Aims and Scope

The Dagstuhl Artifacts Series (DARTS) publishes evaluated research data and artifacts in all areas of computer science. An artifact can be any kind of content related to computer science research, e.g., experimental data, source code, virtual machines containing a complete setup, test suites, or tools.
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The ECOOP artifact evaluation (AE) considers artifacts, such as software and experimental data, associated with a research paper published at ECOOP and reviews them independently of the paper. The goal is to independently reproduce the results reported in the paper and to provide a reusable tool, data set, etc., to the community. The long-term importance of artifacts for the research community has been widely accepted, and this year’s ECOOP follows a sequence of previous artifact evaluations at ECOOP and other conferences.

In total, 18 artifacts were submitted for evaluation, i.e., for 67% of all accepted papers. Out of these 18 artifacts, the committee accepted 16, i.e., a 89% acceptance rate among the submitted artifacts. As a result, 59% of all research papers published at ECOOP 2017 have been successfully artifact evaluated.

The effort of creating an artifact is a long-term contribution to the research community. To recognize the effort invested by the authors, each artifact is archived in the Dagstuhl Artifacts Series (DARTS) published on the Dagstuhl Research Online Publication Server (DROPS). Each artifact is assigned a DOI, separate from the ECOOP companion paper, allowing the community to cite artifacts on their own. Furthermore, all research papers accompanied by an artifact show a seal of approval by the AEC on their first page.

The quality of the published artifacts depends not only on the authors but also on the artifact evaluation committee. This year’s committee consisted of 19 members, all of which did a great job and invested significant time to ensure that artifacts meet their expectations. As the chairs of the artifact evaluation committee, we would like to thank all committee members for contributing their time and energy. The organization of the evaluation process and the publication of the present DARTS issue benefited greatly from the advice and experience of previous AEC chairs, in particular, Camil Demetrescu, Matthew Flatt, and Tijs van der Storm. The guidelines on artifact evaluation by Shriram Krishnamurthi, Matthias Hauswirth, Steve Blackburn, and Jan Vitek published on the Artifact Evaluation site (http://www.artifact-eval.org) were an invaluable resource. We are grateful for the assistance of Michael Wagner in the publication of the artifacts volume. Finally, we would like to thank the Program Chair Peter Müller for his help ensuring a smooth integration of the review process for research papers and the artifact evaluation process.

Philipp Haller, Michael Pradel, Tijs van der Storm
(Artifact Evaluation Co-Chairs)
Artifact Evaluation Process

Authors of a paper accepted to ECOOP 2017 were invited to submit an accompanying artifact. Each submitted artifact was reviewed by at least three members of the artifact evaluation committee. We used a two-phase reviewing process. In the first phase, called “kick-the-tires” phase, reviewers checked the documentation and the basic functionality of each artifact and provided feedback to the authors. Next, the authors could respond to this feedback and fix any minor issues, such as missing documentation or other problems that might prevent reviewers from fully using the artifact. Finally, in the second phase, reviewers thoroughly evaluated each artifact. In particular, the reviewers evaluated the quality of the documentation, whether the results reported in the paper could be reproduced by the artifact, and to what extent the artifact can be reused, e.g., for follow-up research.
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