

## SoftwareX Review Form

1. Please rate the **impact** of this original software publication (OSP)'s contributions.

- Excellent
- Good – substantial contribution
- Fair – incremental contribution
- Poor – almost no contribution at all

*Please, summarize the evidence that the author provided to demonstrate the (potential) impact of the software, taking into account:*

- *the ability to pursue new research questions,*
- *the improved pursuit of existing research questions,*
- *the uptake (re-use) inside or outside of the intended user community*
- *possible commercialization or commercial use, etcetera.*

2. Please rate the overall quality of the manuscript.

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

*Please, summarize your evaluation, considering the following points:*

- *Are the abstract, authors, title and keywords clear?*
- *Is the scientific scope of the software clear?*
- *Is it clearly indicated in what way the software has contributed (or will contribute in the future) to the process of scientific discovery?*
- *Is the software described well, e.g. by way of a pictorial component overview?*
- *Is the description of the experimental setting clear and concise?*
- *Is the empirical evaluation (and possible comparison with past work) clear and concise?*
- *Are the results convincing, and in line with the claimed or expected impact?*
- *Are the included references relevant and sufficiently state-of-the-art?*
- *Are the metadata tables fully and correctly filled in?*

*Please give detailed justifications and explanations for your assessments, including positive and negative aspects of the manuscript.*

3. Please rate the overall quality of the submitted software.

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

*Please, summarize your evaluation, considering the following points:*

- *Is the reviewer convinced the software runs as described (e.g. videos, screenshots)?*
- *Did the reviewer try to install and/or compile the software? If so, was the reviewer capable of reproducing the described experiments, or achieve compatible results?*
- *Does the reviewer believe good standards of coding quality are followed?*
- *Is a proper and appropriate open source license used?*
- *Is there any (API) documentation for the software?*
- *Is the documentation of sufficient quality and completeness?*
- *Is the description of the operating environment and dependencies correct and complete?*
- *Is there a user manual/installation guide available? If so, is this complete and of sufficient quality?*
- *Does the software provide a testing environment, with (automated) testing procedures?*

*Please give detailed justifications and explanations, including positive and negative aspects of the software code artefacts (source and executable codes), documentation and data.*

4. Please give the overall recommendation.

- Accept with No Changes
- Author Should Prepare a Minor Revision
- Author Should Prepare a Major Revision
- Revise and resubmit as “new”
- Reject

*General comments:*

Other more specific questions:

5. How would you rate the empirical evaluation conducted in the manuscript?  
 Thorough  
 Acceptable  
 Not thorough  
 Not applicable
6. Is the code portable to other platforms/compilers/interpreters?  
 Yes  
 No
7. Does the author provide test programs that exercise all the main features of the software?  
 Yes  
 No
8. Is the code readable and easy to maintain?  
 Yes  
 Partially  
 No
9. Are the licensing terms clearly stated in the source package and mentioned in each source file  
 Yes  
 No  
 Not available
10. How would you rate the overall quality of the non-code artifacts, e.g., data and documentation?  
 Excellent  
 Good  
 Fair  
 Poor  
 Not available
11. Is the reviewer able to build, deploy, install and run the software following the documentation?  
 Yes  
 Partial  
 No  
 Not available