Reviewer-Recommended Subjects:		Networks Laboratory/Active Learning Pedagogy High-Performance Computing
Technical Score:	5	Comments: good and complete discussion and description at an appropriate level
Organization Score:	5	Comments: Section 2 shouldn't be bulleted excellent overall organization and style
Originality Score:	4	Comments: similar papers have been presented before but this takes a different approach with a real distributed system rather than a cluster
Significance Score:	5	Comments: excellent description and tools that are readily available
Overall Score:	5	Comments: short, to-the-point, and useful information good to have software available from the author
Oral Presentation Comments: show a diagram of the network system demonstrate programming the system to the audience		

Reviewer-Recommended Subjects:		Laboratory/Active Learning High-Performance Computing
Technical Score:	5	Comments: The paper is technically accurate. Two comments are made: First, the author may need to highlight the motivation and implementation constraints(section 3.1). Second, when introducing the implementation of the client-server suit, the author focuses on its interface but does not mention the design details of the suit. It would be better to give some descriptions about its design, e.g.,architecture, implementing techniques, etc.
Organization Score:	4	Comments: The paper is presented clearly. However,three advices are listed: 1.I suggest that you combine Section 2 and Section 3.1 to form an independend section,which discusses motivation and related work. 2.It would be better to expand the paper to five full pages. 3.Give an obligatory conclusion.
Originality Score:	6	Comments: This paper first provides an easy to use framework for undergraduate-level distributed computing courses. Its originality is quite good.
Significance Score:	5	Comments: The author introduces a client-server suit, in order to provide an easy-to-use distributed computing framework. It is indeed simple to install and to use the software. Such a framework is useful for students to acquire experence in parallel and distributed computing.
		Comments: The paper realizes the constraints of the existing

Overall Score:

5

high-performance computing infrastructures, so introduces an readily configurable client-server suit. The author lists the design considerations, describes the user interface, and discusses other related problems. The paper is presented well, and the technical accuracy is also achieved.

Oral Presentation Comments: Expand it further to five full pages. For instance, the author can give descriptions of the design details of the c-s suit.

[Return to SIGCSE 2007 General Information Page](#)