

1 Summary of the paper

In this paper some empirical standards for peer reviewing papers in the field of software engineering studies are pointed out. This paper also explained three methods(engineering, qualitative and quantitative) used in software engineering research and for which an empirical standard is necessary. Also, described how software engineering might benefit from *Evidence-based Software Engineering* approach. Finally, explained the benefits and challenges of empirical standards. The notable benefit for *reviewers* that, they do not have to create their own criteria for the actual review process and for *researchers*, they can review their own work before submission and check for themselves whether the paper meets the requirements or not. The main challenges of Empirical Standards are, the overview must be completed and gaining the general acceptance in the SE research community.

2 Evaluation of the paper's structure

The paper's structure is perfect. But in section 2, subsections and subsubsections are redundant. Because, this terms are broadly explained in section 3. One section to explain all of the terms briefly is enough. For example, the explanation "*Engineering Research is used when new technological artifacts are introduced and evaluated through research*" is used twice. In section 3, I think there should have subsubsections for *Action Research*, *Case Study*, *Experiments (with Human Participants)* etc. in place of making fonts "bold". I think, *Researcher/Team* section should go before benefits and challenges section.

3 Evaluation of the paper's

Clearly explained the necessity of empirical standards and some methods used in software engineering research.

I think some clear overview about "What is Empirical Standard and what are the Standards?" will beautify the article more. There is a comparison with *EBSM*, so *EBSM* worth clear overview which is absent here.