The Journal of Systems and Software 82 (2009) 1982–2003

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

The Journal of Systems and Software

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jss

A systematic review of domain analysis solutions for product lines

Mahvish Khurum *, Tony Gorschek

Blekinge Institute of Technology, Department of Systems and Software Engineering, S-372 25 Ronneby, Sweden

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 30 January 2009
Received in revised form 18 June 2009
Accepted 26 June 2009
Available online 2 July 2009

Keywords:
Systematic review
Domain analysis
Domain modeling
Domain scoping
Empirical evidence
Usability
Usefulness

ABSTRACT

Domain analysis is crucial and central to software product line engineering (SPLE) as it is one of the main instruments to decide what to include in a product and how it should fit in to the overall software product line. For this reason many domain analysis solutions have been proposed both by researchers and industry practitioners. Domain analysis comprises various modeling and scoping activities. This paper presents a systematic review of all the domain analysis solutions presented until 2007. The goal of the review is to analyze the level of industrial application and/or empirical validation of the proposed solutions with the purpose of mapping maturity in terms of industrial application, as well as to what extent proposed solutions might have been evaluated in terms of usability and usefulness. The finding of this review indicates that, although many new domain analysis solutions for software product lines have been proposed over the years, the absence of qualitative and quantitative results from empirical application and/or validation makes it hard to evaluate the potential of proposed solutions with respect to their usability and/or usefulness for industry adoption. The detailed results of the systematic review can be used by individual researchers to see large gaps in research that give opportunities for future work, and from a general research perspective lessons can be learned from the absence of validation as well as from good examples presented. From an industry practitioner view, the results can be used to gauge as to what extent solutions have been applied and/or validated and in what manner, both valuable as input prior to industry adoption of a domain analysis solution.

1. Introduction

Software product lines have received significant attention from the software engineering community since the 1990s (Clements and Northrop, 2001; DeBaud and Schmid, 1999; Deelstra et al., 2004; Dikel et al., 1997; Svahnberg and Bosch, 1999). The concept of product lines aims towards having a set of systems that share a common, managed set of features, which satisfy the particular needs of a market segment, developed from a common set of core assets in a certain given way (Clements and Northrop, 2001). The product line approach is recognized as a successful approach for reuse in software development (Kim et al., 2007) with the major benefits of product lines adoption reported as reduced time-to-market (Dager, 2000; Hetrick et al., 2006), reduced cost (Pohl et al., 2005) and improved quality (Hetrick et al., 2006; Pohl et al., 2005; Staples and Hill, 2004). For these reasons many companies developing software intensive products have either adopted or are considering the adoption of a software product line approach (Böckle, 2000; Clements and Northrop, 2001; Dager, 2000).

In order to properly introduce software product lines in a company, it is important to start with the product line domain analysis. Domain analysis can be defined as "*the process by which information used in developing software systems within the domain is identified, captured, and organized with the purpose of making it reusable (to create assets) when building new products*" (America et al., 2001). This process can be used to identify commonality and variability in requirements and capture decisions on the ranges and inter-dependencies of variability. If domain analysis is not properly carried out, and ends up in defining either too broad or too restrictive product line scope, the major benefits like reuse, cost reduction and improved quality cannot be realized (Clements and Northrop, 2001).

Several domain analysis solutions for software product lines have been presented in academia and as industry experience reports. However, in order to gauge the usability and usefulness of the proposed solutions, it is important to see the empirical evidence of their application and/or validation, e.g. in industry or through experiments or tests. Furthermore, awareness has increased in the software engineering community about the importance of empirical studies to develop or improve processes, methods and tools for software development and maintenance (Sjøberg et al., 2005). This paper presents a systematic review conducted on the studies, which either proposed or reported on experience with domain analysis solutions or parts of it (e.g. feature modeling, commonality and variability analysis, scoping and so

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: mkm@bth.se (M. Khurum), tgo@bth.se (T. Gorschek).

0164-1212/$ - see front matter © 2009 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.jss.2009.06.048

on), presented between the years 1998 to 2007. The motivation was to gauge the level of actual industry adoption, i.e. to what extent the presented solutions are applied and/or validated in industry. In addition to industry validation, all other types of empirical results are collected to offer a detailed summation of the empirical evidence available. To achieve this, the selected studies are categorized and analyzed from several perspectives, such as research basis, application/validation method, level of validation and type of empirical results in relation to usability and usefulness of the proposed solutions. For industry practitioners looking to adopt a domain analysis solution the results of the study can be used as an indication of maturity as well as to estimate potential risk of adopting a certain solution. From an academic point of view researchers planning studies and evaluation of a solution can use this study as an inspiration for study design because the evaluation criteria of the review presented in this paper could be seen as a checklist to ascertain usability and usefulness.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the background and related work. Section 3 presents the research questions and design details of the review. Section 4 contains the results of the review as well as the categorization of the studies. In Section 4.2 results of data extraction and a detailed analysis are presented in relation to the research questions posed in Section 3.1. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Background and related work

In this section the purpose of domain analysis activities are introduced. The purpose of this is twofold, one, to provide a background to the concepts relevant for this systematic review, and, two, to describe the scope of the study.

Domain analysis is the first phase of domain engineering. Domain can be defined as an area of business/technology processes or knowledge, which is described by a set of concepts and terminology understood by the stakeholders in that area (America et al., 2001). Domains are areas of expertise that can be used for creation of a system or a set of systems (Clements and Northrop, 2001). The purpose of domain analysis is to gather and organize the information that is required for the smooth flow in the subsequent phases of domain engineering e.g. domain design (Clements and Northrop, 2001). Domain analysis helps in the identification of the specification of the systems in the product line. It involves various activities which can be categorized as modeling and scoping (America et al., 2001). Modeling is defined as capturing information and organizing it into a model whereas scoping is defined as a decision-making activity.

In the modeling category, the activities identified are (America et al., 2001):

1. Conceptual modeling contains a set of activities which identify, define, and organize the concepts relevant to the domain and their mutual relationships, to assist in formulating a precise and concise description of the domain. Information modeling is an important part of conceptual modeling.
2. Requirements' modeling contains a set of activities that capture the functional and architecturally relevant requirements for the product line and their inter-dependencies. This may also include mapping of specific constraints to requirements.
3. Commonality and variability modeling comprises a set of activities which identify similarities and differences between the requirements. This includes the distinction of requirements that are valid for the whole domain from those that are only valid in special cases, e.g. for a specific product variant. This activity is strongly connected to domain and feature modeling.
4. Domain modeling comprises a set of activities that specify the domains and their inter-dependencies.
5. Feature modeling comprises a set of activities which identify, study, and describe features appropriate in a given domain. The objective of feature modeling is to express relations between features, properties of features, and/or superstructures of features e.g. a commonality and variability view. One of the important purposes of feature modeling is to help structure the requirements and define the allowed variants in a product line.
6. Scenario or use-case modeling comprises a set of activities which describe and model run-time behavior of members of the system family. This not only includes the functionality of the systems and their interactions with users, but also aspects such as security, safety, reliability, and performance.

In the scoping category, we find the following activities:

1. Domain scoping is the process of identifying appropriate boundaries for a domain which is appropriate for implementing systems in the product line (Pohl et al., 2005).
2. Product line scoping is the process of systematically developing a product portfolio definition, which identifies the specific requirements and the individual products that should be part of the product line. Scope binds a product line by defining the behaviors that are "in" and the behaviors that are "out" of the product line's scope (Clements and Northrop, 2001). The result of a scoping activity is a scope definition document which becomes a product line core asset (Clements and Northrop, 2001). The scope definition points out the entities with which the products in the product line will interact (that is, the product line context), and it also establishes the commonality and defines the variability of the product line (Clements and Northrop, 2001).
3. Asset scoping identifies the various elements that should be reusable, i.e., the specific assets that should be part of the reuse infrastructure (core assets) as opposed to being developed application specific.

A specific domain analysis solution may not mention all these activities or distinguish between them explicitly; however it is important that these activities are discussed in relation to domain analysis. Moreover, depending on the context in which a product line is being developed some of the activities might not be relevant e.g. when only very few individual domains can be distinguished, the domain modeling activity can be omitted (America et al., 2001). Domain analysis describes the characteristics of a class of systems, and not a specific system, and the scope will apply equally to existing products and products that have yet to be defined and built. Domain analysis can occur in a variety of contexts other than "start from scratch" product lines. For example, an organization may choose to apply the product line concept to only a part of the product portfolio.

A number of studies (Catal and Diri, 2009; Dyba and Dingsoyr, 2008; Glass et al., 2002; Gomez et al., 2006; Kitchenham et al., 2009; Mendes, 2005; Perry et al., 2000) have reviewed the state of empirical research in different areas e.g. computer science, software engineering, web engineering and so on. However, to the best of our knowledge no other study has been conducted with the same focus as the review presented in this paper. This review does not aim to systematically classify proposed domain analysis solutions as methods, models, tools, framework or classify the studies according to the classification and evaluation scheme suggested in (Wieringa et al., 2005). The goal of this review is to analyze practical application and validation of proposed domain analysis solutions in industry to gauge their practical usability and usefulness. In addition to this other empirical evidence is also considered e.g. evidence of usability and/or usefulness demonstrated through a controlled experiment or other type of validation.

3. Design

This section gives a detailed description of the review design; a definition of terms used, and discusses the validity of the study.

3.1. Research questions and definitions

The four research questions driving the systematic review can be viewed in Table 1.

The two main terms used in the research questions, namely *usability* and *usefulness*, are defined (by the authors) and exemplified below.

Usability, as can be seen in Fig. 1 is defined in terms of:

- Scalability of Introduction. How scalable is the proposed solution in terms of its introduction cost including e.g. training, manuals and material, tools, pilot run, and tailoring to the organization in question?
- Scalability of Use. How scalable is the proposed solution in terms of its inputs, processing time and outputs? For example, if a feature modeling approach is proposed, can it handle industry scale problems, say a hundred features, or does it solve simplified problems with simple cases or is there any indication that industry grade scalability is possible (or even considered/mentioned/discussed by the creators of the solution)?

Scalability of Introduction and Scalability of Use point to a micro quality of a solution and that is its efficiency. If a proposed solution is demonstrated to have any of these aspects of efficiency, the corresponding paper is counted as having some evidence of usability.

Usefulness, as can be seen in Fig. 1 is defined in terms of:

- Better Alternative Investment. For example, a proposed solution (X) is better than an alternative (maybe previously used) solution (Y) e.g. with respect to usability (as defined above) and/or return on investment etc.
- Effectiveness. The effectiveness of a proposed solution in relation to achieving goals or solving the problems it was designed for. For example, solution X reduces time-to-market by 15%.

Again, a solution demonstrating either of the two aspects of usefulness is counted as having some evidence of usefulness.

