



***Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la  
Adopción de Inspecciones de Software  
Anexo: Resultados Detallados***

**Junio de 2012**

## Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Adopción de Inspecciones de Software – Anexo: Resultados Detallados

# Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Baja Adopción de Inspecciones de Software Anexo: Resultados Detallados

Darío Macchi  
Universidad ORT Uruguay  
Montevideo, Uruguay  
macchi@uni.ort.edu.uy

Martín Solari  
Universidad ORT Uruguay  
Montevideo, Uruguay  
martin.solari@ort.edu.uy

*Abstract—En la literatura técnica de Ingeniería de Software las referencias sobre los beneficios de las inspecciones de software son abundantes. En contraposición, algunos autores plantean el problema de la baja adopción de este proceso. A partir de este problema se realiza una revisión de la literatura para elaborar un mapa sobre los temas más investigados en el área, factores causantes de la baja adopción y posibles soluciones. Como resultados se obtuvo una lista de 64 artículos seleccionados utilizando un protocolo de búsqueda, los cuales fueron clasificados según una taxonomía definida. Se elaboró una codificación de los factores encontrados y una lista de soluciones mencionadas en los trabajos revisados. Como principal conclusión se obtuvo que la mayoría de los factores causantes de baja adopción se encuentran relacionados con la percepción que tienen los desarrolladores respecto al proceso, la falta de capacitación y algunas características propias del proceso como la rigidez, la complejidad y la dificultad de conectar el esfuerzo realizado con la calidad del producto final. Estos factores deberían de ser objeto de estudio en futuros trabajos.*

Como método de investigación para el trabajo “Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Baja Adopción de Inspecciones de Software” se decide utilizar un mapeo sistemático de la literatura. El objetivo de este es conocer los trabajos de investigación publicados recientemente, su relación con la adopción de inspecciones y los factores que puedan estar afectando dicha adopción. El resultado de este estudio presenta un punto de partida para la realización de futuras revisiones sistemáticas sobre las respuestas encontradas. Luego de definir las preguntas de investigación, realizar la búsqueda literaria y seleccionar los estudios, se elabora este documento de trabajo para futuras referencias.

<b>Autores</b>	<b>Título</b>	<b>Año</b>	<b>Fuente</b>
Calefato F., Lanubile F., Mallardo T.	A controlled experiment on the effects of synchronicity in remote inspection meetings	2007	Proceedings - 1st International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement, ESEM 2007
Hayase Y., Lee Y.Y., Inoue K.	A criterion for filtering code clone related bugs	2008	DEFECTS'08: 2008 International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis - Proceedings of the 2008 Workshop on Defects in Large Software Systems 2008, DEFECTS'08
Denger C., Shull F.	A practical approach for quality-driven inspections	2007	IEEE Software
Mishra D., Mishra A.	A software inspection process for globally distributed teams	2010	Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)
Koru G., El Emam K., Neisa A., Umarji M.	A survey of quality assurance practices in biomedical open source software projects	2007	Journal of Medical Internet Research

## Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Adopción de Inspecciones de Software – Anexo: Resultados Detallados

<b>Autores</b>	<b>Título</b>	<b>Año</b>	<b>Fuente</b>
Marin B., Giachetti G., Pastor O., Vos T.E.J.	A tool for automatic defect detection in models used in Model-Driven Engineering	2010	Proceedings - 7th International Conference on the Quality of Information and Communications Technology, QUATIC 2010
Krishnamurthy T.V., Subramani S.	Ailments of distributed document reviews and remedies of DOCTOR (document tree organizer tool) with distributed reviews support	2008	Proceedings - 2008 3rd IEEE International Conference Global Software Engineering, ICGSE 2008
Ferreira A.L., MacHado R.J., Silva J.G., Batista R.F., Costa L., Paulk M.C.	An approach to improving software inspections performance	2010	IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance, ICSM
Humayun A., Basit W., Farrukh G.A., Lodhi F., Aden R.	An empirical analysis of team review approaches for teaching quality software development	2010	Proceedings - International Conference on Software Engineering
Albayrak O.	An experiment to observe the impact of UML diagrams on the effectiveness of software requirements inspections	2009	2009 3rd International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement, ESEM 2009
Siy H., Wu Y.	An ontology to support empirical studies in software engineering	2009	ICC2009 - International Conference of Computing in Engineering, Science and Information
Vasconcelos A., Werner C.	Architecture recovery and evaluation aiming at program understanding and reuse	2007	Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)
Uwano H., Monden A., Matsumoto K.-I.	Are good code reviewers also good at design review?	2008	ESEM'08: Proceedings of the 2008 ACM-IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement
Herbold S., Grabowski J., Neukirchen H.	Automated refactoring suggestions using the results of code analysis tools	2009	1st International Conference on Advances in System Testing and Validation Lifecycle, VALID 2009
Eldin M.N., Kamel A., Hegazy O.	Capture-recapture techniques in software verification	2008	2008 International Conference on Computer Engineering and Systems, ICCES 2008
McMeekin D.A., Von Kinsky B.R., Chang E., Cooper D.J.A.	Checklist based reading's influence on a developer's understanding	2008	Proceedings of the Australian Software Engineering Conference, ASWEC
McMeekin D.A.,	Checklist inspections and modifications:	2008	IEEE International

## Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Adopción de Inspecciones de Software – Anexo: Resultados Detallados

<b>Autores</b>	<b>Título</b>	<b>Año</b>	<b>Fuente</b>
Von Kinsky B.R., Chang E., Cooper D.J.A.	Applying Bloom's taxonomy to categorise developer comprehension		Conference on Program Comprehension
De Oliveira R.Y.S., Ferreira P.G., Alvaro A., De Almeida E.S., De Lemos Meira S.R.	Code inspection: A review	2007	ICEIS 2007 - 9th International Conference on Enterprise Information Systems, Proceedings
Robbins B., Carver J.	Cognitive factors in Perspective-Based Reading (PBR): A protocol analysis study	2009	2009 3rd International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement, ESEM 2009
Mahatody T., Sagar M., Kolski C.	Cognitive Walkthrough pour l'Évaluation des IHM: Synthèse des extensions et Évolutions conceptuelles, méthodologiques et technologiques	2007	Proceedings of the 19th International Conference of the Association Francophone d'Interaction Homme-Machine, IHM '07
Xu B.	Cost efficient software review in an E-business software development project	2010	Proceedings of the International Conference on E-Business and E-Government, ICEE 2010
Porto D., Mendonca M., Fabbri S.	CRISTA: A tool to support code comprehension based on visualization and reading technique	2009	IEEE International Conference on Program Comprehension
Wong Y.K.	Do developers matter in system review?	2011	Behaviour and Information Technology
Uwano H., Monden A., Matsumoto K.-I.	DRESREM 2: An analysis system for multi-document software review using reviewers' eye movements	2008	Proceedings - The 3rd International Conference on Software Engineering Advances, ICSEA 2008, Includes ENTISY 2008: International Workshop on Enterprise Information Systems
Winkler D., Thurnher B., Biffi S.	Early software product improvement with sequential inspection sessions: An empirical investigation of inspector capability and learning effects	2007	EUROMICRO 2007 - Proceedings of the 33rd EUROMICRO Conference on Software Engineering and Advanced Applications, SEAA 2007
Nazir S., Fatima N., Malik S.	Effective hybrid review process (EHRP)	2008	Proceedings - International Conference on Computer Science and Software Engineering, CSSE 2008
Mishra D., Mishra A.	Efficient software review process for small and medium enterprises	2007	IET Software
Olalekan A.S., Adenike O.O.	Empirical study of factors affecting the effectiveness of software inspection: A preliminary report	2008	European Journal of Scientific Research
Suma V., Nair T.R.G.	Enhanced approaches in defect detection and prevention strategies in small and medium scale industries	2008	Proceedings - The 3rd International Conference on Software Engineering Advances, ICSEA 2008,

## Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Adopción de Inspecciones de Software – Anexo: Resultados Detallados

