GENERAL COMMENTS

Thesis has a clear objective and contributions are highlighted since the introduction chapter.

I liked very much the research methodology. It is similar to the one I’m using with my students (running a sequence of studies, collecting data, gathering evidences, testing hypotheses and formulating new ones).

Have good publications for the first two studies.

I was at the proposal defense (first two studies), so my comments will be more focused in the third study.

MAIN QUESTIONS

* Methodology that could be used to analyze other repositories?
* How automated can be this analysis? Can tools be developed to support development teams? Statistical process control?
* Is this only a problem for large scale projects? Or open source projects?
* Justification of RQ are in the middle of the text, after their introduction in the beginning of each chapter. I would put the justification at the beginning, but it is up to you.

STUDY 1: How representatively are Firefox, ArgoUML and Eclipse projects? This should be discussed since the introduction. How the percentages of delivery delay are expected to occur in other projects? And the other findings? Is there a way to compare or group open source projects?

STUDY 2: It is confusing some times in the text about the comparison between rapid and traditional releases, since the delay metric is based on number of releases, not number of days. Is it a fair comparison, etc.?

STUDY 3:

* Who is the population of your survey? People able to answer your questions? Only developers from ArgoUML, Firefox and Eclipse projects?
* Did you run a pilot (dry run) of your survey?
* Why not to do some interviews first, then the questionnaire? What were the criteria for selecting the interviewees?
* Table 18, page 105, highlights severity, but previous study not?
* How well the qualitative study supports your quantitative study? Which parts are uncovered?
* Agreement/concordance test (kendall)?
* What are the main hypotheses or research questions that arised for new studies?

OTHER COMMENTS

STUDY 3:

* Gift cards of what? Chance of answering almost randomly just to get the gift card?
* In section 5.2.3, research approach, you select some variables to evaluate correlation, etc. Could you better explain the reasons in the text? These are the variables with significant correlations or you only analyzed those? Which other variable could be analyzed and was discarded?
* Motivations of research question in Section 5.3, not when they are initially presented. This is weird for me.
* Break of table 19 makes difficult understanding
* Can table 18 shows if the means are statistically different (info of table 19)?