Our revisions are based off of feedback from Group 03 (Justin Levandoski and Mohamed Khalefa) and Sangho Kim. We did not see any feedback posted from Group 12 (Michael Goshey). The structure of our final paper is the same as our rough draft except for switching the Problem Definition and Related Work sections. We decided to put the Related work section first because it gave background on the problem and delineated from previous approaches. The major changes in our paper were in adding more background information and clarifying our key points.

Sango's suggestions were very helpful for structuring the sections in our paper and making sure our paper maintained a constant focus on the problem. In the Abstract section we added a brief motivation example to illustrate why our problem is relevant and that it is a non-trivial problem. We also added the main contribution to the Abstract section and mentioned our preliminary validation results. The original Introduction described B-trees and why they are inadequate for spatial queries. However, this section was omitted from the final because it didn't add anything to our approach and most people reading this paper would already be familiar with the use of R-trees for spatial data. We also added a summary of our evaluation and future work and described the organization of the rest of the paper. Our original Related Work section contained many references, but not enough information on previous approaches and how they are different from ours. We extended the Related Work section to include this information in order to highlight our contribution. In the Validation section we wrote a lot more on the algorithm's complexity and the intuition behind it. Sangho also recommended a number of cosmetic changes to our draft, including providing our email addresses, adding key words, decreasing the width of the Abstract section, and some miscellaneous spacing suggestions.

Group 03's feedback was much appreciated as they did a good job of identifying the areas that we needed to work on and those that were solid. They also said our Related Work section needed to do a better job of summarizing previous approaches and explaining why ours is different and, in some circumstances, better. They recommended that we compare our method with previous methods to show ours is better. Because one of the main focuses of our paper is to expand the well-known, well-studied R-tree data structure to better handle kNN queries, we decided to stick with methods that only dealt with R-trees in the Validation section. To do this, we discussed the intuition behind our approach and why it would perform better than a regular R-tree while still having roughly the same complexity. Group 03 pointed out that our Conclusion section was weak and that the wording didn't necessarily cast our approach in a positive light. We rewrote the Conclusion section to summarize our results and discuss our future work and assumptions more positively.

In summary, we did a lot of work on the final revision in expanding all of the sections and adding and omitting parts in order to keep it focused. We also read more research papers for the final draft to help us better understand the problem and explain why our method is a good one.