
The following list contains the suggestions and critic I have got from my colleagues after their peer review. I have corrected most of it, and where I did not, I am explaining why.

The number in parentheses describes who gave me the review. Number 1 the unnamed English one, 2 the unnamed German one, and number 3 is from Mr Scharinger.

1 Language & Style

- 1.1 However sometimes either the wording is confusing or I do not get the message right. E.g. "Another fairness criteria could be that the minimum utility is maximized." (1)**

Rephrased and extended.

- 1.2 Another point is that it is more common to use cannot instead of 'can not' and another instead of 'an other'. (1)**

Searched and Replaced.

- 1.3 Im Großen und Ganzen in Ordnung. Ein Zeitfehler in Kapitel 3, letzter Absatz: "From this set they chose that", hier gehört choose(Gegenwart) (2)**

Corrected typo.

- 1.4 In section 4 Bidding Representations & Languages the article says "To be equivalent to the naive form these atomic bid must also be OR-conjunctional so that a bidder can submit several bundle he or she wants to bid for." The word bundle is missing the -s ending for plural. (3)**

Corrected typo.

- 1.5 Use of correct/better brackets in section 3 instead of less-than and greater-than signs. (3)**

Replaced all tuple brackets with \langle and \rangle . Also fixed two missing set brackets.

- 1.6 On page six the paper says "During the previous section some small examples were already given but the following ones will go a bit deeper into real work applications." I think there is a typo and it should say real world applications. (3)**

Corrected auto correction.

2 Topic Mistakes

- 2.1 On page five the article says "[BCE12, pp. 46–47] shows that this 'Winner Determination Problem' can be converted into the 'Set Packing Problem' which is known to be NP-hard." But [BCE12] reduces "Set Packing Problem" to "Winner Determination Problem" in order to show NP-hardness of the "Winner Determination Problem". That is, the other way around. Furthermore he states that it is NP-complete. (3)**

Corrected.

3 Clarity

- 3.1 In Kapitel 1.2, letzter Satz geht nicht ganz klar hervor was "ordinal preference" bedeutet. (2)**

Extended the example a bit.

- 3.2 In the restaurant example in section 1.5 Combinatorial Domains it is not clear at first glance that the author does not use a combinatorial voting system. (3)**

Redefined the example a bit by stripping not needed parts and reworked the text in general.

- 3.3 In section 4 Bidding Representations & Languages I think the part about XOR-bids can benefit from some more explanations. I feel that it would be easier to understand, if the the dummy items would have been explained further. [FLBS99] actually has a better example.**

Added another sentence for explanation.

- 3.4 On page five the article says "Its upper limit is $O(n^n)$." without saying what n is. (3)**

Added.

4 References & Literature

- 4.1 Sometimes only the page numbers are given (without the word 'pages'), sometimes it is 'pages 1–12' (1)**

The inconsistency comes from Google Scholar where different BibTex classes (in proceedings, book, article) are used which appears to render differently. I did not change this to stick to Scholar's output, and live with this inconsistency.

- 4.2 In Kapitel 1.1 wäre eine Referenz wünschenswert, ansonsten ausreichend Literatur referenziert. (2)**

From my point of view this is widely known and so a reference is not necessary. Alternatively more information can be found in the references used in the following sub sections.

- 4.3 On page six the paper says “[CELM07] had a look at the American truckload transportation market during the late 1990s and early 2000s.” I believe the reference is wrong and should be replaced by [CS06]. The bibliography entry “[CS06]” is not referenced anywhere in the article. (3)**

Corrected.

5 Further Suggestions

5.1 Table of Contents (2)

I do not think that a table of contents is necessary for such a short paper.

5.2 Greater outlook (1) & More in-depth (1)

I just found some more about current research for the presentation but it also is much more complicated (as described during the presentation).

- 5.3 I would have liked it even more if the conclusion had been a bit longer to summarize the whole article once more (and not just in short terms) since I prefer to have a good overview over the things I have already read so that it sticks in my mind better. (1)**

I have extended the closing words.