M Gmail

<div align="right">Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com></div>

Shepherding - Re: REFSQ 2018 notification for paper 22

17 messages

Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>   Tue, Dec 19, 2017 at 7:50 PM
To: p191@fct.unl.pt, Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>

Dear João,

Hope this message finds you well.
Apologies for not writing before. Gabriel has just moved to Europe and I am here in my last day of grading before the school year ends.

We wonder how you would like to proceed.
Gabriel and I had already meet to discuss the reviewers' comments and had prepared a new version to attend most of the comments.

We could send you this version along with the list of actions taken to address each of the comments. Or we could schedule a Skype call to discuss it.

I will be traveling tomorrow but we could chat on Thus or Fri any time.

Let us know and we will proceed accordingly.

Best, Sabrina

On Fri, Dec 8, 2017 at 8:30 AM, REFSQ 2018 <refsq2018@easychair.org> wrote:
Dear Sabrina,

Thank you for your submission to REFSQ 2018. We are happy to report that your paper

   22: On the understanding of BDD Scenarios' Quality: Preliminary Practitioners' Opinion

has been CONDITIONALLY accepted (with shepherding) for inclusion in the program of the REFSQ 2018 research track. Congratulations!

REVIEW PROCESS
We have received 62 submissions, which went through a thorough review process. At the meeting on December 1 in Utrecht, the program committee accepted 23 papers in the different submissions categories. Each REFSQ 2018 submission received at least three independent reviews, which were discussed first on-line by members of the program committee, and then face-to-face at the committee's meeting.

CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE
While the Program Committee was interested in your work, they required that certain revisions to your paper be made, explicated in one of the enclosed reviews. Hence, the condition is to have your paper shepherded to produce the final version.

PROCEDURE
Please contact your shepherd as soon as possible to discuss the required changes. Your assigned shepherd is 'Joao Araujo' <p191@fct.unl.pt>.

In revising your paper, please pay attention to the reviewers' comments and the guidance of your assigned shepherd. You get an extra page (+1) to address the reviewers' comments. Failure to do so will result in the automatic rejection of your paper. The procedure is as follows:

1.Send you revised paper to the gatekeeper/shepherd by 2018 January, 5.
2.You will get feedback from the gatekeeper/shepherd by 2018 January, 15.

Note that, before we can include your paper in REFSQ 2018, we will require an email confirmation from your shepherd that your paper has been appropriately revised. If your paper is finally accepted, note that January 26, 2018 is the submission deadline for your final camera-ready paper. No further extensions will be given. We will soon contact you with further instructions for preparing your camera-ready version. You will need this information in the case of final acceptance.

CONFIRMATION by December 12
We would like you to confirm by December 12, 2017 that: (1) you are willing to make the required changes, (2) you are willing to submit a camera-ready paper following the instructions of the category that your paper is accepted in, and (3) at least one of the authors will register for the conference by January 26, 2018 and will present the paper at the conference. Please confirm by replying to refsq2018@easychair.org

REFSQ 2018 takes place in Utrecht, The Netherlands on March 19 to March 22, 2018. For details on the conference and the venue, see the conference website at:

   http://refsq.org/

The website also contains information about upcoming submission deadlines for the 5 REFSQ workshops, the Doctoral Symposium, and the Posters and Tools track. We encourage you and your colleagues to submit!

We look forward to seeing the final version of your paper,

All the best,

Erik Kamsties and Jennifer Horkoff
REFSQ 2018 Program Committee Chairs

----------------------- REVIEW 1 ---------------------
PAPER: 22
TITLE: On the understanding of BDD Scenarios' Quality: Preliminary Practitioners' Opinion
AUTHORS: Gabriel Oliveira and Sabrina Marczak

Overall evaluation: 1 (lean towards accept)

----------- Overall evaluation -----------
This paper is a research preview on the identification of quality characteristics for Behavior-Driven Development Scenarios (this is documentation delivered in an agile project). The paper presents a qualitative empirical design, its execution and first results.
The authors assembled their initial list of the quality attributes from (a) literature sources, and (b) a study with students. This all has already been published elsewhere. In the present paper, the authors evaluate the list of attributes with practitioners. The study reported here, is part of a larger evaluation initiative (termed by the authors as "long-term research") in which the authors plan to interview many practitioners, presumably from different organizations. However, within the scope of the current paper, a qualitative interview study with 8 practitioners is reported.

