Id	How long do you develop robotic or other Cyber-Physical Systems? (months)	How long do you manage technology development teams? (months)	What is/are your technology domain? Choose one or more from:	How many setups had the most complicated system you developed, or how big was the product family of the system?	Were you familiar with the Digital Twin concept before the presentation?	In which phase of the system life cycle have you utilized simulation technology, including digital twin? Choose one or more from:	Are you a member of a science or engineering organisation? Choose one or more from:	Did you receive a certificate or graduate a university in the field of systems engineering, robotics, applied information technology or related?	Briefly describe your biggest success in the systems engineering domain.	How valuable is it for you to join simulation and physical models?	Is the requirement-based decomposition applicable to your technology domain? Answer Yes/No and breifly why.	How sure are you that the requirement-based decomposition strengthens traceability between system components and the requirements?	How sure are you that the requirement-based decomposition would help you in comprehensiveness analysis and verification?	Would you apply SPSys Modelling Language as a modelling language to specify and share the system design? Write why, or why not.	Would you apply the requirement-based decomposition? Write why, or why not.	Would you apply the agent-based architecture? Write why, or why not.	Would you apply the simulation-physical integrity factors evaluation for the design evaluation? Write why, or why not.	Would you apply the systematic procedure (based on the simulation-implementation factor) to plan and analyse the development order of components? Write why or why not.	Do you agree that:	the Controller integrity factor and change the system design to control it (enter your probability 0-100%)	the Driver generalisation factor and change the system design to control it (enter your probability 0-100%)	the Digital Twin coverage and control it while developing the system (enter your probability 0-100%)	the Mirror integrity factor and control it while developing the system (enter your probability 0-100%)	How clear (1-5) are the rules for improving the system based on the proposed design evaluation factors? Expand on the answer using the next question answer. Clarity scale:	Expand on the previous answer. Please tell us what aspects: a) are clear (for answer 1), or b) what was not deep enough presented (for answer 2), or c) what is fuzzy to you (for answer 3), or d) what	Do you have any other comments on the SPSysML/SPSysDP performance?	the Controller integrity factor while modifying the system design (enter your probability 0-100%)	the Driver generalisation factor while modifying the system design (enter your probability 0-100%)	the Digital Twin coverage while modifying the system design (enter your probability 0-100%)	the Mirror integrity factor while modifying the system design (enter your probability 0-100%)	Do you see profits in joining simulation and physical models as SPSysML proposes?	What profits do you see?	If you were a complex cyber-physical system project designer, how would SPSysML and SPSysDP help you in change analysis? Choose one or more from:	If you were a complex cyber-physical system project designer, what features of SPSysML would help you maintain the system?	If you were a complex cyber-physical system project designer, how sure are you that SPSysML would help you maintain the system	What difficulties do you see in the application of: SPSysML as a language for system specification and presentation
1	43	0	Robotics;	20	Yes	Development;Testing;Implementation;Maintenence;Evaluation;		Yes	In my MSc thesis I was modeling heterogeneous multi robot system using SysML and MeROS metamodel.	3	Yes	65	80	Not now. At first glance it's time consuming	Yes, it helps to trace all requirements	Rather not. This concept isn't well-known outside WUT.	Yes, I think it's quite descriptive and useful	No, because lack of time during project development.	Driver generalisation factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Mirror integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Digital Twin coverage is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Controller integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;	100	100	90	95	4 – I feel confident to comment on most of it.	General concept is clear	No	100	100	90	90	Yes	At early stage of system development it can show some issues regarding system design	tracing change from a requirement to the system components' attributes,;	requirement-based decomposition	60	Quite high entry level
