REVIEW of PAPER **# \_\_3\_\_** BY REVIEWER # \_\_\_**20\_\_\_**

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): This is paper devoted more than half to explanation of virtual ghost, virtualization and exokernel and reader has to infer the comparison mostly. Whatever presented is correct but my suggestion is devote more part of it to comparison between the feature you choose than introductory explanation like what are they ? And how they work ? . Instead of providing examples of these approaches you should provide reasons and argument that make you do comparison and draw conclusion that why one is more flexible and why it is so. Whatever presented in the paper technically seems correct to me and when I read the heading of paper I was expecting bit more for comparison than presented in paper.