Autores	Título	Año	Fuente
			Includes ENTISY 2008: International Workshop on Enterprise Information Systems
McMeekin D.A., Konsky B.R.V., Chang E., Cooper D.J.A.	Evaluating software inspection cognition levels using bloom's taxonomy	2009	Proceedings - 22nd Conference on Software Engineering Education and Training, CSEET 2009
Marin B., Giachetti G., Pastor O., Vos T.E.J., Abran A.	Evaluating the usefulness of a functional size measurement procedure to detect defects in MDD models	2010	ESEM 2010 - Proceedings of the 2010 ACM-IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement
Walia G.S., Carver J.C.	Evaluation of capture-recapture models for estimating the abundance of naturally-occurring defects	2008	ESEM'08: Proceedings of the 2008 ACM-IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement
Kollanus S.	Experiences from using ICMM in inspection process assessment	2009	Software Quality Journal
Hidetake U., Masahide N., Akito M., Ken-Ichi M.	Exploiting eye movements for evaluating reviewer's performance in software review	2007	IEICE Transactions on Fundamentals of Electronics, Communications and Computer Sciences
Zhao L., Deek F.P., McHugh J.A.	Exploratory inspection-a user-based learning method for improving open source software usability	2010	Journal of Software Maintenance and Evolution
Kokkonniemi J.K., Harjumaa L.	From software documents to experience knowledge based artifacts	2009	Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, HICSS
Shull F., Feldmann R.L., Seaman C., Regardie M., Godfrey S.	Fully employing software inspections data	2010	Innovations in Systems and Software Engineering
Albayrak O., Davenport D.	Impact of maintainability defects on code inspections	2010	ESEM 2010 - Proceedings of the 2010 ACM-IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement
Conte T., Vaz V., Massolar J., Mendes E., Travassos G.H.	Improving a web usability inspection technique using qualitative and quantitative data from an observational study	2009	SBES 2009 - 23rd Brazilian Symposium on Software Engineering
Robinson S., Brooks R.J.	Independent verification and validation of an industrial simulation model	2010	Simulation
Lanubile F., Mallardo T.	Inspecting automated test code: A preliminary study	2007	Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence

## Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Adopción de Inspecciones de Software – Anexo: Resultados Detallados

Autores	Título	Año	Fuente
			and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)
Shull F., Seaman C.	Inspecting the history of inspections: An example of evidence-based technology diffusion	2008	IEEE Software
De Lucia A., Fasano F., Tortora G., Scanniello G.	Integrating a distributed inspection tool within an artefact management system	2007	ICSOFT 2007 - 2nd International Conference on Software and Data Technologies, Proceedings
Liu S.	Integrating specification-based review and testing for detecting errors in programs	2007	Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)
Knab P., Fluri B., Gall H.C., Pinzger M.	Interactive views for analyzing problem reports	2009	IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance, ICSM
Winkler D., Biffel S., Faderl K.	Investigating the temporal behavior of defect detection in software inspection and inspection-based testing	2010	Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)
Kalinowski M., Travassos G.H.	ISPIS: From conception towards industry readiness	2007	Proceedings - International Conference of the Chilean Computer Science Society, SCCC
Stewart R., Priven L.	Management's inspection responsibilities and tools for success	2009	CrossTalk
McMeekin D.A., Von Kinsky B.R., Chang E., Cooper D.J.A.	Mapping a sequence diagram to the related code: Cognitive levels expressed by developers	2009	IEEE International Conference on Industrial Informatics (INDIN)
Cooper D.J.A., Von Kinsky B.R., Robey M.C., McMeekin D.A.	Obstacles to comprehension in usage based reading	2007	Proceedings of the Australian Software Engineering Conference, ASWEC
Yoo W.-S., Cary S.M.	Online FTR log tool in the classroom environment	2010	Proceedings - Frontiers in Education Conference, FIE
Komssi M., Kauppinen M., Pyhajarvi M., Talvio J., Mannisto T.	Persuading software development teams to document inspections: Success factors and challenges in practice	2010	Proceedings of the 2010 18th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference, RE2010
Conte T., Vaz V.T., Massolar J., Mendes E., Travassos G.H.	Process model elicitation and a reading technique for Web usability inspections	2008	Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)
Mishra D., Mishra A.	Simplified software inspection process in compliance with international standards	2009	Computer Standards and Interfaces

## Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Adopción de Inspecciones de Software – Anexo: Resultados Detallados

