REVIEW of PAPER # ___6_____ BY REVIEWER # ___14_____

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

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

1. Presentation: ___2___

      1.1. Organization: ___3___

      1.2 Grammar and spelling: __1____

2. Completeness (Strength of Content- Missing key items?): ___4___

3. Technical Correctness: __4____

4. Proper Referencing: ___2___

5. "Coolness" / Originality: __3____

6. Comments to Author (Suggestions for Improvement):

You did a good job of finding ways to compare the required, yet quite disparate, topics including the Virtual Ghost product, the exokernel model and the concept of virtualization. The paper could have been improved dramatically with more spell checking, grammar checking and consistency in formatting. Repeated misspellings like "virtulization", highlight a lack of review. Pasting your paper into Microsoft Word quickly finds 15 basic spelling errors. There are also many grammatical errors and spacing and punctuation typos. Their prevalence was so abundant that I found them quite distracting and they took away from the content you were trying to convey. The references section used many different citation styles (bolding, quotes, date position, URL colors and font sizes. Using a single referencing style would improve this section.

You made heavy use of citations, which is good, for a paper focused on reviewing other papers. However, I would have liked to have seen more original content. The references were so abundant that they became the overwhelming majority of the content for your paper. On page 3, there are only 7 sentences that are not references from other papers. Often times, you would reference something from another paper, but you would not describe any background information about it or explain why it was important or how it helped improve performance. For instance, "SVA adds its own LLVM instruction set to replace the hardware specific operations used by OS[2]." This is the first time you introduce SVA and there is no explanation in the paper of what it is. You can't

necessarily assume the reader will have read all the referenced papers beforehand and know their details. Explaining what SVA is and something to back up your conclusion that "performance is acceptable", would have been valuable. You pointed out that the results were better than InkTag, but no reference to what InkTag is, so the evidence lacks much strength.