

1. *What problems were addressed or surveyed by the authors?*
The document addresses the problem most authors in software architecture literature face. The problem of representing the entire software system in blue prints. Most authors struggle to represent the system using one diagram when they try to show functionality, control flow, data flow, dependencies etc. in a single blue print.
2. *What solutions were proposed or surveyed by the authors?*
Author proposes different views for different purposes to represent the system. The views give different notations to represent components of the system.
3. *What are the technical strengths and main contributions of the paper's proposed solution?*
Technically, the document separates the views for end-users, programmers, Software managers, integrators and system engineers and makes it easier for all of them to see the system as per their own requirements. The authors follow the object-oriented approach to design *logical architecture* diagram for the system which makes it easier to understand as the approach has been used for many years. Layered structure in Development architecture helps the system integrators to understand partitioning, grouping and visibility in a better way.
4. *What are the technical weaknesses of the paper's proposed solution?*
Because only the first part of the paper is to be evaluated in this review, I can only see one potential problem with this approach. Since the author proposes different notations for each view, it can get confusing when it comes to mapping of two architectures and find out the responsibilities of given modules. Technically, the author should not give very specific examples like the projects they have finished. A little abstract example would help the reader understand the concept better. For e.g. if the reader is not familiar with PABX system, it can be hard for her to follow the concept behind the particular architecture notations.
5. *What suggestions do you have to improve upon the paper's ideas?*
For the first part of the paper, for which this review is to be written, my suggestion for the paper is to include a separate example for each architecture proposed and also a common example (but a little general example) for all architectures.