

✓ okay + okay, but add new row w/ additional tag
 ! change
 - delete

NB: It seems that the system showed paper summaries even to ppl who rated everything as worthwhile or better. People ~~said to do it better~~, then didn't realize that they were asked for explanations of NEG, not POS ratings.

NEG

PaperID	lfdn	reasoning	Tag
# 4	30	no one cares 'how' you developed, just that you have your specifications. there are also too many personalities that no one would use it anyway	+ toospecialized reason:notconvincing
✓ 5	35	Document driven approaches are decreasing in relevance.	reason:notimportant
✓ 16	73	I don't know what techniques will be used	reason:toovague
! 20	57	If an analyst can communicate well with domain experts and users, if he can analyze what he heard and organize his own thoughts logically, he can create a domain model. I am not sure I trust an analyst who needs a method to explain him how to do it...	notconvincing reason:notimportant
✓ 21	37	it is limited to a company , if it would be a survey with many companies it would have more validity	reason:toospecialized
✓ 29	11	No need in my environment.	reason:notimportant
✓ 31	7	Assumes that high-level goals and requirements are hierarchical. They are not in practice. They are many-to-many and attempts to make them hierarchical make things worse.	reason:notconvincing
✓ 40	135	Traceability is not really important or used in all the companies that I worked at. Also, using a small data set does not sound interesting.	reason:notimportant
✓ 40	135	Traceability is not really important or used in all the companies that I worked at. Also, using a small data set does not sound interesting.	reason:notinteresting
✓ 40	135	Traceability is not really important or used in all the companies that I worked at. Also, using a small data set does not sound interesting.	reason:notconvincing
✓ 55	149	I am not convinced that documenting inspections is a good way to improve defect discovering.	reason:notconvincing
✓ 56	9	Most engineers are bad writers but good readers. Most projects use specific vocabulary. Automated analysis would do more harm than good.	reason:notconvincing
✓ 57	98	There should be a wider approach to support impact analysis.	reason:toospecialized
✓ 58	74	I'm not sure how I would apply this research as I don't understand what the outcome would be.	reason:too complicated
✓ 85	21	Very special for domain and land. Genral applicability of results not sure	reason:toospecialized
✓ 87	125	It is very difficult to define a structure to describe requirements that could make possible to extract feature models. The effort to do that would be high, and practitioners would use this to break the problem in small parts, in order to understand	reason:notefficient
✓ 90	147	In my experience, to use cross-references they would not help me to identify conflicting requirements, because to the industries or customer that is not importat, they focus to get finished their project. There are too little bit places that they matter	reason:notimportant

✓	90	147	In my experience, to use cross-references they would not help me to identify conflicting requirements, because to the industries or customer that is not importat, they focus to get finished their project. There are too little bit places that they matter	reason:notconvincing
!	95	47	Not sure if we need a dedicated analyst to actually validate the output of the tool	reason:notimportant
!	108	145	impractical as old solutions may not apply or be hard to find.	reason:notconvincing
✓	127	120	It does not make sense for me.	reason:notconvincing
✓	138	6	relatively uninteresting	reason:notinteresting
✓	162	129	It looks as management problem, wrong person on wrong place and and doesn't general improve the requirement process.	reason:notconvincing
✓	163	15	Too technical, I even do not know what u are talking about. We as REs do not take to hard into consideration what technology to be used nor do we prefer certain tools. As well: we think in requirements and not in solutions	reason:toocomplicated
✓	167	84	Sorry, I don't understand well this topic... If the machine is a project, then it should have this experiment to test its efectiveness	reason:toocomplicated
✓	167	84	Sorry, I don't understand well this topic... If the machine is a project, then it should have this experiment to test its efectiveness	rejection:questionnotunderstood
✓	169	13	Didn't really understand what was going on here.	reason:toocomplicated
✓	179	51	I think it might be a waste of time and a result that is not applicable to any greater extent. But who knows?	reason:notconvincing
✓	183	146	Fluffy.	reason:toovague
✓	196	27	It's too subjective	reason:toosubjective
+	197	50	This is a very narrow topic (on its own in is worthwhile) ... however is there a special method for eliciting and modeling needed? Why not take an existing on?	+ notoriginal reason:toospecialized
✓	201	124	It's not a real lower rating. I only voted in a higher way the papers that I would read first considering to have a short time at job. I didn't rate some papers for that too but I think that all of them could be really interesting.	rejection:ratingnotnegative
✓	206	108	Requirements brainstorming sessions are not that frequent and, furthermore, I do not believe that most interesting ideas in brainstorming necessarily come from people with a knowledge of the domain. Ideas in brainstorming come from exchanging between peop	reason:notimportant
✓	213	40	I dont see a value in designing new notations with novices. Either we train them in a specific notation or we let them use their one intuitive notation and translate in a model language.	reason:notconvincing
✓	219	123	I have no interest in app store feedback. Seem a very tenious link to RE.	reason:notinteresting
✓	220	12	Too case-specific	reason:toospecialized

