So assuming I've been thorough enough at checking submissions quality, I've finished both.

Basically I scanned through the code for violations (where the Roellgen submission is clearly in full-fledged C++ for reasons not relying on the NTL, and the build script (if it works at all) requires some external package, big violations which I noted)

and then tested compilation (the Wang submissions doesn't fully compile, but only because it needs to link against the random_bytes that we've promised to provide [AFAIK we don't have a version of that yet I can put in to test stuff?]).

Is there anything else I should do for ensuring "ANSI C?" Our definition is basically a "I know it when I see it one" after all …

From: "Moody, Dustin (Fed)" <dustin.moody@nist.gov>
Date: Wednesday, August 30, 2017 at 3:17 PM
To: "Alperin-Sheriff, Jacob (Fed)" <jacob.alperin-sheriff@nist.gov>
Subject: formal evaluation of the two submissions

Jacob,

I'm going to be using a more formal checklist on checking that submissions are "complete and proper". We'll need it for the large number of submissions we might get. I've done the more "technical" part of the checklist. I think it will probably fall more to you and Larry to check the "optical data" part. Since he's really busy right now, would you mind taking a quick look at it for the two submissions we've received so far? I've attached the two checklists I've started, and if you could just put X's where appropriate in the Optical Media Checklist portion. Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks!

Dustin