3.2. Search strategy development

The systematic review was performed following guidelines proposed by Kitchenham in Kitchenham (2007). As shown in Fig. 2, a three phase search strategy was devised. In Phase 1: SPLC conference proceedings from the year 2000 up to 2007 were planned to be manually searched. This was planned for several reasons. First, SPLC is the premier forum for practitioners, researchers, and educators presenting and discussing experiences, ideas, innovations, as well as challenges in the area of software product lines. SPLC also has a relatively large industry presence. Second, domain analysis is a very important field and a regularly featured sub-area to software product line engineering, for the purpose of this review domain analysis solutions in relation to product lines were of primary interest. Third, since industry representation at SPLC is fairly high this includes a large amount of industry experience reports, and as one of the main features of the review is to evaluate the level of application and/or validation of the solutions, a large amount of industry experience reports was considered positive. Fourth, through the manual scanning of SPLC proceedings a number of keywords, alternate terms and synonyms were identified:



Fig. 1. Definition of usability and usefulness.



Fig. 2. Three phase search strategy.

Population: software product lines, software product family.
Intervention: requirements, requirements engineering, conceptual model, requirements model, commonality and variability model, domain model, feature model, scenario model,

Table 1
Research questions and motivation.

Research questions	Motivation
RQ1. Are solutions, proposed for domain analysis, based on needs identified in industry?	Is the solution presented based on any need/issue/problem (called *need* from here onwards) identified in industry though empirical investigation? Examples can be process assessments, case studies, participation knowledge, surveys, observations, and so on. Both direct and indirect sources will be considered, giving the presented studies the benefit of the doubt (i.e. any indication of industry basis will be considered and accepted)
RQ2. Are solutions, proposed for domain analysis, applied and/or validated in a laboratory setting or in industry?	Is the solution presented applied/validated through e.g. a controlled experiment or in industry as a part of the paper? Any validation in industry from static validation to dynamic validation will be considered, see Gorschek et al. for details (Gorschek et al., 2006)
RQ3. Are the solutions, proposed for domain analysis, usable?	If the authors of a proposed solution or experience report have applied/validated it in industry or demonstrated its application/validation through a controlled experiment, identify any indications/evidence/reports on its usability in the context of the application/validation (usability is defined below)
RQ4. Are the solutions, proposed for domain analysis, useful?	If the authors of a proposed solution or experience report have applied/validated it in industry or demonstrated its application/validation through a controlled experiment, identify any indications/evidence/reports on its usefulness in the context of the application/validation (usefulness is defined below)

commonality analysis, variability analysis, domain evaluation, domain scope, asset scope.

Comparison intervention: not applicable as the research questions are not aimed at making a comparison. The outcomes of our interest: the level of application/validation of the proposed solutions and their usability and usefulness evidence.

Outcomes: the level of application/validation of the proposed solutions and their usability and usefulness evidence.

Out of scope: domain design, domain engineering and concepts related to architecture, implementation aspects.

In terms of context and experimental design, no restrictions are enforced.

To make the search exhaustive, in Phase 2 electronic databases were searched using the search terms deduced from the population, intervention and outcomes with the use of Boolean OR to join alternate terms and synonyms and use of Boolean AND to join major terms (Population **AND** Intervention **AND** outcomes). Examples of major terms can be seen in Appendix A. The electronic databases searched were:

- Inspec and Compendex via Engineering Village2.
- ACM.
- IEEEXplore.
- ISI Web of Science.

In order to ensure that search strings are comprehensive and precise, an expert librarian was consulted. All the search strings are given in Appendix A.

Activities in Phase 3 were planned to ensure that any important research studies are not missed. Reference lists of the primary studies were scanned. The web pages of the authors in the particular area were also scanned.

Excluded from the search were editorials, prefaces, article summaries, interviews, news, reviews, correspondence, discussions, comments, reader's letters and summaries of tutorials, workshops, symposium, panels, and poster sessions.

3.3. Review design

In this section, the systematic review design is presented describing studies identification method, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and the classification scheme.

3.3.1. Identification of studies

Phase 1: There were a total of 192 studies published in SPLC for the years 2000 to 2007, and in Phase 1 (see Fig. 2) 24 out of 192 studies were selected after reading titles and abstracts.

Phase 2: Phase 2 had 4 steps. In Step1 (see Fig. 3), 843 citations were retrieved. In Step 2 the duplicates were removed leaving 629 unduplicated citations. For all 629 citations the source of each citation, our retrieval decision, retrieval status, and eligibility decision were recorded.

In Step 3, the primary author went through all the titles to judge their relevance to the systematic review being performed. The studies whose titles were clearly not related to software product lines and domain analysis activities were excluded. For example, since our search string contained "software product line and feature model", there were studies that contained feature modeling solutions at the architecture level which were clearly out of scope, see e.g. Zhu et al. (2006). In Step 3, 359 studies were excluded leaving 270 studies in total. In Step 4, 208 studies out of 270 were excluded after reading the abstracts leaving 62 studies. The reason for excluding the 208 studies was that their focus, or main focus, was not domain analysis activities for software product lines. However, it was found that abstracts were of variable quality; some abstracts were missing, poor, and/or misleading, and several gave little indication of what was in the full article. In particular, it was not always obvious whether an experience report indeed included a domain analysis solution. If it was unclear from the title, abstract, and keywords whether a study conformed to the screening criteria, it was included giving it the benefit of doubt.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria were pilot-tested by the authors on a random sample of 15 studies. An agreement on inclusion and exclusion was achieved on 12 studies. The conflict on the remaining 3 studies was resolved after a discussion session and the inclusion/exclusion rules were refined. After the pilot, the primary author screened the remaining studies and marked them as included/excluded based on the approach described.

Phase 3: The reference lists of the studies selected in Phase 2 were scanned to ensure that no relevant studies are missed. Furthermore, three prominent researchers in the field of domain analysis and software product lines were consulted. As a result, three more studies were added.

This led to a selection of 89 studies in total relevant for this systematic review: 24 studies (from Phase 1) + 62 studies (from Phase 2) + 3 studies (from Phase 3). There were no exclusions after reading the full texts.

3.3.2. Quality assessment and data extraction procedure

The aim of the systematic review was to assess levels of empirical evidence and thus it did not impose any restriction in terms of any specific research method or experimental design, therefore the study quality assessment covered both quantitative and qualitative studies. The study quality assessment was primarily included in the inclusion criteria and scoping of the review, i.e. only studies that present any type of evidence or evaluation related to domain analysis for software product lines/families were included in the study. Moreover, the study quality assessment was used as a means to guide the interpretation of the findings.

Based on the research questions (see Section 3.1), a set of data extraction categories were identified with the help of guidelines from Creswell (2003) and Kitchenham et al. (2002). Further, the categories were identified using the Goal Question Metric approach (GQM) (Basili et al., 1994) during several brainstorming sessions to ensure that categories identified address the aspects required to answer the research questions. Table 2 contains the definitions of the data extraction categories. There are only two categories for the research type as the purpose of the review is not to classify studies (Wieringa et al., 2005) but rather find out how many and to what extent the proposed solutions are empirically applied and/or validated.

The categorization of quality attributes (usability and usefulness) into quantitative and qualitative is not intended to indicate a preference or valuation of one over the other. Any empirical data (evidence) is judged on its own merits. For example, quantitative results obtained through a controlled experiment with students as subjects might not be as valuable as the expert opinion obtained in a case study with industry practitioners who actually applied a particular solution in industry. Moreover, context, background description and design also weigh in as the purpose is to categorize the reported empirical data to analyze the levels of usability and usefulness of a proposed solution. For example, a claim about the usability and/or usefulness of the presented solution without any description of context or how the claim may be substantiated is still considered as empirical evidence from the perspective of the study, but further analysis lets the reader weigh the value of the evidence.

In order to demonstrate the mapping between research questions and the design process, Table 3 shows the research questions and the corresponding data extraction categories.

Similar to the inclusion/exclusion process, the data extraction process was tested by the authors using a sample of 10 included



Fig. 3. Steps of Phase 2 of the search strategy.

studies. An initial agreement on the data extraction was achieved for the data extracted from 9 studies which is quite high. For the remaining study, the consensus was reached in a discussion session. This was done to ensure that there was a common understanding of the categories defined and the classification was agreed upon by the two researchers avoiding the potential bias and error source of having only one researcher performing the categorization.

3.4. Validity evaluation

This section presents the different validity threats related to the review and how they were addressed prior to the study to minimize the likelihood of their realization and impact.

3.4.1. Conclusion validity

Threats to conclusion validity are related with issues that affect the ability to draw the correct conclusions from the study (Wohlin et al., 2000). From the review perspective, a potential conclusion validity threat is the reliability of the data extraction categories. To minimize this threat, GQM was used in several brainstorming sessions to extract the research questions and based on the research questions, measures (in this case the data extraction categories) were identified (see Section 3.3.2). In addition, the results presented in the review are not categorical. Any evidence, or claim made by authors are given the benefit of the doubt and counted as evidence. However, the claims are broken down and analyzed, and the value can be judged by the reader as every analysis and analysis step is transparently shown in the paper.

3.4.2. Construct validity

Construct validity concerns generalizing the results of the study to the concept or theory behind the study (Wohlin et al., 2000). It is quite possible that the studies included in the review might not refer to the same construct using same terms thus as reviewers we might misinterpret the terms used. However, we feel fairly confident that the risk is rather minor as in addition to the term there is a context in which the term is used which minimizes the chance of misinterpretation.

From the review's perspective, another construct validity threat could be biased judgment. In this study the decision of which studies to include or exclude and how to categorize the studies could be biased and thus pose a threat. To minimize this threat both the processes of inclusion/exclusion and data extraction and coding were piloted prior to the study (see Section 3.3.1 and 3.3.2).

3.4.3. External validity

The key idea with a systematic review is to capture as much as possible of the available literature to avoid all sorts of bias. The main challenge with a systematic review is the reliability. The reliability has been addressed as far as possible by involving two researchers, and by having a protocol which was piloted and hence evaluated. If the study is replicated by another set of researchers, it is possible that some studies that were removed in this review will be included and other studies would be excluded. However, it is highly unlikely that these random differences based on personal judgments would change the general results. It may change the actual numbers somewhat, but it is not likely that it would change the overall results as they are dominantly skewed towards one end of the spectrum (see Section 4). Thus, in general we believe that the external validity of the study is high given the use of a very systematic procedure, consultation with the researchers in the field and involvement and discussion between the two researchers.

4. Results and analysis

This section presents a summary of the results of the inclusion/exclusion procedure (see Section 4.1) as well as the analysis of data extraction from the included studies (see Section 4.2). The extracted raw data is present in Appendix C. The data labels for Figs. 4–10 have the format: data extraction category, percentage of studies from which the corresponding data was extracted, number of studies from which the corresponding data was extracted. For example in Fig. 4 one of the data labels is (participation knowledge, 50%, 24) which means that 50% of the studies, claiming empirical basis for the need identified, reported "participation knowledge" as the "Basis". The actual number of studies is 24.

Table 2
Definitions of the data extraction categories.

