

Project Title here (that is being evaluated)

Project Authors Name: Gavin Garrison

Project Evaluator Name: Hayden Fuller, Anthony Frias

- Guidelines to review the report for Question 1-3 below:
<https://dl.acm.org/journal/dgov/reviewer-guidelines>
- Guidelines to review the code artifacts for Question 4-8 below:
<https://conferences.sigcomm.org/sigcomm/2022/cf-artifacts.html>

1. Summary

Provide a brief summary of the project in your own words.

This project presents a comprehensive MATLAB simulation of OFDM PAPR reduction techniques (SLM, PTS, and Tone Reservation) under nonlinear power amplifier effects, evaluating their impact on PAPR, EVM, BER, and ACLR across SNR and back-off conditions.

2. Strengths

Provide strengths or positive aspects of the project.

The project is very thorough, well-structured, and technically strong. It cleanly implements multiple PAPR reduction methods, includes meaningful performance metrics, and adds insightful analyses such as target-based EVM comparisons and sensitivity studies.

3. Weakness

Provide any weakness or aspects that can be further improved.

There are no major weaknesses. Future improvements could include additional PA models or receiver equalization options, but this seems beyond the scope of a one semester project. My biggest complaint is actually that I prefer my figures 'WindowStyle','docked' because my laptop gets very loud when 14 matlab windows are thrown at it.

4. Documentation: Is the artifact/code sufficiently documented?

Rate from 0% to 100%, where 0% means "documentation is completely insufficient" and 100% means "documentation is absolutely sufficient". If you need to assess both a dataset and tools, please take the average and comment below. In assessing tools, please consider if they are easy or difficult to install/set up and get to run. In assessing datasets, please consider if the meta data is sufficient.

Choices are:

- 1. 0%
- 2. 20%
- 3. 40%
- 4. 60%
- 5. 80%
- 6. 100%

Documentation: Comment on/explain your choice above:

6. 100%. The README is clear and complete, explaining the purpose, requirements, setup, and execution steps. The code itself is well-commented and organized, making it easy to understand and run.

5. Completeness: Do the submitted artifacts/code include all of the key components described in the report?

Rate from 0% to 100%, where 0% means "does not include any key components" and 100% means "includes all key components".

Choices are:

- 1. 0%
- 2. 20%
- 3. 40%
- 4. 60%
- 5. 80%
- 6. 100%

Completeness: Comment on/explain your choice above

6. 100%. All components described in the report are fully implemented, including simulations, metric calculations, plots, and result saving.

6. Exercisability: Do the submitted artifacts/code include the scripts and data needed to run the experiments described in the paper, and can the software be successfully executed?

Rate from 0% to 100%, where 0% means "the scripts/software cannot be successfully executed and/or no data is included" and 100% means "the artifact includes all necessary scripts/software and data, and scripts/software (if present) can be successfully executed".

Choices are:

- 1. 0%
- 2. 20%

- 3. 40%
- 4. 60%
- 5. 80%
- 6. 100%

Exercisability: Comment on/explain your choice above

6. 100%. The project is fully self-contained, requires no external data, and runs directly in MATLAB as described. All scripts execute successfully and reproduce the experiments.

7. Results attainable: Does the artifact/code make it possible, with reasonable effort, to obtain the key results from the artifact/code?

Rate from 0% to 100%, where 0% means "no results can be obtained" and 100% means "all results can be obtained".

Choices are:

- 1. 0%
- 2. 20%
- 3. 40%
- 4. 60%
- 5. 80%
- 6. 100%

Results attainable: Comment on/explain your choice above

6. 100%. Yes, all key results (PAPR CCDFs, BER/EVM curves, ACLR trends, and comparison plots) are generated automatically with little effort.

8. Results completeness: How many key results of the paper/report is the provided code meant to support?

Rate from 0% to 100%, where 0% means "the artifact is meant to support no key results" and 100% means "the artifact is meant to support all key results".

Choices are:

- 1. 0%
- 2. 20%
- 3. 40%
- 4. 60%
- 5. 80%
- 6. 100%

Results completeness: Comment on/explain your choice above

6. 100%. The code is clearly designed to support all major results discussed in the report and even includes additional analyses that strengthen the overall conclusions.

Reviewer Team member1 Name, Signature
Hayden Fuller

Reviewer Team member2 Name, Signature
Anthony Frias