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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.
## Contents

Artifact Evaluation Process

*Matthias Becker and Julien Forget* ....................................................... 0:vii

Artifact Evaluation Committee

........................................................................................................... 0:ix

## Artifacts

A New Perspective on Criticality: Efficient State Abstraction and Run-Time Monitoring of Mixed-Criticality Real-Time Control Systems (Artifact)

*Tim Rheinfels, Maximilian Gaukler, and Peter Ulbrich* ......................... 1:1–1:3

FUSIONCLOCK: WCEC-Optimal Clock-Tree Reconfigurations (Artifact)

*Eva Dengler, Phillip Raffeck, Simon Schuster, and Peter Wägemann* ........ 2:1–2:3

Isospeed: Improving (min,+)

Convolution by Exploiting (min,+)/(max,+)

Isomorphism (Artifact)

*Raffaele Zippo, Paul Nikolaus, and Giovanni Stea* ................................. 3:1–3:4

From FMTV to WATERS: Lessons Learned from the First Verification Challenge at ECRTS (Artifact)

*Sebastian Altmeyer, Étienne André, Silvano Dal Zilio, Loïc Fejoz, Michael González Harbour, Susanne Graf, J. Javier Gutiérrez, Rafik Henia, Didier Le Botlan, Giuseppe Lipari, Julio Medina, Nicolas Navet, Sophie Quinton, Juan M. Rivas, and Youcheng Sun* ................................. 4:1–4:6
**Artifact Evaluation Process**

The ECRTS Artifact Evaluation (AE) process takes place after the paper decisions have been finalized. We seek to achieve the benefits of the AE process without disturbing the current process through which ECRTS has generated high-quality programs in the past. Therefore, the current submission, review and acceptance procedure are completely unaltered by the decision of running an AE process.

Once acceptance decisions are final, the authors of accepted papers are invited to submit an artifact evaluation (or replication) package. Hence, the repeatability evaluation process has no impact on whether a paper is accepted at ECRTS, and is entirely optional and up to authors. Moreover, there is no disclosure of the title and authors of papers which do not pass the repeatability evaluation. This is to avoid negative bias towards submitting their artifact on the authors’ part. Once authors that desire to do so have submitted their artifacts, an Artifact Evaluation Committee (AEC) composed mainly of PhD students close to graduation, postdocs and young researchers evaluates the artifacts.

Artifacts include two components:
- a document explaining how to use the artifact and which of the experiments presented in the paper are repeatable (with reference to specific digits, figures and tables in the paper), the system requirements and instructions for installing and using the artifact;
- the software and any accompanying data.

During the first week, all the evaluators check that they can run the code of artifacts assigned to them. Problems encountered at that state are anonymously reported to the authors of the artifact who can help fixing them. Afterwards, reviewers have 2 weeks to complete their reviews. Finally, PC chairs take the decision to either accept or reject the submissions based on the reviews, and notifications are then sent to authors.
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