ACM SIGCOMM Artefact Review Form

1. Reviewer Confidence:
        [ ]  Expert
        [ ]  Knowledgeable
        [ ]  Some familiarities
        [ ]  None

# A.   General Information

1.  Type of Artefact:
    [ ]  Dataset
    [ ]  Script/Tools
    [ ]  New Artefact
    [ ]  Extension of existing artefact

2.  Availability:
    [ ] Not available
    [ ] Requires privileged access
    [ ] Openly available

3.  Is the artefact been deposited in the most appropriate available repository, which ensures perennially availability ?
    [ ] Yes
    [ ] No
    If No, please provide an explanation and a suggestion for the most appropriate repository in the "Comments to the Authors" section.

4.  Does the artefact depend on third parties component(s) which do not provide FRAND (Fair, Reasonable and Non Discriminatory) licenses:
    [ ] Yes
    [ ] No
    [ ] Not applicable

5.  Is there any ethical or legal implication with the artefact?
    [ ] Yes
    [ ] No
    [ ] Not applicable

# B.   Completeness of the Information

1.  Is the structure of the artefact documented?
    [ ] Yes
    [ ] No

2.  Are the instruction on how to use the artefact provided?

    i.   Building instructions?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] Not applicable

    ii.   Installation instructions?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] Not applicable

    iii.   Usage instructions?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] Not applicable

    iv.   Step-by-Step toy example?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] Not applicable

    v.   Data Format Description?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] Not applicable

3. Did the authors describe all the meta-data related to the artefact (e.g., environment used to produce data, type of material used to build hardware, data of the experiment)?
[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] Not applicable

4. Did the authors provide all of the information needed for others to reuse the artefact? [Please provide an explanation of in the "Comments to the Authors" section]
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

# C. Research Supported by the Artefact:

1. Is the artefact in adequacy with the paper, i.e., the artefact is clearly linked with results shown in the paper? [Please provide an explanation of in the "Comments to the Authors" section]
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

2. Information provided with the artefact give a clear idea of how the results of the paper have been produced and how can be reproduced? [Please provide an explanation of in the "Comments to the Authors" section]
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

# D. Recommendation:

- Artefacts Available: Author-created artefacts relevant to this paper is publicly available. A DOI or link to this repository along with a unique identifier for the object is provided.
  [ ] Yes
  [ ] No

- Artefacts Evaluated – Functional: The artefacts associated with the research are found to be documented, consistent, complete, exercisable, and include appropriate evidence of verification and validation.
  [ ] Yes
  [ ] No

- Artefacts Evaluated – Reusable: The artefacts associated with the paper are of a quality that significantly exceeds minimal functionality. That is, they have all the qualities of the Artefacts Evaluated – Functional level, but, in addition, they are very carefully documented and well-structured to the extent that reuse and repurposing is facilitated. In particular, norms and standards of the research community for artefacts of this type are strictly adhered to.
  [ ] Yes
  [ ] No

# E. Comments to the authors

# F. Confidential comments to the AEC

# G. Authors rebuttal for AEC public reporting.