Review of
"The ABC of Software Engineering Research"
by Faiz Ahmed

Summary of the Paper The author aims to present the ABC framework, which supports researchers in the selection of appropriate research strategies for their goals. Therefore he describes the term ABC (Author, Behaviour and Context) regarding software engineering and explains the dimensions (generalizability and obtrusiveness) of the ABC Framework. Afterwards, the framework and its eight research strategies are illustrated. An explanation and a metaphor are given for each strategy. He continues by illustrating the applicability of the framework in two research areas and all articles of a journal. Finally, the metaphors and the limits of the ABC framework are discussed and the paper concluded.

Evaluation of the Paper Structure This paper has a good structure. However, it starts with an introduction, explaining the meaning of the term ABC. This is an abrupt start and does not introduce the reader to the topic. Instead, the introduction could explain the context and relevance of this paper. The explanation of the term ABC could be moved into Section 3, which presents the ABC framework. Furthermore, the description of the document structure is missing. The main part (Section 2 to 4) of the paper is well structured and has a common thread. Section 5.1 of the conclusion seems misplaced and having redundant information. The first part of this section explains the advantages and disadvantages of metaphors, belonging to a section where metaphors are introduced (e.g Section 3). The second part describes the research settings (classified into quadrants), already explained in Section 3.1 to 3.8. The conclusion could be expanded with a paragraph about future work.

Evaluation of the Paper The required paper layout is not used. Long sentences are mainly avoided, but the lack of unique words is noticeable in some sections (e.g. Section 4, using less "they"). The quotations are good. In Section 3.1 to 3.8 the corresponding quadrants are not indicated for each strategy, leading to an impure form. A recommendation would also be to use more acronyms, e.g. QIV for quadrant IV. The illustrations and tables are recognizable, whereby a reference to Table 2 is missing. The significance of Tables 1 and 2 can be questioned, as they take up two pages of the paper, but are not discussed further. One possibility would be to compare the settings in these tables with the already presented ones in Section 3. Shortening these tables would also leave more space for the introduction and remove unnecessary papers from the reference list. In the discussion the author refers to "certain research methods ..." and does not give a specific example to justify his argument.

The paper can be considered as well written and provides a good overview of the ABC framework. However, small changes can improve the form and the content.