

KMIS 2024 - Paper #81

Paper Title: *PROV-SwSystem: A Web System for Capturing and Analyzing Provenance Data from Software Development Processes*

Reviewer #1

General Assessment (Please assign scores using the following criteria (1=weakest; 6=strongest))

Relevance (Paper fits one or more of the topic areas?): 5
Originality (Newness of the ideas expressed): 2
Technical Quality (Theoretical soundness/methodology): 3
Significance (Is the problem worth the given attention?): 3
Presentation (Structure/Length/English): 3
Overall Rating (Weighted value of above items): 3

Improvement Suggestions (for authors to consider in the camera-ready version. Additional detail in "Observations")

Abstract and Introduction are adequate? Yes
Needs more experimental results? No
Needs comparative evaluation? No
Improve critical discussion ? (validation): Yes
Figures are adequate ? (in number and quality): No
Conclusions/Future Work are convincing? Yes
References are up-to-date and appropriate? Yes
Paper formatting needs adjustment? No
Improve English? Yes

Detailed comments to authors, including aspects that must be improved in the camera-ready version of the paper:

- typo: extra space in PROV– SwProcess (in the abstract)
- Figure 1 is copy + paste from <https://prov.linceonline.com.br/modelo/index.html> and therefore not needed. The text should refer to it.
- What is meant by "The project prototype is available on the Figma application." ? Do you mean to say you used Figma to design the GUI shown? It should be clarified.
- The following phrase (in Conclusion) is not clear: "Once any identified issues were addressed, the initial version of the PROV–SwSystem is now accessible online." Do you mean: "Identified issues were addressed and the initial version of the PROV–SwSystem is now accessible online."? Can this be accessible publicly?

KMIS 2024 - Paper #81

Paper Title: *PROV-SwSystem: A Web System for Capturing and Analyzing Provenance Data from Software Development Processes*

Reviewer #2

General Assessment (Please assign scores using the following criteria (1=weakest; 6=strongest))

Relevance (Paper fits one or more of the topic areas?): 5
Originality (Newness of the ideas expressed): 2
Technical Quality (Theoretical soundness/methodology): 2
Significance (Is the problem worth the given attention?): 2
Presentation (Structure/Length/English): 2
Overall Rating (Weighted value of above items): 2

Improvement Suggestions (for authors to consider in the camera-ready version. Additional detail in "Observations")

Abstract and Introduction are adequate? Yes
Needs more experimental results? No
Needs comparative evaluation? Yes
Improve critical discussion ? (validation): Yes
Figures are adequate ? (in number and quality): Yes
Conclusions/Future Work are convincing? No
References are up-to-date and appropriate? Yes
Paper formatting needs adjustment? Yes
Improve English? No

Detailed comments to authors, including aspects that must be improved in the camera-ready version of the paper:

This paper is about provenance data from software development process. It first present related work, as some kind of history with concepts such as PROV–DM and PROV–SwProcess. It then described the methodology, related to the development of Prov–SwSystem based on the PROVSswProcess provenance model and the PROV–SwProcess Ontology. The description covers aspects such as modeling with use cases or interaction with a prototype of a web interface. Another section, called critical analysis, provides elements about the implementation, in particular from the web development perspectives.

The topic of managing provenance may be interesting, but it is not clear to me what may be the research contribution. A large part of the paper is dedicated to technical/engineering aspects which are usually not of interest to the research community. On the form the paper can probably be improved. The structure of section3 is quite strange, with a unique subsection after more than one page of description.

Some details:

In the outline it is not necessary to mention the introduction.
Related works → related work
Conclusions → conclusion
Figures 1, 2 and 3 are maybe too small (hard to read)