

Introduction/motivation/goal clearly explained (10)			Appropriate statistical and visualization tools are used (20)	
☐	Is the motivation of the study stated?		☐	Is there more than just time-sequence diagrams?
☐	Is the goal of the study stated?		☐	Were transients removed?
☐	Is it stated in a prominent location?		☐	If box plots, are the center, box edges and whiskers explained?
☐	Are hypotheses stated?		☐	If violin plots, is the distribution sampling explained?
☐	Are the algorithms introduced?		☐	If histograms, is the stepsize discussed?
☐	Are the used tools introduced?		☐	Is the sample rate explained? (BW or throughput samples)
			☐	If events rather than samples are used, is the time between samples considered in the statistics?
Setup and parameter selection clearly explained (10)			Conclusions are justified and sound (20)	
☐	Are parameters presented initially?		☐	Are there any conclusions?
☐	Are the reasons for parameter choices obvious or explained?		☐	Are the conclusions sound?
☐	Are the used metrics introduced?		☐	Are the conclusions based on the simulation, taken from elsewhere, or only speculation?
			☐	Are there reflections of the own work in the conclusion?
			☐	Are there future work questions?
Results are well explained (40)			SCORING	
☐	Are all axes labelled?		0	Terrible. Nothing in this characteristic was answered sensibly.
☐	Does labels include metric and unit?		1	Bad: Nearly nothing achieved. Apparently nothing was learned from the lecture or presentation round.
☐	Do legends exist?		2	Not good: Very few boxes are checked.
☐	Are figures readable?		3	Satisfactory. There are mistakes, some of the boxes are not checked.
☐	Are axis starting at 0 or offsets explained?		4	Very good. No mistake have been made, all the boxes are checked.
☐	Are colors used sensible?		5	Extraordinary. All boxes are ticked, either perfectly solved or nice/innovative ideas are added.
☐	Are colors used consistently across graphs?			
☐	Do axis units use sensible multipliers for easy reading?			
☐	Are figures well explained?			