Data extraction

| | TITLE | AUTHORS | YEAR | APPROACH | ARTIFACT | METHOD | DESCRIPTION | PROCESS TOOL | NFR | SYSTEM TYPE | FOCUS | CHALLENGES |
|---|---|--|------|--|----------|---------------------------|--|--------------|--|-------------------|--|---|
| | A Model-Driven Approach to Requirements Engineering in Ubiquitous Systems | Ruiz-Lopez, Tomas and Rodriguez-Dominguez, Carlos and Noguera, Manueland Jose Rodriguez, Maria | 2012 | MD- UBI | Method | REUBI | REUBI is a method for specifying the system's requirements under development, paying particular attention to the treatment of Non-Functional Requirements, taking into account the specific characteristics of the Ubiquitous Computing and Ambient Intelligence fields. | Yes No | General | Ubiquitous System | System in development | Systematic evaluation |
| | Applying model-driven engineering to a method for systematic treatment of NFRs in Aml systems | Ruiz-Lopez, Tomas and Rodriguez-Dominguez, Carlos and Noguera, Manueland Jose Rodriguez, Maria and Benghazi, Kawtar and Luis Garrido, Jose | 2013 | MD- UBI | Process | None | The authors propose a model-driven approach for the development of high-quality Ubiquitous Systems. This approach is designed as a complete development methodology, covering the entire software development life cycle. In the end, the approach provides four deliverables: The Requirements Analysis, an application design document, the system implementation, and the verification and validation report. | Yes No | General | Ubiquitous System | System in development anf Final product | Context-awareness, adaptivity, heterogeneity |
| | Evaluating energy efficiency of Internet of Things software architecture based on reusable software components | Kim, Doohwan and Choi, Jae-Young and Hong, Jang-Eui | 2017 | Architecture-based energy evaluation | Approach | None | This paper proposes an architecture for IoT solution development focusing on better energy consumption, evaluates the architecture by software measurement, comparing it with another system that does not use it. | No No | Energy efficiency | IoT Application | System in development | Security, performance power interoperability |
| | Heuristics to Evaluate the Usability of Ubiquitous Systems | Rocha, Larissa C. and Andrade, Rossana M. C. and Sampaio, Andreia L. andLelli, Valeria | | None | Tool | None | This paper proposes usability evaluation of ubiquitous systems by heuristic inspection. Each heuristic has one or more quality characteristics for ubiquitous systems associated with it. | No HUbis | Acceptability, Adaptation, Attention, Availability, Calmness, Context-awareness, Device Capability, Ease of use, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Familiarity, Interconnectivity, Mobility, Network Capability, Predictability, Privacy, Reliability, Robustness, Safety, Scalability Security, Simplicity, Transparency, Trust, Usability, User Satisfaction, Utility, Data input, Flexibility, Information display, Positioning of components | Ubiquitous System | System implemented | Context-awareness, transparency, attention, calmness, mobility |
| | Infrastructure for ubiquitous computing: Improving quality with modularisation | Munnelly, J. and Clarke, S. | 2008 | None | Method | GQM | The authors identify the major challenges for improving ubiquitous systems through modularization and use GQM (Goal Question Metric) to guide the evaluation of systems post improvement process. | No No | Comprehensibility, Maneageability, Maintenability, Reusability, Scalability, Testability, and Usability | Ubiquitous System | System in development | Connectivity, adaptivity |
| | Quantification of the quality characteristics for the calculation of software reliability | Jazdi, N. and Oppenlaender, N. and Weyrich, M. | 2016 | Determination of the software reliability approach | Approach | None | The authors propose a method that uses fuzzy logic and neural networks to estimate software reliability. | No None | Reliability | IoT Application | System in development | Lack of methods to evalue reliability |
