

Matt Renzelmann

From: mmswift@gmail.com on behalf of Michael Swift <swift@cs.wisc.edu>
Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2012 2:07 PM
To: Matt Renzelmann
Subject: Fwd: symdrive

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Julia Lawall** <julia.lawall@lip6.fr>
Date: Sat, Mar 24, 2012 at 1:11 PM
Subject: symdrive
To: swift@cs.wisc.edu
Cc: Gilles Muller <Gilles.Muller@lip6.fr>

Mike,

I took a look at the SymDrive paper. So far (up through page 6) I think that the position of the paper could be more clear. Why not do static analysis if you have the source code? Is the extension to more types of buses a conceptual contribution over s2e or is it just engineering? In the related work section, it is not clear what it is that solves the problems with loops etc found in s2e. The solution is probably that you have the source code and they do not, but that is not mentioned at all.

Overall, it would seem that the contribution of the paper is some sort of sweet spot between static and dynamic analysis, but the issues involved (ie why do other approaches not work well, not just that they do not work well) and the benefits of the approach (ie why does symdrive do better?) could be more clear in the introduction.

I scanned some other much more detailed comments, but they don't seem to have shown up in my mailbox yet. Perhaps later, perhaps Monday.

julia