SLR on SPL Scoping - Supplementary Data

Luciano Marchezan^{a,*}, Elder Rodrigues^b, Maicon Bernardino^b, Fábio Paulo Basso^b, Wesley Klewerton Guez Assunção^c, João Carbonell^b

 ^a Institute for Software Systems Engineering Johannes Kepler University, Linz, Austria.
 ^b Laboratory of Empirical Studies in Software Engineering Federal University of Pampa, Alegrete, Brazil.
 ^c COTSI, Federal University of Technology - Paraná. Toledo, Brazil.

1. Complementary Material

Table 1 presents all activities identified in the approaches analyzed. These activities are grouped by phase (when it was possible). Table 2 shows the SPL scoping concepts identified, their definitions and the traceability with each activity identified in the approaches.

	DI	A
Approach	Phases	Activities
PuLSE	A) Preparation	 Pre-assessment meeting 2. Initialization 3. Assessment Team Identification 4. Planning and scheduling PL-Mapping
	B) Execution	1. Opening Briefing 2. Domain Assessment 3. Pre- liminary Results 4. Interviewee Feedback
	C) Analysis	1. Final Report Preparation 2. On-site final meeting
Kishi <i>et al.</i>	NM	1. Identify the requirements 2. Define the design policy 3. List the architectural candidates 4. Deter- mine the Preference of Each Architectural Candidate 5. Examine the Architectural Candidate's Applica- bility for Each Product 6. Examine the Candidates for the SPL Scope 7. Determine Preferences among the Candidates 8. Define Scope
FORM	NM	1. Marketing and Product Plan 2. Product Plan Re- finement 3. Feature Modeling 4. Conceptual Archi- tecture Design 5. Design Object Modeling 6. Archi- tecture Refinement 7. Component Design
GOA	NM	NM
DRM	A) SPL ScopingB) Domain Requirements	 Business Investigation 2. Candidate Products Selection 3. Development of SPL scenarios 4. Feature Attachment Goal Discovery 2. Scenario Authoring 3. Feature Attachment
	Analysis	
		Legend: NM - Not Mentioned;

Table 1: Approaches activities

*Corresponding author, email: lucianomarchp@gmail.com. Address: - Universidade Federal do Pampa, Av. Tiaraju, 810 - Ibirapuitã, Alegrete - RS - Brazil, Zip-Code: 97546-550

Preprint submitted to Elsevier

		Table 1: Continued
Approach	Phases	Activities
	C) Commonal- ity and Vari- ability Analysis	1. Commonality and Variability Analysis 2. Feature Modeling
Park et al.	NM	 Commonality analysis 2. Variability analysis Variability Dependency Analysis 4. Domain Model Refinement 5. Economical Evaluation of Core Asset Scope.
Traceability Map	A) Core Asset Engineering	1. SPL Scoping 2. Domain Analysis 3. Core Analysis
FARE	A) Prepare	1. Establish Analysis Scope 2. Carry out Feasibility Study
	B) Plan	1. Prepare checklists for assessment 2. Explain Checklists and Processes to Participants 3. Identify Domain Boundaries
	C) C&V Anal- ysis	1. Identify Commonalities 2. Identify Reuse Opportunities
	D) Quantify	1. Generate Variation Parameters 2. Carry out Cost-Benefit Analysis
	E) Review	1. Apply Checklists 2. Check consistency of market requirements 3. Highlight areas of improvement
Her <i>et al.</i>	NM	NM
		 view SPL feature map 3. Identify logical components 4. Map technical solution packages to logical components 5. Map features to the logical components 6. Review reusability metrics of logical components 7. Evaluate the reuse potential of logical components 8. Prioritize logical components for reuse.
DRAMA	NM	1. Identifying components 2. Calculating the priority of components 3. Calculating the priority of quality attributes 4. Modeling domain architectures
Planning Game for SPLE	A) ExplorationB) CommitmentC) Steering	 Customer creates User Stories (US) with prioritization 2. Developers add estimated time and effort in the US 3. Generate prioritized set of US Sort US by value and risk 2. Derive the scope from selected US Conduct planning game for iterations
CADSE	NM	NM
CAVE	A) PreparationB) Analysis	 Collect user documentation 2. Divide documents into manageable parts 3. Check manageable parts Apply patterns 2. Produce invalidated SPL artifacts
	C) Validation	1. Validate and change invalidated artifacts 2. Gen- erate product map
COPE+	A) Voice of the customer analysisB) Structural impact analysis	 Customer voting on features 2. Clustering of Customers 3. Identification of product variants for each cluster configuration Identification of features impact 2. Setting up the Genetic Algorithm (GA) 3. Features sequence generation using GA
	C) Similarity Analysis	1. Conformance of product variant implementation

