

# Review 1

**PC member:** Gustave Mougenot

**Time:** Nov 20, 20:46 UTC

## Review

### 1. General Comment

The article is highly relevant, well aligned with the state of the art, and properly introduced through existing work. The motivations and objectives are clear and reproducible.

A few sentences could be interpreted as personal implications or appear slightly misplaced within the structure, but no major issue was identified.

### 2. Strong Points

- The article is clear, with appropriate and coherent citations in the broader context.
- The objectives and expected outcomes are concrete, and the logical reasoning is consistent (although some terms appear overly strong or engaging).
- (Minor) A discussion of limitations could be useful, particularly regarding how trivial protections might behave when a large number of requests are issued.

### 3. Weaknesses

- Heavy use of acronyms, some appearing only once (e.g., ROS in the title, PDN not redefined after the abstract, double definition of FF-ROs).
- A source seems to be missing for the cryptographic application mentioned in the introduction (line 4).
- (Minor) The phrase "even a weak correlation" could be improved; briefly introducing tools for measuring correlation (e.g., standard deviation) may help.
- (Minor) Some uncertainty in the sentence "Negative results would ...," though generally acceptable.
- (Minor) Including a second operating frequency, or justifying a single frequency, could strengthen result interpretation.

### 4. Quality of Writing

- Slight mix between background and methodology in the sentence "We employ Flip-Flop ...".
- No typos identified; minor phrasing issues to revise:
  - At the end of the conclusion, use "future work could" instead of "future work will."
  - (Minor) Use a less assertive term than "demonstrate" in Section VI (Conclusion), such as "show."

### Reviewer's confidence

**2:** Partly, I may be missing some concepts or elements of the state-of-the-art, but I got the main idea.

## Usage of LLM

2: Yes, a bit.

### Confidential remarks for the program committee

Discovering this topic through this extended abstract, I genuinely enjoyed exploring the field. In my view, this is a very good piece of work.

I acknowledge that I still have some limitations in my detailed understanding of certain aspects, particularly regarding FPGAs.

In my review, I have tried to be as relevant as possible; most comments concern phrasing only and do not diminish the quality of the work.