**Analysis of RE-Pract tags for “What”?**

*1) Challenge:*

1.a) Content

* All -> Unspecified / Undetermined (I cannot believe that a single approach is able to deal with “all” these content challenges
* Missing: Volatility (please note that, unlike you have used a given corpus that define this criteria, other values may eventually emerge). Didn’t check the summaries, but possible terms are “volatile”, “changing”, “ephemeral”, etc.

1.b) Context: in principle, ok (please note that, unlike you have used a given corpus that define this criteria, other values may eventually emerge)

1.c) Failure, Problem: I just propose to merge them and become Level\_4 for a new Level\_3 tag, Reporting (reporting a problem, reporting a failure)

1.d) People: in principle, ok (please note that, unlike you have used a given corpus that define this criteria, other values may eventually emerge)

1.e) Process:

* Wording (for harmonization): deciding -> decision; improving -> improvement
* Standardization: probably needs to be split into Standardization on the one hand, and Reuse (for the rest of terms, and I would include “pattern”) on the other hand
* Improving: add “enhance” as term
* Automation: add “generation/generate” as term
* Missing: definitively, quality\_assurance. I saw three papers (in the first 50) that fit here: paper 5 (“quality assurance”), paper 20 (“being in control”), paper 28 (“meets”)

*2) Documentation:*

* Wording: I would suggest “Unspecified” or “General” before “Artifact”
* A structuring option could be to introduce as Level\_3 Models and Text-based, and then in Level\_4: for Models, businessmodels, goalmodels, featuremodels, statemachines, and then probably diagrams too (but look, in the rule you have both “diagram” and UML; for UML diagrams, better an independent tag); for Text-based, naturallanguage, usecases and usestories. Prototypes would remain Level\_3 or even disappear, since we have only one occurrence at reading the summary, it is considered more as an alternative to documentation than as documentation itself

*3) Domain:*

3.a) Organization: in principle ok, just to comment: (i) numbers seem a bit low, it may be a problem of the way summaries were written; (ii) similarly, it is strange not to see “non-agile” (whatever tag is better, e.g. traditional, waterfall-like, etc.)

3.b) Sector: I’m not really sure that the sector was consistently recorded in the summaries. Said that, this classification is as good as any other else.

3.c) System Class: same as above

*4) General*:

This category looks a bit weird to me. Quickly looking the summaries, I have the feeling that this category depends a lot on the way the summaries were written and that any conclusion we could try to extract, would be basically not trustable. Furthermore, only 8 papers are there. Therefore, I propose to remove.

*5) Information*:

* The three last tags (rules, scenarios, system behaviour) look very different compared to the others. I would just leave Goals, Functional, Quality and Architecture. I may wonder if Test wouldn’t be a fifth category (just as Architecture is). Also, if we have Functional and Quality, Constraint could be another category, provided that some paper mentions it (I found at least one, 67).
* In fact, rules and scenarios could be integrated into the Documentation category.
* Quality is always tricky. I would suggest to take the ISO/IEC 25010 for identifying the Level\_4 tags and the subcategories in the standard could be used as terms in the rules.
* Still, we have this “odd” types as e.g. Sustainability, and it may be the case that we have others as Transparency. We could have them as “Others” or “Social qualities” (in contraposition to Technical qualities as the others are). Last (but not least :-P ) we have some transversal concepts, e.g. dependability, that do not appear in the standard but are quite popular (please note that “dependability” is not a synonymous for “reliability” as you use it in the rule, I barely remember that the standard even mentions this case explicitly).
* “All” should be applied again with care. Maybe some papers are really “generic” meaning that they propose a method that may be applicable to any type of quality requirement, but other papers may simply

*6) Phase*:

Just a question: which is the corpus used to define the tags? There are several textbooks or standards that define slightly differently the phases and I think it would be nice to adhere to any of them. E.g., we could use IREB phases, so that we could eventually think of some follow-up at this respect in the IREB community.

In “specification”, wouldn’t be “documentation” a term to be included in the rule?

*7) Region*:

This should disappear, since we intentionally removed the region in paper summaries, therefore these two occurrences should be considered outliers in the control process.