2	43	0	Robotics;	6	Yes	Design;Implementation;Testing;		Yes	Design and implementation of manipulation system, which was able to move chess pawns.		Yes	100	100	I would, because it simplifys decomposition of cyber physics systems.	Yes, because it helps to describe required parts of system. It enables to assign requirements to hardware parts.	Yes, it clearly describes low part functionality of the system	Yes, it helps validate system and point out the week parts of system	Yes, it is clearly described and shows the way of achiving end-product	Controller integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Driver generalisation factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Digital Twin coverage is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Mirror integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;	100	100	100	100	4 – I feel confident to comment on most of it.			100	100	100	100	Yes	Ability to transfer physics system to simulation and test it without any physics hardware damages	promote wider simulation-based change verification,;promote wider simulation-based change validation,;	requirement-based decomposition	80	Not clearly specified when agent based on ROS is hybrid. E.g. same topics names and structure
3	84	0	Robotics;Artificial Intelligence;	1	Yes	Analysis;Design;Development;Testing;Implementation;	No;	Yes	Creating a description of robots system and how it works	4	Yes	100	100	Yes, it seems clear and easy to understand.	Yes, it should help to decide what functions are required for a Robot.	Yes, it divides a project into seperate working being who cooperate with each other, making the system clear.	It seems as a good metric for evaluating how much of a control system is universal for both simulation and physical agents.	I would, it is better to detect mistakes on simulation and fix them before testing on physical robot.	Driver generalisation factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Digital Twin coverage is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Mirror integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Controller integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;	80	80	100	80	4 – I feel confident to comment on most of it.			80	80	80	80	Yes	It allows the testing of the system in simulation before deploying the physical ones.	promote wider simulation-based change verification,;promote wider simulation-based change validation,;	requirement-based decomposition	90	Unwillingness of others to learn new specification language
4	23	0	Robotics;Artificial Intelligence;	1	No	Analysis;Design;Testing;		Yes	design and implementation of an intrusion detection system for mobile robots	5	Yes, it can be used to increase the clarity of requirements fulfillment	90	80	I would apply SPSysML for specifying and sharing a cyber-physical system, particularly because of its rich feature set for modeling complex systems and its support for Digital Twin concept based architectures.	I would apply requirement-based decomposition. This approach ensures that the system is developed to meet functional requirements, enhances traceability, and supports modularity, risk management, and efficient development.	I would consider applying agent-based architecture if the system involves complex, distributed interactions, and would benefit from the robustness and fault tolerance offered by autonomous agents.	I would apply simulation-physical integrity factors evaluation for the design evaluation as it provides a comprehensive assessment		Mirror integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Digital Twin coverage is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Controller integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Driver generalisation factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;	100	80	90	90	4 – I feel confident to comment on most of it.			100	80	90	90	Yes	Joining simulation and physical models provides numerous benefits. SPSysML allows to clearly depict this in system architecture.		requirement-based decomposition	80	model management complexities and need for organizational change
5	144	0	Robotics;Artificial Intelligence;	3	Yes	Design;Development;Testing;Implementation;Evaluation;	Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE);	Yes	Development of a real-time robotic system for a two arm robot.	5	yes	100	100	Yes. It is a clear graphical language, easy to understand.	Yes, due to traceability of requirements.	Yes, it provides a good balance between constrained architecture and universality.	Yes - to make right decisions about division between simulation and physical parts.	Yes. Order of development of components is important and decisions should be made early.	Controller integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Mirror integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;	80	50	50	80	4 – I feel confident to comment on most of it.			80	70	80	80	Yes	It is a systematic framework for joining simulation and physical systems. This process can be controlled with SPSysML.	promote wider simulation-based change verification,;tracing change from a requirement to the system components' attributes,;	requirement-based decomposition	90	The diagrams are very detailed. Some of elements can be omitted on some diagrams due to better visibility of other elements. That may cause that some elements may be lost. A dedicated software for diagram analysis can solve this problem, e.g. to check if all requirements are allocated.