| | REUBI: A Requirements Engineering method for ubiquitous systems | Ruiz-López, T. and Noguera, M. and Rodríguez, M.J. and Garrido, J.L. and Chung, L. | 2013 | None | Method | REUBI | REUBI is a method for specifying the system's requirements under development, paying particular attention to the treatment of Non-Functional Requirements, taking into account the specifics characteristics of the Ubiquito | No None | General | Ubiquitous System | System in development | Context-awareness, dynamicity, heterogeneity, adaptivity, personalization |
| | | Badii, C. and Belay, E.G. and Bellini, P. and Cenni, D. and Marazzini, M. and Mesiti, M. and Nesi, P. and Pantaleo, G. and Paolucci, M. and Valtolina, S. and Soderi, M. and Zaza, I. and Hachem, F. | 2018 | Performance evaluation | Approach | No | The authors propose a platform for developing smart city applications, focusing on practicality and communication performance, and scalability. To prove the platform's applicability, the authors conduct a performance evaluation on applications developed from the platform. | No None | Performance and Scalability | IoT Application | System in development | Context-awareness |
| | Structural and behavioral reference model for IoT-based elderly healthcare systems in smart home | Ghasemi, Farideh and Rezaee, Ali and Rahmani, Amir Masoud | 2019 | ATAM scenario-based approach | Approach | No | The authors proposed an architecture evaluation based on the Architecture Tradeoff Analysis Method (ATAM) scenario-based approach. ATAM is a method for analysis and evaluation of software systems architecture. | No None | Availability , Performance, Modifiability. Interoperability, Security and Usability. | IoT Application | System in development | Availability, performance, security, interoperability, modifiability |
|) | Using Reference Architectures for Design and Evaluation of Web of Things Systems: A Case of Smart Homes Domain | Chauhan, M.A. and Babar, M.A. | 2017 | Reference Architectures for Design and Evaluation of Web of Things Systems | Approach | No | They propose a process for defining the architecture for IoT subsystems. This process contains an evaluation step, where previously defined quality attributes are evaluated using questionnaires. As a result of the evaluation, a report shows commonly unmet quality attributes, risky design decisions, sensitivity and benchmarks, and suggestions for improvement in IoT subsystem architectures. | No None | Security, Availability, Scalability, Elasticity, Reliability, Multi-tenancy and, Interoperability | IoT Application | System in development | Security, availability, scalability, reliability, interoperability |
| | Comparing Heuristic Evaluation and MALTU Model in Interaction Evaluation of Ubiquitous Systems | José Cezar de Souza Filho, Marcos Randel Freitas Brito, Andréia Libório Sampaio | 2020 | Heuristic evaluation and MALTU model | Approach | No | It proposes usability evaluation of ubiquitous systems through heuristic inspection. Each heuristic has one or more quality characteristics for ubiquitous systems associated with it. In this study, a comparison is mode between HUBIS and MALTU, a model for interaction evaluation in ubiquitous systems based on textual analysis, using texts about the system posted by users on social networks. | No HUbis | Acceptability, Adaptation, Attention, Availability, Calmness, Context-awareness, Device Capability, Ease of use, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Familiarity, Interconnectivity, Mobility, Network Capability, Predictability, Privacy, Reliability, Robustness, Safety, Scalability Security, Simplicity, Transparency, Trust, Usability User Satisfaction, Utility, Adaptability, Data input, Flexibility, Information display, Positioning of components | Ubiquitous System | System implemented | Transparency, attention, calmness, mobility, contex awareness |
| 2 | RC-ASEF: An Open-Source Tool-Supported Requirements Elicitation Framework for Context-Aware Systems Development | Unai Alegre-Ibarra, Juan Carlos Augusto, Carl Evans | 2018 | No | Tool | Reubi and NFF Framewor | The authors use the NFR Framework and REUBI for the requirements analysis of context-aware applications. | No RC-ASEF | General | Ubiquitous System | System in development | Context-awareness |

