Computing Science – Student Colloquium – Re-review of Manuscripts

Title of Manuscript: Techniques for the comparison of public cloud providers

Paper id: 17

Author(s): Frans Simanjuntak and Marco Gunnink

Reviewer(s): Vasilios Andrikopoulos

Please note that the paper you are reviewing is sent to you only for the purpose of this evaluation. The paper is to remain confidential until it is actually published in the conference proceedings. You should not pass it on or disclose it to anyone else. Delegation of the reviewing to someone else is not allowed.

Please indicate grade:
5 = excellent ("Definitely accept the paper w.r.t. this point")
4 = good   ("I would argue for accepting the paper w.r.t. this point")
3 = neutral   ("Not sure, could go either way the paper w.r.t. this point")
2 = bad   ("I would argue against accepting the paper w.r.t. this point")
1 = completely unsatisfactory ("Definitely reject the paper w.r.t. this point")

General impression	**grade**	**according to previous version:**
Is the manuscript properly and coherently structured, and 'easy to navigate'? Are all of the required sections (including abstract, references etc.) present and well-positioned, and are subheadings well-chosen?	5	Already fine in previous version
Is the manuscript clearly and concisely written in a proper tone of voice? (please mark sections, sentences, and phrases that are obscure, too complex, ambiguous, too wordy, too vague, that contain redundancies, or that appear to be irrelevant, and words or phrases that do not conform proper English idiom or scientific discourse) Does the document follow the prescribed style, does it give the necessary details in the references, does it generally maintain the proper form (give examples if not)?	5	The language used is appropriate and correct
How would you assess the overall quality of the contribution offered in the manuscript in terms of innovativeness, originality, and independent thinking?	5	It was already fine in the previous version

Framework (initial and final sections)	grade	according to previous version:
Do **title** and **abstract** properly cover the content and the argument of the entire manuscript (including results and discussion/conclusion)? (please mark deficiencies in title and abstract)	4	(no difference to previous version)
Does the **introduction** cleverly introduce the topic and its importance? Do the authors briefly describe the current state of knowledge about this topic? Do they clearly state the approach they report, or the research problem they address, or the question they intend to answer in the paper, and its relevance? Do they give a brief overview of the entire document?	4	The point about highlighting the added value contribution of this work remains unaddressed
Does the concluding section (**summary/conclusion/ discussion**) actually address the approach/problem/question stated in the introduction? Do the authors clearly indicate the significance of their findings for the state of knowledge in the field? Do they assess their own approach to the problem? Do they suggest future directions or directions?	5	It was already addressed in the previous version

Core sections of manuscript	grade	according to previous version:
Are the authors clear, complete, concise and coherent in their overview of the current state of knowledge regarding the topic addressed in the manuscript?	5	The structure of the core sections of the paper has been improved significantly
Are the authors clear, complete, concise and coherent in their account of their own approach of the topic? Is this approach well-chosen?	5	It was already addressed in the previous version
Have the authors provided sufficient methodological detail about their approach?	5	The discussion on the methodology has improved
Have the authors been fair and explicit in their use and treatment of previous	5	Citations to reused tables and figures have been added as appropriate.

literature and the work of others (including visuals)? Are references in the text mentioned according to the criteria current in the field? Is the list of references complete and correct?		
Have the authors made clever and proper use of illustrations?	4	The used figures and tables can be improved for readability

Re-reviewing	grade	comment/suggestions
Has the paper improved in comparison with the first version? In what way?	5	The paper was already in a good state in the previous version, but it has been improved even more in this version by the reframing of the discussion and the addition of more material on the presented approaches.
Did the authors meet your remarks on the first version?	5	The authors have addressed almost all of the remarks w.r.t. the previous version

Acceptance	
What is your overall grade for the paper? Should the paper be accepted for the studColl proceedings? (encircle what is appropiate)	5 = excellent, "Definitely accept the paper" 4 = good, "I would argue for accepting the paper" 3 = neutral, "Not sure, could go either way" 2 = bad, "I would argue against accepting the paper" 1 = completely unsatisfactory, "Definitely reject the paper" **5** / 4 / 3 / 2 / 1

Further comments or suggestions