SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_BJMCS_12641**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Performance evaluation of two stage scheduling algorithm in cloud computing**
Type of the Article	**Computer Science**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	1.The texts "…this algorithm reduces average waiting time and total elapsed time when compare to other scheduling algorithms…" in the Abstract Section should be modified as "…this algorithm reduces average waiting time and total elapsed time when compares to other scheduling algorithms…". 2.The first paragraph and the second paragraph in the Introduction Section should be combined into one paragraph. 3.The texts "...Scheduling algorithms in Cloud computing comes under the class of NP-complete ..." in the Introduction Section should be modified as "...Scheduling algorithms in Cloud computing come under the class of NP-complete...". 4.The text "...Richard.J [2] discussed a classic three machine scheduling model with optimal permutation of n items by considering total elapsed time as objective function..." in the 2.1 Section should be modified as "...Richard.J [2] discussed a classic three machines scheduling model with optimal permutation of n items by considering total elapsed time as objective function....". 5.There are a redundant space in the 88th line of 2.3 Section. 6.The texts "…Nguyen and Nam [13] discussed power aware allocation for user request in virtual computing by proposing host selection policies like MAP(Minimum of Active Ports)…" in the Abstract Section should be modified as "…Nguyen and Nam [13] discussed power aware allocation for user request in virtual computing by	Updated all the modified texts and thanks for patience for giving more detailed review comments

	proposing host selection policies like MAP(Minimum of Active Ports)….". Authors lost one " . " after the texts " MAP(Minimum of Active Ports)". 7.The title of the third Section Model could not clearly describe the section. 8.The texts "…Consider the resource allocation in cloud computing for each job request in physical machines Each request requires a series of different virtual machine to complete its task…." in the Model Section should be modified as "…Consider the resource allocation in cloud computing for each job request in physical machines Each request requires a series of different virtual machines to complete its task….".	
Minor REVISION comments	1.The paper construct is not enough seriousness and clarity. 2.There are are some typos. 3.Author does not exactly describe the detail of every reference.It is better to change them as the form of "Wing S. An Efficient Implementation of a Two Stage Production Scheduling Algorithm[J].Journal of Operational Research Vol 40,1989(11):1049-1052. "	Replaced the typos. Changed the reference types.
Optional/General comments	The paper construct is not enough seriousness and clarity.What's more, it propose a new algorithm to evaluate performance,but the approach given is not clear.	Explain in more clear way