The paper reads well. The results are interesting and could generate discussion. In particular, I like the contrast between "bad practice" and "good practice".
Also, there are implications for practitioners, and researchers (however those are only implicitly stated in the paper).

There are quite a few unclear points, which need to be addressed in order to bring the paper to the next quality level.

1.I feel the authors need to describe explicitly the scope of this paper and its position in the "long-term research".
It took me multiple attempts to read the respective paragraphs and understand the scope. A picture could help to show the role of the literature sources and the study with students, in the generation of the list of quality attributes.

2. If the authors do not specify Research Questions, then they should formulate very clearly their research goal. We read about the goal of the "long-term research". But is then the goal of this preliminary interview study the same as the one of the "long-term research'? This is unclear in the current version. Please state explicitly.

3.The literature sources used to come up with the quality attribute list are BABOK and INVEST. Why these two only? Why not the general list of quality attributes characterizing requirements in general - described in any RE textbook (e.g. the book of S. Lauesen?) I'm OK if you use 2 sources only, but there is a need to justify tis choice.

4. Research Design:

4.1. The description of the data collection and analysis is spread over 2 sections (Section 2, with a heading "Research Method", and Section 3 "Results"). These text fragments are a bit chaotic. I suggest you merge the text from the respective fragments in those two sections and rewrite the Research Method section, in order to make sure the paragraphs build upon each other. Use subheadings if necessary to help readers understand the scope, and then the data collection and data analysis strategies for this specific study.

4.2. The paper reports findings based on 8 interviewed practitioners. Although descriptive information is presented about the participants, the description is not informative and readers can not clearly see and evaluate for themselves the weight of empirical evidence collected. For example, we read that the experience of the participants ranged from 1 to 10 years. I think, it would be much more informative to contextualize this a bit more and write a statement like this one: "X practitioners had Y years of experience in using BDD, while Z people had 1-2 years". So, were most of your practitioners senior professionals?

4.3.Please address in similar fashion, the other descriptive aspects of the practitioners (e.g. the projects they worked on, the organizations and so on).

4.4. Data Analysis: how did you process the data? What techniques were used? Ad were both researchers involved in this? This needs clarification.

5. Results.
5.1. In Table 1, we read the column "Interpretation".
- Whose interpretation s this?
- The one of the practitioners?
- Or the researchers' interpretation of the practitioners' perceptions?

5.2. In the Results section, we too often read "Some interviewees had identified…", "majority identified…" and so on. This reduces clarity. Better to be explicit on the numbers of the interviewees: how many had identified the missing characteristics in your list? 6 out of 8? Or 3 our of 8 practitioners? This has an effect over the weight of evidence. Another example is where we read : "…most of the interviewees judged that having a list of attributes would be helpful". How many are these interviewees?

6. The conclusion is essentially about validity threats. I suggest you add a methodological reference to back up the claims you do here. E.g. R. Yin, Case Study Research, Sage, 2008. Of course, there are more validity concerns than those described. But I understand that 6 pages may not be enough to address the other possible threats.

----------------------- REVIEW 2 ---------------------
PAPER: 22
TITLE: On the understanding of BDD Scenarios' Quality: Preliminary Practitioners' Opinion
AUTHORS: Gabriel Oliveira and Sabrina Marczak

Overall evaluation: -1 (lean towards reject)

----------- Overall evaluation -----------
This paper describes an initial experiment to validate a list of quality attributes with students, to identify their interpretation of these attributes to later define general recommendations to write BDD scenarios. Results from interviews revealed interpretations for a list of quality attributes.

In the introduction, page 2, not clear about the decision of executing the empirical study with graduate students. It seems to me that is just more of

convenient or maybe work as a pilot. I don't believe that understanding how novice evaluators use known quality attributes brings relevant conclusions. What matters is how practitioners use the quality attributes.

Page 2, 3rd paragraph. when you say about BABOK "Those attributes are not used on user stories, tough.", you may want to say that not all of those attributes are adequate o evaluate user stories.

