**Paper-1: 2014ACMSE Submission\_3: Double skip-list**

**Review/Comments:** This paper introduced Skip-List, a modified version of double linked list, that takesskip-list more level up from its original target of sudt being an effecient emulation of a balanced tree. Actually, a double skip-list is a combination of two skip-lists that shares their noded. The author(s) pointed out noe of the notable problems of the double skip-lists is that they use double set of links that cause extra memory usage. The author(s) presented a mathematicall prooof of an algorithmic height of ordinarty double skip-list that yields almost 33% of the memory usage. With a goal of overcoming extra memory usage in the double skip-lists, the authors proposed an aalysis for changing the randomization factor of the double skip-lists.They claimed and proved that their proposed double skip-list is capable of performing basic list operations such as, random access, random positioon inseration, random position deletion, and search operations in an expected algorithmic time complexity. The tests performed on double skip-list seemes to be adequate, to justfy the author(s)' claim that it may be able to use 33% more memory spaces than the ordinary skip-lsit. In case of extensively serching of contradicting and position based insertion and deletion operations, use of the proposed souble skip-list may yield better results.

Overall, this is a good paper and well written but needs to make the some corrections, upon which I would recommend it to be accepted.

1. There are some inconsistencies in typing the term "Skip-List" in the title and many places throughout the paper that need to be fixed. For instance, in some places it is used as "Skip-list", "skip-list", "skip-List", etc.
2. The in-text reference numbers should be consistent to the standard style, for instance, on the second page, the [12, 13, 5, 2] should be [2, 5, 12, 13], and as well as in all other places.
3. There should not have any period at the end of the figure/table captions. Need to fix this in some places.
4. Headings and sub-heading should be consistent in style and format.

**Paper-2: 2014ACMSE Submission\_25: Impact of Data Transfer to Hadoop Job Performance**

**- Architectural Analysis and Experiment -**

**Review/Comments:** This paper talked about Hadoop, an open source distributed data processing platform that thas been widely using in the cloud computing environment.The author(s) explored the affect of data transfer on Hadoop cluster system. They modified the original Hadoop Map and Reduce programs in order to run a series of sort operations over a massive amount of data. According to the authors' claim, they build and conducted they experiment with two different kind of experimental Hadoop cluster systems: one using their local laboratory mechines and another with the Amazon EC2. While processing some tasks paralley in both of the systems, they kept track the progress in both systems. Comparing the performance record of the systems, the study revealed that the task slot hoarding is mainly repossibke for incuring congested disk I/O operations by the Hadoop Mappers. The study, furthermore, revealed that speculative task executions brought adverse effects on some cases. However, this needs furthermore researcfh for its proper justification. Overall, it is a good and timely study.

Overall, this is a good paper and well written but needs to make the some corrections, upon which I would recommend it to be accepted.

1. I did not expect to see the authors' info in the paper.
2. There are some inconsistencies in using the term "Map-Reduce" in many places throughout the paper that need to be fixed. For instance, in some places it is used as "Map", "map", "Reduce", "reduce", "Sort", "sort", etc. Use of these terminology should be consistent throughout the paper.
3. Headings and sub-heading should be consistent in style and format. e.g., "4. Discussion" should be  "4. DISCUSSION", " 5. Conclusion" should be  "5. CONCLUSIONS", ALL uppercase.
4. Proper indentation needed in places of bullet/pointed sections.
5. There are some grammatical, in tense, inconsistencies through out the paper that should be fixed.

**Paper-3: 2014ACMSE Submission\_7: Software Project Status and Completion Estimation with Earned Value Management**

**Review/Comments:** This paper presented a study report of a project tracking process called, Earned Value Management (EVM). EVM is a project control and management technique that is used mostly for large-scale projects. Recenlty use of EVM is being popular in the software development industry for the project managers for keeping and maintaining the progress of the on planning and going projects. In this paper, the authors tried to present the EVM technique and its potential problems on a software development project; and proposed an improved model for forecasting within the EVM paradigm. However, due to inadequeate information about the project where and how that was conducted the extensive benefits of the Modified EVM technique is not presented explicitly. Otherwise, this could be a good paper to be accepted for the conference presentation. Most imporantly, the paper is NOT well- written, especially it is NOT in the conference style. Thus, unless this and the following changes I would NOT recommend it to be accepted.

1. I did not expect to see the authors' info in the paper.
2. The paper is not written it the conference style.
3. Inadequate background study in the Introduction section.
4. Inadequate information about the project/study that the paper discussed.
5. Used as variable or technical letter/term (e.g., t, ) should be in italicized.
6. Inadequate conclusion and implication of the study.
7. There are some grammatical, in tense, inconsistencies through out the paper that should be fixed.
8. There are some problems in the references.