Research type	
New solution	Is it a new solution for domain analysis? This includes only scoping and/or modeling parts of domain analysis solution e.g. if a new method of feature modeling has been presented it is considered as a new solution
Experience report	Is the paper an experience report describing the introduction of product lines in a company?
Empirical basis	
Empirical	If it is "New Solution", is it developed based on empirically identified industry needs?
Non-empirical	It is a new research idea
Basis reported as	If a study has empirical basis then the empirical basis reported can be categorized into 1. Statements only: the authors have written statements claiming that the need for the proposed solution has been identified in industry. 2. Participation knowledge: the authors are either practitioners in industry or participate in industry work and have identified the need for the proposed solution through participation. 3. Interviews: the authors have conducted interviews with experts in industry to identify/confirm a need and have shown that the need for the proposed solution has been identified through those interviews. 4. Process assessment: the authors have undertaken some formal process assessment e.g. using CMMI, IDEAL, REPEAT etc. and identified the need for the proposed solution.
Application/validation	
Empirical	It is applied/validated in laboratory setting or industry
Non-empirical	It is not applied/validated in laboratory setting or industry
Application/validation method	If a study contains empirical application/validation, what method of application/validation was used? Case study, survey, interviews, experiment, observations, other, as stated by the authors. We did not differentiate between research type and research context because of the fact that almost all the studies included in the review had industry as context, thus we only differentiated between research types If it is mentioned in the study that it has been applied/validated in industry but no description of application/validation method used is given then the method is classified as "Mentioned Industry Use"
Application/validation design explained	If a study contains empirical application/validation, the level of explanation of the design/execution of the application/validation method used is categorized into: 1. Statements: authors stated that they have applied/validated the solution in industry but no summary/details as how this was done 2. Application/Validation summary: summary of the method without details e.g. no research questions/hypothesis, context of study, sampling of population, study execution, validity threats and so on 3. Application/Validation in detail: a detailed explanation of the application/validation method including research questions/hypothesis, context of study, sampling of population, study execution, validity threats and so on
Application/validation results explained	If a study contains empirical application/validation, the level of explanation of the application/validation results is categorized into: 1. Nothing: no information is stated as to the results of the application/validation in the paper 2. Statements only: the authors have written statements about the results e.g. '*by applying the proposed solution, time-to-market decreased by 15%*'. This is a statement without any results or clarification of how the results were obtained 3. Qualitative results: for example expert opinions, e.g. 4 experts were interviewed and they foresee that application of the proposed solution would result in 15% decrease in time-to-market 4. Quantitative results: collected metrics and measurements are presented 5. Qual + Quant: when a combination of qualitative and quantitative results are presented
Driver of validation	If a study contains empirical application/validation, who was driving the validation of the solution in industry, was it a researcher or a practitioner? Answers can be: researcher, practitioner
Replication study	Is it a replication study? The answer could be Yes, No, Not clear, N/A (not applicable)
Builds on paper(s)	Does the current study build on future work of some previous study published or uses and enhances any "New Solution" presented previously? This does not include a study that has been referenced in "Introduction" and/or "Related work" section. The answer could be Yes or No. If the answer to the question is yes, mention the study it is related to
Usability and usefulness	
Usable	Yes/no
Usability reported as	If a study reports usability of proposed solution, the level of usability reported can be categorized into 1. Statements: the authors have written statements claiming usability e.g. "*a recent BigLever customer was able to convert their existing one-of-a-kind product into a GEARS production line with three custom product instances in less than one day*" (Krueger, 2002) 2. Qualitative data: as expert opinions e.g. 4 experts were interviewed and based on their judgment they stated the solution can be introduced in 2 days and can be applied to products with 50–500 requirements 3. Quantitative data: e.g. "*Document examination indicated that the team understood and was able to apply all notations used after only the four hour introduction to the approach, even though they had no earlier experience of feature modeling*" (Eriksson et al., 2005) 4. Qual + Quant: qualitative and quantitative data proving scalability of introduction and/or scalability of use e.g. **Quantitative data for scalability of introduction**:"*Document examination indicated that the team understood and was able to apply all notations used after only the four hour introduction to the approach, even though they had no earlier experience of feature modeling*" (Eriksson et al., 2005). **Qualitative data for scalability of use**: "*Experts could not identify any scalability problems with the approach*" (Eriksson et al., 2005)
Useful	Yes/no
Usefulness reported as	If a study reports usefulness of proposed solution, the level of usefulness reported can be categorized into 1. Statements: the authors have written statements claiming usefulness e.g. "*It is an effective product line validation model*" (Mannion and Camara, 2003) 2. Qualitative data: as expert opinions e.g. 4 experts were interviewed and based on their judgment they stated the proposed solution will be effective than the existing method for requirements triage 3. Quantitative data: proving effectiveness of the proposed solution e.g. data showing effective features representation and handling using proposed solution compared to existing solution 4. Qual + Quant: qualitative and quantitative data proving effectiveness of proposed solution
Future work mentioned	Has the study made promises of future work in relation to the current research? The answer can be yes/no
Written by	Is the study written by a practitioner? As stated above by practitioners it is meant the people working in industry. If the author is affiliated with industry research departments, the study is categorized as "written by practitioner". The answer can be yes/no/not clear

Table 3
Mapping between research questions with data extraction categories.

Research questions	Data extraction categories
RQ1. Are solutions, proposed for domain analysis, based on needs identified in industry?	• Research type • Empirical Basis • Builds on Paper(s)
RQ2. Are solutions, proposed for domain analysis, applied and/or validated in a laboratory setting or in industry?	• Research type • Application/validation a. Application/validation method b. Application/validation design explained c. Application/validation results explained d. Driver of application/validation e. Replication study • Builds on paper(s) • Future work mentioned • Written by
RQ3. Are the solutions, proposed for domain analysis, usable? RQ4. Are the solutions, proposed for domain analysis, useful?	• Usability and usefulness a. Usability b. Usability reported as c. Usefulness d. Usefulness reported as



Fig. 4. Included studies, "Basis" categorization.

4.1. Included studies overview

Summarizing the data extracted from the included studies, 48 studies[1] out of 89 studies (both "new solution" and "experience report" types) have some form of empirical basis, all 89 studies contain some form of application/validation, and out of these 64[2] are written by researchers. The remaining 25 studies[3] are written by practitioners. None of the 89 studies is a replication study. In total 36 studies[4] out of 89 have reported on some sort of usability, and 87[5] studies out of 89 have claimed usefulness in some form.

4.2. Analysis

In this section the data extracted is analyzed with respect to the research questions posed in Table 1.

[1] 9, 11, 16, 33, 38, 40, 45, 46, 48, 50, 52, 56, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 72, 84, 2, 3, 13, 14, 15, 18, 24, 28, 31, 49, 53, 67, 68, 70, 74, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86, 88, 89, 78, 69, 83, 87.
[2] 1, 3, 4–14, 16–22, 25, 26, 28–46, 49–55, 57–59, 61–64, 73, 75–79, 84, 86, 87.
[3] 2, 15, 23, 24, 27, 47, 48, 56, 60, 65–72, 74, 80–83, 85, 88, 89.
[4] 1, 2, 8, 11, 12, 13, 31, 34, 40, 41, 43, 46, 49, 51, 53, 56, 59, 69, 70, 72, 74, 76, 77, 78, 80, 84, 85, 86, 88, 3, 24, 30, 37, 52, 87, 75.
[5] 1, 2, 4–10, 13, 16–20, 22, 23, 25–29, 31–36, 39–43, 45–51, 53, 55–64, 66, 67, 69–74, 76–78, 80–86, 89, 15, 75, 3, 11, 12, 14, 21, 24, 30, 44, 88, 37, 38, 52, 54, 79, 87.

4.2.1. RQ1 (Are solutions, proposed for domain analysis, based on needs identified from Industry?)

Almost half of the studies are based in some sense on the needs identified in industry (see Section 4.1). However, a deeper analysis of the empirical basis reported can be seen in Fig. 4 which shows that a majority of the studies have mentioned identified needs as "Statements only" (42% studies[6]), or as "Participation knowledge" (50% studies[7]). Only 2% studies[8] have mentioned interviewing experts to identify needs, and only 6% studies[9] have stated that some form of process assessment was used to identify the need for the proposed solutions.

These results make it hard to judge the credibility of the empirical basis of the solutions proposed due to the absence of presentation of e.g. process assessment and/or experts' opinions through e.g. interviews. In addition, due to the almost total lack of how the practitioners knew about the problems/needs that constitute the basis for the solutions proposed, it is impossible to draw any conclusions. In the few cases where process assessment or interviews were conducted no details such as selection criteria, method used or number of interviews, and so on are explained.

Moreover, although a majority of the studies claims empirical basis, very few are based on future work described by previously published studies, or extend previously published solutions.[10] This may indicate that in the absence of expert interviews or proper process assessments, the needs identified may not be representative of the current problem or valid for other companies in similar situations.

The answer to RQ1 is that a majority of the proposed solutions are based on needs identified in industry, however, the actual method used and the validity of the results are impossible to ascertain as very little information is given.

4.2.2. RQ2 (Are solutions, proposed for domain analysis, applied and/or validated in a laboratory setting or in industry?)

An analysis of the studies, claiming application/validation (see Fig. 5) reveals that for the years 1998–2007, 33% studies[11] have used case study as an application/validation method. In 24% of the studies[12] industry use was only stated and 36% studies[13] have demonstrated application/validation through simplified examples. This means that 60% of the applied/validated studies have either only mentioned industry use without any details reported, or have used simplified examples to demonstrate practicality of a proposed solution. The remaining 40% have described some details about application/validation. This makes it harder to judge the scalability of introduction and scalability of use of the proposed solutions. From Fig. 5, it is evident that only 5% studies[14] have used workshops, pilots and prototyping. It is also interesting to note that for the years 1998–2007 only 2% studies[15] have used experimentation as a validation method.

One of the reasons for these numbers could be that it is difficult to do experimentation for new solutions for product lines due to complexity of the area and difficulty in covering the entire scope in a controlled experiment. However, empirical studies are the building blocks essential for collecting evidence and to determine what situations are best for using a particular solution (Pfleeger,

[6] 9, 11, 16, 33, 38, 40, 45, 46, 48, 50, 52, 56, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 72, 84.
[7] 2, 3, 13, 14, 15, 18, 24, 28, 31, 49, 53, 67, 68, 70, 74, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86, 88, 89.
[8] 78.
[9] 69, 83, 87.
[10] 3, 12, 20, 34, 43, 44, 58, 83.
[11] 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15, 16, 19, 24, 26, 30, 34, 37, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 58, 65, 72, 75, 76, 77.
[12] 18, 22, 33, 40, 50, 63, 64, 66, 67, 70, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89.
[13] 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 39, 41, 44, 45, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 71, 73.
[14] 42, 68, 69, 74, 78.
[15] 23, 38.



Fig. 5. Number of studies categorized according to the application/validation method.



Fig. 7. Included studies "Application/Validation Results" categorized.



Fig. 6. Included studies, "Application/Validation Design Explained" categorized.



Fig. 8. Cumulative Number of studies vs Cumulative Number of previously proposed "new solution" studies.

