Feedback

1.1 In the first part, you have explained the largest benefits of the classic real-time theory and some important limitations. You explain it really simple and easy to understand. When you talk about some limitations, you also give an example to make it clear. That is a perfect way. It would be better if you also explained from another point of view, rather than just theory.

1.2 In the second part, you have explained how to determine period and execution time in practice and how accurately to determine these parameters. You describe a very logical approach to execution time, which is really good. On the other hand, your conclusion said really difficult to determine the period and the accuracy of the period is really low, even you gave suggestions about worst-case execution time, all of them are still problems, and it would be better if you also provide a solution or a more technical approach.

1.3 In the third section, you have explained the main difference between semaphores, protected objects, and rendezvous and which communication mechanisms seem most suitable for a safety-critical real-time system. Your explanation is really good and structure. You provide a theory and your point of view to understand the point in your explanation. I think it is perfect for readers. Although different from my point of view about which of these communication mechanisms seems to be most suitable for a safety-critical real-time system, which is all communication mechanisms are suitable depend on characteristic application or system, your approach has opened new insights for me.

1.4 In the fourth section, you explained very simply and logically about Hardware also important to support programming languages like Ada and real-time operating systems like MicroC/OS-II for safety-critical real-time systems. On the other hand, I cannot see your explanation about how can the real-time theory be used in an industrial design process for safety-critical real-time systems. Furthermore, the first paragraph seems not related to this section.

In conclusion, you understand this work well, although some parts need attention to be explained in more detail and according to the questions asked so that anyone who reads your work understands the answers and comprehensive approach. On the other hand, I see many different views from yours, which helps me see other aspects. Thank you, good luck 😊