Assessing GDPR coverage is not an easy question. In order to answer this question we refer to the key concepts/aspects drawn from the qualitative assessment, where we evaluated questionnaires from reliable sources.

The table below shows the works (in rows) and the criteria (in columns). If a job covers a criterion, the cell will contain the sign ✓ if on the opposite the criterion is not covered the cell will contain the sign ✗.
We add to these two values, the value "unclear" which means that the formal representation of the RGPD proposed by the authors does not make it clear whether the criterion is covered or not.

If the concept appears explicitly in the model -> Ok
If the authors talk about it in the text and the criterion does not appear explicitly in the model, then there are two cases:
   - If they explain how the model meets the criteria -> OK
   else -> unclear

Note: This table shows an overview of the criteria covered by each work. This means that we are not interested in the level of detail of each criterion (e.g., breaches include notifying the supervisory authority,
the data subject, documenting all necessary information and maintaining a breach register). By adopting this approach, we are able to draw conclusions given that the work, except one, does not cover all aspects of the GDPR.

Privacy-based works	Lawfulness				User rights									Accountability and Governance								Security & Breach		Transfer outside the EU.
	consent	consent and decisions for minors	legal basis	record of processing activities	To be informed	withdrawal of consent	access	portability	erasure	rectification	restriction	objection	automated decision making and profiling	Purpose	accuracy	minimization	data retention	third parties	DPO	DPIA	representative	Security	Breach.	Transfer outside the EU.
Diamantopoulou et al. [27]	✓	✗	✗	unclear	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	unclear	unclear	✗	✗	unclear	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Tom et al. [55]	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓						✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	unclear	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗
Burneister et al. [24]	✗	✗	✗	unclear	the authors do not mention the exercise of rights by the persons concerned									✓	unclear	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗
Matulevičius et al. [38]	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kirrane et al. [35]	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	unclear	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
Krasnashchok et al. [37]	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗
Torre et al. [56]	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	unclear	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓
Torre et al. [57]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ribalta et al. [41]	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
Geko et al. [29]	Only high level ontology is available, *note that: several concepts have not been addressed either, including DPIA, DPO, representative*																							
Mougiakou et al. [40]	✓	✗	unclear *figures illegible*	unclear *figures illegible*	✓	unclear *figures illegible*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pandit et al. [47]	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Palmirani et al [44]	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗
Sangaroonsilp et al. [52]	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Amaral et al [19]	?	✗	✗	✗	unclear (authors cite rights in general)				✓	unclear (authors cite rights in general)				✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
Amaral et al [17]	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓		
Bartolini et al. [21]	The complete list is not available																							
Caramujo et al. [25]	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	unclear	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗			unclear
PRIAM	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