6	36	0	Robotics;Information systems;Artificial Intelligence;	100	Yes	Analysis;Design;Development;Testing;Implementation;		Yes	Designing task scheduling system in multi robot environment	5	Yes	90	100	Yes, as it provides methodology to describe the common problem of utilization of simulation alongside physical hardware.	Yes, from my perspective it gives clear connection between the requirements (what we want the system to do) and system components. Potentially this approach would allow to notice redundant/not necessary parts of the systems.	For sure it depends on the application. But most of current systems' architecture utilize distributed approach and/or consist on multiple components. In general I would apply.	Yes, it would require some additional description as the non optimal output is not always the indicator of the faulty architecture. Even though, this approach gives a clear measure to describe/compare the simulation-physical integrity.	Yes, as this would allow me to prioritize implementation of the most important components of the system	Controller integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Driver generalisation factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Digital Twin coverage is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Mirror integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;	90	80	90	100	4 – I feel confident to comment on most of it.		I think the importance of the components is omitted while calculating factors - it might give unclear outputs.	90	90	100	90	Yes	Mostly the emphasized importance of sharing/reusing the components, logic etc. between simulation and real hardware.	component change propagation analysis,;tracing change from a requirement to the system components' attributes,;	SPSys Modelling Language as a modelling language to specify changes and share the system design	90	It might be difficult for the audience to comprehend the notation, especially when seeing it the first time.
7	12	0	Robotics;Information systems;	1	Yes	Design;		Yes	Supervised student's projects (6 DOF robotic arm), industrial process control systems.	5	Yes	80	90	Yes	Yes, I find it clear and well-structured.	Yes, I'm familiar with embodied agent concept and find it useful.	Yes.	Yes, it allows to verify the system in simulation before its deployment.	Driver generalisation factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Digital Twin coverage is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Controller integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;	90	80	95	50	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments.			90	90	100	50	Yes		component change propagation analysis,;promote wider simulation-based change verification,;promote wider simulation-based change validation,;tracing change from a requirement to the system components' attributes,;communicating change impact,;	SPSys Modelling Language as a modelling language to specify changes and share the system design	95	Everyone in the team should be familiar with the SPSysML.
8	53	41	Robotics;	64	Yes	Development;Testing;Implementation;Evaluation;		Yes	Leading the design of mobile inspection robot for FLASH particle accelerator at DESY	5	Yes. Besides hardware interfaces, all robot software subsystems are first developed in a simulation and later validated and used on the physical system. Therefore, most of the requirements apply both to a physical and simulated system, and should be satisfied by both.	100	100	Possibly. I would apply the proposed methodology because it improves the development process. Using SPSysML as a modeling language would necessitate that other team members understand its syntax. Therefore, I would consider using SPSysML if it is simple and quick to learn, without requiring a comprehensive understanding of the entire methodology.	Yes. It provides an organized approach to the development process with clear benefits. Although including simulation at such an early design stage is not initially obvious, it allows for a more comprehensive analysis, maximizing opportunities for common (hybrid) subsystems and ensuring that all other systems are mirrored in a simulation if needed. This results in a simulation system that more closely reflects the physical system, and vice versa.	Possibly. Although I was not familiar with the agent-based architecture before the presentation, the concept is convincing. I am willing to further familiarize myself with this approach and consider its application.	Probably not. I don't see a clear benefit in terms of design evaluation, as calculating these factors already requires an advanced and comprehensive analysis that provides detailed insights into the design and areas needing improvement. However, the proposed integrity factors are good metrics for summarizing design evaluation and could be beneficial in other processes, such as tracking project development.	Yes. While the development order of components depends on other important factors, the proposed procedure is helpful in assigning priorities to simulated and hybrid systems.	Digital Twin coverage is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Mirror integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Driver generalisation factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;	20	100	100	40	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments.	IIF and DGF are very similar metrics, it's not clear what insight might one offer that the other does not.		100	100	100	100	Yes	Better integrity of the simulated and physical system. This minimizes the amount of work required with the actual robot in the dedicated requirement, leading to faster development.	tracing change from a requirement to the system components' attributes,;promote wider simulation-based change validation,;component change propagation analysis,;	requirement-based decomposition	60	Since SPSysML is a novel language, it is not widely known. It would benefit from a simple introduction and clear guidelines to help its presentation to people who are not familiar with it.
