Dear Dr. Mahanti:

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript entitled "Locality Characteristics of Web Streams Revisited" for publication in the SPECTS 2005. The comments of the reviewer(s) who reviewed your manuscript are included at the foot of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have suggested some revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to consider the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript for the final version of it.

Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Organizers for SPECTS 2005, we appreciate your contribution.

Sincerely,
Prof. Mario Marchese
Conference Chair, SPECTS 2005
mario.marchese@cnit.it

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1
Comments to the Author
This paper have technical weak points. First the background and references are not adequate! The locality characteristics are found not only with characteristics of 2-tier architecture but also with 3-tier etc. Thus locality characteristics are examined not only in a temporal context but also in client temporal context particularly for web based streams...
Secondly, authors do not evaluate through exhaustive simulations the correlation between locality characteristics and self similar traffic for demand-driven caching schemes. However this paper has a positive point that it hosts many results... But I believe that these results do not figure out any significance... I recommend that authors should exploit circular explanations to concepts reaching readers without the topic's background.

Some questions arise from reading this paper:
(i) Why authors used predetermined traces to understand the filtering effects on locality characteristics?
(ii) Also why a two level web proxy hierarchy was used?

The paper is well written.
Reviewer: 2
Comments to the Author
Most of the paper relies on Fonseca et al. research, even the experiments are really nice. Some detailed description of the model (including some graphical schema) would be helpful to read the paper. Even though minor problems are found during reading. Please rewrite the questions of introduction, they seem repetitive and more clear in abstract and conclusions. By the way, there is no "conclusion" at the end, it seems that two models are not enough to make your conclusions definitive. Even policies and hierarchies could tell us some more stories from your experiments, right?. Good development of experiments and consistent but lack of novelty on research. Be careful with synthetic workloads, although they are fully validated you may rely on them partially. Try to recap some nice real workload to validate your models. Open problems and future work sections must be specified at the end.