1999). The current situation means there is a lack of quantitative and/or qualitative data that a new solution is better than an already existing one, or what the impact of implementing the new solution might be. This makes it impossible to gauge efficiency or effectiveness of proposed solutions either alone or in relation to better alternative investment (BAI).

Moving on from the analysis of application/validation methods used to the analysis of the application/validation design details, Fig. 6 shows the categorization of the application/validation design explanation given in the included studies claiming some form of application/validation. From Fig. 6, it is possible to see that 84% studies either provide application/validation summary (50% studies[16]) or explain application/validation in detail (34% studies[17]). This seems to be a positive outcome that most of the studies have explained application/validation in detail. However, after analyzing the level of application/validation results, it is found that a majority of the studies either say nothing about the application/validation results (11%) or have only statements about the results (70% studies) (see Fig. 7). Only 7% studies[18] provide qualitative results as experts' opinion, 9% studies[19] provide quantitative results and only 3% studies[20] provide both qualitative and quantitative results.

[16] 1, 4, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 43, 46, 47, 49, 50, 54, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 67, 68, 70, 74, 76, 78, 79, 80, 83, 85, 87, 89.

[17] 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 37, 41, 44, 45, 51, 52, 56, 59, 71, 72, 75, 81, 82, 86, 88.

[18] 3, 24, 32, 49, 81, 88.

[19] 38, 52, 54, 59, 67, 79, 87.

[20] 11, 15, 75.

Thus, Fig. 7 reveals that out of 89 included studies with the claim of empirical evidence, 80% studies lack qualitative or quantitative results of application/validation. The absence of strong application/validation results may be one of the reasons that few studies have used previously proposed solutions (see Section 4.2.1).

Majority of the "Experience report" studies state the results of the experiences as lessons learned without any indication how these lessons were collected. The lack of description in relation to the experiences, for example if interviews were used, if there were any quantitative measures and so on, makes it difficult to judge validity. This also makes it hard for other practitioners to gauge the context and relevance of the experiences reported.

Fig. 8 presents another aspect to answer this question and that is to see how many solutions from each year are based on solutions presented in previous years. Fig. 8 shows that many new solutions have been presented over the years, but very few actually have been used as a basis for further development or adoption, piloting or test in industry. For example, by the year 2003 a total of 28 new solutions had been proposed but only 5 studies reported the use of any of the previously proposed solutions (in industry or as a basis for refinement of a solution). By 2007 the number of "New Solution" studies had reached 73, and only 12 studies were based on previously proposed solutions or reported experience based on the use of previously proposed solutions. This may indicate that the proposed solutions are not applicable in industry or that due to missing application/validation results the solutions are not applied by practitioners and not used by researchers. This problem has been indicated by others as well e.g. in Kircher et al. (2006). This may imply that a focus on validation and proper reporting should be



Fig. 9. "Usability" reported in included studies.



Fig. 10. "Usefulness" reported in included studies.

premiered over the continuous presentation of new solutions. Another possibility is that the proposed solutions do not solve the challenges in industry, which in turn implies that there is a need to understand the challenges. Another possible conclusion could be that industry practitioners are not up to date with the new solutions proposed, thus the solutions go unused. None of the studies presented from the year 1998 to 2007 were replicated studies.

Summarizing all the aspects analyzed above, the answer to RQ2 is that although the studies from the years 1998 to 2007 have reported some form of application/validation, the absence of detailed results or replicated studies make it difficult to evaluate the potential of the proposed solutions. This is further compounded by the fact that the validity of the reported experiences reports is also very hard to judge.

4.2.3. Answering RQ3 (Are the solutions, proposed for domain analysis, usable?) and RQ4 (Are the solutions, proposed for domain analysis, useful?)

In 36 studies usability was mentioned as a part of the proposed solutions. However, looking at Fig. 9 it is possible to see that 80% of the studies[21] only have statements claiming usability. An example of this can be illustrated by the following statement: "*A minor problem occurs as the table can grow and become unwieldy for large application areas, but this can be addressed by segmenting the table appropriately*" (DeBaud and Schmid, 1999). In 8% of the studies[22] qualitative evidence of usability as expert opinion was presented, for example, "*After finishing the project, the project manager and developers agreed that the proposed domain requirements development approach was very helpful for identifying and specifying application requirements, resulting in reducing the overall development effort*" (Moon et al., 2005). 8% of the studies[23] gave quantitative evidence of usability and only 2% of the studies[24] gave both qualitative and quantitative evidence of usability e.g. "*...indicated that the team understood and was able to apply all notations used after only the four hour introduction to the approach, even though they had no earlier experience of feature modeling*", results of "*questionnaire indicated that the product line analysis team gained a better understanding of the domain during the modeling activity*" (Eriksson et al., 2005).

Clearly with the usability statements as exemplified above, it is difficult to judge the usability of a proposed solution. A clear majority of the studies do not include either qualitative or quantitative data about scalability of introduction or scalability of use, making it harder for practitioners to evaluate usability. It is important to understand that the intention in this review is not to criticize studies but to highlight the absence of qualitative and quantitative evidence in relation to usability, which might be a barrier for the industrial adoption of the proposed solutions.

Positive results regarding usefulness were reported by 87 of the included studies, which seem to be very good, but a deeper analysis as can be seen in Fig. 10 shows that 81% of the studies[25] claim usefulness as statements. For example, "*The ILP modeling approach presented in the former section was tested in a Stago project with satisfying results*" (Djebbi and Salinesi, 2007). There are only 2% of the studies[26] that provides qualitative and quantitative data about the usefulness of the proposed solution.

If the percentages and the categorization of reported application/validation results are kept in mind, it seems logical that since the application/validation results were mostly statements (see Fig. 7), usability and usefulness evidence would naturally also be statements due to the absence of qualitative and/or quantitative results for the application/validation of a solution. This also results in difficulty to find any qualitative or quantitative evidence of usability or usefulness, even in the form of statements and claims, made by the authors of respective studies.

The answer to RQ3 and RQ4 is that although there are statements regarding usability and usefulness in the studies published for the years 1998–2007, lack of qualitative and quantitative data of any sort makes it difficult to evaluate how usable and useful the proposed solutions/experiences are. In industry, time and resources are scarce. If a practitioner cannot clearly determine the time and resources required to implement a solution against the usefulness of the solution in comparison to available better alternative investments, it is very unlikely that the solution will be adopted based only on statements made by the creators of the solution. Similarly, if authors do not show scalability of use of a particular solution indication the ability to tackle industry scale problems, practitioners would probably not take the risk of implementing a solution, as it falls short on reporting even rudimentary evidence on efficiency.

5. Conclusion

This paper presents the systematic review of the modeling and scoping activities involved in domain analysis for software product lines from the year 1998 until 2007. With a three phase search strategy, 89 studies were selected that either proposed new solutions of

[21] 1, 2, 8, 11, 12, 13, 31, 34, 40, 41, 43, 46, 49, 51, 53, 56, 59, 69, 70, 72, 74, 76, 77, 78, 80, 84, 85, 86, 88.
[22] 3, 24, 30.
[23] 37, 52, 87.
[24] 75.
[25] 1, 2, 4–10, 13, 16–20, 22, 23, 25–29, 31–36, 39–43, 45–51, 53, 55–64, 66, 67, 69–74, 76–78, 80–86, 89.
[26] 15, 75.

domain analysis or reports of experiences in using such solutions. In order to *analyze the practical application and validation of proposed domain analysis solutions in industry and to gauge their practical usability and usefulness*, four research questions were specified (see Section 3.1.). Based on the goal and corresponding research questions to achieve that goal, a data extraction procedure was defined (see Section 3.3.2.). Data was then extracted using a defined procedure covering the basis of a study, practicality, usability and usefulness, future work and information about the authors.

The major findings of the review can be summarized as follows:

1. Many domain analysis solutions have been presented over the years and a majority of the studies address needs identified in industry, but they fall short on the approach used to identify the need for a solution. Most studies only claim that they based the solution on a need identified in industry or state that through participation knowledge the need for the proposed solution was identified. Such claims and statements may be valid, but they raise validity questions both from a research perspective and an industrial adoption perspective. Without interviewing experts in industry or performing some form of process assessment, it is hard to triangulate the need identified thus raising the issue that the need may not be representative of the current situation. As a result, this poses questions about the internal and external validity of the needs identified, and this is passed on to the corresponding solutions proposed.
2. Many studies claim that they have applied/validated the proposed solutions in industry; however, a deeper analysis reveals that a majority of the claims are merely statements (80%), and qualitative and quantitative evidence supporting these claims is generally missing. Claims and statements may be valid, but in the absence of clear qualitative evidence as experts' opinions and/or quantitative data about the benefits of the proposed solution, it is hard to evaluate the potential of these solutions for industry adoption.
3. Many studies claim usability and usefulness of the proposed solutions in some form, however a deeper analysis reveals that majority of the claims are also merely statements about usability (80%) and usefulness (81%). As mentioned previously such claims may be valid, but they raise validity questions from both a research and industrial adoption perspective. Without experts' opinions and/or quantitative data supporting the usability and usefulness claims, it is difficult to evaluate the validity of the claims, and similarly it is difficult for the practitioners to evaluate the usability and usefulness of a proposed solution for application in industry.

The overall goal of this review was not to expect or demand perfect evidence of usability and usefulness following perfect and extensive data collection in industry. However, many studies over the years have shown that it is possible to validate proposed solutions in any number of ways. Controlled experiments could be used in academia, even if the use of students as subjects is debated. Traditionally, experiments in software engineering were performed on a limited scale e.g. comparing defects detection techniques (Lott and Rombach, 1996). In the context of software product lines specific techniques can also be tested e.g. comparing different feature modeling techniques however, testing areas such as scoping and requirements engineering decisions in SPL are harder to simulate in a controlled environment. One of the contributions of this paper is to highlight the fact that refined experiment designs might be needed keeping in view the inherent complexity and broader scope of software product lines. Static (preliminary) validation may be performed in industry as case studies through workshops, interviews, or surveys. Dynamic validation (e.g. pilots) may be performed collecting metrics and qualitative data though interviews with practitioners. The data collected is not complete, but vastly better than no data at all.

In addition to doing validation (e.g. in industry), the way in which the validation is planned and reported is also crucial. The studies reviewed are full of statements, claiming usability and usefulness. The good thing is that this indicates that our interest in these two concepts in this systematic review is relevant, i.e. usability and usefulness of solutions are important and this is confirmed by the authors themselves. However, even if statements are common, very little evidence is presented, both in terms of absence of data, but also absence of design for the studies presented. The only seemingly complete validation is when there is no real validation, e.g. in case of presenting simplified examples. The use of simplified examples is not without merit, e.g. it may be used to explain and exemplify the use of a solution initially, but use of a simplified example is not the same as validation, even if the example is based on something relevant for industry. One might even go so far as to expect an evolution, that is, a new solution proposed is exemplified and explained through the use of simplified and scaled down examples in initial publications, then validation is performed, scaling up the tests of the solution.

