


Reviews and Comments on Submission 184

[Submission details](#)

Submission

Submission	
Conflict of Interest	
File	
Current decision	REJECT (reject)

Summary of Received Reviews and Comments

Reviews superseded by other reviews are shown in the grey color in the table. All times are GMT.

	date	PC member	subreviewer	Total score	Reviewer's confidence	Overall evaluation	Best Paper Award
Review 1	Feb 23	Auri Marcelo Rizzo Vincenzi	Marllos Prado	0	3	0	
Review 2							
Review 3							
Review 3							
Comment 1							
Comment 2							
Review 2							

Reviews and Comments

Review 1	
PC member	Auri Marcelo Rizzo Vincenzi
Reviewer	Marllos Prado <marllosprado@gmail.com>
Time	Feb 23, 15:33
	<p>0: (borderline paper)</p> <p>Overall, the topic covered in this paper is interesting, mainly considering its immediate use in the industry. ALM tools gained more importance in the recent years due to the spread of distributed software development organizations worldwide and the need to manage and track their underlying processes. Thus, having a way to compare the strength and weaknesses of them comes in hand.</p> <p>However, I have some concerns regarding the way the paper currently presents the research. First, I think that it takes a little bit too long to bring the reader into the research core (final of section 3 and section 4). The first section looks fine, but section 2 repeats motivational elements in the first paragraph that in my opinion would fit better in the first section. Also, I think the brief description about the tools is too general and do not add too much to the reader. For example, knowing that ``GForge was founded in 1999 close to the date of the development of SourceForge.net" is secondary compared to the functionalities it had in the past and that it provides nowadays for supporting application lifecycle management. Another example is to say that Mantis ``provides several basic functionalities and plugins" without given some examples of this basic functionalities and plugins.</p> <p>In the other hand, many researchers would be interested to know how did you come up with the questions in the third column of your quality model, for example. How did you create or propose them using the GQM? Was their relevance based on any previous study e.g. compared to other candidate questions? Why are they important? These questions do not seem clearly elucidated for me. I think that spending more space explaining the process of building your framework is more important than the general information for the tools given in section 2. Reducing or even eliminating Fig. 2 could also help you to save space.</p> <p>I would also like to suggest a more critic view over the framework's benefits. What are the flaws that the framework do not cover (if any)? In case the framework has no gap, explain the reason it is complete in your opinion.</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <p>I would also suggest a more straight language. Avoid wordy sentences like:</p> <p>"Following to a set of case studies carried out" --->prefer---> "After some case studies";</p> <p>"with respect to tool support" --->prefer---> "to tool support"</p> <p>The table 1 should be bigger... It is very difficult to read when printed on paper. I would personally remove Fig 2. for more space to table 1.</p> <p>Fig1. Use more distinctive colors. In a grayscale mode, they became very similar.</p>
Overall evaluation	
Reviewer's confidence	3: (medium)