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Presentation Specific:
- Added an outline slide to the presentation.
- Added a “Questions?” slide so the audience knows the presentation is over.
- Made some of the slides less wordy.

Problem Statement:
- Rephrased the problem statement so it is clearer exactly what the paper addresses.
- The global feedback recommended using the “formal style” to address the problem statement. However we felt that because the nature of the paper was to identify problems more than it was to address these problems, it was best to simply outline the goals and introduce the topics the paper addressed.

Contributions:
- In the narrative we overstated the issues with the operating system. We've changed the statement to make it clearer that the problems with the OS are only relevant in the context of a DBMS.

Key Concepts:
- We've added diagrams from the paper to demonstrate some of the key concepts where they may have been unclear.
- Expanded the section on the page replacement strategy and discussed when LRU is and is not appropriate. Stonebraker discusses 4 different possible memory access scenarios and shows how LRU is only appropriate for one of them.
- The “Scheduling, Process Management, and Interprocess, Communication” section has been rewritten, restructured, and a diagram added. One group noted that the section didn't summarize the the problems well enough.
- We added a short summary describing paged virtual memory to make the section clearer.

Validation:
- Stonebraker references research papers that describe the merits of every one of the methods that he describes for the various services presented in this paper. We expanded the validation to include the validation method.

Assumptions:
- Rephrased the assumptions to keep them in the context of when the paper was written. This is
done to delineate between the 'Assumptions' section and the 'Changes is Rewritten Today' section.

**Changes if Rewritten Today:**

- When we first wrote this section, we didn't give as much thought to the fact that the paper was written about 20 years ago. Both reviewers suggested that we give credit to the fact that many of the technology around today did not exist when the paper was written.

- An extra paragraph was added describing what we think were some of Stonebraker's premises for his conclusions. He seemed to have 2 implicit major premises:
  - It would make sense to rewrite major components of an operating system to cater to the needs of a niche market.
  - DBMS software developers still consider the issues presented to be problematic.

**References:**

- Added more references for the content we added.