The presence of empirical evidence of any sort with at least some intent to explain the overall design and execution of a validation (e.g. a pilot test in industry) could be very beneficial for both researchers and industry practitioners. From an academic point of view the possibility to learn and extend on presented research is crucial for progress. In addition, one of the foundations of research is the possibility to replicate studies. None of the studies included was a replicated study.

From a practitioner point of view, a design and illustration of how conclusions about usability and usefulness are made can vastly improve the relevance of any paper. The total absence of data or evidence is problematic from two perspectives. First, can the results be trusted? Second, even if the authors are given the benefit of the doubt, is the proposed solution relevant for all cases? If not, what cases?

There may be several explanations for the results of this systematic review. One could be that the included conference and journals attract a certain type of studies that do not focus on empirical results. Another explanation could be that in case of conferences a ten page limit presents problems for presenting empirical results, even if there are many studies who manage (some examples from SPLC conference are Eriksson et al. (2005), Jepsen et al. (2007) and Lee et al. (2000)). Moreover, guidelines for conducting empirical research has been presented in a number of papers e.g. Jedlitschka and Pfahl (2005), Kitchenham et al. (2002, 2008), Runeson and Höst (2009) and Staples and Niazi (2007), which can be used. Yet another explanation could be that industry validation is hard to achieve. The question is, should we accept these explanations, or should we strive for improving state-of-the-art reporting?

Summarizing the contribution of this systematic review we have two main perspectives. For industry practitioners looking to adopt a domain analysis solution, the results of the study can be used as an indication of maturity as well as to estimate potential risk of a certain solution before considering its application. From an academic point of view researchers planning studies and evaluation of a solution can use this study as inspiration for study design as the evaluation criteria of the review presented in this paper could be seen as a checklist to ascertain usability and usefulness.

Acknowledgements

We will like to thank Klaus Schmid, Lianping Chen, Mikael Svahnberg and Kent Pettersson who helped us in binding the scope of this systematic review and making searches as exhaustive as possible.

Appendix A. Search strings

Search strings	Databases
((((“product famil*” OR “product line*”) AND ({requirements} OR {requirements engineering*} OR {conceptual model*} OR {requirements model*} OR {commonality and variability model*} OR {domain model*} OR {feature model*} OR {scenario model*} OR {commonality analysis} OR {variability analysis} OR {domain eval*} OR {domain scop*} OR “asset scop*”)) AND (((((“product famil*” OR “product line*”) AND ({requirements} OR {requirements engineering*} OR {conceptual model*} OR {requirements model*} OR {commonality and variability model*} OR {domain model*} OR {feature model*} OR {scenario model*} OR {commonality analysis} OR {variability analysis} OR {domain eval*} OR {domain scop*} OR “asset scop*”)) AND (empiric* OR experience* OR “lesson learned” OR “lesson learnt” OR “lessons learned” OR evaluat* OR validat* OR experiment* OR stud* OR case* OR example* OR survey OR analys* OR investig* OR demonstrate* OR industr*) WN KY) AND (1969–2007 WN YR) AND (English) WN LA)) WN KY) AND (1969–2007 WN YR) AND (English) WN LA)	Inspec and Compendex via Engineering Village2
(((Abstract:product and Abstract:line) OR (Abstract:product and Abstract:famil*)) AND ((Abstract:requirements and Abstract: Model*) OR (Abstract:requirements and Abstract: engineer*) OR (Abstract:requirements) OR (Abstract:conceptual and Abstract:Model*) OR (Abstract:feature and Abstract: Model*) OR (Abstract:commonality and Abstract:analysis) OR (Abstract:variability and Abstract:analysis) OR (Abstract:domain and Abstract:scop*) OR (Abstract:domain and Abstract:eval*) OR (Abstract:Asset and Abstract:scop*)) AND ((Abstract:case and Abstract:stud*) OR (Abstract:empiric*) OR (Abstract:experienc*) OR (Abstract:lessons and Abstract:learn*) OR (Abstract:evaluate*) OR (Abstract:validate*) OR (Abstract:experiment*) OR (Abstract:example*) OR (Abstract:survey*) OR (Abstract:analy*) OR (Abstract:investigat*) OR (Abstract:demonstrat*) OR (Abstract:industr*)))	ACM
((((product line)<in>ab) <or> ((product famil*)<in>ab)) <and> (((requirements model*)<in>ab) <or> ((requirements engineer*)<in>ab) <or> ((requirements)<in>ab) <or> ((conceptual model*)<in>ab) <or> ((feature model*)<in>ab) <or> ((commonality analysis)<in>ab) <or> ((variability analysis)<in>ab) <or> ((domain sco*)<in>ab) <or> ((domain eval*)<in>ab) <or> ((asset sco*)<in>ab)) <and> (((experienc*)<in>ab) <or> ((empiric*)<in>ab)<or> ((lessons learn**)<in>ab)<or> ((evaluat*)<in>ab)<or> ((validat*)<in>ab)<or> ((expeiment*)<in>ab)<or> ((case study)<in>ab)<or> ((survey*)<in>ab)<or> ((analy*)<in>ab)<or> ((investigat*)<in>ab)<or> ((demonstrat*)<in>ab)<or> ((industr*)<in>ab)))	IEEEXplore
TS = (“product line” OR “product famil*” AND (TS = (“requirements” OR “requirements engineering” OR “requirements model*” OR “feature model*” OR “commonality analysis” OR “variability analysis” OR “domain scop*” OR “domain eval*” OR “asset scop*”)) AND (TS = (“case stud*” OR “empiric*” OR “experien” OR “Lessons learn*” OR “evaluat*” or “validat*” OR “experiment” OR “exampl” OR “survey” OR “Analy*” OR “investigat*” OR “validat*” OR “industri*”))) AND Language = (English) AND Document Type = (Article)	ISI Web of Science

Appendix B. Selected studies

Study id	Study name
1	S. Jarzabek, B. Yang and S. Yoeun. (2006). Addressing quality attributes in domain analysis for product lines. IEE Software. 153. 2. 61–73
2	J. M. Thompson and M. P. E. Heimdahl. (2003). Structuring product family requirements for n-dimensional and hierarchical product lines. Requirements Engineering. 8. 1. 42–54
3	P. Knauber, D. Muthig, K. Schmid and T. Widen. (2000). Applying product line concepts in small and medium-sized companies. IEEE Software. 17. 5. 88–95
4	L. Soon-Bok, K. Jin-Woo, S. Chee-Yang and B. Doo-Kwon. (2007). An approach to analyzing commonality and variability of features using ontology in a software product line engineering. Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Software Engineering Research, Management and Applications. Piscataway, NJ, USA. IEEE Computer Society
5	C. Kun, Z. Wei, Z. Haiyan and M. Hong. (2005). An approach to constructing feature models based on requirements clustering. Proceedings of 13th IEEE International Conference on Requirements Engineering. Los Alamitos, CA, USA. IEEE Computer Society
6	L. Yuqin, Y. Chuanyao, Z. Chongxiang and Z. Wenyun. (2006). An approach to managing feature dependencies for product releasing in software product lines. Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Software Reuse. Berlin, Germany. Springer-Verlag
7	C. Kuloor and A. Eberlein. (2003). Aspect-oriented requirements engineering for software product lines. Proceedings of the 10th IEEE International Conference and Workshop on the Engineering of Computer-Based Systems. Los Alamitos, CA, USA. IEEE Computer Society
8	R. R. Lutz and F. Qian. (2005). Bi-directional safety analysis of product lines. Journal of Systems and Software. 78. 2. 111–27
9	W. Lam. (1998). A case-study of requirements reuse through product families. Annals of Software Engineering. 5. 253–77
10	M. Ramachandran and P. Allen. (2005). Commonality and variability analysis in industrial practice for product line improvement. Software Process Improvement and Practice. 10. 1. 31–40
11	K. Schmid. (2002). A comprehensive product line scoping approach and its validation. Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Software Engineering. ICSE 2002. New York, NY, USA. ACM

Appendix B (*continued*)

Study id	Study name
12	J.-M. DeBaud and K. Schmid. (1999). A systematic approach to derive the scope of software product lines. Proceedings of the 21st international conference on Software Engineering. Los Angeles, California, United States. ACM
13	J. Bayer, O. Flege, P. Knauber, R. Laqua, D. Muthig, K. Schmid, T. Widen and J. M. DeBaud. (1999). PuLSE: A methodology to develop software product lines. Proceedings of the Fifth Symposium on Software Reusability. Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice. New York, NY, USA. ACM
14	M. Sinnema, S. Deelstra, J. Nijhuis and J. Bosch. (2004). COVAMOF: a framework for modeling variability in software product families. Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Software Product Lines. Berlin, Germany. Springer-Verlag
15	D. Aubrey. (2006). Controlling the HMS Program through managing requirements. Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Requirements Engineering. Piscataway, NJ 08855-1331, United States. IEEE Computer Society
16	K. Schmid and I. John. (2004). A customizable approach to full lifecycle variability management. Science of Computer Programming. 53. 3. 259–284
17	T. Eisenbarth, R. Koschke and D. Simon. (2001). Derivation of feature component maps by means of concept analysis. Fifth European Conference on Software Maintenance and Reengineering. Lisbon, Portugal. IEEE Computer Society
18	O. Djebbi, C. Salinesi and D. Diaz. (2007). Deriving product line requirements: The RED-PL guidance approach. Proceedings of the Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference, APSEC. Los Alamitos, CA 90720-1314, United States. IEEE Computer Society
19	S. Deelstra, M. Sinnema, J. Nijhuis and J. Bosch. (2004). COSVAM: A technique for assessing software variability in software product families. IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance, ICSM. Los Alamitos, CA 90720-1314, United States. IEEE Computer Society
20	A. Metzger, P. Heymans, K. Pohl, P. Y. Schobbens and G. Saval. (2007). Disambiguating the documentation of variability in software product lines: a separation of concerns, formalization and automated analysis. Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Requirements Engineering. Piscataway, NJ, USA. IEEE Computer Society
21	K. Minseong, Y. Hwasil and P. Sooyong. (2003). A domain analysis method for software product lines based on scenarios, goals and features. Proceedings of the 10th Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference. Los Alamitos, CA, USA. IEEE Comput. Society
22	I. John, D. Muthig, P. Sody and E. Tolzmann. (2002). Efficient and systematic software evolution through domain analysis. Proceedings of the 10th Anniversary IEEE Joint International Conference on Requirements Engineering. Essen, Germany. IEEE Computer Society
23	A. K. Thurimella and B. Bruegge. (2007). Evolution in product line requirements engineering: a rationale management approach. IEEE International Conference on Requirements Engineering. Piscataway, NJ, USA. IEEE Computer Society
24	M. Breen. (2005). Experience of using a lightweight formal specification method for a commercial embedded system product line. Requirements Engineering. 10. 2. 161–72
25	H. Zuo, M. Mannion, D. Sellier and R. Foley. (2005). An extension of problem frame notation for software product lines. Proceedings of Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference, APSEC. Los Alamitos, CA 90720-1314, United States. IEEE Computer Society
26	B. Jongsu and K. Sungwon. (2007). A Method to Generate a Feature Model from a Business Process Model for Business Applications. Proceedings of the 7th IEEE International Conference on Computer and Information Technology. Fukushima Japan. IEEE Computer Society
27	K. C. Kang, L. Jaejoon and P. Donohoe. (2002). Feature-oriented product line engineering. IEEE Software. 19. 4. 58–65
28	S. Thiel and A. Hein. (2002). Modeling and using product line variability in automotive systems. IEEE Software. 19. 4. 66–72
29	J. Kim, M. Kim, H. Yang and S. Park. (2004). A method and tool support for variant requirements analysis: Goal and scenario based approach. Proceedings of Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference, APSEC. Los Alamitos, CA 90720-1314, United States. IEEE Computer Society
30	M. Moon, K. Yeom and H. S. Chae. (2005). An approach to developing domain requirements as a core asset based on commonality and variability analysis in a product line. IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering. 31. 7. 551–569
31	H. Zhang and S. Jarzabek. (2004). XVCL: A mechanism for handling variants in software product lines. Science of Computer Programming. 53. 3. 381–407
32	J. Savolainen and J. Kuusela. (2001). Volatility analysis framework for product lines. Proceedings of the Symposium on Software Reusability. Association for Computing Machinery
33	A. K. Jeong. (2006). Variability management with ACM (Adaptable Component Model) for insurance product line. Proceedings of the 2006 IEEE International Conference on Information Reuse and Integration. Piscataway, NJ 08855-1331, United States. IEEE Computer Society
34	P. Prasanna and R. R. Lutz. (2005). Tool-supported verification of product line requirements. Automated Software Engineering. 12. 4. 447–65
35	T. Nakanishi, M. Fujita, S. Yamazaki, N. Yamashita and S. Ashihara. (2007). Tailoring the Domain Engineering Process of the PLUS Method. Proceedings of the14th Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference. Nagoya, Japan. IEEE Computer Society
36	Y. P. Shin and D. K. Soo. (2005). A systematic method for scoping core assets in product line engineering. Proceedings - Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference, APSEC. Los Alamitos, CA 90720-1314, United States. IEEE Computer Society
37	M. Ardis, N. Daley, D. Hoffman, H. Siy and D. Weiss. (2000). Software product lines: a case study. Software-Practice & Experience. 30. 7. 825–847
38	G. Spanoudakis, A. Zisman, E. Perez-Minana and P. Krause. (2004). Rule-based generation of requirements traceability relations. Journal of Systems and Software. 72. 2. 105–127