Legend: NM - Not Mentioned;

		Table 1: Continued
Approach	Phases	Activities
PLiCs	NM	1. Specify Customized Product Lines (CPL) 2. Set up CPL 3. Specify CPL Product 4. Generate CPL Product
PLEvo-	A) Preparation	1. Establish the time-frame restriction 2. Iden-
Scoping	for volatility	tify/update system components related to SPL prod-
	analysis B) Environ- ment Change Anticipation	ucts 1. Identify the actors that play a role in the PL's environment 2. Identify and characterize facts that may be caused or realized by the identified actors 3. Verify the perspective of new actors playing a part in the SPL's environment 4. Classify facts according to their relevance
	C) Change impact analysis	1. Identify adaptation needs 2. Characterize adapta- tion needs 3. Classify adaptation needs according to relevance
	D) SPL evolu- tion planning	1. Determine when and which adaptations are expected to be introduced 2. Analyze alternative solutions for dealing with adaptation needs 3. Select alternatives for dealing with the adaptation needs 4. Revise the SPL Evolution Map
Cavalcanti et	NM	NM
al.		
RiPLE	A) Pre-ScopingB) DomainScoping	 Pre-scoping meeting 2. Analyze market Analyze domains 2. Review domains 3. Identify sub-domains 4. Analyze sub-domains 5. Prioritize do- mains and sub-domains
	C) ProductScopingD) AssetsScoping	1. Construct user stories 2. Identify features 3. Fea- tures review meeting 4. Identify products 5. Con- struct product map 6. Validate product map 1. Create metrics 2. Apply metrics 3. Prioritize prod- uct map
VB Portfolio	NM	uct map 1. Select Preliminary Features 2. Analyse Customer
Opt.	11111	3. Analyse Cost 4. Analyze Competitors 5. Optimize 6. Decide 7. Realize
Acher <i>et al.</i>	NM	NM
Bartholdt and Becker	NM	NM
Gillain et al.	NM	1. Determine the relevant customers and what their needs are 2. Defining what the products are consti- tuted of 3. Identify conditions for the product to re- alize the tasks
Pro-PD	A) InitiateprojectB) Identify and	 Translate Customer Requirements 2. Coverage analysis 3. Customer negotiation 4. Create the prod- uct requirements 5. Verify the product requirements Define role and task structures Find and entities requirements 2. Create the mod
	B) Identify and refine require- ments	1. Find and outline requirements 2. Create the prod- uct test cases 3. Allocate requirements 4. Create guidance for decision makers
	C) Derive products	1. Component development 2. Component testing
ARF-E	NM	3. Component integration 4. Integration testing NM
1111 -12	11111	Legend: NM - Not Mentioned;