9	80	10	Robotics;Information systems;	12	No			Yes	Analysis and plan of system integration for several thousand customers.	4	Yes. Dividing the system into microservices is not possible without analyzing the domain and business requirements.	100	100	I would like to apply as a proof of concept in a team of domain architects.	Yes. Requirement-based decomposition is a natural approach to creating system architecture. Requirements allocation ensures that all requirements are met. This makes also planning easier.	Yes. I would use agent-based architecture as a proof of concept or as an attempt to properly arrange microservices and plan connections between them. This can help organize connections and not create "spaghetti architecture"	Yes. This seems to be an interesting approach to architecture evaluation. Again, I would consider this a proof of concept and test this method of evaluation on my system.	Yes. I would consider this a proof of concept.	Mirror integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Digital Twin coverage is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;Controller integrity factor is a significant evaluation factor for simulation-physical systems;	90	70	100	100	5 – I feel confident giving precise comments on all its aspects.	The approach is clear because it is described in a standard description language, which is SysML. The subject matter is not trivial, it requires getting used to the taxonomies and names, but thanks to the diagrams, getting started does not take long.		90	80	90	95	Yes	This certainly gives you the opportunity to evaluate the system architecture and make conscious design decisions.	promote wider simulation-based change validation,;promote wider simulation-based change verification,;tracing change from a requirement to the system components' attributes,;	SPSys Modelling Language as a modelling language to specify changes and share the system design	90	The methodology requires deeper knowledge. Only then can its use be effective. So it would be used by a small group of architects.

Based on your experience and knowledge, does the method comply with the V model?	What difficulties do you see in the application of: SPSysDP as a development procedure	What difficulties do you see in the application of: The proposed design evaluation factors as design assessment markers	What difficulties do you see in the application of: The requirement-based decomposition in finding systems' setups, their components and simulation-physical classes of these components	What difficulties do you see in the application of: The proposed requirement model in tracing component requirements	Do you have any other comments on the aims of SPSysML/SPSysDP?	If Yes/No, justify your previous answer.	To which Zahman Framework cells SPSysML applies, and to which it does not. Please write: APPLIES WELL: 1-A, 1-B ...; APPLIES: 1-A, 1-B ... ; NOT APPLIES: 1-A, 1-B	Do you have any other comments on the compatibility of SPSysML/SPSysDP?	Linked to Decision Support: denotes the fundamental quality of models that seamlessly integrate into decision-making frameworks. Exceptional models within this paradigm serve as invaluable tools for n	Model Credibility: signifies the degree to which decision-makers trust the results produced by a model. The credibility of a model is pivotal, as it directly impacts the decision-making process. When	Clear Scope: defines the extent of system modelling required for a project. This involves determining which system or subsystem will be modelled, ensuring alignment with project objectives. For instan	Verification & Validation With Models: refers to the process of utilizing models to verify and validate products, processes, or businesses. A quality systems engineering model should explicitly demons	Understandable and Well-Organized: clarifies where and how additional components can be integrated into the model. Following a structured Model Development Process enhances modularity and organization	Analyzable and Traceable: this quality denotes models that can be readily interrogated and offer clear insight into the factors influencing their outputs. They enable easy identification of the specif	Data Extrapolation: refers to the capability of models to operate within predefined boundaries of data, conditions, physics, and assumptions. Great models explicitly delineate their validity range, di	Complete Relative to Scope and Intended Purpose: signifies that the model comprehensively encompasses all pertinent physics or dynamics within its defined scope and purpose.	Internally Consistent: denotes a model that maintains coherence without direct contradictions throughout its components. For instance, assumptions such as the gravity constant remain consistent across	Verifiable: this signifies that the model's outputs can be verified to meet the modelling requirements and align with calibration data, enhancing its credibility for decision-making purposes.	