<b>Autores</b>	<b>Título</b>	<b>Año</b>	<b>Fuente</b>
Jain A., Patnaik A.R., Dhar P., Srivastava V.	Software defect content estimation: A Bayesian approach	2007	Canadian Conference on Electrical and Computer Engineering
Savkin V.	Software inspections in practice	2009	2009 5th Central and Eastern European Software Engineering Conference in Russia, CEE-SECR 2009
Elberzhager F., Klaus A., Jawurek M.	Software inspections using guided checklists to ensure security goals	2009	Proceedings - International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security, ARES 2009
Wong Y.K.	Software quality and group performance	2009	AI and Society
Walia G.S., Carver J.C., Nagappan N.	The effect of the number of inspectors on the defect estimates produced by capture-recapture models	2008	Proceedings - International Conference on Software Engineering
Petersen K., Ronkko K., Wohlin C.	The impact of time controlled reading on software inspection effectiveness and efficiency: A controlled experiment	2008	ESEM'08: Proceedings of the 2008 ACM-IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement
McMeekin D.A., Konsky B.R.V., Robey M., Cooper D.J.A.	The significance of participant experience when evaluating software inspection techniques	2009	Proceedings of the Australian Software Engineering Conference, ASWEC
Carver J.	The use of grounded theory in empirical software engineering	2007	Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)
Porto D., Mendonca M., Fabbri S.	The use of reading technique and visualization for program understanding	2009	Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering, SEKE 2009
Jun Y., Bin X., Hua H.	Towards capability maturity in software review	2007	Proceedings - International Computer Software and Applications Conference



## Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Adopción de Inspecciones de Software – Anexo: Resultados Detallados

### FACTORES IDENTIFICADOS COMO CAUSANTES DE LA BAJA ADOPCIÓN DE INSPECCIONES

Codificación	Factor (citado)	Fuente
Desarrollo distribuido	<i>As companies have begun to turn to distributed software development, meeting in a room has become impractical.</i>	Calefato, F., Lanubile, F., & Mallardo, T. (2007). A Controlled Experiment on the Effects of Synchronicity in Remote Inspection Meetings. First International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement (ESEM 2007), 473-475. Ieee. doi: 10.1109/ESEM.2007.61.
Falta de conocimiento y entrenamiento de los inspectores	<i>... the problem here is that not a lot of companies know how to use these things.</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering, 23-27.
Otros	<i>Lack of supportive SDLC infrastructure</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering, 23-27.
Falta de conocimiento y entrenamiento de los inspectores	<i>Poor management understanding of the Inspection Process, its benefits, and their responsibilities</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering, 23-27.
Falta de conocimiento y entrenamiento de los inspectores	<i>Poor management understanding of the Inspection Process, its benefits, and their responsibilities</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering, 23-27.
Falta de conocimiento y entrenamiento de los inspectores	<i>Poor management understanding of the Inspection Process, its benefits, and their responsibilities</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering, 23-27.
Falta de herramientas de gestión, soporte, análisis del proceso y sus resultados.	<i>No computerized management-planning tools</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering, 23-27.
Falta de tiempo asignado a las inspecciones durante la planificación	<i>Too little schedule time for inspections</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering, 23-27.



## Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Adopción de Inspecciones de Software – Anexo: Resultados Detallados

<b>Codificación</b>	<b>Factor (citado)</b>	<b>Fuente</b>
Falta de herramientas de gestión, soporte, análisis del proceso y sus resultados	<i>No computerized inspector tools</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. <i>CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering</i> , 23-27.
Falta de monitoreo y registro de la ejecución del proceso y de resultados	<i>Inadequate monitoring of inspection execution and tracking of results</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. <i>CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering</i> , 23-27.
Falta de monitoreo y registro de la ejecución del proceso y de resultados	<i>Inadequate monitoring of inspection execution and tracking of results</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. <i>CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering</i> , 23-27.
Falta de herramientas de gestión, soporte, análisis del proceso y sus resultados	<i>Computerized tools... performing analysis to identify how future inspections can be improved.</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. <i>CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering</i> , 23-27.
Falta de adaptación y mejoras del proceso según el contexto donde se aplique	<i>Computerized tools... performing analysis to identify how future inspections can be improved.</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. <i>CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering</i> , 23-27.
Rol de facilitador	<i>No inspection facilitator/ project champion</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. <i>CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering</i> , 23-27.
Otros	<i>Slow inspection implementation by project teams</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. <i>CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering</i> , 23-27.
Falta de monitoreo y registro de la ejecución del proceso y de resultados	<i>No inspection process capture</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. <i>CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering</i> , 23-27.

## Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Adopción de Inspecciones de Software – Anexo: Resultados Detallados

Codificación	Factor (citado)	Fuente
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>Software inspection process should be made simple and easy to implement with limited resources to promote its use in small and medium size organizations</i>	Mishra, D., & Mishra, A. (2009). Simplified software inspection process in compliance with international standards. <i>Computer Standards &amp; Interfaces</i> , 31(4), 763-771. Elsevier B.V. doi: 10.1016/j.csi.2008.09.018.
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>Software inspection process should be made simple and easy to implement with limited resources to promote its use in small and medium size organizations</i>	Mishra, D., & Mishra, A. (2009). Simplified software inspection process in compliance with international standards. <i>Computer Standards &amp; Interfaces</i> , 31(4), 763-771. Elsevier B.V. doi: 10.1016/j.csi.2008.09.018.
Falta de conocimiento y entrenamiento de los inspectores	<i>...for others, inspections never succeeded aswell as expected, primarily because these organizations did not learn how to make inspections both effective and low cost.</i>	Mishra, D., & Mishra, A. (2009). Simplified software inspection process in compliance with international standards. <i>Computer Standards &amp; Interfaces</i> , 31(4), 763-771. Elsevier B.V. doi: 10.1016/j.csi.2008.09.018.
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>...most of the organizations are not able to use inspections in software development process as these are too rigorous to follow...</i>	Mishra, D., & Mishra, A. (2009). Simplified software inspection process in compliance with international standards. <i>Computer Standards &amp; Interfaces</i> , 31(4), 763-771. Elsevier B.V. doi: 10.1016/j.csi.2008.09.018.
Otros	<i>...these evolutions in areas such as strongly typed languages, automated tools and improved testing environments, many defect groupings no longer exist.</i>	Mcmeekin, D. A., Kinsky, B. R. V., Chang, E., & Cooper, D. J. A. (n.d.). Checklist Based Reading 's Influence on a Developer ' s Understanding. <i>Communications</i> .
Falta o consumo intensivo de recursos	<i>It can even sometimes be difficult for projects to get the resources to keep a sufficient number of inspections in place at all...</i>	Shull, F., Feldmann, R. L., Seaman, C., Regardie, M., & Godfrey, S. (2010). Fully employing software inspections data. <i>Innovations in Systems and Software Engineering</i> . doi: 10.1007/s11334-010-0132-1.
Falta de conocimiento y entrenamiento de los inspectores	<i>There is a learning curve involved, meaning that it takes some time for developers to understand how to effectively find defects</i>	Shull, F., Feldmann, R. L., Seaman, C., Regardie, M., & Godfrey, S. (2010). Fully employing software inspections data. <i>Innovations in Systems and Software Engineering</i> . doi: 10.1007/s11334-010-0132-1.

## Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Adopción de Inspecciones de Software – Anexo: Resultados Detallados

