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| **From:** | vardi@cs.rice.edu |
| **To:** | lmkr@hib.no |
| **CC:** |  |
| **Subject:** | Communications of the ACM - Decision on Manuscript ID CACM-14-02-1903.R1 |
| **Body:** | 05-Aug-2014  Dear Prof. Kristensen:  Manuscript ID CACM-14-02-1903.R1 entitled "Coloured Petri Nets: A Graphical Language for Formal Modeling and Validation of Concurrent Systems" which you submitted to the Communications of the ACM, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.  The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.  To revise your manuscript, log into http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/cacm and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.  You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your own copy of the manuscript and resubmit upon completion. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or colored text. It is also important to remember the revision must continue to adhere to Communications' Author Guidelines.  Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center.  When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).  IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.  Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to Communications of the ACM, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.  Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to Communications of the ACM and I look forward to receiving your revision.  Sincerely, Dr. Moshe Vardi Editor in Chief, Communications of the ACM vardi@cs.rice.edu     Reviewer: 2  Comments to the Author I only have some comments on spelling. Not being a native speaker myself, I am not sure about the following:  The title spells “Coloured”, whereas in the main text it is (almost?) “colored”   Page 1 line 16, 2nd column: replace „were – and still is – a …“ by „where – and still are a …“  Page 5 line 39, 2nd column: replace “ …provides a means…” by “ …provide a means…”   Page 6 line 16, 1st column: replace “syntax check” by “ syntax checking”   Page 6 line 168, 1st column: replace “ …made a dramatic change” by “had a dramatic impact on …”   Page 7 line 44, 2nd column: replace “ …and relies on “ by “…and rely on”  Page 7 line 52, 2nd column: replace “support” by “enable”     Reviewer: 3  Comments to the Author This is my review of the revised version of "Coloured Petri Nets: ..." submitted to CACM. I will not repeat the main (positive) points from my original review, but I will just briefly address the (positive) differences.  Essentially, the authors address both of main concerns, by both discussing the analysis techniques available for CPNs and by positioning CPNs in the larger universe of extended versions of Petri nets with "colored or typed tokens". Both added discussions are brief but reasonably complete and provide pointers (especially w.r.t. alternative definitions to CPNs), so I am satisfied on both aspects.  The article is still of course very CPN-centric, but the reader is alerted in the title that this is the case, so this is not a problem. Rather, the paper can now be seen as a nice contribution to the popularization of CPNs (and possibly a way to increase interest in Petri nets in general).  I still have a few minor editing suggestions:  were -- and still is -- => were -- and still are --  At its origin, CPNs => At their origin, CPNs  syntax cheek => syntax check  has been popped up => has popped up (OR MAYBE BETTER: has appeared)  monitors that observes => monitors that observe  indepted => indebted | |
| **Date Sent:** | 05-Aug-2014 |  |