Table 1: Continued

Approach	Phases	Activities
Cruz et al.	NM	1. Inferring the cost of each asset 2. Calculating the asset relevance for each segment 3. Calculating can- didate products for each segment 4. Qualifying can- didate products 5. Grouping the best product of each segment
FeDRE	NM	1. Scoping 2. Requirements Specification for Domain Engineering 3. Requirements Specification for Appli- cation Engineering.
Nobauer <i>et al.</i>	NM	1. Select products for analysis 2. Define the scope of the analysis 3. Define how similarity between selected configuration settings are calculated 4. Perform sim- ilarity analysis 5. Draw conclusions
Sierszecki <i>et al.</i>	NM	1. Portfolio 2. Requirements management 3. Design and implementation 4. Testing
SPLICE	A) Portfolio planningB) Release de- velopment	 Select Business Goals and Marketing Strate- gies 2. Identify products 3. Identify major features Build product map and feature model 5. Priori- tize major features Release planning 2. Sprint development
SPLBench	A) RequirementsB) Features	 Elicitation 2. Weighting 3. Transformation of re- quirements to language Transformation of domain FM to XML 2. Instan- tiation of application FM
PPSMS	A) Analyzing customer needsB) Analyzing featuresC) Optimiza- tion	 Classify customer preferences using the Kano's model 2. Prioritize features using the absolute im- portance values Analyzing features for potential commonality and variability Construct mathematical model 2. Optimize with simulated Annealing 3. Analyze non-dominated so- lutions
Ianzen <i>et al.</i>	A) ScopingB) Product en-	 Feature identification 2. Feature Classification Evaluate variabilities and commonalities 2. Decide
	gineering	to include the features
Karimpour and Ruhe	NM	1. Plan the portfolio scoping based on high profits goals 2. Incorporate uncertainty into SPL scope mod- elling 3. Perform optimization by simulating changes in the environment
Neto <i>et al.</i>	NM	1. Calculate features' cost 2. Calculate features' rel- evance 3. Generate candidate products 4. Calculate products' suitability 5. Select best products
Domain analy- sis process	A) Domain analysis	 Gather products and information sources; 2. Establish criteria for reuse 3. Collect and analyze documentation 4. Prepare initial interview documents On-site interview sessions 6. Evaluate results and identify opportunities
		Townsh NM Not Montional

Legend: NM - Not Mentioned;

		Table 1: Continued
Approach	Phases	Activities
	B) Economic analysis	1. Create business case calculation
ISPL	A) Domain en- gineering	1. Business feasibility study 2. SPL scoping 3. SPL requirements analysis 4. Security policy and modeling 5. SPL design and architecting 6. SPL implementation 7. SPL Testing
AgiFPL	A) Domain re- quirement en- gineering	1. Problem space 2. Upgrade domain requirements
	B) Domain de- signC) Implemen- tation	 Domain scoping 2. Domain modelling Planning meeting 2. Production flow 3. Review Retrospective
CoMeS	NM	 Initial meeting 2. Explore existing products Identify features 4. Identify products sub-domains 5. Specify product map 6. Establish objectives Quantify product map and domains 8. Closure meeting
Small-SPL	A) Scoping	 Study the objective domain 2. Identify needs Explore existing solutions 4. List possible solutions and Identify features 5. Establish common features 6. Recognize variable features 7. Diagram feature model
APLE	 A) Planning Meeting B) Map use requirements C) Sprint backlog 	 Identify Future Configuration 2. Select Base Configuration Customer evaluation 2. Customer negotiation Implementation 2. Daily meeting
	C) Sprint re- view	1. Review 2. Retrospective

Legend: NM - Not Mentioned;

 Table 2: Relation Between Scoping Concepts and Approaches

Concept	Description	Activities
Architecture Definition	Define a high-level structure to be used for all products [1].	PuLSE B.3 / Kishi et al. 5 / FORM 4 and 6 / GOA / Traceability Map A.3 / Her et al. / DRAMA 4 / PLiCs 3 / RiPLE D.3 / Bartholdt and Becker / Pro-PD D.1 / ARF-E B.2 / Sierszecki et al. 3 / Domain Analysis Process A.1 and A.3 / ISPL A.5 / AgiFPL B.2 / APLE A.2
Scoping Metamodel	Make use of a meta- model to define the structure and con- straints of SPL scoping	CADSE / PLiCs 1 / Cavalcanti <i>et al.</i> / VB Portfolio Opt. 7 / Traceability Map 2 and 3 / FeDRE 2
Cost Mod- els	Define/Use mathemat- ical models for cal- culating costs related with the SPL develop- ment [2].	Park et al. 5 / FARE D.2 / DRAMA 2 and 3 / VB Portfolio Opt. 3 / Gillain et al. 1 / Cruz et al. 1, 2 and 3 / PPSMS C.1 and C.2 / Karimpour and Ruhe 1 / Neto et al. 1, 2 and 4 / Domain Analysis Process B.1

