

Journal Review Form

Manuscript # 15

Reviewer: 8

**I. Describe the manuscript with just a sentence or two under each factor below.**

1) What is the primary **focus or topic** of the manuscript?

The focus of the manuscript is secure IC designs and on-chip security.

2) What is the **primary objective** of the manuscript (e.g. algorithm development, experimental verification, comparison of technique/method with other groups, improvement on prior work, characterization of device or other physical item, etc.)?

The primary objective of the manuscript is comparing the techniques used in IC security.

3) What **method** was used to reach the manuscript's objective?

The manuscript goes about achieving the objective by describing the secure digital design flow first , then goes over multiple research done in 3D technologies for hardware security and potential threats.

4) What **conclusion** was ultimately drawn in the manuscript?

With the counter measured used to project against side channel attacks, there are many trade off as in cost, area, and test overhead. But, implementing these measures increase the security and protect the IP effectively.

5) The major **strengths** of the manuscript are . . .

The figures properly backed up and clarified concept discussed throughout the manuscript.

6) The major **weaknesses** of the manuscript are . . .

EDA algorithms need to be more thoroughly discussed in technical detail

## II. Rate the manuscript.

Place an X on the line next to each factor to rate the manuscript. An X close to “SD” is taken to mean that you strongly disagree with the statement, and an X close to “SA” is taken to mean that you strongly agree with the statement. If a factor is not applicable, then put a line through it. You may add comments to justify your answer or modify the measure.

Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree

SD: \_\_: \_\_: \_\_: \_\_: X: SA The objectives of the manuscript were clear.

SD: \_\_: \_\_: \_\_: \_\_: X: SA The manuscript topic is important.

SD: \_\_: \_\_: \_\_: X: \_\_: SA The manuscript should be of interest to a large audience.

SD: \_\_: \_\_: \_\_: X: \_\_: SA The literature review was thorough given the objectives.

SD: \_\_: \_\_: \_\_: \_\_: X: SA References were complete and were appropriate.

SD: \_\_: \_\_: \_\_: X: \_\_: SA The methodology was appropriate for the conclusions drawn.

SD: \_\_: \_\_: \_\_: X: \_\_: SA The analysis was done correctly.

SD: \_\_: \_\_: \_\_: \_\_: X: SA The results of analysis were correctly interpreted and/or conclusions were sound.

SD: \_\_: \_\_: \_\_: \_\_: X: SA Tables and figures were appropriate and adequate.

SD: \_\_: \_\_: X: \_\_: \_\_: SA Formatting and structure was appropriate.

SD: \_\_: \_\_: X: \_\_: \_\_: SA Writing was clear and concise.

SD: \_\_: \_\_: X: \_\_: \_\_: SA The manuscript was relatively free of issues of grammar, punctuation, and such.

**III. Recommended disposition of the manuscript: *check one*.**

\_\_\_\_\_ Do not accept for publication.

\_\_\_\_\_ Ask for major revisions and allow to again be reviewed if re-submitted.

\_\_\_\_\_ Ask for revisions and continue with a second review.

  X   Accept with minor revisions.

\_\_\_\_\_ Accept as written with no need for any revisions.

**IV. Additional questions (including technical), comments, or suggestions to be sent to the author(s):**