Validation: entails ensuring that the model aligns with and satisfies customer needs and expectations. For descriptive models, this involves effective presentation of information, often through layere	Model Fidelity: refers to ensuring that the model possesses the correct level of detail in relation to the decision being made and the design phase. Excessive fidelity can complicate evaluation and wa	Elegant: denotes a model crafted with a balance of simplicity and effectiveness, avoiding unnecessary complexity. For instance, an elegant model minimizes redundancy, such as by storing and reusing co	Well Formed for Optimization: refers to constructing a model to enable optimization if required. It ensures that the model provides pertinent optimization information, such as gradients or convexity,	Avoid Optimizing on a Black Box: advises against optimizing models that operate as "black boxes" with obscure or inaccessible internal features. Such optimization routines may perform inadequately whe	Availability of Interfaces: signifies that great models offer readily accessible interfaces to interact with underlying data and outputs and components	Reusable: means designing models that are applicable across various systems or scenarios beyond their initial creation context. Achieving this involves adopting a modular model structure and avoiding	How clear is the motivation of Simulation-Physical System (SPSys) to you?	How clear is the SPSys idea to you?	How clear is the requirement-based decomposition to you?	How clear is the motivation of SPSys Development Procedure to you?	How clear is the idea of SPSys Development Procedure to you?	How clear are the steps of the SPSys Development Procedure to you?	How clear is the idea of evaluation factors to you?	How clear is the relationship of SPSysML and SPSysDP with V-model?	How clear is the relationship of SPSysML and SPSysDP with Zachman framework?	How clear is the relationship of SPSysML and SPSysDP with SysML?	Do you have any other comments on the presentation's quality/straightness/form or the questionnaire?
I don't khow the V model	System decomposition is a hard task	No difficulties	Choice of decomposition criteria	None	No	After presentation I understand general concept of SPSysML	APPLIES WELL: 3-B, 3-C ...; APPLIES: 4-F ... ; NOT APPLIES: 6-C	No	4	4	4	5	4	5	3	2	4	5	4	3	3	4	4	5	5	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	5 – I feel confident in giving precise comments on all its aspects.	2 – I get the general concept of it. I can give abstract comments and relate it roughly to my knowledge.	1 – It is completely fuzzy. I cannot even comment on it.	5 – I feel confident in giving precise comments on all its aspects.	Great presentation
I don't khow the V model	Early decomposition is the hardest part								5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4		5	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	5 – I feel confident in giving precise comments on all its aspects.	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	5 – I feel confident in giving precise comments on all its aspects.	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	1 – It is completely fuzzy. I cannot even comment on it.	1 – It is completely fuzzy. I cannot even comment on it.	1 – It is completely fuzzy. I cannot even comment on it.	Great presentation
Yes	Possible pushback from other developers/management, as they may prefer to push system without testing it thoroughly.	None come to mind	None come to mind	None come to mind			It seems to be possible to apply to most of them, but i think it would apply to rows 3 and 4 the most.		5	5	5	5	4	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	5 – I feel confident in giving precise comments on all its aspects.	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments on it,	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments on it,	2 – I get the general concept of it. I can give abstract comments and relate it roughly to my knowledge.	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	
I don't khow the V model			determining the appropriate level of decomposition				APPLIES WELL: 2-A, 2-D, 3-A, 2-E, 3-B, 3-C, 3-D, 3-E,4-A, 4-B, 4-C, 4-D, 4-E, APPLIES: 1-A, 5-A, 5-B, 5-C, 5-D, 5-E, 5-F, NOT APPLIES: 1-B, 1-C, 1-D, 1-E, 1-F, 2-B, 2-C, 2-F, 3-F, 4-F, 6-A, 6-B, 6-C, 6-D, 6-E, 6-F																			5 – I feel confident in giving precise comments on all its aspects.	5 – I feel confident in giving precise comments on all its aspects.	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	5 – I feel confident in giving precise comments on all its aspects.	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments on it,	2 – I get the general concept of it. I can give abstract comments and relate it roughly to my knowledge.	
