

发件人: Harald Gall and Nenad Medvidovic [icse2011-papers-chairs@borbala.com]  
发送时间: 2010年10月30日星期六 9:31  
收件人: zhonghao@nfs.iscas.ac.cn; sthumma@ncsu.edu; txie@ncsu.edu  
抄送: icse2011-papers-chairs@borbala.com; icse2011-papers-webadmin@borbala.com  
主题: ICSE 2011 - Author Clarification [120]

Dear Hao, Suresh and Tao,

The reviews of your paper

"Automated Testing of API Mapping Relations"

are in and we ask you to consider whether you want to clarify some of the reviewers' comments in a 'clarification' response.

These clarifications can only be very short and are limited to 250 words, plain text, no pictures or formatting.

You are not required to make clarifications, and there is no penalty for not doing so. Note that you may not receive specific responses to your clarifications. However, your responses will be considered as we make decisions.

Deadline for clarifications is: November 2, 2010, 23:59:59 (Apia time).

Clarifications can only be made via CyberChairPRO. So please log in to the system, check your reviews and, if you wish, provide a response.

You can access your reviews via this URL:

<http://cyberchairpro3.borbala.net/icsepapers/authorresponse/>

Login: [zhonghao@nfs.iscas.ac.cn](mailto:zhonghao@nfs.iscas.ac.cn)

Pw: ICS-128225933931474

Instructions on clarifications are appended for your convenience.

Please note that these are **\*\*clarifications\*\***. The most advantageous way to use the clarification is to address anything the reviewer may have misread, misconstrued, or overlooked. The reviewers will ignore any new technical content (data, inferences, results, theorems) in the clarifications beyond what was already in the paper.

Surely, this distinction is not hard and fast; the judgement of the program committee will be the final word on this.

Some response patterns and anti-patterns can be found below.

Best regards,  
Neno Medvidovic and Harald Gall  
PC Chairs.

>>>

Clarification Patterns:

- 1) Reviewer 1 says that the term "blanket assignment" is not defined. In fact, it is defined with other terms in Section 1, para 3.
- 2) Reviewer 2 states that the p-values in figure 2 are subject to false discovery. In fact they have been corrected using .... procedure.
- 3) Reviewer 1 says that this work is anticipated by Katy & Perry (our reference 3) but in fact Katy & Perry did not consider ..... but we have.

4) Reviewer 1 states that no rationale is provided for the choice of test programs. In fact we explain in Section 5, para 3, the factors we controlled for when choosing the test programs.

Anti-patterns:

1) Reviewer 1 says that theorem claims soundness and completeness, but only soundness is proven. In fact, completeness follows quickly from the observation that... (extending paper results)

2) Reviewer 2 complains that the Pearson correlation reported in figure 2, while high, is improper given the highly skewed distribution. In fact, the spearman coefficient is also high, at 0.55 (presenting new data)

3) Definition 6 was wrong, it should have said....

4) We have since shown that the approach scales up to programs of size over...

5) We have now also proven the following property..

-----