Response to the Referees’ Comments

I am very pleased that two referees give outstanding reviews and propose the project should proceed.

I would also like to take this opportunity to respond to some of the queries made by the referees.

Item *Research impact.*

Referee 7TEVVB expresses doubts about the practical utility of the method of program synthesis from proofs in general and, as a result of this, rates the overall likely impact of this work as limited.

In the Case for Support (CFS) I tried to make it clear that program synthesis from proofs is only one of three main objectives of this project, the other two being the analysis of termination and complexity of higher-type rewrite systems. Moreover, the Referee acknowledges the high quality and the likely high academic impact of the latter two objectives of the project. Therefore I am surprised to see the likely overall impact of this work being rated as limited. I suspect, given the enthusiasm of the other referees, that this rating is intended to refer to the industrial/non-academic impact only, but not to the overall impact.

Item *Resources and Management.*

Referee 7TEVVB says that the role of the named RA is insufficiently explained. Furthermore, Referees 7WI5SY and 7TEVVB ask why the RA should be employed 50% of the time only.

In the CFS, the tasks of the named RA were specified. The reason for 50% employment is simply that the RA is only available half time. 50% employment of the RA in the project fits the proposed work very well.

Referee 7TEVVB correctly notices that the funds for a technician requested in the CFS are not itemised in the electronic application form.

I am grateful to the referee for pointing this out. The costs for a technician will be £2.165 (5% employment over 3 years) in total. The discrepancy between the CFS and the form, for which I apologise, has been reported to the EPSRC and has been corrected.

Ulrich Berger