Yes	It should be understood by all members of the team. The diagrams are detailed, and it may be challenging to understand them.						APPLIES WELL: 2-A, 2-B, 2-D, 3-A, 3-B, 3-C, 3-D, 3-E, 3-F, 4-A, 4-B, 4-C, 4-D, 4-E, 4-F, 5-A, 5-B, 5-C, 5-D, 5-E, 5-F NOT APPLIES: 1-A, 1-B, 1-C, 1-D, 1-E, 1-F, 2-C, 2-E, 2-F, 6-A, 6-B, 6-C, 6-D, 6-E, 6-F		4	5	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	5	3	4	3	5	4	3	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	2 – I get the general concept of it. I can give abstract comments and relate it roughly to my knowledge.	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments on it,	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments on it,	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments on it,	2 – I get the general concept of it. I can give abstract comments and relate it roughly to my knowledge.	2 – I get the general concept of it. I can give abstract comments and relate it roughly to my knowledge.	2 – I get the general concept of it. I can give abstract comments and relate it roughly to my knowledge.	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	
Yes	The maintaining the documentation in SysML, calculating and updating the factors. For sure the automated tools would be of great help.	Evaluation factors might be abused as the importance of components is not taken into account as much.	It is not easy to find all essential requirements, it is iterative process.	As diagrams might get complicated, it might be difficult to trace component requirements.	-		APPLIES WELL: 1-B, 1-C, 1-F; APPLIES: 1-A, ; NOT APPLIES: 1-D,E APPLIES WELL: 2-A, 2-B; APPLIES: 2-A,E ; NOT APPLIES: 2-C,F APPLIES WELL: 3-B, 3-C, 3-F; APPLIES: 3-A, ; NOT APPLIES: 3-D,E APPLIES WELL: 4-B, 4-C; APPLIES: 4-A, 4-F ; NOT APPLIES: 4-D,E APPLIES WELL: 5-B, 5-F; APPLIES: 5-A, ; NOT APPLIES: 5-C,D,E APPLIES WELL: 6-B; APPLIES: 6-A, ; NOT APPLIES: 6-C,D,E,F		4	5	5	4	4	5	3	4	5	4	4	3	3	3	4	5	5	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments on it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments on it,	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments on it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	
Yes							Applies well: 3-a, 3-b, 3-c, 4-b, 4-c, 4-e		4	4	5	4	4	5	3	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments on it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments on it,	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments on it,	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments on it,	
I don't khow the V model	I don't find any difficulties	The proposed design evaluation factors are not clearly understandable without a good grasp of SPSysML. Additionally, it is unclear what unique insights can be gained from the IIF that cannot already be derived from the DGF and MIR.	I don't find any difficulties	I don't find any difficulties			APPLIES WELL: 3-A, 3-B, 3-C, 3-D, 3-E, 4-B, 4-C, 4-D, 4-E APPLIES: NOT APPLIES: 1,2, 3-F, 4-A, 4-F, 5,6		4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	3	3	4	5	3	3	3	5	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments on it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	3 – I understand most of it but can give hesitant comments on it,	2 – I get the general concept of it. I can give abstract comments and relate it roughly to my knowledge.	2 – I get the general concept of it. I can give abstract comments and relate it roughly to my knowledge.	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	
Yes	This requires proper training of developers, who often have less experience with similar models than architects.			With a large number of requirements that have a complex structure, the diagrams may be unreadable. The solution would be a requirements association table.			APPLIES WELL: 3-A, 4-A, 3-B, 4-B, APPLIES WELL: 2-A NOT APPLIES: rest		5	4	5	4	5	5	3	3	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	5 – I feel confident in giving precise comments on all its aspects.	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	5 – I feel confident in giving precise comments on all its aspects.	4 – I feel confident to give comments on most of it,	5 – I feel confident in giving precise comments on all its aspects.	
									4,375	4,625	4,625	4,5	4,375	4,875	3,375	3,75	4,5	4,5	4,25	4	4,25	4	4,125	4,428571429	4,75											
									4	**5**	**5**	**4,5**	**4**	**5**	**3**	**4**	**4,5**	**5**	**4**	**4**	**4,5**	**4**	**4**	**5**	**5**											
									4	4	3	4	4	4	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3											
									5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5											