

# Review Form Response

## Review FOSS4G Academic Track Submission

This form is for reviewing a FOSS4G Academic Track Submission.

Remarks to the editors \*

The authors describe a bench-mark of graphic APIs for the use in GIS rendering. While benchmarks for graphics are common in computer science literature, this is not the case so when specifically applied to GIS. So this should be a very interesting paper for FOSS4G visitors.

The paper does deliver in that sense, but not fully lives up to expectations, because of the following points:

- The benchmark sets out to to be GIS-centric, but only deals with vector data, so is not useful for raster GIS;
- the benchmark seems also Windows-centric, and especially FOSS4G software is often non-windows and/or multi-platform;
- in the benchmarks of OpenGL and DirectsD APIs a wrapper has been used. It is not quite made clear why, and it is not discussed if (or how) this would have influenced the results.

Some smaller remarks and errors that should be remedied are:

- Keyword header on page 1
- Reference to Zhang (2001) missing in Bibliography
- p9. note 1 is irrelevant. Instead please provide link to Shapefile format reference.
- figure 4 could (and should) be bigger
- p11. "relatively decent graphic card" is not a very scientific description...
- IMHO the 2nd and 3rd paragraph of the RESULTS section belong to the METHODOLOGY section.

Remarks to the author

The authors describe a bench-mark of graphic APIs for the use in GIS rendering. While benchmarks for graphics are common in computer science literature, this is not the case so when specifically applied to GIS. So this should be a very interesting paper for FOSS4G visitors.

The paper does deliver in that sense, but not fully lives up to expectations, because of the following points:

- The benchmark sets out to to be GIS-centric, but only deals with vector data, so is not useful for raster GIS;
- the benchmark seems also Windows-centric, and especially FOSS4G software is often non-windows and/or multi-platform;
- in the benchmarks of OpenGL and DirectsD APIs a wrapper has been used. It is not quite made clear why, and it is not discussed if (or how) this would have influenced the results.

Some smaller remarks and errors that should be remedied are:

- Keyword header on page 1
- Reference to Zhang (2001) missing in Bibliography
- p9. note 1 is irrelevant. Instead please provide link to Shapefile format reference.
- figure 4 could (and should) be bigger
- p11. "relatively decent graphic card" is not a very scientific description...
- IMHO the 2nd and 3rd paragraph of the RESULTS section belong to the METHODOLOGY section.

Recommendation \*

- Strong Accept and recommendation for inclusion in Transactions in GIS
- Strong Accept
- Weak Accept
- Reject

Close

\* Denotes required field

