Reviews and Comments on Submission 184

Submission

Submission	Maria Teresa Baldassarre, Danilo Caivano and Giuseppe Visaggio. Application Lifecycle Management Tools as Support to Software Production: an Evaluation Assessment
Conflict of Interest	Jose Antonio Cruz-Lemus, Felix Garcia, Sergio Soares, Martin Solari, Guilherme Travassos
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Reviews superseded by other reviews are shown in the grey color in the table.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	Mar 2	Gleison Santos		**-3**	4	-3	
Review 3	Mar 3	Marcos Kalinowski		1	4	1	
Review 3	Mar 3	Marcos Kalinowski		**0**	**4**	0	
Comment 1	Mar 3	Marcos Kalinowski					
Comment 2	Mar 3	Marcela Genero Bocco					
Review 2	Mar 3	Gleison Santos		**-1**	**4**	-1	

Reviews and Comments

Review 1	
PC member	Auri Marcelo Rizzo Vincenzi
Reviewer	Marllos Prado <marllosprado@gmail.com>
Time	Feb 23, 15:33
Overall evaluation	**0**: (borderline paper) 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. 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. 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. 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. Other comments: I would also suggest a more straight language. Avoid wordy sentences like: "Following to a set of case studies carried out" --->prefer---> "After some case studies"; "with respect to tool support" --->prefer---> "to tool support" 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. Fig1. Use more distinctive colors. In a grayscale mode, they became very similar.
Reviewer's confidence	**3**: (medium)

Review 2

PC member	Gleison Santos
Time	Mar 02, 14:33
Overall evaluation	**-3**: (strong reject) Authors present a evaluation of 5 ALM tools regarding characteristics such as traceability, automation and visibility. - results are limited as is the assessment framework. - the only evaluated aspect of the tools are their issue tracking system capabilities, not what would be expected by a more comprehensive ALM tool. Actually I wouldn't say that Mantis, for instance, is a ALM tool. - It is not clear the criteria to select those 5 tools. Also it is not clear if the tools were evaluated in its "basic form" or if plugins (which?) were considered as well. - paragraph formatting must be reviewed to comply to the conference format. - section 2 is more about issue tracking tools than to ALM State of Art - It is not possible to read Table 1 content. The same applies to Figure 2. - paper lacks discussion of limitations / threats to validity.
Reviewer's confidence	**4**: (high)
Confidential remarks for the program committee	
Best Paper Award	-

Review 3

PC member	Marcos Kalinowski
Time	Mar 03, 01:43
Overall evaluation	**1**: (weak accept) The paper presents the definition of an evaluation quality model framework, defined with the GQM (Goal Question Metrics) approach and illustrates how it has been used to evaluate ALM (Application Lifecycle Management) tools. + The takeaway of the paper is quite interesting, given that the results of the study can be directly used by researchers or practitioners when selecting ALM tools. + GQM was properly applied to plan the evaluation. The goal, questions and metrics were explicitly stated in the paper, providing an interesting example on the subject. - While I like the set of selected ALM tools, I miss an argumentation on why those ones have been selected for the evaluation. - I miss a paragraph further explaining how, based on which material, and by whom the evaluation has been conducted. Did someone install all the ALM tools and assess the features? Were manuals used? This description is not sufficiently provided throughout the paper. - Still aligned to the last issue, I miss a section on the limitations (and/or threats to validity) of the conducted evaluation. One limitation, IMHO, is that it seems that the evaluation framework has been applied by the authors. Would it be easy for others to apply it? Would the evaluation framework retrieve the same results if applied by a different person? Minor details: - Consider adding some additional references to statements in the Introduction. - Spacing between paragraphs doesn't seem to follow a consistent pattern. Also, the authors could have used 14 pages, but used only 12.
Reviewer's confidence	**4**: (high)
Confidential remarks for the program committee	I would not mind accepting this paper. Although it does not concern an in-depth empirical study, it contains an interesting assessment of ALM tools, which are of great interest to researchers and practitioners. It will foster interesting discussions during the conference.
Best Paper Award	-

Review 3

PC member	Marcos Kalinowski
Time	Mar 03, 01:48
Overall evaluation	**0**: (borderline paper) The paper presents the definition of an evaluation quality model framework, defined with the GQM (Goal Question Metrics) approach and illustrates how it has been used to evaluate ALM (Application Lifecycle Management) tools. + The takeaway of the paper is quite interesting, given that the results of the study can be directly used by researchers or practitioners when selecting ALM tools.

	+ GQM was properly applied to plan the evaluation. The goal, questions and metrics were explicitly stated in the paper, providing an interesting example on the subject. - While I like the set of selected ALM tools, I miss an argumentation on why those ones have been selected for the evaluation. - I miss a paragraph further explaining how, based on which material, and by whom the evaluation has been conducted. Did someone install all the ALM tools and assess the features? Were manuals used? This description is not sufficiently provided throughout the paper. - Still aligned to the last issue, I miss a section on the limitations (and/or threats to validity) of the conducted evaluation. One limitation, IMHO, is that it seems that the evaluation framework has been applied by the authors. Would it be easy for others to apply it? Would the evaluation framework retrieve the same results if applied by a different person? Minor details: - Consider adding some additional references to statements in the Introduction. - Spacing between paragraphs doesn't seem to follow a consistent pattern. Also, the authors could have used 14 pages, but used only 12.
Reviewer's confidence	**4**: (high)
Confidential remarks for the program committee	I would not mind accepting this paper. Although it does not concern an in-depth empirical study and has some limitations, it contains an assessment of ALM tools, which are of interest to researchers and practitioners. It would foster interesting discussions during the conference. However, after reading the reviews of the other reviewers, I must agree that there are some limitations to the paper (also pointed out in my review) that could be used to argue for its rejection.
Best Paper Award	-

Comment 1

PC member	Marcos Kalinowski
Comment	After reading the reviews of the other reviewers, I must agree that some of the limitations of the paper (also pointed out in my review) could indeed be used to argue for its rejection. Therefore, I changed my review from 'Weak Accept' to 'Borderline'.
Time	Mar 03, 01:51

Comment 2

PC member	Marcela Genero Bocco
Comment	Dear reviewers, we noticed that there are some discrepancies within your reviews. Could you please discuss between you through easychair and try to reach consensus? Remember that without forgetting the quality, ESELAW's main goal is to foster research and the possibility that researchers in Latin America will attend this type of event. Moreover, in the review consider if the problems detected could be improved for the camera ready version. Discussion will be opened until March 10th. Many thanks Marcela and Fabio ESELAW Chairs
Time	Mar 03, 07:26

Review 2

PC member	Gleison Santos
Time	Mar 03, 12:39
Overall evaluation	**-1**: (weak reject) Authors present a evaluation of 5 ALM tools regarding characteristics such as traceability, automation and visibility. - results are limited as is the assessment framework. - the only evaluated aspect of the tools are their issue tracking system capabilities, not what would be expected by a more comprehensive ALM tool. Actually I wouldn't say that Mantis, for instance, is a ALM tool. - It is not clear the criteria to select those 5 tools. Also it is not clear if the tools were evaluated in its "basic form" or if plugins (which?) were considered as well. - paragraph formatting must be reviewed to comply to the conference format. - section 2 is more about issue tracking tools than to ALM State of Art - It is not possible to read Table 1 content. The same applies to Figure 2. - paper lacks discussion of limitations / threats to validity.
Reviewer's confidence	**4**: (high)
Confidential remarks for the program committee	
Best Paper Award	-