Pledge	Score	Comments
(Author) I will properly cite software used to produce my research results.	4.56	Properly' is so vague that we could as well just remove it? "properly" needs an external, but easy to find definition. The citation information needs to be readily available/accessible, though.
(Reviewer) When reviewing, I will require others to properly cite software used to produce research results.	4.00	properly' again - and i wonder if this can be folded with the previous. I agree with this, but it's harder to operationalise than a positive action that can be taken by oneself.
(Reviewer) I will actively encourage funding agencies to include software experts in their review processes.	3.33	Reviewers don't normally have that much influence on reviewer selection.
(Manager/Faculty) I will recognize software contributions in hiring and promotion within my institution.	4.50	
(Program Committee Member) I will recognize software contributions at conferences by proposing dedicated sessions and prizes.	3.56	perhaps less necessary, and is this a result of our efforts or a tactic to arrive at them?
(Developer) I will publish the intellectual contributions of my research software.	4.00	this is vague Will need some practice/experience... Not sure to fully understand this pledge. is it about the "internals" of the research software?
(Developer) I will distinguish the intellectual contribution of my software from its service contribution.	2.72	yes, but how? needs clarification If publishing includes posting a technical report, this seems fine. If it refers to a peer-reviewed process, this will depend on community support for the creation of venues / tracks that enable this, rather than being a choice of an individual contributor / team. Will need some practice/experience... I think this is important but unclear, it requires lots of explanation and so might not be good as a pledge.
(Researcher) I will invite developers of software that enables research to be co-authors on papers.	3.33	make "invite" stronger? I personally don't think this is right, as stated. I think it's covered by "I will cite the software I use" and "I will publish my software" It is unclear why the traditional model of citation will not suffice. Why must developers expect to be promoted to co-authors if our software has been used at arms' length? Probably different for every domain... I think this is key to recognising intellectual contribution! I don't think this is always appropriate. Perhaps if it said "consider inviting" but then perhaps too weak? This is for me highly depending of the context. We do not add the R developpers on all papers using R for their results.
(Author) I will publish how I organize and run my software projects.	3.39	I agree but I don't know if this fits with the current list. Different topic for a different audience. Needs clarification: Is that question about instructions on how to install and use a software artifact? Or more about the authors' general approach to organize their software artifacts and the processes producing them?
(Developer) I will develop software as open source from the start, whenever possible.	4.17	If publicly funded...
(All: Reviewer, Developer, Author) I will acknowledge that reading and understanding source code is a legitimate part of the academic discourse.	4.00	"acknowledge" is too vague So important - it's fundamental to the science Again, important but requires lots of explanation, perhaps not good as a pledge.
(Project Advisor) I will match proposed software engineering practices to the actual needs and resources of the project.	3.78	That depends. The other way around sounds like a better approach... Agree with this but not sure it's crucial
(Project Advisor) I will help scientists improve the quality of their software without passing judgment.	3.89	Hard to generalize and do. Might work on a personal level, though. agreed, but... which kind of "judgment"? Is it usefull to add the end of the sentence?
(Developer) I will document my academic software, including usage instructions, and input and output examples.	4.33	This is important, but it's still better to have software out there even if it's not properly documented/usable
(Developer) I will contribute to sustaining software I use and rely on.	3.89	If time allows... When possible (?). Not always the case (e.g., no support from her institution, etc.)
(Developer) I will package, release and archive versions of my software.	4.06	In projects with agile development models, particularly where all commits are public, there are multiple active branches, where tags are added to mark independently meaningful significant points in a parallel development process, the linear package/release/archive model may not be a good match.
(Developer) I will make explicit how to cite my software.	4.33	these two could be combined "I will package, release and archive versions of my software, and make it explicit how to cite my software" Will need some practice/experience...
(Developer) I will consider and document the sustainability of my research software as thoroughly as its function.	3.33	For software that has multiple uses / application domains, varied funding sources, is long-lived with ebbs and tides, sustenance may be organic. The point as stated may not be a good match in such cases. Depends on community interest... Not sure exactly what this meant - it may be hard to predict? Not sure to fully understand the key message of this pledge?