(*continued on next page*)

Appendix B (*continued*)

Study id	Study name
39	L. Yiyuan, Y. Jianwei, S. Dongcai, L. Ying and D. Jinxiang. (2007). Software product line oriented feature map. Proceedings of the 7th International Conference of Computational Science-ICCS Berlin, Germany. Springer
40	M. Eriksson, J. Borstler and K. Borg. (2006). Software product line modeling made practical. Communications of the ACM. 49. 12. 1183265
41	H. Gomaa and M. Saleh. (2006). Software product line engineering and dynamic customization of a radio frequency management system. Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Systems and Applications. Piscataway, NJ 08855-1331, United States. IEEE Computer Society
42	H. Gomaa and M. E. Shin. (2002). Multiple-view meta-modeling of software product lines. Proceedings of the Eighth IEEE International Conference on Engineering of Complex Computer Systems. Los Alamitos, CA, USA. IEEE Computer Society
43	M. A. Laguna, B. Gonzalez-Baixauli and J. M. Marques. (2007). Seamless development of software product lines. Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Generative Programming and Component Engineering. New York, NY 10036-5701, United States. Association for Computing Machinery
44	P. Sooyong, K. Minseong and V. Sugumaran. (2004). A scenario, goal and feature-oriented domain analysis approach for developing software product lines. Industrial Management + Data Systems. 104. 4. 296–308
45	J. Liu, J. Dehlinger and R. Lutz. (2007). Safety analysis of software product lines using state-based modeling. Journal of Systems and Software. 80. 11. 1879–1892
46	R. R. Lutz, G. G. Helmer, M. M. Moseman, D. E. Statezni and S. R. Tockey. (1998). Safety analysis of requirements for a product family. Third International Conference on Requirements Engineering. Colorado Springs, CO, USA. IEEE Computer Society
47	F. Loesch and E. Ploedereder. (2007). Restructuring variability in software product lines using concept analysis of product configurations. Proceedings of the 11th European Conference on Software Maintenance and Reengineering. Los Alamitos, CA, USA. IEEE Computer Society
48	J. Kuusela and J. Savolainen. (2000). Requirements engineering for product families. Proceedings of International Conference on Software Engineering. Los Alamitos, CA, USA. IEEE Computer Society
49	O. Djebbi and C. Salinesi. (2007). RED-PL, a method for deriving product requirements from a product line requirements model. Proceedings 19th International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering. Berlin, Germany. Springer-Verlag
50	P. Clements, L. G. Jones, L. M. Northrop and J. D. McGregor. (2005). Project management in a software product line organization. IEEE Software. 22. 5. 54–62
51	S. R. Faulk. (2001). Product-Line Requirements Specification (PRS): An approach and case study. Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Requirements Engineering. IEEE Computer Society
52	K. Schmid. (2002). The product line mapping approach to defining and structuring product portfolios. Proceedings of the IEEE Joint International Conference on Requirements Engineering. Los Alamitos, CA, USA. IEEE Computer Society
53	A. Birk, G. Heller, I. John, K. Schmid, T. Von der Massen and K. Muller. (2003). Product Line Engineering: The State of the Practice. IEEE Software. 20. 6. 52–60
54	M. Aoyama. (2005). Persona-and-scenario based requirements engineering for software embedded in digital consumer products. Proceedings of the 13th IEEE International Conference on Requirements Engineering. Paris, France. IEEE Computer Society
55	K. Mohan and B. Ramesh. (2003). Ontology-based support for variability management in product and families. Proceedings of the 36th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. Hawaii, USA. IEEE Computer Society
56	S. Buhne, K. Lauenroth and K. Pohl. (2005). Modelling requirements variability across product lines. Proceedings of 13th IEEE International Conference on Requirements Engineering. Los Alamitos, CA, USA. IEEE Computer Society
57	T. J. Redling. (2003). A methodology for developing new product line requirements through gap analysis. Proceedings of 22nd Digital Avionics Systems Conference. Piscataway, NJ, USA. IEEE Computer Society
58	I. Hammouda, J. Hautamaki, M. Pussinen and K. Koskimies. (2005). Managing variability using heterogeneous feature variation patterns. FASE 2005 Held as Part of the Joint European Conference on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2005. Berlin, Germany. Springer-Verlag
59	M. Kim, S. Park, V. Sugumaran and H. Yang. (2007). Managing requirements conflicts in software product lines: A goal and scenario based approach. Data and Knowledge Engineering. 61. 3. 417–432
60	M. O. Reiser and M. Weber. (2006). Managing Highly Complex Product Families with Multi-Level Feature Trees. 14th IEEE International Conference on Requirements Engineering. Minessota, USA. IEEE Computer Society
61	R. Rabiser and D. Dhungana. (2007). Integrated support for product configuration and requirements engineering in product derivation. 33rd Euromicro Conference on Software Engineering and Advanced Applications. Piscataway, NJ, USA. IEEE Computer Society
62	J. Savolainen, M. Kauppinen and T. Mannisto. (2007). Identifying key requirements for a new product line. Proceedings of Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference, APSEC. Nagoya, Japan. IEEE Computer Society
63	P. C. Clements, L. G. Jones, J. D. McGregor and L. M. Northrop. (2006). Getting there from here: A Roadmap for software product line adoption. Communications of the ACM. 49. 12. 1183261
64	J. Lee and D. Muthig. (2006). Feature-oriented variability management in product line engineering. Communications of the ACM. 49. 12. 1183266
65	H. Mei, W. Zhang and F. Gu. (2003). A Feature Oriented Approach to Modeling and Reusing Requirements of Software Product Lines. Proceedings of IEEE Computer Society's International Computer Software and Applications Conference. IEEE Computer Society

Appendix B (*continued*)

Study id	Study name
66	G. Böckle. (2000). Model-based requirements engineering for product lines. Proceedings of the First Conference on Software Product Lines: experience and research directions: experience and research directions. Denver, Colorado, United States. Kluwer Academic Publishers
67	A. Hein, M. Schlick and R. Vinga-Martins. (2000). Applying feature models in industrial settings. Proceedings of the First Conference on Software Product Lines: experience and research directions: experience and research directions. Denver, Colorado, United States. Kluwer Academic Publishers
68	T. Kishi and N. Noda. (2000). Aspect-oriented analysis for product line architecture. Proceedings of the First Conference on Software Product Lines: experience and research directions: experience and research directions. Denver, Colorado, United States. Kluwer Academic Publishers
69	D. Fey, R. Fajta and A. Boros. (2002). Feature Modeling: A Meta-Model to Enhance Usability and Usefulness. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Software Product Lines. Springer-Verlag
70	S. Ferber, J. Haag and J. Savolainen. (2002). Feature Interaction and Dependencies: Modeling Features for Reengineering a Legacy Product Line. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Software Product Lines. Springer-Verlag
71	M. Mannion. (2002). Using First-Order Logic for Product Line Model Validation. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Software Product Lines. Springer-Verlag
72	T. Kishi, N. Noda and T. Katayama. (2002). A Method for Product Line Scoping Based on a Decision-Making Framework. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Software Product Lines. Springer-Verlag
73	D. Simon and T. Eisenbarth. (2002). Evolutionary Introduction of Software Product Lines. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Software Product Lines. Springer-Verlag
74	F. Claudia and H. Ralf. (2004). Product line potential analysis. Proceedings of the Third International Conference of Software Product Lines. Boston, MA, USA. Springer Berlin–Heidelberg
75	M. Eriksson, J. Börstler and K. Borg (2005). The PLUSS Approach – Domain Modeling with Features, Use Cases and Use Case Realizations. Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Software Product Lines. Rennes, France. Springer Berlin–Heidelberg
76	T. Asikainen, T. Mannisto and T. Soininen. (2006). A Unified Conceptual Foundation for Feature Modelling. Proceedings of the 10th International on Software Product Line Conference. Baltimore, Maryland, USA. IEEE Computer Society
77	I. John, J. Knodel, T. Lehner and D. Muthig. (2006). A Practical Guide to Product Line Scoping. Proceedings of the 10th International Software Product Line Conference. Baltimore, Maryland, USA. IEEE Computer Society
78	G. J. Chastek, P. Donohoe and J. D. McGregor. (2007). A Production System for Software Product Lines. Proceedings of the 11th International Software Product Line Conference. Kyoto, Japan. IEEE Computer Society
79	K. Lee, K. C. Kang, E. Koh, W. Chae, B. Kim and B. W. Choi. (2000). Domain-oriented engineering of elevator control software: a product line practice. Proceedings of the First Conference on Software Product Lines: experience and research directions. Denver, Colorado, United States. Kluwer Academic Publishers
80	M. Ardis, P. Dudak, L. Dor, W.-j. Leu, L. Nakatani, B. Olsen and P. Pontrelli. (2000). Domain engineered configuration control. Proceedings of the First Conference on Software Product Lines: experience and research directions: experience and research directions. Denver, Colorado, United States. Kluwer Academic Publishers
81	S. Thiel and F. Peruzzi. (2000). Starting a product line approach for an envisioned market: research and experience in an industrial environment. Proceedings of the First Conference on Software Product Lines: experience and research directions: experience and research directions. Denver, Colorado, United States. Kluwer Academic Publishers
82	J. C. Dager. (2000). Cummins's experience in developing a software product line architecture for real-time embedded diesel engine controls. Proceedings of the First Conference on Software Product Lines: experience and research directions: experience and research directions. Denver, Colorado, United States. Kluwer Academic Publishers
83	M. Steger, C. Tischer, B. Boss, A. Müller, O. Pertler, W. Stolz and S. Ferber (2004). Introducing PLA at Bosch Gasoline Systems: Experiences and Practices. Proceedings of the Fifth International Product Family Engineering Workshop. Boston, Massachusetts. Springer Berlin–Heidelberg
84	M. Kircher, C. Schwanninger and I. Groher. (2006). Transitioning to a Software Product Family Approach – Challenges and Best Practices. Proceedings of the 10th International Software Product Line Conference. Baltimore, Maryland, USA. IEEE Computer Society
85	P. Jensen. (2007). Experiences with Product Line Development of Multi-Discipline Analysis Software at Overwatch Textron Systems. Proceedings of the 11th International Software Product Line Conference. Kyoto, Japan. IEEE Computer Society
86	Y. Ishida. (2007). Software Product Lines Approach in Enterprise System Development. Proceedings of the 11th International Software Product Line Conference. Kyoto, Japan. IEEE Computer Society
87	D. Sellier, G. Benguria and G. Urchegui. (2007). Introducing Software Product Line Engineering for Metal Processing Lines in a Small to Medium Enterprise. Proceedings of the 11th International Software Product Line Conference. Kyoto, Japan. IEEE Computer Society
88	H. P. Jepsen, J. G. Dall and D. Beuche. (2007). Minimally Invasive Migration to Software Product Lines. Proceedings of the 11th International Software Product Line Conference. Kyoto, Japan. IEEE Computer Society
89	C. Tischer, A. Muller, M. Ketterer and L. A. Geyer. (2007). Why does it take that long? Establishing Product Lines in the Automotive Domain. Proceedings of the 11th International Software Product Line Conference. Kyoto, Japan. IEEE Computer Society

