

Journal Review Form

Manuscript # 14

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 main focus of the manuscript is hardware intellectual property protection and techniques.

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 to talk about how to combat the counterfeit ICs and the inclusion of malicious circuitry, through hardware obfuscation techniques.

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

The method used to reach the object was to section off each type of hardware obfuscation technique.

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

With the fabless design of hardware IP protecting these IP has become increasingly challenging and the main goal of obfuscation of to increase the cost and complexity of determining IC design and functionality.

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

The manuscript does a great job of introducing the topic and explaining how fabless design is vulnerable. Also, the structure of the manuscript does a great job in explaining each type of obfuscation.

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

The manuscript does not explain what PUFs are or what it stands for.

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.

☒ 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):

Some technical details were left out such as fully describing what PUFs are.