Responses to Reviewers' Comments

for paper titled
Progress Concerns as Design Guidelines
by
Simon Hudon and Thai Son Hoang

Thanks We are in debt to the anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments of the paper. We have updated our paper accordingly and addressed the reviewers' concerns. Below are the summary of our updates with regards to the reviewers' comments.

Reviewer #1: 1. The availability of the proof-rules

In Section 5 (Conclusion), the authors say that "We expect to have more refinement rules to complement the current set of rules." So, it would be better to explain how powerful the proof-rules currently given in Theorems 1-6 are. For example, the assumptions in Theorems 6 and 7 are sufficient conditions, but are not necessary. Therefore, if an example which cannot be proved by the current rules is shown, it would be good information for readers. If current rules are already powerful enough to prove most of practical cases, it should be briefly stated.

Note: this comment does not request to construct the sound and complete rules. The reviewer also think that it is important to give some useful and practical rules, as given in this paper.

Response: We mentioned that the rules are sufficient for us to develop several examples of different size.

Reviewer #1: 2. Typos etc.

Response: The typos have been fixed. Thank you very much.

Reviewer #1:

```
(5) P.5, L.-11:
     "... => X; s.t.e.v>"
==> "... => X; s.t.e.v'>"
```

Response: v is correct. The fresh variable e stores the before value v and v in $s.t.e.v$ represents the current (after) value of v.