Appendix C. Raw data

Paper id	Research type	Empirical basis	Basis reported as	Application/ validation	Application/ validation method	Application/ validation explained	Application/ validation results explained	Driver of application/ validation in industry	Replication study by researcher	Build on paper(s)	Usability	Usability reported as	Useful-ness	Usefulness reported as	Future work	Written by
1	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application/ validation summary	Statements only	Researcher	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
2	Yet another solution	Empirical	Participation knowledge	Yes	Simplified example	Application in detail	Statements	None	No		Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Practitioner
3	Experience report	Empirical	Particpation knowledge	Yes	Case study	Application in detail	Qualitative data	Researcher	No	Yes	Yes	Qualitative data	Yes	Qualitative data	No	Researcher
4	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Case study, experiment	Application process summary	Statements	None	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher
5	New solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Case study	Application/ validation in detail	Statements only	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
6	New solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application/ validation in detail	Statements only	Researcher	No	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
7	New solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application/ validation in detail	Statements only	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher
8	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application in detail	Nothing	None	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
9	New solution	Empirical	Statements only	Yes	Simplified example	Application/ validation summary	Statements only	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
10	New solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application/ validation summary	Statements only	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher
11	Yet another solution	Empirical	Statements	Yes	Case studies	Validation in detail	Qual + Quant	Rsearcher	No	15.	Yes	Statements	Yes	Qualitative	Yes	Researcher
12	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application in detail	Statements	None	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Qualitative data	Yes	Researcher

13	Yet another solution	Empirical	Particpation knowledge	Yes	Simplified example	Application in detail	Statements	Researcher	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
14	Yet another solution	Empirical	Particiaption knowledge	Yes	3 case studies	Application in detail	Statements	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Qualitative analysis	Yes	Researcher
15	New solution	Empirical	Participation knowledge	Yes	Case study	Application/ validation summary	Qual + Quant	Practitioner	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Qual + Quant	No	Practitioner
16	New solution	Empirical	Statements	Yes	3 Case studies	Application/ validation summary	Statements only	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
17	New solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application/ validation summary	Statements only	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
18	New solution	Empirical	Participation knowledge	Yes	Mentioned industry used	Application/ validation summary	Nothing	Practitioner	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
19	New solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Case study	Application/ validation summary	Statements only	Researcher	No	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
20	New solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application/ validation summary	Statements only	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
21	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application in detail	Statements	No	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Qualitative analysis	Yes	Researcher
22	New solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Mentioned industry used	Application/ validation summary	Statements	Practitioner	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
23	New solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Experiment	Application/ validation summary	Statements only	Practitioner	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Practitioner
24	Yet another solution	Empirical	Participation knowledge	Yes	Case study	Application in detail	qualitative results	Practitioner	No	No	Yes	Qualitative data	Yes	Qualitative data	No	Practitioner
25	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Applicaton in detail	Statements	None	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher
26	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Case study	Application in detail	Statements	Researcher	No	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher

(continued on next page)

Paper id	Research type	Empirical basis	Basis reported as	Application/ validation	Application/ validation method	Application/ validation explained	Application/ validation results explained	Driver of application/ validation in industry	Replication study by researcher	Build on paper(s)	Usability	Usability reported as	Useful-ness	Usefulness reported as	Future work	Written by
27	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified examples	Application in detail	Statements	None	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Practitioner
28	Experience report	Empirical	Particpation knowledge	Yes	Simplified example	Application summary	Statements	Practitioner	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
29	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application summary	Statements	None	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
30	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Case study	Application summary	Statements	Rsearcher	No	No	Yes	Qualitative data	Yes	Qualitative data	Yes	Researcher
31	New solution	Empirical	Participation knowledge	Yes	Simplified example	Application/ validation summary	Statements only	Researcher	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
32	New solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application/ validation summary	Quantitative results	Practitioner	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher
33	New solution	Empirical	Statement only	Yes	Mentioned industry used	Statements	Statements	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher
34	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	case study	Apllication summary	Statements	None	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher
35	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application summary	Statements	None	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher
36	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application summary	No	None	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
37	Experience report	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Case study	Application in detail		Yes	No	No	Yes	Quantitative data	Yes	Quantitative results	No	Researcher
38	Yet another solution	Empirical	Statements	Yes	experiment	Application summary	Quantitative results	None	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Quantitative results	Yes	Researcher
39	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application summary	Statements	None	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
40	Experience report	Empirical	Statements	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Statements	Statements	Yes	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher

41	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application in detail	Statements	None	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
42	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Prototyping	Statements	Nothing	None	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
43	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Case study	Application summary	Statements	None	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
44	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application in detail	Nothing	None	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Qualitative analysis	Yes	Researcher
45	Yet another solution	Empirical	Statements	Yes	Simplified example	Application in detail	Statements	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
46	Yet another solution	Empirical	Statements	Yes	Case study	Application summary	Statements	Practitioner	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
47	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	case study	Application summary	Statements	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Practitioner
48	Yet another solution	Empirical	Statements	Yes	case study	Statements	Statements	Practitioner	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Practitioner
49	Yet another solution	Empirical	Participation knowledge	Yes	Case study	Application summary	qualitative results	Practitioner	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
50	Experience report	Empirical	Statements	Yes	Mentioned indusrty use	Application summary	Statements	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher
51	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Case study	Validation in detail	Statements	Researcher	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
52	Yet another solution	Empirical	Statements	Yes	Case studies	Validation in detail	Quantitative results	Researcher	No	Yes	Yes	Quantitative results	Yes	Quantitative results	Yes	Researcher
53	Experience report	Empirical	Particpation knowledge	Yes	Case studies	Statements	Statements	Researcher	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher
54	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Case studies	Application summary	Quantitative results	Researcher	Yes	No	No	N/A	Yes	Quantitative results	Yes	Researcher

(continued on next page)

Paper id	Research type	Empirical basis	Basis reported as	Application/validation	Application/validation method	Application/validation explained	Application/validation results explained	Driver of application/validation in industry	Replication study by researcher	Build on paper(s)	Usability	Usability reported as	Useful-ness	Usefulness reported as	Future work	Written by
55	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	case study	Statements	Statements	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
56	Yet another solution	Empirical	Statements	Yes	Simplified example	Application in detail	Statements	Researcher	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Practitioner
57	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified examples	Application summary	Statements	None	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher
58	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Case study	Application summary	Statements	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statement	No	Researcher
59	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application in detail	Quantitative	None	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
60	Yet another solution	Empirical	Statements	Yes	Simplified example	Application summary	Statements	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Practitioner
61	Yet another solution	Empirical	Statements	Yes	Simplified example	Application summary	Statements	Practitioner	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
62	Yet another solution	Empirical	Statements	Yes	Simplified example	Application summary	Statements	None	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
63	Experience report	Empirical	Statements	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Statements	Statements	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher
64	Yet another solution	Empirical	Statements	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Statements	Statements	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher
65	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Case study	Statements	Statements	None	No	No	No	N/A	No	N/A	Yes	Practitioner
66	Yet another solution	Empirical	Statements	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Statements		Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Practitioner
67	Yet another solution	Empirical	Participation knowledge	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Validation process summary	Quantitative data	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Practitioner

68	Yet another solution	Empirical	Participation knowledge	Yes	Prototyping	Application process summary	Nothing	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	Practitioner
69	Yet another solution	Empirical	Assessment	Yes	Pilot applications	Statements	Statements	Researcher	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Practitioner
70	Yet another solution	Empirical	Participation knowledge	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Validation/ application process summary	Statements	Researcher	No	Yes	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Practitioner
71	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Application process in detail	Nothing	Researcher	No	No	Yes	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Practitioner
72	Yet another solution	Empirical	Statements	Yes	case study	Application process in detail	Nothing	None	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	No	Practitioner
73	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Simplified example	Statements	Statements	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
74	Yet another solution	Empirical	Participation knowledge	Yes	1/2 day workshop	Validation process summary	Statements	Practitioner	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Practitioner
75	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Case study	Validation process in detail	Qual + Quant	Researcher	No	No	Yes	Qual + Quant	Yes	Qual + Quant	Yes	Researcher
76	Yet another solution	Non-empirical	N/A	Yes	Case study	Validation process summary	Statements	Researcher	No	Yes	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
77	Yet another solution	Empirical	Participation knowledge	Yes	Case studies	Statements	Statements	Researcher	N/A	Yes	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher
78	Yet another solution	Empirical	Participation knowledge + interviews	Yes	Workshop	Application process summary	Statements	None	N/A	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	No	Researcher
79	Experience report	Empirical	Particpation knowledge	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Application summary	Qunatitative data	Practitioner	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Quantitative data	Yes	Researcher
80	Experience report	Empirical	Particpation knowledge	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Application summary	Statements	Practitioner	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	No	Practitioner
81	Yet another solution	Empirical	Particpation knowledge	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Application detail	Qualitative data	Practitioner	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Practitioner

