Short paper (4 pages in ACM-format) Research project and academic publishing, DMD 15 ECTS - referee's comments

Course description:
https://mit.itu.dk/ucs/cb/course.sml?course_id=1232604&mode=search&goto=1351772138.000

_____

Author(s) of article: Martin Grøndal, Frederik Stoltze, Tino Søfgren, Aleksander Wodschou, Katja Deichmann

Title of article: Micro Innovation: User-involvement in agile development processes

Referee's name:

	Strong Yes	Weak Yes	Average	Weak No	Strong No
Is the paper interesting, timely and thought provoking?	5	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Is the subject matter relevant to the DMD area?	5	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Is the intellectual level appropriate?	5	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Is the paper written and structured clearly?	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Are there adequate references to related work?	5	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Are there sufficient graphics?	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1

Recommendation (select one only)   •   Accept with no changes
_____   •   Accept with minor changes
                                         •   Request a major revision
                                         •   Reject

Comments for the editors only:

Comments which may be shown anonymously to the author(s):

I think this paper makes a sincere attempt to evaluate the platform for microparticipation, since it clearly states the criteria upon which a "good user story" should be judged.

Talk of co-creation, maybe semantics, but that is a deep and profound idea – I wonder what kinds of data tools such as this would produce.

You seem to adopt the quality criteria developed in Agile methods

What kind of data – again, practical evaluation!

It has a good critical focus – but I would suggest that the authors also aim to contribute in a more structured manner with suggestions for making the platform more useful, i.e. design implications etc.?

However, I think that, language wise, the res. questions should be fixed up a bit - they are not proper English!

The authors might consider to bring in the criteria for evaluation in the res. question; e.g. referring to Wike's qualities (independent, negotiable, valuable, estimable, small and testable), stating that they wish to judge the stories in relation to those qualities. This, however, might entail a more critical discussion of those qualities – are they good, proven?

Are they practitioner-oriented,… what are they actually?

Drawing on the qualities, the discussion of data could also be made clearer: the paper could, very squarely, just use the categories to discuss whether the stories qualify…?

The authors might also consider their contribution, - what is the nature of the contribution? What have others contributed with in the same field. This is not entirely clear as it stands. Do they contribute to agile, UCD,? User test methods?

Section 4.2. is underdeveloped. Needs to be fixed.

Lastly, the authors might consider some future research paths, - I think an interesting study could be assessing how these qualities work in practice – that is, how do actual agile developers work with the qualities, and how might they become part of the process of evaluation the quality of the micro-participation tool?