

REVIEW of PAPER # 1 BY REVIEWER # 13

Fill in each \_\_\_\_\_ with a number on a scale of 1-5.

(1=Poor) (2=Fair) (3=Acceptable) (4=Good) (5=Excellent)

1. Presentation: 3

1.1. Organization: 3.5

1.2 Grammar and spelling: 3

2. Completeness (Strength of Content- Missing key items? ): 3

3. Technical Correctness: 4

4. Proper Referencing: 3

5. "Coolness" / Originality: 3.5

6. Comments to Author (Suggestions for Improvement):

The title of the paper is not clear, and the author does not capture the essence of the subject in this title. The introduction sections where the author draws highlights from other papers do not cite the sources. Also when the article refers to previous work in several places, it is not clear what the previous work was and references are also missing. Though the author tried to organize the paper well, it suffered from complex sentences which are hard to comprehend. Citations are not given in proper format and punctuations are misplaced at several places along the text. The text needs to be proof-read to correct for grammatical errors. Text is repetitive in some places in introduction as well as abstract.

The interesting part of the paper is the comparative analysis section. The author has reviewed the differences between Exokernel, Xen and Virtual Ghost architectures well in this section. The author has also briefly summarized the individual sections well prior to comparison.