Section 2: I am confused yous aid that BABOK is not used, but them you will use it combined with INVEST...
Also you should define "concise, estimable, feasible, negotiable, prioritized, small, testable, understandable, unambiguous, and valuable". Moreover, I don't think it is a good idea to check how they interpret each attribute (specially for novices). So a definition should have been provided with examples before going ahead with the experiment.
Additionally, when you say "we judged it necessary to illustrate practitioners opinions with real BDD scenarios". Please provide examples in the text. The links provided is not a direct link to those examples.

Section 3: the problems with the interpretation is lack of knowledge of novices, a definition should have been provided.

Validity threats should have come in Section 3, not in the conclusions

Minors:
- page 1: an user story card --> a user story card
- page 1: Bjarnason et. al --> Bjarnason et al.
- page 2, 3rd parag: there is a typo --> instead of tough, should be though.

---------------------- REVIEW 3 --------------------
PAPER: 22
TITLE: On the understanding of BDD Scenarios' Quality: Preliminary Practitioners' Opinion
AUTHORS: Gabriel Oliveira and Sabrina Marczak

Overall evaluation: 0 (neutral)

----------- Overall evaluation -----------
This paper describes a plan for an empirical study to determine quality
attributes for BDD scenario specifications and to determine the effect
of poorly written BDD scenario specifications on the downstream development.

Their plan is to gather a list of what are believed to be attibutes of
quality BDD scenario specifications and to validate with practitioners the
correctness and completeness of the list. They have already a list and have
done some interviews with practitioners about the current list. The plan is
good and there is even a brief discussion of threats.

However, the results are VERY preliminary. I am not even certain that this
paper is ready for a research preview.

I suppose that it is useful to stake the claim to the research question and
invite others to participate.

Linguistic Issues:

no need to quote any words, such as "good" and "bad", which are NEITHER
cited quotations NOR words used as themselves, such as "where ``Given"
steps"

"methodology" -> "method", also in plural, globally

opening quote marks are input as "``" in LaTeX

"can only rely on a few guidelines"
->
"can rely on only a few guidelines"
For placement of "only" and "also", despite what you learned in ESL or
living in Canada, the placement of "somente" and "tambem" in Portuguese is
correct. Fix globally

"like" -> "such as"

"reunions" -> "meetings"

---------------------- REVIEW 4 --------------------
PAPER: 22
TITLE: On the understanding of BDD Scenarios' Quality: Preliminary Practitioners' Opinion
AUTHORS: Gabriel Oliveira and Sabrina Marczak

Overall evaluation: 0 (neutral)

----------- Overall evaluation -----------
Meta-review:

This paper describes an initial experiment to validate a list of quality attributes with students, to identify their interpretation of these attributes to later define general recommendations to write BDD scenarios. The reviewers agreed that the paper addresses an interesting, topic, where you start by validating a set of attributes relevant to the specification of BDD scenarios. However, several points must be improved:

•The authors need to describe explicitly the scope of this paper and its position in the "long-term research".
• Not clear about the decision of executing the empirical study with graduate students. You should say that the experiment described is a pilot (understanding how novices use quality attributes is not relevant).
• Justify the use of BABOK and INVEST, and not others.
• Section 2: define "concise, estimable, …".
• Explain why a definition has not been provided with examples before going ahead with the experiment with novices.
• The description of the participants is not informative and readers can not see the weight of empirical evidence collected.
• Describe how the Data Analysis was performed (techniques used, data processing).
•Concerning the results, be explicit/precise on the numbers of the interviewees.

--
Sabrina Marczak, PhD
Assistant Professor, School of Computer Science
PUCRS University
Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil
sabrina.marczak@pucrs.br
http://lattes.cnpq.br/9458496222461501
sabrinamarczak.wordpress.com/

Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>   Tue, Dec 19, 2017 at 11:14 PM
To: Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>
Cc: Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>

Olá Sabrina,

eu me voluntariei para ser shepherd da nova versão.
O processo vai ser simples, para já envie a nova versao e uma carta indicando como
endereçou os comentários dos revisores.
podemos marcar sim um Skype, na 6a é melhor.

