



Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>

REFSQ 2018 notification for paper 22

3 messages

REFSQ 2018 <refsq2018@easychair.org>

Fri, Dec 8, 2017 at 11:30 AM

To: Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pimentel@acad.pucrs.br>

Dear Gabriel,

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 your 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 this 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? And were both researchers involved in this? This needs clarification.

5. Results.

5.1. In Table 1, we read the column "Interpretation".

- Whose interpretation is 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 out 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 to evaluate user stories.

Section 2: I am confused you said that BABOK is not used, but then 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 attributes 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 "samente" 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.

1/8/2018

Gmail - REFSQ 2018 notification for paper 22

Nao sei se recebeste esse email, entao dando forward :)

Conhece o 'Joao Araujo' <p191@fct.unl.pt> ?

[Quoted text hidden]

Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pa.oliveira@gmail.com>

Thu, Jan 4, 2018 at 7:44 PM

To: Joao Araujo <p191@fct.unl.pt>

FYI

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **REFSQ 2018** <refsq2018@easychair.org>

Date: Fri, Dec 8, 2017 at 11:30 AM

Subject: REFSQ 2018 notification for paper 22

To: Gabriel Oliveira <gabriel.pimentel@acad.pucrs.br>

[Quoted text hidden]