

Settings / **Review form**

(All)

Search

[Basics](#)[Accounts](#)[Messages](#)[Submissions](#)[Submission form](#)[Reviews](#)**[Review form](#)**[Tags & tracks](#)[Decisions](#)[ACM](#)

Cancel

Save changes

▼ **Artifact publicly available?**

## Visibility

Shown to authors ▼

## Colors

Green to red ▼

## Description

The author-created artifacts relevant to this paper will receive an ACM "artifact available" badge <strong>only if</strong> they have been placed on a publicly accessible archival repository such as Zenodo, FigShare and Dryad. A DOI will be then assigned to their artifacts and must be provided in the Artifact Appendix!

<p>Note: publisher repositories, institutional repositories or open commercial repositories are acceptable only if they have a declared plan to enable permanent accessibility! Personal web pages, GitHub, GitLab, BitBucket, Google Drive and DropBox are not acceptable for this purpose!</p>

<p>Artifacts do not need to have been formally evaluated in order

## Choices

1. Publicly available
2. Not publicly available

Move up

Move down

Delete from form and current reviews

▼ **Artifact functional?**

## Visibility

Shown to authors ▼

## Colors

Green to red ▼

## Description

```

<ul>

  <li>Package complete?
    <ul>
      <li>All components relevant to evaluation are included in the
package? </li>
    </ul>
  </li>
  <li>Well documented?
    <ul>
      <li>Enough to understand, install and evaluate
artifact? </li>
    </ul>
  </li>
  <li>Exercisable?
    <ul>
      <li>Includes scripts and/or software to perform appropriate
experiments and generate results? </li>
    </ul>
  </li>
  <li>Consistent?
    <ul>
      <li>Artifacts are relevant to the associated paper and
contribute in some inherent way to the generation of its main
results? </li>
    </ul>
  </li>
</ul>

```

### Choices

1. Exceeded expectations
2. Met expectations
3. Fell below expectations




### ▼ Artifact customizable and reusable?

#### Visibility

#### Colors

#### Description

Can

this artifact be easily reused and customized? For example, can it be used on a different platform, with different benchmarks, data sets, compilers, tools, under different conditions and parameters, etc.? Is any portable workflow framework used for this purpose?

<p>The artifacts associated with the paper will receive an "Artifact Evaluated - Reusable" badge <strong>only if</strong> they are of a quality that significantly exceeds minimal functionality. That is, they have all the qualities of the

### Choices

1. Exceeded expectations
2. Met expectations
3. Fell below expectations

Move up

Move down

Delete from form and current reviews

### ▼ Results validated?

#### Visibility

Shown to authors ▼

#### Colors

Green to red ▼

### Description

Can

all main results from the paper be validated using provided artifacts?

<p>Report any unexpected artifact behavior (depends on the type of artifact such as unexpected output, scalability issues, crashes, performance variation, etc).</p>

<p>The artifacts associated with the paper will receive a "Results replicated" badge <strong>only if</strong> the main results of the paper have been obtained in a subsequent study by a person or team other than the authors, using, in part, artifacts provided by the author.</p>

### Choices

1. Exceeded expectations
2. Met expectations
3. Fell below expectations

Move upMove downDelete from form and current reviews

### ▼ Portable workflow framework used?

#### Visibility

Shown to authors ▼

#### Description

Was  
any portable workflow framework used (e.g. Collective Knowledge) to  
automate preparation and validation of experiments?

We promote the use of workflow frameworks to help evaluators quickly  
validate results in an automated and portable way. The idea is to

Move upMove downDelete from form and current reviews

### ▼ Distinguished artifact?

#### Visibility

Hidden from authors ▼

#### Colors

Green to red ▼

#### Description

Would you like to nominate this artifact for distinguished artifact award?

Artifact must be publicly available, functional, reproducible and easily

#### Choices

1. Nominate for distinguished artifact
2. Do not nominate for distinguished artifact

Move upMove downDelete from form and current reviews

▼

Comments for authors

Visibility

Shown to authors

▼

Description

Did artifacts and results match authors' description? Provide explanation of your scores and what can be improved during rebuttal.

▲

▼

✎

Move up

Move down

Delete from form and current reviews

▼

Comments for PC

Visibility

Hidden from authors

▼

Description

✎

Move up

Move down

Delete from form and current reviews

Add score field

Add text field

Cancel

Save changes