Abraços

João
[Quoted text hidden]

Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>   Thu, Dec 21, 2017 at 11:20 PM
To: Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>
Cc: Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>

Boa noite João,

Obrigado por se voluntariar como shepherd da nova versão - segue essa em anexo para revisão. No final do email, listamos os comentários e as modificações endereçadas por essa nova versão.

Sobre o skype de sexta-feira (22/12), podemos deixar marcado para as 13h do Brasil (15h em Lisboa)?

Comentários e modificações:

1. The authors need to describe explicitly the scope of this paper and its position in the "long-term research" - endereçado com o acréscimo da figura 1, que ilustra todo o ciclo de pesquisa, além de termos adicionado no texto detalhes do nosso objetivo a longo prazo e da demarcação do escopo do paper como sendo uma versão preliminar dos resultados;

2. Not clear about the decision of executing the empirical study with graduate students. You should say that the experiment described is a pilot (understanding how novices use quality attributes is not relevant) - endereçado ao chamar o estudo com alunos de um "pilot study" e de ressaltar que resultados do mesmo nos levaram a estratégia do uso de exemplos de cenarios BDD para auxiliar nas entrevistas com especialistas;

3. Justify the use of BABOK and INVEST, and not others - endereçado pela figura 1, explicando no texto como foram identificados essas características através de uma revisão da literatura;

4. The description of the participants is not informative and readers can not see the weight of empirical evidence collected - endereçado ao explicitar numa sub-seção o perfil dos participantes. Se achares necessário, podemos expor também o gênero dos participantes, assim como o tipo de empresa em que atuam - esses são os dados demográficos adicionais que coletamos;

5. Describe how the Data Analysis was performed (techniques used, data processing) - endereçado ao reescrever o parágrafo indicando que usamos a fase de open coding de grounded theory;

6. Concerning the results, be explicit/precise on the numbers of the interviewees - adicionamos os participantes em cada trecho ao declarar uma ou outra opinião;

Abraços,

--

Gabriel P.A. de Oliveira

[Quoted text hidden]

📄 **REFSQ2018_for_shepherding.pdf**
115K

Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>   Tue, Jan 2, 2018 at 5:46 PM
To: Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>
Cc: Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>

Dear João,

Greetings and wishes of a happy 2018!

We wonder if you are back from the holidays and could provide us with your feedback on the paper.
It would be important to us to hear from you at your earliest convenience so we still have time to rework any excerpt you think is still not fit for publication.

Let us know if you still think a Skype call is necessary so we can quickly schedule one.

Best, Sabrina

[Quoted text hidden]

Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>   Tue, Jan 2, 2018 at 6:27 PM
To: Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>
Cc: Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>

Ola Sabrina e GAbriel,

Yes getting back today from the vacations.
I've started checking the modifications and will send comments tomorrow morning, if not before.^
Depending on the state of the new version it may be necessary a skype call, for clarification purposes. I let you know in the morning

Happy New Year

Joao
[Quoted text hidden]

Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>   Tue, Jan 2, 2018 at 6:30 PM
To: Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>
Cc: Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>

Olá João!

Glad to hear from you!
We were just back today too!

We will be on stand by then!

Thank you for the effort just right after the holidays!

Warm welcoming wishes, Sabrina
[Quoted text hidden]

Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>   Wed, Jan 3, 2018 at 12:38 PM
To: Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>
Cc: Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>

Olá

Muuuuito melhor agora.
vejam as poucas anotações em attach.
quanto ao ponto 4, sim, por também o gênero dos participantes, assim como o tipo de empresa em que atuam.
acho q nao precisa de skype, a nao ser algo que nao entenderam fo file in attach.

abr

J.

[Quoted text hidden]

📄 **REFSQ2018_for_shepherding.pdf**
146K

Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>   Wed, Jan 3, 2018 at 12:55 PM
To: Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>
Cc: Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>

Oi João,

Que bela notícia!
Que bom que você achou que agora estava adequado.

Gabriel e eu já vamos trabalhar hoje mesmo nisto, amanhã te enviamos a versão final o mais cedo possível para poderes dar uma última olhada.

Obrigada novamente pelo tempo disponibilizado e pelo interesse em nos auxiliar!