/	222	97	not relevant for my work	reason:notimportant
✓	224	133	It is not necessary	reason:notimportant
✓	228	114	This is not clearly understood to me	reason:toocomplicated
/	228	114	This is not clearly understood to me	reason:toovague
✓	232	140	I don't think evolution prediction could be reduced to a metric-based approach. This could be too simplistic for a complex phenomenon.	reason:notconvincing
✗	234	5	This seems restrictive. I am not interested in data supply chains.	reason:notinteresting + toospecialized
✓	240	61	I can't see the value of such a case study	reason:notconvincing
✓	241	94	Not so important to all resources.	reason:notimportant
✓	242	71	Students do not yet have the skills to contribute meaningfully.	reason:notrealistic
✓	242	90	Real scenario would provide best results and conclusions	reason:notrealistic
✓	248	54	Preferring experiment for skilled people	reason:notrealistic
✓	249	89	because sometimes is not easy understand structured requirements models. processes and images, if they are simple, are easy to understand	reason:toocomplicated
✓	253	119	Don't know what social adaptation is and how is it related to real-word software development.	reason:notrealistic
+	257	10	Detailed prioritization methods are Never Applied in practice because effort much too high. Usually it is pretty fast and easy, to decide the implementation order of the reqs. Through personal communication e.g. in a Meeting with some engineers and managers	+ notrealistic reason:notefficient
✓	258	36	Dont see the big benefit because I see the consistency less as a method topic than a resource topic. Often too less capacity is available to keep consistency.	reason:notconvincing
✗	277	45	The easiest answer is, that this doesn't affect my daily business and I'm sure that there are already approaches existing.	+ notimportant reason:notoriginal
✓	278	118	I cannot see how such a study would benefit me and the area in which I work.	reason:notconvincing
✓	279	78	Distraction from the goal	reason:notimportant
✓	283	31	I am not sure of how this can help an analyst working on a commercial application.	reason:notconvincing
✓	287	117	In my opinion, this will not work. Additionally, this leads to promises which will not be satisfied.	reason:notconvincing
✓	288	82	Sorry, I don't know...	rejection:questionnotunderstood
/	294	65	feedback loops in CR systems are already common practice	reason:notoriginal
/	299	152	.	NotAnswered
✗	301	28	i cannot imagine any sensefull use of possible results in the reality of software engineering	reason:notconvincing + notrealistic

✓	304	41	NFRs are not that important after all and current prosa-based methods are sufficient. Modeling language for NFRRs is too much!	reason:notimportant
✓	307	110	I do not understand the question. No idea/No opinion option was not available.	rejection:questionnotunderstood
✓	311	68	Not too relevant in my industry.	reason:notimportant
!	316	151	for me it's too general a piece of research with no use for me.	- reason:notconvincing <i>too vague</i> ?
✓	334	44	These studies already exist	reason:notoriginal
✓	351	86	uncertainty on uncertainty - not a good approach	reason:notconvincing
+			Worthwile to research, but the approaches might be extremely different in each company or engineering environment. If standard patterns can be identified, it could be very interesting from a Test and QM perspective,	+ unrealistic
	357	62	but not really essential to RM.	reason:notimportant
✓	358	42	Traceability is not a high-priority activity in Requirements Engineering.	reason:notimportant
!			I do not see in practice use case specifications as software artifacts to which software engineers return to perform changes, normally they are used just once as initial specifications	- unrealistic - reason:notconvincing
+			Because it is assessing the usefulness of a particular diagramming tool, and in particular with students. It would be more relevant assessing the modeling capabilities of a diagramming notation, whatsoever the tool, by practitioners with expertise on diag	+ unrealistic
✓	366	59		reason:toospecialized
✓	368	72	The subject looks obscure to me, so the benefits for performing such research	reason:notconvincing
✓	375	70	probably because of my own attitude.	reason:respondentattitude
✓	380	66	Not interesting for my working environment.	reason:notinteresting
✓	380	85	Formal specifications (that I've worked extensively with myself in an industrial context) are usually way too advanced compared to the real-world problems that most product managers struggle with	reason:notrealistic
✓	381	58	pointless. Clip on modules to a complex set of goals cannot be orchestrated to be as robust as the original goal	reason:notconvincing
✓	386	32	This seems an overkill and the expected outcome does not appear to be justifying the efforts.	reason:notefficient
✓	388	55	huge effort and need a lot of time, better approaches are available	reason:notefficient
✓	394	17	This oinly applies to a small (significant) sector of BAs - spend your efforts on helping more BAs!	reason:notefficient
✓	396	92	interesting, but sounds too theoretical for real project life	reason:notrealistic
✓	398	16	Cannot be representative because it is highly depending on experience of the reader	reason:notconvincing
✓	400	2	Processes and frameworks almost always fail because they don't take into account the context of a given adoption. This is true even for processes that have had years of exposure in the field. I don't see for research can reasonably do better.	reason:notconvincing

