

Method engineering paper review table

Read the paper, and rate the criteria below as strong / satisfactory / weak (please check the cell that applies). Please add comments to clarify.

Topic: *Commitment analysis approach*

Author: *Olivier Richters*

Reviewer: *Erik ten Brinke*

**** For detailed info please check the comments below this review table, I put the comments under the review table in order to keep the table itself readable****

Weak	Satisfactory	Strong	Criteria	Reader's comments
Overall				
	X		Are the basic sections (intro, example, etc.) adequate? If not, what is missing?	See comment above this table!
X			Are there any grammatical or spelling problems?	See other document for details, grammar and spelling need some looking after.
	X		Is the writer's writing style clear?	
		X	Are the figures created by the author him/herself?	
Example				
		X	Is the example understandable and informative?	
		X	Do the authors provide one or more usable templates with the example?	
Method description				
	X		Is the PDD properly formatted?	
	X		Does the PDD have a good level of detail?	
	X		Are the activity and concept table informative?	
Related literature & references				
	X		Does the writer cite sources adequately and appropriately? Note any incorrect formatting.	
		X	Are there enough references to other sources?	
	X		Are the references properly formatted?	

Introduction

No comments.

Example

The example is good but it's needs a bit more explanation. Why has there be chosen for procedural and why for commitment/rights/etcetera? (table 2)

Table 3 needs some more explanation. I don't understand what it does exactly. Some textual elaboration would sort this problem.

Improve outlining of the report, tables + figure captions now fall off the pages.

PDD

Why is there an aggregation used between 'statement' and 'policy document'? A statement consists of policy documents? Maybe an association would be better because the statements are derived from the documents (label of the line would be 'derived from').

Outlining of the PDD can be improved (attachment of arrows, crooked arrows, use of capitals)

Concept 'requirement template' is aiming towards which concept? This is not clear due to two arrowheads.

Maybe it's a good idea to enlarge your PDD a bit since some sections are barely readable and multiplicities almost overlap.

No description of the PDD. Readers that are not familiar with the PDD (and its notation) probably will not understand the complete PDD.

Activity table

All the activities have a role indicated apart from the activity 'Collect all relevant policy document'.

Concept table

Are sources like *thefreedictionary.com* and *dictionary.com* applicable for a scientific report?

References

See other document for comments on references. (on your Twiki)