Dear Ph.D. Lone Malmborg:

On behalf of the INTERACT 2009 Program Committee, I am delighted to inform you that the following submission has been accepted for the INTERACT 2009 Conference:

    Location-based services in public places: design for
       privacy

The Program Committee worked very hard to thoroughly review and discuss all the submitted papers.  Please repay their efforts, by following their suggestions when you revise your paper for final submission.

Each paper was reviewed and discussed by between 3 and 6 members of the International Programme Committee. The final acceptance rate for full paper submissions were 27% (of the full paper submissions that went through the entire peer-review process).

To upload your final manuscript, please visit the following site:

    https://www.softconf.com/s08/interact2009/

and, on the left-hand side of the page, enter the passcode associated with your submission.  Your passcode is as follows:

    486X-C2J1J0J1E4

Alternatively, you can click on the following URL, which will take you directly to a form to submit your final paper:

https://www.softconf.com/s08/interact2009/cgi-bin/scmd.cgi?scmd=aLogin&passcode=486X-C2J1J0J1E4

The reviews and comments are attached below. Address the reviewers' comments in the camera-ready version of your submission. You also need to prepare an additional document that describes how you addressed these reviewer comments in your final full paper document.

The proceedings of INTERACT'2009 will be published by Springer-Verlag in the series Lecture Notes in Computer Science (LNCS). Please follow the guidelines below whilst preparing the camera-ready version to make sure your paper meets all the requirements of Springer.

\* Make sure your paper adhere 100% to the Springer LNCS publication format available at http://www.interact2009.org/sites/default/files/SpringerLNCS-word%20format.zip. But, please do not change the headers or footers: the proceedings editor will finalise those in a uniform way.

\* Complete and duly sign BOTH the IFIP and Springer Copyright form and submit as scanned versions with your final documents (PDF, JPEG or TIF).

\* Prepare both a MS Word Version (.DOC or .DOCX) and a .PDF version of your revised paper.

\* Use the web site at https://www.softconf.com/s08/interact2009/ to upload the following 5 final documents by NO later than 13 April 2009:

1. Your final full paper document in either .DOC or .DOCX format based on the Springer template provided. You must attach and use the template (you will have to 'enable macros' for this specific document only, to do so).

2. A second PDF version of this final full paper document – we will use this document to check final formatting, etc. in case there is a problem with your MS Word document.

3. The extra document explaining how you addressed the reviewer comments in your final full paper document.

4. The Springer copyright form.

5. The IFIP copyright form.

IMPORTANT: In order to make sure your paper will appear in the LNCS proceedings, at least one author for each paper must be registered for the conference by the camera-ready deadline: April 13th 2009.

For additional information concerning the publication specifically (no general enquiries) please contact the Proceedings Editor, Marco Winckler (winckler@irit.fr).

Congratulations on your fine work.  If you have any additional questions, please

feel free to get in touch at: chair.interact2009@gmail.com


Best Wishes,

Paula Kotze
INTERACT 2009 technical Co-Chair


====================================================================
===============
INTERACT 2009 Reviews for Submission #486
====================================================================
===============

Title: Location-based services in public places: design for privacy

Authors: Alexandre Alapetite, Henning Boje Andersen, John Paulin Hansen,
Lone Malmborg and Jacob Thommesen
====================================================================
===============
                              REVIEWER #1
====================================================================
===============


--------------------------------------------------------------------
Reviewer's Scores
--------------------------------------------------------------------

    Scientific contribution of the paper: 4
  Coverage of related work in the paper: 4
                    Technical quality: 5
                    Validity of results: 5
                      Overall Rating: 5
                  Reviewer's Expertise: 4
          Best fitting topic category: Ubiquitous and Context-Aware Computing
                  Best Paper Award: Yes
          Best fitting submission type: Full Research Paper


--------------------------------------------------------------------
Comments
--------------------------------------------------------------------

Location-based services in public places: design for privacy

The paper presents a case study with location-based services at an airport, and the related benefits and privacy concerns.

Overall, the paper is very well written with an exceptionally inclusive approach in the evaluation, where different types of stakeholders are considered. From the personas and scenarios creation to the iterative design based on observations, this is a model study for designing and evaluating large scale location-based services.

An area for improvement would be to provide more details in the design section, such as which mobile devices were used and how information from different databases were combined.

The literature review is scattered around the paper but it is not posing a problem as it is always supporting the flow of the paper. Perhaps more references would benefit the paper. For example, references could be included on mobile usability issues identified in the literature (page 7 where these challenges are mentioned), or on Bluetooth usage in different contexts.

Finally, the authors might want to consider changing the title to reflect the limits of the generalisability of their results to airports (or transport hubs), as they clearly acknowledge in the discussion. The phrase "public places" in the title is perhaps slightly misleading.

