**Review**  
tPad: A Contact Augmented Reality Implementation to Support Active reading

**Comments on content:**

Most reviewers, not all, are satisfied with the style of presentation mentioning that it is well-written. The terms are explained properly and the idea is presented in a manner one can easily follow. However, there are still confusions lurking around, and some weak spots that can easily be fixed.

* The title, as one reviewer points out, is focused on tPad. Whereas, tPad is not the only contribution the paper makes or claims to make.
* You introduce a term, “device registration” and you go ahead and explain what it is. However, reviewers mention a need to know if this is a term that’s commonly used in literature.
* One reviewer questions if Contact Augmented reality (CAR) is a new concept & should be called so because it seems it is just a “close distance augmented reality”.
* The concept of “device registration” needs more elaboration. What are the existing problems with it? What are the other ways? How is your approach different?
* Why are you going with two prototypes and why are you focusing on tPad alone? It’s very confusing as while reading it, one feels drifting here and there.
* In the paper, you claim to make several contributions. They are well laid out and clear. However, the same clarity is missing in the paragraphs that come before it. It’s not really that bad but there are a few ideas thrown that are not followed up or don’t show up later. And what happened to the device registration challenge? One would expect some contribution that clearly states something about it.
* A few grammar & structural points were pointed out by reviewers. I’ll forward them to the authors of the paper.