



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
In Introduction section you explain Virtual Machine (VM) concept. However, you should relate that with your study in the last paragraph of Introduction section. Why did you tell about VM? Are you using it for the test purposes? Explain. Related work section is a raw list of studies in the paper's domain. Authors need to relate the work presented in the paper with those studies. Why did you mention about workflow scheduling in the related work section? How do you relate workflow scheduling with your scheduling approach? In the first paragraph of Section 3, Do VMs share the resources? Are the resources replicated? If VMs share the same resources and the resources are not replicated, then the performance results do not give valuable information about your approach's advantages. You should make it clear. You should also explain if the jobs are dependent or not. I guess they are independent jobs. Also, analyze what would happen if they were dependent. Would your algorithm still work? What type of complications would be introduced? (Line 150) There are not enough details on the Johnson's algorithm. You should explain what the reasoning is for adding job-requests from the front and from the end. You should clearly explain Johnson's algorithm first. Then, it will be easier to understand your proposed extended approach. Why did you focus on two stage scheduling? What is the motivation behind this? How about three stage scheduling? Does your algorithm also work for three stage scheduling? If yes, what would you need to extend? If no, why? Do you thing Figure 3 gives good enough results to prove that your approach is much better than FCSFS? In the last sentence of the conclusion section, you can't comment on all the other approaches, because you are only comparing your approach with FCFS. Finally, the paper contains many typos and grammatical errors Let's just look at lines between 126 and 131: algorithm is seems -> algorithm seems, on Resource type-1 -> on resource type-1, implementation Johnson	Firstly Thanks for your honourable review comments. Explained Virtual Machine(VM) concept related to our approach. Workflow schedules and multi-stage scheduling are having similarities hence quoted them. Yes on same physical resources we can create several Virtual Machine Instances. Hence cost for end users will be very less. We assumed that all the jobs are independent. In the nest paper we also consider for dependent jobs. Added more information on Johnson Scheduling algorithm design strategy and its approach. At initial stage we focused on two stage scheduling and later we will extend for 4 and then for k. Our approach will gives better results than FCFS. We considered only two approaches in this paper. Thanks for all your suggestions and we corrected all mistakes.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

algorithm -> implementation of Johnson algorithm, schedule n job request ->
schedule n job requests

When you give reference to figures in the sentences, start with capital letters: figure

3 -> Figure 3

Do not use varying notations for the same thing such as type-1 or type 1.