|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Data Extraction Form** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Title** | User Feedback in the App Store: An Empirical Study | | | | | | | | | | **Authors(s)** | | Dennis Pagano, Walid Maalej, | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Year** | 2013 | | | | | | | | | | **Venue** | | * Journal | | * **Conference** | | | | | * Other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | | | |
| **Quality Assessment criteria** | | | | * QC1 | | | | * **QC2** | | | | | * **QC3** | | * QC4 | | | | | * **QC5** | | | * QC6 |
| **Inclusion Criteria** | | | | * IC1 | | | | * IC2 | | | | | * **IC3** | | | * **IC4** | | | | * IC5 | | | |
| **Exclusion Criteria** | | | | * EC1 | | | * EC2 | | * EC3 | | | | * EC4 | * EC5 | | | | | * EC6 | | * EC7 | | |
| **Approach Used**   * Supervised Machine Learning algorithms (Model based testing) * Unsupervised Machine Learning algorithms * Natural language processing * Deep Learning algorithms * Data mining based techniques * **Statistical Method(Descriptive statistical method)** * Tool * Other | | | | | | | | | | **Type of Solution** | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** | | **Unclear** | |
| Novel Technique (Method, Tool, Technique) | | | | | | | | Check mark, Wingdings font, character code 252 decimal. | |  | |  | |
| Evaluation of existing techniques  (Evaluation framework, tool, platform) | | | | | | | |  | | Check mark, Wingdings font, character code 252 decimal. | |  | |
| Supporting techniques | | | | | | | |  | | Check mark, Wingdings font, character code 252 decimal. | |  | |
| **Review dataset** | | **Total number of apps** | | | | App Store application reviews | | | | **Evaluation Method Used** | | | | | | | | Feedback frequency , feedback meta data, ratings | | | | | |
| **Total number of crawled reviews** | | | | 1126453 | | | |
| **Year** | | | | 2013 | | | |
| **Research Type Facet**   * Validation Research * **Evaluation Research** * **Solution Proposal** * Philosophical Papers * Opinion Papers * Experience Papers | | | | | **Solution Type**   * **Single** * Hybrid/Integrated | | | | | | | **Contribution**   * Technique * Tool * Comparison * Model * Framework * Prototype * **Taxonomy** | | | | | **Evaluation Strategy**   * **Case Study** | | | | | | |
| **Features used**   * Categorical * **Textual** * Both | | | | | | |
| **Factors Considered** | | | User reviews to understand user requirements from store, aggregation and use of feedback | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Notes** | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Limitations** | | | * No identification of bugs from user reviews | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Description / Summary** | | | This paper reports on an exploratory study, which analyzes over one million reviews from the Apple AppStore. They investigated how and when users provide feedback, inspected the feedback content, and analyzed its impact on the user community. Found that most of the feedback is provided shortly after new releases, with a quickly decreasing frequency over time. Reviews typically contain multiple topics, such as user experience, bug reports, and feature requests. The quality and constructiveness vary widely, from helpful advices and innovative ideas to insulting offenses. Feedback content has an impact on download numbers: positive messages usually lead to better ratings and vice versa. Negative feedback such as shortcomings is typically destructive and miss’s context details and user experience. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |