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Dear authors,

Based on the further round of reviews your submission has been set to minor

revision.

Please prepare your new revision taking the reviewers' comments into account,

and a description of how you addressed the reviewers concerns.

Once having done so, please submit a ZIP FILE, containing your revised version

ALONG WITH A COVER LETTER, explaining the changes made, to the service till 17th

April 2017.

Kind regards,

Julia Rehder

STTT Editorial Office
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**SECTION I: Summary and Recommendation**

**Summary of Evaluation**

Overall quality is:

Excelent

**Score**

Please select the score of the paper.

Mild Accept

**Confidence**

Please select your confidence.

High

**SECTION III: Overview**

**Reader Interest**

1. Is the paper of current interest to a reasonable segment of the journal?

Yes

2. Relative to the current level of reader interest in the paper, how is this interest likely to change during the next five years?

Relatively little change

3. Within its particular field of specialization, is the topic of the paper considered important?

Yes, definitely

**Content**

1. Is the paper technically sound?

(not necessary for style review)

Appears to be, but didn't check completely

2. How would you describe the technical depth of the paper?

Appropriate for someone working in the field

3. Does the paper make a tangible contribution to the state-of-the-art in its field?

To a limited extent

4. Is the bibliography adequate?

Yes

5. To what extent is the material in the paper likely to be used by other researchers and practitioners?

Average

**Presentation**

1. Is the abstract an appropriate and adequate digest of the work presented?

Yes

2. Does the introduction clearly state the background and motivation in terms understandable to the non-specialist?

Yes

3. How would you rate the overall organization of the paper?

Satisfactory

4. Relative to the technical content, is the length of the paper appropriate?

Yes

5. Is the English satisfactory

Yes

6. How readable is the paper for a computer scientist or engineer who is not a specialist in this particular field

Paper is self-contained, but considerable effort is needed

7. Disregarding the technical content, how would you regard the quality of presentation?

Good

**Section IV: Detailed Comments for Author(s)**

Mandatory, please elaborate on your judgement.

I have only the following minor remarks:

- p.10: In order to avoid concurrently-executing conflicting interactions [...] can be simultaneously

executed.": This part is a bit misleading with respect to the state of the art of code generation for BIP

models. There exist 3 different implementations: a single-threaded, a multi-threaded and a distributed

one. The multi-threaded version executes components and [non conflicting] interactions in parallel,

without any specific overhead (except classical overheads due to threads synchronisation).

Moreover, I think the degree of parallelism offered by the multi-threaded version is greater than the

one obtained by merging cycles as proposed in the paper. In the case of merging of cycles in OLPs a

cycle has to be fully completed before executing a new one (e.g. all non conflicting interactions

enabled initially has to be completed before starting new interactions) whereas the multi-thread

implementation of BIP can start new interactions at any type (e.g. after the completion of only a

subset of the initially non conflicting interactions).

- p.15: "The OLP program is a concurrent C implementation of the BIP system with a minor

modification involving replacing the do-together directives with OpenMP API directives.": I think this

could be reformulated into "OLP programs generated from BIP systems can be straightforwardly

translated into concurrent C implementations with a minor modifications (e.g. replacing the do-

together directives with OpenMP API directives)."
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**Default**

**SECTION I: Summary and Recommendation**

**Summary of Evaluation**

Overall quality is:

Good

**Score**

Please select the score of the paper.

Strong Accept

**Confidence**

Please select your confidence.

High

**SECTION III: Overview**

**Reader Interest**

1. Is the paper of current interest to a reasonable segment of the journal?

Yes

2. Relative to the current level of reader interest in the paper, how is this interest likely to change during the next five years?

Relatively little change

3. Within its particular field of specialization, is the topic of the paper considered important?

Moderately so

**Content**

1. Is the paper technically sound?

(not necessary for style review)

Yes

2. How would you describe the technical depth of the paper?

Appropriate for someone working in the field

3. Does the paper make a tangible contribution to the state-of-the-art in its field?

To a limited extent

4. Is the bibliography adequate?

Yes

5. To what extent is the material in the paper likely to be used by other researchers and practitioners?

Average

**Presentation**

1. Is the abstract an appropriate and adequate digest of the work presented?

Yes

2. Does the introduction clearly state the background and motivation in terms understandable to the non-specialist?

Yes

3. How would you rate the overall organization of the paper?

Satisfactory

4. Relative to the technical content, is the length of the paper appropriate?

Yes

5. Is the English satisfactory

Yes

6. How readable is the paper for a computer scientist or engineer who is not a specialist in this particular field

Readable with ordinary effort

7. Disregarding the technical content, how would you regard the quality of presentation?

Good

**Section IV: Detailed Comments for Author(s)**

Mandatory, please elaborate on your judgement.

Thank you for addressing my previous concerns. I have no further comments on the paper.