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103 Invitations
62 Accepts
58 AEC+ERC Members
Postdocs, Asst. Profs., Senior PhDs
Member Survey
When you joined the AEC, did the ERC+AEC offer affect your decision?

28 responses

- Yes, in a positive way. The ERC offer was a good incentive.
- Yes, but in a negative way. I would have rather joined the AEC alone.
- No, it was not a major factor.
- Thought it was AEC originally, but would rather have joined ERC only.
- I wanted to join the ERC and not the AEC. At the end it was a pleasant exp…
- I was not aware of this and surprised t…

ERC helped with recruitment
Member Survey

Did ERC work help with AEC work?
28 responses

- 50%: Yes, it was easier to review an artifact after reviewing the paper
- 28.6%: No, reviewing a paper did not help much for reviewing the artifact
- 10.7%: Not sure, my ERC and AEC reviews did not overlap
- 5.7%: I noticed that, though I was more familiar with them, I was much more critical re...
- 5.7%: It was somewhat helpful. There was o...
- 2.8%: Not sure, ERC/AEC reviews did not o...

ERC work was not a big help for AEC work
"ERC and AEC concerns are neatly separable. The main intersection is identifying claims that should be supported."

"Have a PC reviewer write the Functional guidelines."
The survey question was: "How did you find the artifact review load?" With 28 responses, the results showed:

- 16 participants (57.1%) rated the workload as 3.
- 8 participants (28.6%) rated it as 4.
- 3 participants (10.7%) rated it as 2.
- 1 participant (3.6%) rated it as 1.

In summary, the workload was rated as "OK" by most participants.
Member Survey

Were the guidelines for Functional clear enough?

28 responses

- Yes: 92.9%
- No, the Cell needs revision (please leave a comment below): 7.1%

Should Functional = Reproduced? (My take: No)
Member Survey

https://www.acm.org/publications/policies/artifact-review-and-badging-current
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Results Reproduced

OOPSLA needs a Reproduced badge.
"I would say that the bar for getting the badges should be a bit higher. I got some artifacts that barely ran and needed so much time from the reviewers. But they still got Functional."
Member Survey
Next time, ask authors to propose instructions.

Were the guidelines for Reusable clear enough?

26 responses

53.8% Yes
46.2% No, the Call needs revision (please leave a comment)
"Reusable is a pretty broad description. For a software library, reusability is the point of the artifact! For a mechanized proof or empirical test, R. is less clear since these were not necessarily intended to be reused."
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Distinguished Artifacts:

**Proof Automation for Linearizability in Separation Logic**
Ike Mulder, Robbert Krebbers

**The Essence of Verilog: A Tractable and Tested Operational Semantics for Verilog**
Qinlin Chen, Nairen Zhang, Jinpeng Wang, Tian Tan, Chang Xu, Xiaoxing Ma, Yue Li

**A Deductive Verification Infrastructure for Probabilistic Programs**
Philipp Schröer, Kevin Batz, Benjamin Lucien Kaminski, Joost-Pieter Katoen, Christoph Matheja

**Validating IoT Devices with Rate-Based Session Types**
Grant Iraci, Cheng-En Chuang, Raymond Hu, Lukasz Ziarek
OOPSLA 2024 - Artifact Evaluation

Evaluation: similar to previous year
- Kick-the-tires: ~1 week, open communication
- Full review: ~1 month, closed communication

Artifact Review Committee (AEC)
- Who can apply? PhD students, Post-Docs, Faculties, ...
- Contact us if you are interested!

New in artifact submissions
- Explicit hardware requirements
- Reusability guide

guillaume.baudart@inria.fr sankha@ku.edu