

Results of the Purposive Literature Review		
Phase	Pain Point	Reference
Requirements Elicitation	The lack of clarity in the project description hindered me in defining the scope of the model.	[1] [2] [29]
	It was a challenge to translate the needs of the projects and the stakeholders into model requirements.	[3] [4] [5] [6] [7]
Model Creation	I had trouble defining the right level of abstraction and this affected my judgment as to what to include or not in the model.	[8] [9] [10]
	I did not know the right time to stop modeling.	[10] [21] [29]
	I could not find any formal technical material (e.g. manuals, books) to consult when I had doubts about the language I had chosen.	[10] [11] [12]
	I did not know how to increase my model's comprehensibility.	[13] [14] [15]
	Developing the model was hard because the modeling team was not sufficiently skilled in modeling.	[16] [17] [18] [19] [20]
Model Testing and Evaluation	I verified my model but did not understand the errors in it.	[21] [24]
	I verified my model but did not know how to solve the errors in it.	[22] [23] [24]
	The model allowed for unintended interpretations and I did not know how to fix it.	[22] [25] [26] [27]
	The model did not allow for all the intended interpretations and I did not know how to fix it.	[25] [26] [27]
Model Implementation	I was the only one on the team interested in using and reusing the model.	[28] [30]
	The model was insufficient to achieve its application objective.	[29] [31] [32]

Total = 13 Pain Points

REFERENCES

- [1] Kumari, N., & Pillai, A. S. (2014, March). A study on project scope as a requirements elicitation issue. In *2014 International Conference on Computing for Sustainable Global Development (INDIACom)* (pp. 510-514). IEEE.
- [2] France, R. (1999, October). A problem-oriented analysis of basic UML static requirements modeling concepts. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGPLAN conference on Object-oriented programming, systems, languages, and applications* (pp. 57-69).

- [3] Herchi, H., & Abdessalem, W. B. (2012). From user requirements to UML class diagram. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1211.0713*.
- [4] Lubars, M., Potts, C., & Richter, C. (1993, January). A Review of the State of the Practice in Requirements Modeling. In *[1993] Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Requirements Engineering* (pp. 2-14). IEEE.
- [5] Nuseibeh, B., & Easterbrook, S. (2000, May). Requirements engineering: a roadmap. In *Proceedings of the Conference on the Future of Software Engineering* (pp. 35-46).
- [6] Dalpiaz, F., Gieske, P., & Sturm, A. (2021). On deriving conceptual models from user requirements: An empirical study. *Information and Software Technology*, 131, 106484.
- [7] Cysneiros, L. M., & do Prado Leite, J. C. S. (2004). Nonfunctional requirements: From elicitation to conceptual models. *IEEE transactions on Software engineering*, 30(5), 328-350.
- [8] Kotiadis, K., & Robinson, S. (2008, December). Conceptual modelling: knowledge acquisition and model abstraction. In *2008 Winter Simulation Conference* (pp. 951-958). IEEE.
- [9] Kao, D., & Archer, N. P. (1997). Abstraction in conceptual model design. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 46(1), 125-150.
- [10] Reuter, R., Stark, T., Sedelmaier, Y., Landes, D., Mottok, J., & Wolff, C. (2020, April). Insights in students' problems during UML modeling. In *2020 IEEE Global engineering education conference (EDUCON)* (pp. 592-600). IEEE.
- [11] Siau, K., & Loo, P. P. (2006). Identifying difficulties in learning UML. *Information Systems Management*, 23(3), 43-51.
- [12] Song, I. Y., & Froehlich, K. (1994). Entity-relationship modeling. *IEEE Potentials*, 13(5), 29-34.
- [13] Gleicher M. (2016). A Framework for Considering Comprehensibility in Modeling. *Big data*, 4(2), 75–88.
- [14] Aranda, J., Ernst, N., Horkoff, J., & Easterbrook, S. (2007, May). A framework for empirical evaluation of model comprehensibility. In *International Workshop on Modeling in Software Engineering (MISE'07: ICSE Workshop 2007)* (pp. 7-7). IEEE.
- [15] Houy, C., Fettke, P., & Loos, P. (2012). Understanding understandability of conceptual models—what are we actually talking about?. In *Conceptual Modeling: 31st International Conference ER 2012, Florence, Italy, October 15-18, 2012. Proceedings 31* (pp. 64-77). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [16] Renger, M., Kolfschoten, G. L., & de Vreede, G. J. (2008, June). Challenges in collaborative modeling: A literature review. In *International Workshop on Cooperation and Interoperability, Architecture and Ontology* (pp. 61-77). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

- [17] Richardson, G. P., & Andersen, D. F. (1995). Teamwork in group model building. *System Dynamics Review*, 11(2), 113-137.
- [18] De Lucia, A., Gravino, C., Oliveto, R., & Tortora, G. (2010). An experimental comparison of ER and UML class diagrams for data modelling. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 15(5), 455-492.
- [19] Fettke, P. (2009). How conceptual modeling is used. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 25(1), 43.
- [20] Py, D., Auxepaules, L., & Alonso, M. (2013). Diagram, a learning environment for initiation to object-oriented modeling with UML class diagrams. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, 24(4), 425-446.
- [21] Szlenk, M. (2006, May). Formal semantics and reasoning about UML class diagram. In *2006 International Conference on Dependability of Computer Systems* (pp. 51-59). IEEE.
- [22] Cabot, J., Claris, R., & Riera, D. (2008, April). Verification of UML/OCL class diagrams using constraint programming. In *2008 IEEE International Conference on Software Testing Verification and Validation Workshop* (pp. 73-80). IEEE.
- [23] Xia, Y., Wang, C., Shi, Z., Zhou, J., Lu, C., Huang, H., & Xiong, H. (2021, August). Medical entity relation verification with large-scale machine reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining* (pp. 3765-3774).
- [24] Guizzardi, G., Fonseca, C. M., Almeida, J. P. A., Sales, T. P., Benevides, A. B., & Porello, D. (2021). Types and taxonomic structures in conceptual modeling: A novel ontological theory and engineering support. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, 134, 101891.
- [25] Guarino, N., Oberle, D., & Staab, S. (2009). What is an ontology?. *Handbook on ontologies*, 1-17.
- [26] Guarino, N. (1997). Semantic matching: Formal ontological distinctions for information organization, extraction, and integration. In *Information Extraction A Multidisciplinary Approach to an Emerging Information Technology: International Summer School, SCIE-97 Frascati, Italy, July 14-18, 1997* (pp. 139-170). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [27] Lindland, O. I., Sindre, G., & Solvberg, A. (1994). Understanding quality in conceptual modeling. *IEEE software*, 11(2), 42-49.
- [28] Ramos, A. L., Ferreira, J. V., & Barceló, J. (2011). Model-based systems engineering: An emerging approach for modern systems. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)*, 42(1), 101-111.
- [29] Henderson, K., & Salado, A. (2021). Value and benefits of model-based systems engineering (MBSE): Evidence from the literature. *Systems Engineering*, 24(1), 51-66.
- [30] Amorim, T., Vogelsang, A., Pudlitz, F., Gersing, P., & Philipps, J. (2019, May). Strategies and best practices for model-based systems engineering adoption in embedded

systems industry. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice (ICSE-SEIP)* (pp. 203-212). IEEE.

[31] Nelson, H. J., Poels, G., Genero, M., & Piattini, M. (2012). A conceptual modeling quality framework. *Software Quality Journal*, 20, 201-228.

[32] Goulão, M., Amaral, V., & Mernik, M. (2016). Quality in model-driven engineering: a tertiary study. *Software Quality Journal*, 24, 601-633.