This paper deals with web caches and how they can share content. Any network with multiple proxy servers for any reasons, would present an opportunity to reduce Internet traffic by efficiently sharing the cached pages. Efficiency is important as the overhead of sharing shouldn’t be of the same order as the cost of retrieving the page from the remote server. The ICP protocol had several performance bottlenecks due to its tendency to multicast cache misses, which results in greater network traffic as well as processing overheads. The modified ICP protocol presented here stores a summary of all the pages available at the neighboring web caches and updates these periodically. This brings down the inefficiencies seen with traditional ICP protocol, but also introduces false positives and false misses (but, the correctness of the caching is not compromised in either case).

Pros
1. Importance of sharing cached pages makes it mandatory to have a protocol that is efficient with minimal overheads - network, cpu and memory.
2. The use of bloom filters to store summary pages not only brings down the size of the summary, it also provides an efficient lookup mechanism, and a scalable design.

Cons
1. The simulations used in the paper employs a very simple topology - a wide area network, which SC-ICP is supposed to serve, would have a more complex topology, and its impact could have been interesting to observe. The simulations fires requests from a set of workstations, for comparison it seems good enough, but may seem too trivial to prove its real capabilities.
2. A more heterogeneous setup, involving different proxy servers (not only squid), and each proxy configured with different cache hit ratios would have been more convincing.
3. The paper compares the worst case performance of ICP with SC-ICP, instead, average case of ICP would have been a better option.
4. ICP seems to be more suitable for a hierarchy of caches, so each cache miss will would only query its child nodes and parent node. Whereas, SC-ICP seems to fit in a more ad-hoc kind of arrangement of the proxies. So direct comparison would seem inappropriate.