Grande abraço, Sabrina

[Quoted text hidden]

Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>   Wed, Jan 3, 2018 at 1:13 PM
To: Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>
Cc: Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>

ok, combinado
~
j.
[Quoted text hidden]

Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>   Thu, Jan 4, 2018 at 2:47 PM
To: Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>
Cc: Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>

Olá João,

Segue a versão com as alterações e recomendações que fizestes.
Fizemos também uma última revisão de conteúdo para consistência e da gramática.
Achamos algumas pequenas coisas aqui e ali (uma sigla não usada, alguns apóstrofes faltando) mas nada substancial que alterasse conteúdo.
Adicionamos também o acknowledgments para reconhecer a bolsa de pesquisa do Gabriel.

Você sabe dizer se precisamos preparar uma carta formal para indicar como tratamos o feedback dos revisores, a ser submetida aos PC chairs?
Pelo e-mail de notificação entendemos que os PC Chairs vão conversar com você, sem precisarmos a carta.
Mas só nos avisar que preparamos ela se preciso.

Uma última pergunta:
Considerando que o paper está okay e que vai ser aceito, você acha que seria adequado solicitar aos PC chairs que nos enviassem uma notificação de aceite final até amanhã, antecipando um pouco o processo?
Precisamos anexar uma notificação formal para o currículo do Gabriel, para fazer parte da defesa de mestrado dele, e casualmente tem uma reunião do comitê que aprova as Master oral examinations amanhã (6a-feira) 14h do Brasil (17h horário da Europa). Seria conveniente não termos que esperar outro mês para solicitar a defesa dele.

Se você achar que for adequado, agradecemos a consideração.

Mais uma vez, muito obrigada pela ajuda!
Abraço, Sabrina

[Quoted text hidden]

📄 **REFSQ2018_Gabriel_Shepherding_vRevisada.pdf**
116K

Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>   Thu, Jan 4, 2018 at 3:09 PM
To: Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>
Cc: Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>

Ola Sabrina,

<looks good, só uma coisinha, na pagina 2
vc diz "We preferred to clarify the INVEST attributes", mas na seção 2

vc diz "o discover the list of quality attributes used on agile requirements, which brought us the following attributes from the BABOK [7] and INVEST [1]:"

please corrigir a inconsistencia. de resto ta OK.
vou informar a Jennifer que ta OK e se precisa enviar carta´
´
beijinhos

J.

[Quoted text hidden]

Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>   Thu, Jan 4, 2018 at 3:39 PM
To: Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>
Cc: Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>

Jennifer's reply:

"Hi Joao,

If you're ok with the final version, that's all we need. She should upload the final version to easychair, just for our records.

We'll inform them of acceptance after the deadline for shepherds. The CR is due for them the same time as everyone else.

Thanks,

Jennifer"

[Quoted text hidden]

Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>   Thu, Jan 4, 2018 at 3:46 PM
To: Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>
Cc: Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>

Thanks a bunch João!

Gabriel vai alterar sua última sugestão e já submeter no EasyChair mais tarde hoje.

Sabrina
[Quoted text hidden]

Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>   Thu, Jan 4, 2018 at 6:03 PM
To: Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>
Cc: Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>

Joao,

Segue anexo a ultima versao, com o ajuste que comentaste e ja submetida no EasyChair
[Quoted text hidden]

📄 **REFSQ2018_Gabriel_Shepherding_Final.pdf**
116K

Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>   Thu, Jan 4, 2018 at 7:20 PM
To: Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>
Cc: Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>

Gabriel,

reparei num problema, o artigo está com 7 paginas, nao eram 6.?
favor confirrnar com jenniffer, e se for o caso pedir uma pag extra?
por favor veja isso rapidamente

J

[Quoted text hidden]

Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>   Thu, Jan 4, 2018 at 7:45 PM
To: Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>
Cc: Sabrina Marczak <marczak.sabrina@gmail.com>

Joao

Pelo email de notificacao do paper que recebemos, constava a permissao para usar a pagina extra.

Te encaminhei o email, com titulo "REFSQ 2018 notification for paper 22", para confirmar.

[Quoted text hidden]

Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Thu, Jan 4, 2018 at 7:53 PM
To: Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>

GREAT , CLARIFIED :-)

J.
[Quoted text hidden]