Approaches, methods, process and tools

| ID | APPROACH | METHOD | PROCESS | TOOL |
|-----|--|-------------------------|---------|---------|
| S1 | - | REUBI | MD- UBI | - |
| S2 | - | - | MD- UBI | - |
| S3 | Architecture-based energy evaluation. | - | - | - |
| S4 | Heuristic evaluation | - | - | HUbis |
| S5 | - | GQM | - | - |
| S6 | Determination of the software reliability approach | - | - | - |
| S7 | - | REUBI | - | - |
| S8 | Performance evaluation | - | - | - |
| S9 | ATAM scenario-based approach | - | - | - |
| S10 | - | - | - | - |
| S11 | Heuristic evaluation and MALTU model | - | - | HUbis |
| S12 | - | Reubi and NFR Framework | - | RC-ASEF |
| | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 |

RNFs Identified

| Quality characteristics | Definition | Cited by | ISO 25000 | Carvalho (2017) |
|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Acceptability | Represents the desire to use an application and its utilization rates | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Adaptation | System ability to perceive the environment and adapt the information display accordingly. | S4, S11 | 1 | 1 |
| | The ability to keep the user's attention to her/his main activity and not on the system and the technology | | | |
| Attention | involved | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| | The service is always available, regardless of hardware, software or user | | | |
| Availability | fault, and it is often taken for granted until downtime occurs | S4, S9, S10, S11 | 1 | 1 |
| Calmness | The ability to prevent users from feeling overwhelmed by information system | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Context-awareness | The ability to perceive contextual information system and proactively adapt its functionality | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Comprehensibility | Ease with which application developers understand the software. | S5 | 0 | 0 |
| Data Input | Verify that the different ways of providing data entry to the system are pleasing to the user. | S4, S11 | 0 | 0 |
| Device Capability | Properties of the device where the application will run (e.g., screen size, color depth, battery life) | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Ease of use | The system should be easy to use by a target user group | S4, S11 | 1 | 1 |
| Effectiveness | It refers to completeness in performing tasks proactively adapt its functionality | S4, S11 | 1 | 1 |
| Efficiency | It refers to the amount of effort and resources required to reach a certain goal in the system | S4, S11 | 1 | 1 |
| Energy efficiency | P17 | S3 | 0 | 0 |
| Familiarity | User interactions with the system should improve the quality of her/his work. The user should be treated with respect. The design should be aesthetically pleasing. | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Flexibility | The application should give the users the ability to customize configurations according to their needs and experiences. | S4, S11 | 0 | 0 |
| Information display | The way the information is presented on the screen is consistent with what is expected. | S4, S11 | 0 | 0 |
| Interconnectivity | An interconnected network between devices. | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Interoperability | Degree which the system components are coordinated and compatible in relation with each other. | S9, S10 | 1 | 0 |
| | Maintainability is the ease with which software components can be changed and updated with least disruption to | | | |
| Maintenability | the software system. | S5 | 1 | 0 |
| Maneageability | Manageability is the ease with which software components can be developed in isolation and later composed. | S5 | 0 | 0 |
| Mobility | The ability to provide users with continuous access to resources and information system, regardless of its location within the limits of the systems | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Modifiability | The system's ability to withstand changes | S9 | 1 | 0 |
| Network Capability | Represents the collection of network information (e.g., signal strength, delay, jitter) | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Performance | Refers to this fact that how long it takes to respond to an event. | S8, S9 | 1 | 0 |
| Positioning of components | The elements in the interface have their positioning to please the users. | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Predictability | The ability, from past experiences, to predict the result of the system. | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Privacy | The ability to maintain information and data protected. | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Reliability | The ability to maintain a particular level of performance when used under specific software conditions | S4, S6, S10, S11 | 1 | 1 |
| Reusability | Reusability is the extent to which software components can be used again in other systems. | S5 | 1 | 0 |
| | Degree to which a system or component can execute correctly in the presence of invalid inputs or stressful | | | |
| Robustness | environmental conditions. | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Safety | The level of risk of harm to people, business, software, hardware, property or the environment in a specified context of use. | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Scalability | The ability to provide services to a few or a large number of users. | S4, S5, S8, S10, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Security | The protection to transport and to store information and also security controls who can access, use and modify context information. | S4, S9, S10, S11 | 1 | 1 |
| Simplicity | The user interface and the instructions should be simple. | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Testability | Testability is the ease with which checks can be carried out on various aspects of the software. | S5 | 1 | 0 |
| restability | The ability to hide the system, so users may not be aware of it. Moreover, the interaction is performed through | 33 | 1 | |
| Transparency | natural interfaces. | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Trust | It is the belief of the user that the system uses data properly and not cause any harm. Implies awareness, privacy and control. | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| Usability | The ability of the software to be understood, learned, used and attractive to the user, when used under specified conditions. | S4, S5, S9, S11 | 1 | 1 |
| | The degree of user satisfaction and how the system is attractive for the user | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| User Satisfaction | | | | |
| | The ability to provide value to user. The system provides a contribution to user that was not available before its development. | S4, S11 | 0 | 1 |
| User Satisfaction Utility Elasticity | The ability to provide value to user. The system provides a contribution to user that was not available before its development. The ability of the system to provide particular service on demand during a time interval. | S4, S11 S10 | 0 | 0 |