

# Efficiency of Review Meetings

Haris Causegic, Aretina Iazzolino, Andreas Korge, Josip Ledic and Thommy Zelenik  
University of Stuttgart  
Institute of Software Technology  
Stuttgart, Germany  
Email: inf82831@stud.uni-stuttgart.de

**Abstract**—The abstract goes here.

## I. INTRODUCTION

This demo file is intended to serve as a “starter file” for IEEE conference papers produced under L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X using IEEE-tran.cls version 1.8b and later. I wish you the best of success.

mds

August 26, 2015

### A. Subsection Heading Here

Subsection text here.

1) *Subsubsection Heading Here*: Subsubsection text here.

## II. INTRODUCTION

## III. RELATED WORK

## IV. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

### A. Research Questions

*RQ1*: How effective are review meetings in regards to improving document or code quality?

*RQ2*: Are code review meetings an efficient way of increasing document or code quality?

### B. Hypothesis

H1: Review meetings are effective at improving document or code quality.

H10: Review meetings are not effective at improving document or code quality.

H2: Review meetings are an efficient way of increasing document or code quality.

H20: Review meetings are not an efficient way of increasing document or code quality.

### C. Design

Quantitative and qualitative analysis.? One factor 2 treatment.

For our quantitative analysis we used a one factor two treatment design. The first treatment is the control treatment of doing no review meetings, while the second treatment is the execution of a review meeting. Since doing no review does not influence the subjects, each group was assigned to both treatments.

### D. Objects

The idea of our experiment was that we analyse the review report that result out of the review meetings and compare them to the merged lists of findings from each individual reviewer.

Subjects	No Review Meeting	Review Meeting
”SoPra” Group 1	x	x
”SoPra” Group 2	x	x
...	x	x

TABLE I

THE ONE FACTOR TWO TREATMENT DESIGN USED FOR OUR EXPERIMENT.

1) *Review Meetings*: The review meetings are conducted by students of the University of Stuttgart within the scope of the ”Software Praktikum”. Each review group consists of five people, being three reviewers, one moderator and one scribe, who is also representing the authors. Before the review meeting itself, all reviewers have to inspect the document and create a list of findings using a review tool [?] tool. The reviews are expected to have a duration of TODO:90 minutes. During the reviews, the scribe also uses a review meeting tool to gather the findings and in the end creates a final review report.

2) *Review Tools*: We looked into the following review tools: *RevAger*: *Collaborator* TODO: Find more review tools, explain them, decide for RevAger (and find a reason).

### E. Data collection Procedure

The data for the control treatment is gathered by taking the findings lists of each reviewer in a review group and merging these lists together, eliminating duplicates. On the other hand, the data for the review treatment equals the findings list that results out of the review. Additionally, the RevAger tool automatically measures the elapsed time. The tool also saves the participants and their respective roles.

The structure of a finding consists of a description, an aspect (what reviewers should have a special focus on, e.g. completeness), a reference (where to find it in the document) and an importance rating.

### F. Analysis Procedure

For the analysis of the findings, we decided to evaluate them manually, due to the fact that there is no objective way of rating the quality of a finding.

In order to rate the findings, we constructed the following formula/method: The weighting of the findings are worth 1 for good, 2 for besides error, 3 for main error and 5 for crucial error. (TODO: TABELLE?). If a rating is incorrect, we will instead assign the value for the correct weighting and decrease it by 1. If a finding itself is incorrect (e.g. claims to have found

a mistake, where there is none), the finding will receive a rating of -1.

#### *G. Validity Procedure*

### V. ANALYSIS

#### VI. THREATS TO VALIDITY

##### *A. Conclusion Validity*

The threat level to conclusion validity of our experiment is rather high. This is due to the fact that some of our measurements could not be automatically calculated but instead had to be determined manually by the conductors. In order to reduce this threat, we decided to let three conductors determine the values independently and finally took the median as our final result.

Code quality definition?

##### *B. Internal Validity*

Due to the fact that the participants had to be informed about the experiment to give us their consent, they knew that some part of their work will be evaluated and thus might have been influenced in their behavior by the experiment, e.g. resulting in them making more efforts than they would have done otherwise.

##### *C. Construct Validity*

The construct validity between the treatment and the cause construct is a given, since they are identical, being the review meeting.

As for the validity between the outcome and the construct of the effect, ?

##### *D. External Validity*

Our study also contains external threats to validity. Since every group of students in the "SoPra" has to solve the exact same task, all produces code or specifications should ideally be semantically equal and thus our results might not necessarily be generalizable to all kind of software systems.

Another external factor that threatens validity are the participants of the study. These are limited to students of the university Stuttgart and thus represent only a minor part of software engineers.

Lastly, the size of the "SoPra" is very small, since it is only a six month project for three developers and thus is far off from realistic industrial projects.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank...

### REFERENCES

- [1] H. Kopka and P. W. Daly, *A Guide to L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X*, 3rd ed. Harlow, England: Addison-Wesley, 1999.