<b>Codificación</b>	<b>Factor (citado)</b>	<b>Fuente</b>
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>It's hard to make connections between inspection effort and specific final product qualities...</i>	Denger, C., & Shull, F. (2007). A Practical Approach for Quality-Driven Inspections. IEEE Software, 24(2), 79-86. doi:10.1109/MS.2007.31
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>Largely dependent on individual experience</i>	Xu, B. (2010). Cost Efficient Software Review in an E-Business Software Development Project. 2010 International Conference on E-Business and E-Government, 2680-2683. Ieee. doi:10.1109/ICEE.2010.677
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>Current review processes face these obstacles due to their rigid and time consuming nature.</i>	Nazir, S., Fatima, N., & Malik, S. (2008). Effective Hybrid Review Process (EHRP). 2008 International Conference on Computer Science and Software Engineering, 763-771. Ieee. doi:10.1109/CSSE.2008.1417
Inspecciones son consideradas como costosas (aumento del costo upfront)	<i>...some engineers consider inspections to be uncreative work that adds costs.</i>	Komssi, M., Kauppinen, M., Pyhajarvi, M., Talvio, J., & Mannisto, T. (2010). Persuading Software Development Teams to Document Inspections: Success Factors and Challenges in Practice. 2010 18th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference, 283-288. Ieee. doi: 10.1109/RE.2010.40.
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>The reason may be that the original software inspection process, as described by Fagan [8], or its later variations are very rigorous</i>	Mishra, D., & Mishra, A. (2007). Efficient software review process for small and medium enterprises. Engineering and Technology, (4), 132 -142. doi:10.1049/iet-sen
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>...inspections are low tech and are not the most enjoyable engineering tasks...</i>	Poulin, L. (2003). High Quality , Low Cost Software Inspections. Quality, (January), 2003-2003.
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>...inspections are low tech and are not the most enjoyable engineering tasks...</i>	Poulin, L. (2003). High Quality , Low Cost Software Inspections. Quality, (January), 2003-2003.
Otros	<i>...it is difficult to maintain the interest of software developers in performing inspections, even when management supports their usage</i>	Komssi, M., Kauppinen, M., Pyhajarvi, M., Talvio, J., & Mannisto, T. (2010). Persuading Software Development Teams to Document Inspections: Success Factors and Challenges in Practice. 2010 18th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference, 283-288. Ieee. doi: 10.1109/RE.2010.40.

## Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Adopción de Inspecciones de Software – Anexo: Resultados Detallados

Codificación	Factor (citado)	Fuente
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>Inspections can be perceived as a heavyweight process that does not address the real issues of concern to the team</i>	Shull, F., Feldmann, R. L., Seaman, C., Regardie, M., & Godfrey, S. (2010). Fully employing software inspections data. <i>Innovations in Systems and Software Engineering</i> . doi: 10.1007/s11334-010-0132-1.
Malas experiencias previas y experiencias fallidas sin reportar	<i>The failed applications of document inspections have typically not been reported.</i>	Komssi, M., Kauppinen, M., Pyhajarvi, M., Talvio, J., & Mannisto, T. (2010). Persuading Software Development Teams to Document Inspections: Success Factors and Challenges in Practice. 2010 18th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference, 283-288. Ieee. doi: 10.1109/RE.2010.40.
Malas experiencias previas y experiencias fallidas sin reportar	<i>...bad previous experiences and a stagnant inspection process seemed to be the main reasons for the deterioration of the use of inspections or their bad quality...</i>	Komssi, M., Kauppinen, M., Pyhajarvi, M., Talvio, J., & Mannisto, T. (2010). Persuading Software Development Teams to Document Inspections: Success Factors and Challenges in Practice. 2010 18th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference, 283-288. Ieee. doi: 10.1109/RE.2010.40.
Falta de adaptación y mejoras del proceso según el contexto donde se aplique	<i>...bad previous experiences and a stagnant inspection process seemed to be the main reasons for the deterioration of the use of inspections or their bad quality...</i>	Komssi, M., Kauppinen, M., Pyhajarvi, M., Talvio, J., & Mannisto, T. (2010). Persuading Software Development Teams to Document Inspections: Success Factors and Challenges in Practice. 2010 18th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference, 283-288. Ieee. doi: 10.1109/RE.2010.40.
Falta de herramientas de gestión, soporte, análisis del proceso y sus resultados	<i>No post-class practitioner refresher</i>	Ebert, C., Stewart, R., & Priven, L. (2008). How to Avoid Software Inspection Failure and Achieve Ongoing Benefits. <i>CrossTalk: The Journal for Defense Software Engineering</i> , 23-27.
Resistencia al cambio	<i>Technology transition/improvement is not easy</i>	Brykczynski, B., Meeson, R., & Wheeler, D. (1994). Software Inspection: Eliminating Software Defects. In <i>Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Software Technology Conference</i> . doi: 10.1.1.50.612.
Inspecciones son consideradas como costosas (aumento del costo upfront)	<i>Upfront cost</i>	Brykczynski, B., Meeson, R., & Wheeler, D. (1994). Software Inspection: Eliminating Software Defects. In <i>Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Software Technology Conference</i> . doi: 10.1.1.50.612.
Falta de conocimiento y entrenamiento de los inspectores	<i>Confusion with other review processes</i>	Brykczynski, B., Meeson, R., & Wheeler, D. (1994). Software Inspection: Eliminating Software Defects. In <i>Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Software Technology Conference</i> . doi: 10.1.1.50.612.

## Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Adopción de Inspecciones de Software – Anexo: Resultados Detallados

Codificación	Factor (citado)	Fuente
Resistencia al cambio	<i>The alligator syndrome. An ongoing project that has many problems may not be receptive to introducing a new process.</i>	Brykczynski, B., Meeson, R., & Wheeler, D. (1994). Software Inspection: Eliminating Software Defects. In Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Software Technology Conference. doi: 10.1.1.50.612.
Malas experiencias previas y experiencias fallidas sin reportar	<i>Bad prior experience.</i>	Brykczynski, B., Meeson, R., & Wheeler, D. (1994). Software Inspection: Eliminating Software Defects. In Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Software Technology Conference. doi: 10.1.1.50.612.
Otros	<i>Improved quality not beneficial to the bottom line. For this particular product or set of products, quality is desired but is traded for other goals</i>	Brykczynski, B., Meeson, R., & Wheeler, D. (1994). Software Inspection: Eliminating Software Defects. In Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Software Technology Conference. doi: 10.1.1.50.612.
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>Inspections can be perceived as a heavyweight process that does not address the real issues of concern to the team</i>	Shull, F., Feldmann, R. L., Seaman, C., Regardie, M., & Godfrey, S. (2010). Fully employing software inspections data. Innovations in Systems and Software Engineering. doi: 10.1007/s11334-010-0132-1.
Inspecciones son consideradas como costosas (aumento del costo upfront)	<i>...upfront investment appears too large...</i>	Denger, C., & Shull, F. (2007). A Practical Approach for Quality-Driven Inspections. IEEE Software, 24(2), 79-86. doi:10.1109/MS.2007.31
Falta de adaptación y mejoras del proceso según el contexto donde se aplique	<i>Inspections are insufficiently tailored to a given context...</i>	Denger, C., & Shull, F. (2007). A Practical Approach for Quality-Driven Inspections. IEEE Software, 24(2), 79-86. doi:10.1109/MS.2007.31
Otros	<i>Lack official review standards</i>	Xu, B. (2010). Cost Efficient Software Review in an E-Business Software Development Project. 2010 International Conference on E-Business and E-Government, 2680-2683. Ieee. doi:10.1109/ICEE.2010.677
Otros	<i>Un-clear goal in practice</i>	Xu, B. (2010). Cost Efficient Software Review in an E-Business Software Development Project. 2010 International Conference on E-Business and E-Government, 2680-2683. Ieee. doi:10.1109/ICEE.2010.677

## Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Adopción de Inspecciones de Software – Anexo: Resultados Detallados

