Computing Science – Student Colloquium – Re-review of Manuscripts

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

<div align="center">Paper id: 17</div>

Author(s): Frans Simanjuntak, Marco Gunnink.

Reviewer(s): Timon Back

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	Clear structure. Nice reorganization of paragraphs.
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	Nice job in easing the understandablity of the described methods. Also, now all figures are clearly readable.
How would you assess the overall quality of the contribution offered in the manuscript in terms of innovativeness, originality, and independent thinking?	4	A lot of progress has been made. The results are proberly discussed and stated.

Framework	grade	according to previous version:

(initial and final sections)		
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)	5	The title and abstract precisely state the content of the paper
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?	5	The introduction clearly motivates the importance of the topic. Additionally, also the approach is described, which is in line with the structure of the document. A short overview is not present, but I like it that way.
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?	4	The discussion/conclusion provides answers to the question asked in the introduction. Also a comparison between these techniques is performed. The authors point out difficulties with the methods and also see no "winner". Therefore, the significance is presented. The authors do reflect on their results, which proves their approach. One future direction is presented, but very shortly. Opportunity to add more remarks about the current state of the research would have been possible or how to overcome the shortcomings of i.e. "the decisions maker's subjectivity"

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	This has been improved. Nothing to add
Are the authors clear, complete, concise and coherent in their account of their own approach of the topic? Is this approach well-chosen?	5	The comparison is well-chosen and explained with clear reasoning why specific frameworks were chosen and their findings.
Have the authors provided sufficient methodological detail about their approach?	5	
Have the authors been fair and explicit in their use and treatment of previous 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	5	References are used and also used figures are labelled/cited References are well used/spread over the paper

correct?		
Have the authors made clever and proper use of illustrations?	4	Figures and Tables have largely improved. Most importantly they are readable and also have been reduced to the necessary minimum. Still, the labels of tables are above, while the labels of figures are below the figure, which is confusing

Re-reviewing	grade	comment/suggestions
Has the paper improved in comparison with the first version? In what way?	5	The paper was greatly improved. It been became much more easier and enjoyable to read. No repetitions are used anymore and a clear structure is provided. Clear results of the outcome of the methods and also the steps inbetween.
Did the authors meet your remarks on the first version?	5	The authors did meet my remarks of the first version to a large extend. Of course, some comments are 'personal preferences', still all important remarks are meet

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