REVIEW of PAPER # __24____ BY REVIEWER # __19_____

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___

    1.2 Grammar and spelling: ___5___

2. Completeness (Strength of Content- Missing key items?): __3____

3. Technical Correctness: __3____

4. Proper Referencing: __4____

5. "Coolness" / Originality: __2____

6. Comments to Author (Suggestions for Improvement):

1. **Presentation:** When presenting the security models in each of the approaches, the author plainly describes how each approach addresses security, rather than providing insights into the underlying techniques used such as using processor privilege levels, page protection etc. Section 3 is not well organized. Without properly discussing the mechanism being employed to provide security, the author just calls out the name of the technique.
2. **Completeness:** In section 3, where the similarities and differences are discusses, the techniques are presented in a hand waving nature. For instance, sandboxing in Virtual Ghost is achieved via compiler instrumentation technique and the paper does not mention it anywhere. Section 4, which is the conclusion section, is more like the introduction, rather than providing a meaningful conclusion.
3. **Correctness:** Section 3.1.3 says that supporting multiple systems and applications is a similarity. This is actually a motivation for requiring a security mechanism.
4. **Referencing:** The author talks about the limitations of prior work to ExoKernel, Xen and Virtual Ghost but not provide references for the same.
5. **Originality:** The paper is severely lacking in originality with of lot of sentences repeated verbatim from the original papers, in almost every section.