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- You need to correct the figure numbering. You are referring to two images as figure one. The first figure has no caption.
- You should develop a larger description in your caption. The figure and caption should be able to stand alone in what you are trying to describe within the figure.
- You should explain what you mean by “better” and “worse” in the first paragraph. This is not clear.
- The example and the use of figure one does not make complete sense. You are talking about prices but there is no price listed. Consider adding a table that has a list of letters and prices to support your example.
- By cleaning up that confusion, I think your definition will be good for the problem.
- Is there any information as to how the skyline query was developed for databases? Did they originally start as a DB problem, or was it migrated to the DB?
- You may want to consider extending the historical background a bit further. There really is not much in this section yet. Describing what the application of the problem of finding the maxima of a set of points. Was this an original problem, or one that was developed later?
- How recently? Do you have sources to point to for the algorithms as to how they were developed?
- The steps to the block nested loop algorithm may be better of being summarized or condensed. A condensed version and a reference to a place where they can read more on the topic may be more effective for the intended audience. Also listing for what purposes that particular algorithm is good for would be beneficial.
- List purposes for each algorithm. (The Why use this algorithm question)
- Make captions on all figures, and use the captions and figures to explain the problem. A figure won't tell much unless it is referred to and has a good description explaining the purpose.
- Nearest neighbor explanation is good, but may be too much for this purpose. Consider summarizing it, and condensing it down. If you can do this without losing information, that would be great. If you want to keep the algorithm, find a way to make it less split up (figures on one side of the page, the algorithm on the other, then reference to the figures for each step.
- Same thing as previous comment for the Branch and bound skyline algorithm.
- For the variations, you may want to add a sentence about why the variation was created, and if there is a reference to more information on it, add that in.
- Key applications are good and explain how it works well. Add some references to show where this concept has been implemented in the application.
- May want to consider adding related works, Voronoi diagrams for example.
- “Recommended reading” you should remove the extra D. Also, make sure to do a good spelling check. I didn't notice it in your paper, but many papers have had considerable problems with spelling errors or correctly spelled wrong words that are not the right words.

Overall very good job of explaining the information. I feel as though I understood the content. The few areas that need some work to enhance the information you are providing, but overall, it was nicely done.