

Volume 11 | Issue 1 | July 2025

Special Issue of the 37th Euromicro Conference on Real-Time Systems (ECRTS 2025)

Edited by

Catherine E. Nemitz Bryan C. Ward

ISSN 2509-8195

DARTS Special Issue Editors

Catherine E. Nemitz

Davidson College, Davidson, NC, USA canemitz@davidson.edu

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5800-3533

Bryan C. Ward

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA bryan.ward@vanderbilt.edu

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7168-6693

ACM Classification 2012

Computer systems organization \rightarrow Real-time systems

Published online and open access by Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik GmbH, Dagstuhl Publishing, Saarbrücken/Wadern, Germany.

Online available at

https://drops.dagstuhl.de/darts.

Publication date
July 2025

License

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC BY 4.0): https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0.



In brief, this license authorizes each and everybody to share (to copy,

distribute and transmit) the work under the following conditions, without impairing or restricting the authors' moral rights:

Attribution: The work must be attributed to its authors

The copyright is retained by the corresponding authors.

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.

Contact
Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik
DARTS, Editorial Office
Oktavie-Allee, 66687 Wadern, Germany
publishing@dagstuhl.de

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/DARTS.11.1.0 https://www.dagstuhl.de/darts

Contents

Artifact Evaluation Process Catherine E. Nemitz and Bryan C. Ward	0:vii
Artifact Evaluation Committee	0.:
	0:ix
Artifacts	
Sensor Fusion Desynchronization Attacks (Artifact) Andreas Finkenzeller, Andrew Roberts, Mauro Bellone, Olaf Maennel, Mohammad Hamad, and Sebastian Steinhorst	1:1-1:3
A First Look at ROS 2 Applications Written in Asynchronous Rust (Artifact) Martin Škoudlil and Michal Sojka	2:1-2:2
Bounding the WCET of a GPU Thread Block with a Multi-Phase Representation of Warps Execution (Artifact) Louison Jeanmougin, Thomas Carle, and Christine Rochange	3:1-3:5
Faster Classification of Time-Series Input Streams (Artifact) Kunal Agrawal, Sanjoy Baruah, Zhishan Guo, Jing Li, Federico Reghenzani, Kecheng Yang, and Jinhao Zhao	4:1-4:3

Artifact Evaluation Process

The ECRTS Artifact Evaluation (AE) process took place separately from paper acceptance. We sought 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 were completely unaltered by the decision to run an AE process.

The authors of accepted or shepherded papers were invited to submit an artifact evaluation (or replication) package; artifacts associated with shepherded papers were allowed to be submitted as there was a slight overlap in reviewing timelines. The repeatability evaluation process had no impact on whether a paper was accepted at ECRTS and was entirely optional and up to authors. Moreover, there is no disclosure of the title and authors of papers that did not pass evaluation. This is to avoid negative bias towards submitting artifacts. Once authors who desired to do so submitted their artifacts, an Artifact Evaluation Committee composed mainly of PhD students close to graduation, postdocs, and young researchers evaluated the artifacts.

Artifacts included 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.

Evaluators bid on artifacts based on their ability to meet the system requirements listed by authors. Evaluators were assigned to artifacts on this basis to the extent possible, with the goal of three reviewers per artifact. For any artifacts for which one of the co-chairs had a conflict of interest, the other co-chair managed reviewer assignment, communication, and determination of the final decision. For any artifacts for which both co-chairs had a conflict of interest, the designated Conflicts-of-Interest Chair managed the submission.

During the first week, all the evaluators checked that they could run the code of artifacts assigned to them. In case of problems, these were promptly (and anonymously) reported to the authors of the artifact in order to help fix them. The total evaluation period was two weeks. After the review period, a brief online discussion took place if/when necessary and notifications were sent to authors.

Artifact Evaluation Committee

Conflicts-of-Interest Chair

Matthias Becker KTH Royal Institute of Technology Stockholm, Sweden mabecker@kth.se

Evaluation Committee

Tanya Amert Carleton University Northfield, United States of America tamert@carleton.edu

Federico Aromolo Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna Pisa, Italy federico.aromolo@santannapisa.it

Anna Friebe Mälardalen University Västerås, Sweden anna.friebe@mdh.se

Arpan Gujarati University of British Columbia Vancouver, Canada arpanbg@cs.ubc.ca

Christian Hakert TU Dortmund University Dortmund, Germany christian.hakert@tu-dortmund.de

Seonyeong Heo Kyung Hee University Yongin, South Korea seonyeong.heo@khu.ac.kr

Sims Osborne Elon University Elon, United States of America sosborne3@elon.edu

Marion Sudvarg Washington University in St. Louis St. Louis, United States of America msudvarg@wustl.edu Binqi Sun TU Munich Munich, Germany binqi.sun@tum.de

Corey Tessler University of Nevada Las Vegas Las Vegas, United States of America corey.tessler@unlv.edu