**Vera Gehlen-Baum - PILOT@QualityMinds**

- Die Frage 5 ist mir echt schwer gefallen  - weil mir hier Infos fehlen - was genau meint ihr mit software intensiv

- Bei Frage 7 fehlt ein i in distributed

- Ich finde die slidebars etwas irritierend da ich nicht zwischen items landen kann â€“ ich hÃ¤tte erwartet das wäre der Vorteil zu kreuzchen und wenn einmal gesetzt kann man es nicht mehr raus nehmen

- Es wäre schön wenn man vorher wÃ¼ÃŸte wieviele Antworten man anklicken darf

- Bei Frage 24 kommt es zu einem netten fehler â€“ meine Antwort war nicht â€“ und jetzt soll ich das weiter ausführenÂ â˜º

-Â Ich habe es ein paar Mal probiert habe es aber nicht geschafft andere Fragen zu bekommen

**Jose Luis de la Vara**

---- Intro ----

- thank you very much for sparing --> missing capital 'T' in "thank"

- please refer to your experiences in your most recent software development project --> I think this must be highlighted some way: capital letters, bold, underlined...

---- Question 7 ----

- Typos: the \*\*proect\*\* is carried out [...] \*\*dstributed\*\* teams

---- Question 8 ----

- Typo: you \*\*occopy\*\*

---- Question 22 ----

- Typo: For \*\*instane\*\*

---- 58%-progress page ----

- Typo: the problems you \*\*experiene\*\* in your projects

- "in your projects" --> "project" or "projects"

**Sjaak Brinkkemper**

- Type of application: should Consumer apps be added as a category? The gaming company develops a learning app on a tablet.Â

-  Question 22: “For instance”

**Martin Solari**

1) The general focus of the survey is in dissatisfaction. While the

goal of NaPiRE is clearly finding pains, asking for satisfactory areas

(positive results, techniques that are working ) in RE could be a

complementary way to find opportunities to solve the challenges.

2) The questionnaire is long and a bit redundant in the final

sections. Since we want the respondents to be profound in the final

open questions, I see this a risk (the respondent being tired at the

end). Maybe one possibility is to ask the important stuff first (or in

the middle), and leave for the end the administrative stuff (general

profile of the respondent, other closed answer fields).

3) Differentiating causes and effects (or implications) in some areas

could be challenging or produce repeated answers. This is a difficult

thing to tackle, but a minor change could be to limit the final list

of problems to 3 instead of 5 to produce more discrete problem areas

and profound reflections in the open questions.

4) I feel that some specific topics (potential pains) are not explored

in the survey: RE process and time management, customer / user

expectations management and requirements prioritization - negotiation.

Maybe they are addressed and I didnâ€™t perceive it as important in the

survey.

Minor comments:

+ University degree could be a certification?

+ Iteratively and project phase could be a slider?

+ What are the consequences of the dissatisfying requirements

engineering? Question writing is confusing.

+ Question 31 seems redundant from the respondent perspective. Maybe

we can use it to check the consistency with previous page answers

(sliders).

+ Question 33. Implications of problems are already questioned before

in general.