

Paul Hubbard
usr629

SC|05
Submitter Site

Quick Links

help | log out

ACCOUNT | SUBMIT | **My SUBMISSIONS** | LINKS

Announcements

- **June 30, 2005 Deadline:** StorCloud Submissions Close.
- You may update your submission until the submission deadline. See the "Sample Submission Forms" tab for a list of deadlines.

All submission deadlines are to be understood as occurring at **11:59PM ET (Eastern Time in the USA)** on the day of the deadline.

- **September 1, 2005:** Bandwidth Challenge submissions close. *However, in order to be included in the final SC|05 program, an abstract must be submitted by July 29, 2005.* If you intend to submit after July 29th, please email an "intent to participate in the BWC" to bwc@sc05.supercomputing.org by July 29.

[hide announcements](#)

Decision: Not Accepted

Title: Using a Network Ring Buffer for Science and Outreach

Contact Person: Paul Hubbard

Review Categories:

Rel: Relevance

Sound: Technical Soundness

Imp: Technical Importance

Orig: Originality

Pres: Quality of Presentation

Overall: Overall rating

Rec: Recommended action

Paper Reviews Summary

Reviewer	Rel	Sound	Imp	Orig	Pres	Overall	Rec	Conf	Exp
usr236	6	6	5	4	3	3	WEAK REJECT	8	Knowledgeable
usr323	6	5	3	5	3	4	WEAK REJECT	9	Some background
usr325	7	4	7	4	1	3	REJECT	7	Knowledgeable
Averages:	6.3	5.0	5.0	4.3	2.3	3.3		8.0	

[Committee Comments](#)

[top](#)

Comments to Authors:

This seems like a practical solution to a real problem. But...

This paper reads like a status report, not a conference paper. What is inovative here? What about related work? Who care that "site progammer Jason Hanley developed a Java program"? How about some specific performance results?

[top](#)

Comments to Authors:

This paper presents dataTurbine aka Ring-Based Network Buffer, as an intermediate data storage device.

This paper, while well written, is simply not written as a research paper. It almost feels like a marketing release or a commercial status update. This can be seen in the background of the project (section 2), the number of times patents or such are mentioned, the emphasis on who has done what (I'm sure Hanley and Ferschweiler appreciate this but it's simply not the protocol).

No research results are given in terms of scalability or performance numbers, No related work is mentioned at all, for which i feel any research paper should be outright rejected for. And a nitpick - either call it DataTurbine OR RBNB, don't alternate between the two.

For these reasons, i feel the paper should not be accepted at SC.

[top](#)

Comments to Authors:

It would be useful to include the following in the paper:

- an explanation of not just the properties of a Network Ring Buffer, but what classes of problems it is ideally suited to solving as compared against other competing technologies. For example, my guess is the Japanese are equally active in this area of research, considering their earthquake engineering budget is an order of magnitude larger than the US budget. How does their approach differ and why did you choose your ring buffer approach over theirs? Or are they using Ring buffers too?

- an explanation of what the little circles, arrows and squares at the edges of the lines in Figure 1 mean. Also, what is a Tomcat?

I think this paper is better suited to a conference specifically focused on earthquake engineering as a showcase of how the community can assemble the appropriate technology to build NEES

cyberinfrastructure. This has some value to SC audience members who might be surveying different approaches to cyberinfrastructure development, however I think this paper needs to be written as a technical research paper rather than a project report, to satisfy the majority of the audience members.

Committee comments to authors:

None

*Please report comments to
support@sc-submissions.org*

*This site uses
Linklings software*

*Suggestions
to improve this site?*