✓	401	75	It seems more literature on advises about how to apply RE in a particular domain.	reason:toospecialized
✓	404	100	I suspect is no different to any other process to un-earth requirements. It would not add much value.	reason:notconvincing
✓	421	20	Not relevant in practical settings	reason:notimportant
✓	421	63	Understandability of requirements is not the biggest problem in RE.	reason:notimportant
✓	428	81	Not relevant to my company.	reason:notimportant
✓	429	4	The research is too academy oriented, it mixes so many aspects, I doubt that it can lead to practical results, other than the ones that can be obtained in a controlled environment with a very reduced set of requirements.	reason:notrealistic many ↓
	6	122	If we could see how ambiguous documentation can affect a software project, perhaps software industry could be persuaded to do a better requirements documentation.	rating:negative
	18	153	because it can benefit the reusability of solutions	rating:neutral
	41	115	Quantitative analysis of usability is confusing and misleading	convincing
	44	101	not for all, some is, some not.	notconvincing
	53	93	I selected the option 'Worthwhile', so I consider it important.	rating:negative
	82	8	Form specification would solve a lot of problem, however I do not know any industry project which could specify the system with formal language. Yes we need a more dynamic way of specifying our systems	notrealistic
	89	79	As a practitioner, I prefer learning about the answers than learning about the problems we all know we have.	notinteresting
	125	141	In my experience, most modeling language research never goes beyond the PhD lab. It may be valuable eventually, but this needs application before asserting its utility.	notrealistic
	127	23	creativity ist nicht der entscheidende Punkt, eher geht es um Kenntnis der Probleme eines Anwendungsbereichs	notimportant
	127	91	i am not clear not this	questionnotunderstood
	132	88	Too many different personal opinions, different standards in different industries	notrealistic
+	143	116	To me it is unclear how the self-understanding of product managers is a beneficial input for the education of product managers. More relevant would be the problems that hinder product manager from doing their work effectively.	notconvincing, notimportant
	143	139	Better to have involving than from paper work	notconvincing
	169	26	It is not clear to me how simple data (whatever that means) can help to create requirements or just recommendations.	notconvincing
	169	80	Sounds more like a specialised piece of analytics research for which is a field in its own right. We have specialists that do this work.	toospecialized
	180	127	The product that we deliver is not a web page.	toospecialized

191	126	Usually, one mind is the head of the project. This person gives the direction, thus s/he is the only person which needs to align the different between the requirements and the customer needs.	<i>unrealistic</i>
197	43	I consider that domain professionals are better placed to recommend and oversight the rehabilitation process (human interactions still important I guess ;)	<i>unconvincing</i>
198	53	keyword AI: how can requirements for AIs be defined?	<i>unconvincing</i>
201	48	the level at which architects work and the magnitude of software system projects does not always justify the means	<i>unconvincing</i>
+ 209	46	Each project is very different and is impacted by a multitude of variables that are not consistent across all industry domains and corporation operations. This would make it very difficult to design an algorithm that can reliably predict integration bugs	<i>unconvincing, unrealistic</i>
214	132	The industry has never go too far from natural language specifications.	<i>unrealistic</i>
215	134	automatic extracted requirement needs to reviewed again by person.	<i>unefficient</i>
222	102	The prerequisites from applying the investigated method are rarely met. It is like an investigation Given the assumption that humans can fly, what would be the effect on CO_2 pollution	<i>unrealistic</i>
224	144	Because the regulations are changed	unconvincing <i>unrealistic</i>
286	128	It's a work that human beings can do without a high technology level involved.	unconvincing , <i>unefficient</i>
296	104	Advances in technology and changes in society are rapid, systems need to be able to keep up with it.	<i>uninteresting, negative</i>
305	95	The decision of which feature next is not based on uncertainty but on an economic or technical risk view as e.g. in WSJF.	<i>unconvincing</i>
330	33	It's always important to have a clear prioritization mechanism so we don't get additional conflicts and frustrations	<i>uninteresting, negative</i>
333	105	Do not understand the he problem with safety requirement.	<i>unconvincing</i>
334	34	Availability is only one of many NFRs, and I don't see why this one should receive special attention.	<i>unconvincing</i>
338	52	For us it is important to continuously check if the requirements are still up to date.	<i>uninteresting, negative</i>
366	111	Agile approach, I do not see this as applicable (at the moment) in the automotive industry	<i>too specialized, unrealistic</i>
+ 397	107	first things first. Big-bang integration are history in an agile world. Design and architecture have major impact on complexity.	<i>unimportant, inefficient, unrealistic</i>
+ 418	24	Blablabla	<i>not interesting, unimportant, too vague</i>
+ 420	22	it's important if one is searching for a good tool to do RE. I did this once and it was difficult.	<i>uninteresting, negative</i>