Abstract
1. Missing why the problem is a problem (why are improved spreadsheet practices needed?)
2. Length is appropriate
3. Yes, want to keep reading.
4. I think the abstract is accessible to non-experts.

Introduction
1. Convinced it's a real problem. Like the spreadsheet use projections but do you have the actual numbers for 2012? Evidence written like it's for the future but now it's from the past.
2. Convinced it's an important problem with good example.
3. Yes, contribution is a tool to explore the combination of spreadsheet functions.
4. So far paper delivers on promises in intro. Probably will be sold correctly when tool evaluation is complete.
5. Can somewhat predict the structure, could probably outline paper in more detail in the intro.
6. Yes, want to keep reading to see how tool will help.

* First sentence doesn't make sense. Maybe a typo?

Methodology
1. Not necessarily research questions but clearly describes design goals and decisions very well.
2. All described in Design Decisions and Implementation Details.
3. Why this methodology was chosen is not obvious to me.
4. I think the case study should also be a part of the methodology, at least describing what the evaluation is.
5. Methodology mostly describes the design of the tool rather than methodology of the evaluation.
6. Technical terms used accurately.
7. Technical terms are appropriate.
8. Unusual to have approach and methodology. I think they could be separate sections with the methodology including the case study details and approach only being design.
9. How did you come up with the design goals to implement and avoid?
10. Nothing seems too dubious, but not really enough details to tell in the case study experiment.

* Mention a reference to Section A in 3.3 but there's not one in the paper.