

## REVIEW of PAPER # 10 BY REVIEWER # 6

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

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

1. Presentation: \_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_

1.1. Organization: \_\_4\_\_\_\_

1.2 Grammar and spelling: \_\_5\_\_\_\_

2. Completeness (Strength of Content- Missing key items? ): \_\_\_\_3\_\_\_\_

3. Technical Correctness: \_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_

4. Proper Referencing: \_\_3\_\_\_\_

5. "Coolness" / Originality: \_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_

6. Comments to Author (Suggestions for Improvement):

Till end of page 4, the discussion is more on the three approaches, but the paper should talk more about the differences and similarities between them. Comparision is only one page matter, it would have been good to have more comparision.

No referencing in "discussion section", even though the matter is one page long.

There are only 7 references, 2 are wiki page and 3 are reading papers. It would have been better refer to technical or journal papers than wiki pages.