Claim 1: *The authors claim to have implemented a crypto library for Standard ML.*

EVALUATION OF CLAIM: It was very difficult for the committee to assess this library because we could not even identify what language it was in. Due to the combination of references in German and a .pl file extension, we assumed the library was written in German Prolog. We gave the code to a local German Prolog expert for further analysis, but his evaluation consisted only of the single word "Achtung".

Due to numerous references to Arabic and a wide variety of Arabic numerals in the text, we next tried interpreting the library as Arabic, with equally little success. A senior PC member then pointed out that .pl stands for Programming Language (this is why we keep the programming languages group around) after which we tried running the code as a Program, and finally found success.

The code ran with the desired effect, and the committee was impressed. However, we think you may have gone overboard with your security measures, because the source code itself appeared to be equally encrypted, and even after running it, we have no idea why it worked.

Claim 2: *The provided encryption method is robust to Shredders.*

EVALUATION OF CLAIM: The artifact committee had actually already unwittingly evaluated this claim when we attempted to shred the submission without reading it. Luckily for all involved, our department has a surprising dearth of shredding equipment, after which we decided to actually read the paper.

We do, however, have an SNES, which we used to evaluate this claim by playing our old Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles games. When we got to the final battle with Shredder, the submission actually ripped the controller out of our hands and quickly defeated the final boss.

This scheme is **beyond** Shredder-proof.

OVERALL EVALUATION: This encryption scheme is worth its salt. The artifact provided is of such quality that we extend an invitation to publish an extended article in our Journal: SIGBOVIK Heretics Anonymous Digest: Volume 256.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- The LaTeX implementation included extensive use of CS names. In the final draft of your paper, please elaborate on why names from other scientific fields were not supported and list this as a limitation of your current implementation. That being said, the committee is not concerned by this restriction.

- There was also much discussion of ex-leaders in the LaTeX code. Given that we're in the middle of a heated election year, it may make a more interesting read to focus on current leaders.