Table 2: Continued

Concept	Description	Activities
Customer Needs	Understand and con- sider the needs of cus- tomers when scoping the SPL [3].	PuLSE A.2 and B.1 / Noor et al. A.1 / DRAMA 3.1 / Planning Game in SPLE A.1 / PLiCs 1 / RiPLE A.1 and C.1 / VB Portfolio Opt. 2 / Bartholdt and Becker / Gillain et al. 1 / Cruz et al. 2 / Nobauer et al. 3 / SPLBench A.1 and A.2 / PPSMS A.1 / Karimpour and Ruhe 1 / ISPL A.1 and A.3 / CoMeS 1 and 8 / SPLICE A.1 / APLE B.1 and B.2
Metrics Definition	Define metrics to be used for measuring SPL scoping tasks or artifacts [2]	Park et al. 5 / Her et al. / Noor et al. 6 / COPE+ B.1 / Cavalcanti et al. / RiPLE D.1 and D2 / Cruz et al. 2 and 3 / SPLBench 2 / PPSMS A.1 / Karimpour and Ruhe 1 / Neto et al. 2
Market Analysis	Analyze the market to understand the domain and identify competi- tor products	PuLSE A.2 / FORM 1 and 2 / GOA / DRM A.1 and B.1 / FARE A.1 and E.2 / DRAMA 1 / RiPLE A.2 / VB Portfolio Opt. 4 / Gillain <i>et al.</i> 1 / PPSMS A.1 / Karimpour and Ruhe 1 / ISPL A.1 / CoMeS 1 / Small-SPL A.1 / FeDRE 1 and 2 / SPLICE A.1, A.2, A.3, and B.1 / Domain analysis Process A.6 and B.1 / AgiFPL A.1, B.1 and C.3
Product Map	Maps the relation between features and products, usually rep- resented as a matrix [4]	PuLSE A.5 / Noor et al. 5 / CAVE C.2 / PLEvo-Scoping D.4 / RiPLE C.5 and D.3 / ISPL A.2 / CoMeS 5 / FeDRE 1, 2 and 3 / SPLICE A.4
Candidates Analysis	Analyze candidate products or assets to be reused by the SPL [5]	PuLSE A.5 and B.2 / Kishi <i>et al.</i> 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 / GOA / DRM A.2 / Traceability Map 1 and 2 / COPE+ C.1 / RiPLE C.4 and C.5 / VB Portfolio Opt. 1 and 5 / Acher <i>et al.</i> / Cruz <i>et al.</i> 4 / PPSMS A.2 and B.1 / Ianzen <i>et al.</i> A.2 and B.2 / Neto <i>et al.</i> 3 and 4 / SPLICE A.2 and A.3 / Domain Analysis Process A.1 and A.3 / APLE A.1 and A.2
Evolution Planning	Plan the evolution of the SPL based on the demand from new cus- tomer requirements [6]	PuLSE C.2 / Planning Game in SPLE C.1 / CADSE / COPE+ C.1 / PLEvo-Scoping D.1, D.2, D.3 and D.4 / RiPLE C.5 and D.4 / ISPL 1
Prioritize Products	Give higher/lower pri- oritization to products during SPL scoping.	Kishi et al. 4 and 7 / Noor et al. 2 / Planning Game in SPLE A.3 / RiPLE B.5 and D.3 / Cruz et al. 4 / PPSMS A.2 / CoMeS 7 / FeDRE 3 / SPLICE A.5 / AgiFPL B.1 and C.1

References

- K. Pohl, G. Böckle, F. van Der Linden, Software product line engineering: foundations, principles and techniques, Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.
- [2] M. B. S. de Moraes, E. S. de Almeida, S. Romero, A systematic review on software product lines scoping, in: 6th Experimental Software Engineering Latin American Workshop (ESELAW 2009), 2009, p. 63.

- [3] J. Lee, S. Kang, D. Lee, A comparison of software product line scoping approaches, International Journal of Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering 20 (05) (2010) 637–663. doi:10.1142/S021819401000489X.
- [4] M. Balbino, E. Almeida, S. Meira, An agile scoping process for software product lines, in: International Conference on Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering (SEKE), 2011, pp. 717–722.
- [5] K. Schmid, Scoping software product lines: An analysis of an emerging technology, in: First Conference on Software Product Lines : Experience and Research Directions: Experience and Research Directions, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Norwell, MA, USA, 2000, pp. 513–532.
- [6] J. Krüger, W. Mahmood, T. Berger, Promote-pl: A round-trip engineering process model for adopting and evolving product lines, in: Proceedings of the 24th ACM Conference on Systems and Software Product Line: Volume A - Volume A, SPLC '20, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2020. doi:10.1145/3382025.3414970. URL https://doi.org/10.1145/3382025.3414970

Primary sources