Response to reviewers.

We are very happy with the positive comments of the reviewers. In the full paper, we were able to address *all* issues that were identified by the reviewers.

> It is important that the authors take a tutorial
> oriented style and more carefully introduce the
> application context, including radio-astronomy
> basics, instruments that they use (including
> installation roadmap). The algorithm is quite
> simple and so the strength of the paper lies in
> the thoroughness of the analysis, and the
> aforementioned tutorial background.

We were careful to take a tutorial oriented style throughout the entire paper. We dedicated a part of the introduction, as well as Sections 2 and 3 to explain the radio-astronomy basics, the instruments we use, and the correlator algorithm.

> It will also be preferred if the authors can spend
> a significant portion on the design and
> implementation of the correlator on five different
> multi-core platforms, and the difficulties the
> authors encountered, optimizations that were
> needed, and the programmability of the platforms.

Sections 5 and 6 deal with this extensively.

> Please be aware that another potential paper in
> the special issue believes GPU is better than
> other platforms. The readers will be happy to
> learn from both sides of the argument. Thus, the
> authors may want to spend significant portion on
> describing what the important platform
> characteristics are, and a set of guidelines that
> are fundamental to choose the right platform for
> readers' applications.

We present a set of guidelines that are fundamental to choose the right platform for signal processing applications in Section 5. In Section 6, we explain this in more detail, using the correlator application as a running example. We provide a comparison and evaluation discussion in Section 6.3. We summarize the most important platform characteristics in Tables 1 and 2, and the weak and strong points of the architectures in Table 3.