Reviewers’ Comments:

Reviewer 1:

(1) Even though the first part of the thesis describes all the aspects of the context, I would omit description of particular topics such as Timed Automata here and postpone it to the corresponding sections in Part II. They are too far apart this way and the reader, if not familiar with the formalism, would need to return to the description after reaching the appropriate section.

🡪 DONE removed description

(2) The text contains a lot of typographic issues, especially overflow lines. Also, the text contains some residuals from original (I assume) versions (such as “this research proposal”), especially in the introduction part.

🡪 TODO I correct “this research proposal”, I have to re-read the introduction part

(3) In sect. 1.2, paragraph F does not contain the promised description of candidate’s contribution to the result.

🡪 DONE added missing description

(4) In sect. 1.3, the example of verbatim copy starts with “the following paragraph...”, but it should read “this paragraph...”.

🡪 DONE

(5) Fig. 4.5 is referenced 16 pages (and later several times again) before it actually appears. I consider this too many pages in advance and propose to move it closer to the first reference.

🡪 DONE changed references from 4.5 to 4.1a (the correct one), and added a short paragraph explaining the differences between the two figures of the same model (WashingMachine), although with a different constraint

(6) In sect. 4.2.3, there is a misplaced line break in the sentence starting “Formally, given an assignment t...”.

🡪 DONE

(7) Fig. 4.8 should be made larger – this way the details are not really readable. If it should serve just for the basic overview, I would simplify the figure as such.

🡪 DONE made larger

(8) In sect. 5.2.2, before the “Naïve repair approach” paragraph, the sentence starting “We first describe...” is strange as it refers to the surrounding section. I propose to delete it, or at least delete the section references from it.

🡪 DONE removed

(9) In chapter 6, at the beginning in the “Contribution” paragraph, I propose to use a list or an algorithm to describe the process for automatic repair. The current shape, is it hard to recognise the particular steps in the text.

🡪 DONE made as list

Reviewer 2:

The thesis of Marco Radavelli has a very specific and well-articulated scope: the repair of models of variable software systems throuh the use of testing. The combinatorical explosion problem of testing variable systems is well known. I have merely a few comments for improvement, which should be considered minor. The first comment is with regards to the title of the theses. The title gives a broader scope than the thesis addresses. Hence, I recommend that the title reflects the focus of the thesis on the combinatorical testing in variable/configurable systems.

🡪 DONE Renamed to “Using Combinatorial Interaction Testing to Repair Models of Configurable Software Systems”

The second comment is with regards to the benchmarks. I could not acertain why the artficial benchmarks were necessary or how they complemented the real benchmarks. Overall, I see little value in having the artificial benchmarks and I recommend either removing them or clearly justfy their usefulness.

🡪 TODO Add more description in the introduction about such benchmarks

Do note that I answered "yes" to the questions whether the title fits the content because in principle it does and the answer "no" would be been wrong.