(continued on next page)

Paper id	Research type	Empirical basis	Basis reported as	Application/validation	Application/validation method	Application/validation explained	Application/validation results explained	Driver of application/validation in industry	Replication study by researcher	Build on paper(s)	Usability	Usability reported as	Useful-ness	Usefulness reported as	Future work	Written by
82	Experience report	Empirical	Particpation knowledge	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Application detail	Statements	Researcher	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Practitioner
83	Experience report	Empirical	Process assessment	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Application summary	Statements	Practitioner	No	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	No	Practitioner
84	Experience report	Empirical	Statements	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Statements	Statements	Practitioner	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
85	Experience report	Empirical	Particpation knowledge	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Application summary	Statements	Practitioner	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Practitioner
86	Experience report	Empirical	Particpation knowledge	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Application in detail	Statements	Practitioner	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Statements	Yes	Researcher
87	Experience report	Empirical	Process assessment	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Application summary	Quantitative data	Practitioner	No	No	No	Quantitative data	Yes	Quantitative data	No	Researcher
88	Experience report	Empirical	Particpation knowledge	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Application in detail	Qualitative data	Practitioner	No	No	Yes	Statements	Yes	Qualitative data	No	Practitioner
89	Experience report	Empirical	Particpation knowledge	Yes	Mentioned industry use	Application summary	Statements	Practitioner	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Statements	Yes	Practitioner

References

America, P., Thiel, S., Ferber, S., Mergel, M., 2001. Introduction to Domain Analysis. <http://www.esi.es/esaps/public-pdf/CWD121-20-06-01.pdf>.

Basili, V., Caldiera, G., Rombach, H.D., 1994. The Goal Question Metric Approach. Encyclopedia of Software Engineering. John Wiley & Sons.

Böckle, G., 2000. Model-based requirements engineering for product lines. In: Proceedings of the First Conference on Software Product Lines: Experience and Research Directions, Denver, Colorado, United States. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Catal, C., Diri, B., 2009. A systematic review of software fault prediction studies. Expert Systems with Applications 36 (4), 7346–7354.

Clements, P., Northrop, L., 2001. Software Product Lines: Practices and Patterns. Addisson-Wesley. 0-201-70332-7.

Creswell, J.W., 2003. Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. Sage Publications.

Dager, J.C., 2000. Cummins's experience in developing a software product line architecture for real-time embedded diesel engine controls. In: Proceedings of the First Conference on Software Product Lines: Experience and Research Directions: Experience and Research Directions, Denver, Colorado, United States. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

DeBaud, J.M., Schmid, K, 1999. A systematic approach to derive the scope of software product lines. In: Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Software Engineering, Los Angeles, California, United States.

Deelstra, S., Sinnema, M., Bosch, J., 2004. Experiences in software product families: problems and issues during product derivation. In: Proceedings of Third International Conference, SPLC2004, Boston, MA, USA. Springer.

Dikel, D., Kane, D., Ornburn, S., Loftus, W., Wilson, J., 1997. Applying software product-line architecture. Computer 30 (8), 49–55.

Djebbi, O., Salinesi, C., 2007. RED-PL, a Method for Deriving Product Requirements from a Product Line Requirements Model. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, Germany. pp. 0302–9743 (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics).

Dyba, T., Dingsoyr, T., 2008. Empirical studies of agile software development: a systematic review. Information and Software Technology 50 (9–10), 833–859.

Eriksson, M., Börstler, J., Borg, K., 2005. The PLUSS approach – domain modeling with features, use cases and use case realizations. In: Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Software Product Lines, Rennes, France. Springer, Berlin–Heidelberg.

Glass, R.L., Vessey, I., Ramesh, V., 2002. Research in software engineering: an analysis of the literature. Information and Software Technology 44 (8), 491–506.

Gomez, O., Oktaba, H., Piattini, M., Garcia, F., 2006. A Systematic Review Measurement in Software Engineering: State-of-the-art in Measures. Institute for Systems and Technologies of Information, Control and Communication.

Gorschek, T., Wohlin, C., Garre, P., Larsson, S., 2006. A model for technology transfer in practice. IEEE Software 23 (6), 88–95.

Hetrick, W.A., Krueger, C.W., Moore, J.G., 2006. Incremental return on incremental investment: Engenio's transition to software product line practice. In: Companion to the 21st ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Object-oriented Programming Systems, Languages, and Applications, Portland, Oregon, USA. ACM.

Jedlitschka, A., Pfahl, D., 2005. Reporting Guidelines for Controlled Experiments in Software Engineering. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Computer Society.

Jepsen, H.P., Dall, J.G., Beuche, D., 2007. Minimally invasive migration to software product lines. In: Proceedings of the 11th International Software Product Line Conference, Kyoto, Japan. IEEE Computer Society.

Kim, M., Park, S., Sugumaran, V., Yang, H., 2007. Managing requirements conflicts in software product lines: a goal and scenario based approach. Data and Knowledge Engineering 61 (3), 417–432.

Kircher, M., Schwanninger, C., Groher, I., 2006. Transitioning to a Software Product Family Approach – Challenges and Best Practices. Proceedings of the 10th International Software Product Line Conference, Baltimore, Maryland, USA. IEEE Computer Society.

Kitchenham, B.A., 2007. Guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering. Technical Report EBSE-2007-01.

Kitchenham, B.A., Pfleeger, S.L., Pickard, L.M., Jones, P.W., Hoaglin, D.C., El Emam, K., Rosenberg, J., 2002. Preliminary guidelines for empirical research in software engineering. IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering 28 (8), 721–734.

Kitchenham, B., Al-Khilidar, H., Babar, M.A., Berry, M., Cox, K., Keung, J., Kurniawati, F., Staples, M., Zhang, H., Zhu, L., 2008. Evaluating guidelines for reporting empirical software engineering studies. Empirical Software Engineering 13 (1), 97–121.

Kitchenham, B., Pearl Brereton, O., Budgen, D., Turner, M., Bailey, J., Linkman, S., 2009. Systematic literature reviews in software engineering – a systematic literature review. Information and Software Technology 51 (1), 7–15.

Krueger, C.W., 2002. Easing the transition to software mass customization. In: Revised Papers from the Fourth International Workshop on Software Product-Family Engineering. Springer-Verlag.

Lee, K., Kang, K.C., Koh, E., Chae, W., Kim, B., Choi, B.W., 2000. Domain-oriented engineering of elevator control software: a product line practice. In: Proceedings of the First Conference on Software Product Lines: Experience and Research Directions: Experience and Research Directions, Denver, Colorado, United States. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lott, C.M., Rombach, H.D., 1996. Repeatable software engineering experiments for comparing defect-detection techniques. Empirical Software Engineering 1 (3), 241–277.

Mannion, M., Camara, J., 2003. Theorem proving for product line model verification. In: Fifth International Workshop Software Product-Family Engineering, Siena, Italy.

Mendes, E., 2005. A systematic review of Web engineering research. In: International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering, 2005.

Moon, M., Yeom, K., Chae, H.S., 2005. An approach to developing domain requirements as a core asset based on commonality and variability analysis in a product line. IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering 31 (7), 551–569.

Perry, D.E., Porter, A.A., Votta, L.G., 2000. Empirical studies of software engineering: a roadmap. In: Proceedings of the Conference on the Future of Software Engineering, Limerick, Ireland. ACM.

Pfleeger, S.L., 1999. Albert Einstein and empirical software engineering. Computer 32 (10), 32–38.

Pohl, K., Böckle, G., van der Linden, F., 2005. Software Product Line Engineering. Springer, Berlin/Heidelberg/New York. 10 3-540-24372-0.

Runeson, P., Höst, M., 2009. Guidelines for conducting and reporting case study research in software engineering. Empirical Software Engineering 14 (2), 131–164.

Sjøberg, D.I.K., Hannay, J.E., Hansen, O., Kampenes, V.B., Karahasanovic, A., Liborg, N.K., Rekdal, A.C., 2005. A survey of controlled experiments in software engineering. IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering 31 (9), 733–753.

Staples, M., Hill, D., 2004. Experiences adopting software product line development without a product line architecture. In: Proceedings of the 11th Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference, Busan, Korea. IEEE Computer Society.

Staples, M., Niazi, M., 2007. Experiences using systematic review guidelines. Journal of Systems and Software 80 (9), 1425–1437.

Svahnberg, M., Bosch, J., 1999. Evolution in software product lines: two cases. Journal of Software Maintenance: Research and Practice 11 (6), 391–422.

Wieringa, R., Maiden, N., Mead, N., Rolland, C., 2005. Requirements engineering paper classification and evaluation criteria: a proposal and a discussion. Requirements Engineering 11 (1), 102–107.

Wohlin, C., Runeson, P., Höst, M., Ohlson, M.C., Regnell, B., Wesslén, A., 2000. Experimentation in Software Engineering: An Introduction. Kluwer Academic. 0792386825.

Zhu, C., Lee, Y., Zhao, W., Jingzhou, Z., 2006. A feature oriented approach to mapping from domain requirements to product line architecture. In: Proceedings of the 2006 International Conference on Software Engineering Research and Practice and Conference on Programming Languages and Compilers SERP'06, USA. CSREA Press.

Mahvish Khurum received the Bachelors in Software Engineering degree in 2002 from the Foundation University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan and the Masters in Software Engineering degree in 2007 from the Blekinge Institute of Technology (BTH), Ronneby, Sweden. She is currently a Ph.D. student in the Software Engineering discipline at BTH. She is doing her Ph.D. research in collaboration with industry. Her research areas include strategic software engineering, requirement engineering and technical software product management. Before starting her Ph.D. studies Mahvish has worked for four years as software developer and project manager in two companies involved in software product development.

Tony Gorschek is an Associate Professor of Software Engineering at Blekinge Institute of Technology (BTH). He holds a Ph.D. in Software Engineering and a Bachelor in Economics from BTH. Prior to, and in parallel with, his academic career Dr. Gorschek has worked as a consultant in industry and has also held the positions of CTO, chief architect, and project manager in a number of companies doing development of software intensive systems, totaling over ten years industrial experience. At present Dr. Gorschek manages his own consultancy company in parallel with a full time research position. His research interests include requirements engineering, technical product management, process assessment and improvement, quality assurance, and innovation. Most of the research is conducted in close collaboration and cooperation with industry partners such as ABB and Ericsson. He is a member of the IEEE and the ACM.