Minor issues:
SPOPOS should be referenced (at least with a URL)
Section titles and subtitles are not appropriately capitalised.
One-line figure captions are not centred.
Wrong indentation in second paragraph of 2.3 and first paragraph of 4.1
Bottom of page 7 two full stops appear.

============================================================
===============
                    REVIEWER #2
============================================================
===============


-------------------------------------------------------------------------
Reviewer's Scores
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Scientific contribution of the paper: 4
Coverage of related work in the paper: 4
Technical quality: 4
Validity of results: 4
Overall Rating: 4
Reviewer's Expertise: 2
Best fitting topic category: Context-dependent Systems
Best Paper Award: No
Best fitting submission type: Full Research Paper


------------------------------------------------------------------------
Comments
------------------------------------------------------------------------


The paper is well written and reports a field experiment involving 116 subjects in a real environment (an airport).
The findings may not very surprising but the study is strong enough to deserve publication.
One minor criticism is that the claim present in the abstract: "We find that users' concerns with privacy issues are tightly related to their perception of the usefulness of the location-based service they are offered" is not really supported by the experiment (at least by the results reported in the paper).
It looks like it is more an hypothesis made by the authors than a finding of the experiment.
May be it should be better justified in the paper or removed from the abstract.


============================================================================
===============
                        REVIEWER #3
============================================================================
===============


------------------------------------------------------------------------
Reviewer's Scores
------------------------------------------------------------------------


Scientific contribution of the paper: 3
Coverage of related work in the paper: 3
Technical quality: 4
Validity of results: 4
Overall Rating: 4
Reviewer's Expertise: 4

Best fitting topic category: Context-dependent Systems
Best Paper Award: No
Best fitting submission type: Full Research Paper


--------------------------------------------------------------------------
Comments
--------------------------------------------------------------------------


The research reported investigates the value and privacy concern of an RFID/Bluetooth tracking system in an airport context. The paper reports the challenge airports face in getting passengers in time to the gate. The basic dilemma that motivates much of the work is: (1) airports want all passengers at the gate when the flight is due to leave and (2) they want the passengers spend as much time as possible away from the gate in the shopping/restaurant area. The paper describes a system design and an iterative development process. The results (obtained from a large user study with real passengers) suggest that a large portion of the people is willing to accept tracking devices while at the airport and that the see a value in such a system.

Strength of the paper
* clear analysis of requirements for passenger tracking in the airport
* use of an appropriate method for the design of the system
* large scale user study with real passengers in the situation of a real flight

Weaknesses
* little comparison with other solutions
* short and superficial discussion of the results of the study

Addressing privacy in the context of the airport is interesting as there is already a very tight monitoring of the passengers – but so far with cameras and not on a personal level. Hence the results reported (little worries about privacy) are not surprising, but still a very valuable finding that has not been reported before (to my knowledge) based on a fairly large real world study.

The paper compares very little to other solutions. E.g. if the passengers would provide their mobile phone numbers (some airlines do this already) you can push an SMS or even call the passenger. In this case no tracking would be required and this could also improve the passengers' sense of safety. It would be good if the paper provides more of a rational why the tracking is really important as with direct communication a similar result could be achieved.

The study results in general are interesting and it would improve the paper to

discuss these findings in more detail. E.g. the question "Feeling more secure now?" is not clear; secure in which sense e.g. Did they feel that they never late to get to the airplane?

===============================================================================
               REVIEWER #4
===============================================================================


-------------------------------------------------------------------------
Reviewer's Scores
-------------------------------------------------------------------------


   Scientific contribution of the paper: 2
   Coverage of related work in the paper: 2
                  Technical quality: 3
                  Validity of results: 2
                    Overall Rating: 3
                  Reviewer's Expertise: 4
         Best fitting topic category: Evaluation Methods / Usability Evaluation
                  Best Paper Award: No
         Best fitting submission type: Full Research Paper


-------------------------------------------------------------------------
Comments
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Overall, this paper has an interesting premise.  But the current manuscript is somewhat under-developed. First, as a study addressing privacy issues, I can't find a definition/conceptualization of privacy or privacy concerns. Defining privacy in your research context is important because it is widely recognized that as a concept, privacy "is in disarray [and n]obody can articulate what it means" (Solove 2006, p.477). Second, the contribution of this research is limited. The author(s) need to acknowledge the stream of logic on which they are drawing and to which they are contributing. Why does this research lead to a new or unanswered theoretical question?  Which concepts and causal arguments
are linked to the new theory being developed or tested?

Solove, D.J. "A Taxonomy of Privacy," University of Pennsylvania Law Review (154:3) 2006, pp 477-560.