<b>Codificación</b>	<b>Factor (citado)</b>	<b>Fuente</b>
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>...some engineers consider inspections to be uncreative work that adds costs.</i>	Komssi, M., Kauppinen, M., Pyhajarvi, M., Talvio, J., & Mannisto, T. (2010). Persuading Software Development Teams to Document Inspections: Success Factors and Challenges in Practice. 2010 18th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference, 283-288. Ieee. doi: 10.1109/RE.2010.40.
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>...regardless of its importance, some practitioners perceive any review as a disturbance of their valuable time.</i>	Komssi, M., Kauppinen, M., Pyhajarvi, M., Talvio, J., & Mannisto, T. (2010). Persuading Software Development Teams to Document Inspections: Success Factors and Challenges in Practice. 2010 18th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference, 283-288. Ieee. doi: 10.1109/RE.2010.40.
Falta de tiempo asignado a las inspecciones durante la planificación	<i>Current review processes face these obstacles due to their rigid and time consuming nature.</i>	Nazir, S., Fatima, N., & Malik, S. (2008). Effective Hybrid Review Process (EHRP). 2008 International Conference on Computer Science and Software Engineering, 763-771. Ieee. doi:10.1109/CSSE.2008.1417
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>industry practitioners experience inspections as being ineffective and difficult</i>	Komssi, M., Kauppinen, M., Pyhajarvi, M., Talvio, J., & Mannisto, T. (2010). Persuading Software Development Teams to Document Inspections: Success Factors and Challenges in Practice. 2010 18th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference, 283-288. Ieee. doi: 10.1109/RE.2010.40.
Falta o consumo intensivo de recursos	<i>...inspections have proved to be resource intensive pertaining to tedious tasks by the inspectors...</i>	Suma, V., & Nair, T. R. G. (2008). Enhanced Approaches in Defect Detection and Prevention Strategies in Small and Medium Scale Industries. 2008 The Third International Conference on Software Engineering Advances, 389-393. Ieee. doi:10.1109/ICSEA.2008.79
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>industry practitioners experience inspections as being ineffective and difficult</i>	Komssi, M., Kauppinen, M., Pyhajarvi, M., Talvio, J., & Mannisto, T. (2010). Persuading Software Development Teams to Document Inspections: Success Factors and Challenges in Practice. 2010 18th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference, 283-288. Ieee. doi: 10.1109/RE.2010.40.
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>...inspection is considered an effective method but perceived as boring work...</i>	Komssi, M., Kauppinen, M., Pyhajarvi, M., Talvio, J., & Mannisto, T. (2010). Persuading Software Development Teams to Document Inspections: Success Factors and Challenges in Practice. 2010 18th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference, 283-288. Ieee. doi: 10.1109/RE.2010.40.
Falta de adaptación y mejoras del proceso según el contexto donde se aplique	<i>...is the belief that inspections can only be done one way</i>	Poulin, L. (2003). High Quality , Low Cost Software Inspections. Quality, (January), 2003-2003.



## Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Adopción de Inspecciones de Software – Anexo: Resultados Detallados

<b>Codificación</b>	<b>Factor (citado)</b>	<b>Fuente</b>
Falta de conocimiento y entrenamiento de los inspectores	<i>...inspections are not easy to do well, given the psychology that permeates them.</i>	Poulin, L. (2003). High Quality , Low Cost Software Inspections. Quality, (January), 2003-2003.
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>...inspections have proved to be resource intensive pertaining to tedious tasks by the inspectors...</i>	Suma, V., & Nair, T. R. G. (2008). Enhanced Approaches in Defect Detection and Prevention Strategies in Small and Medium Scale Industries. 2008 The Third International Conference on Software Engineering Advances, 389-393. Ieee. doi:10.1109/ICSEA.2008.79
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>Manual inspections are considered too laborious for widespread adoption.</i>	Albayrak, Ö., & Davenport, D. (2010). Impact of Maintainability Defects on Code Inspections. Computer Engineering, 9-12.
Inspecciones son consideradas como costosas (aumento del costo upfront)	<i>...the perception that inspections represent an added cost to software development is still widely prevalent.</i>	Poulin, L. (2003). High Quality , Low Cost Software Inspections. Quality, (January), 2003-2003.
Falta de tiempo asignado a las inspecciones durante la planificación	<i>(When asked about obstacles...) cited time pressure (75 %)</i>	Ciolkowski, M., Laitenberger, O., & Biffel, S. (2003). Software reviews: The state of the practice. IEEE software, 46–51. IEEE Computer Society. Retrieved from <a href="http://www.computer.org/portal/web/csdl/doi/10.1109/MS.2003.1241366">http://www.computer.org/portal/web/csdl/doi/10.1109/MS.2003.1241366</a>
Inspecciones son consideradas como costosas (aumento del costo upfront)	<i>(When asked about obstacles...) cost (56 %)</i>	Ciolkowski, M., Laitenberger, O., & Biffel, S. (2003). Software reviews: The state of the practice. IEEE software, 46–51. IEEE Computer Society. Retrieved from <a href="http://www.computer.org/portal/web/csdl/doi/10.1109/MS.2003.1241366">http://www.computer.org/portal/web/csdl/doi/10.1109/MS.2003.1241366</a>
Falta de conocimiento y entrenamiento de los inspectores	<i>(When asked about obstacles...) lack of training in introducing reviews (50 %)</i>	Ciolkowski, M., Laitenberger, O., & Biffel, S. (2003). Software reviews: The state of the practice. IEEE software, 46–51. IEEE Computer Society. Retrieved from <a href="http://www.computer.org/portal/web/csdl/doi/10.1109/MS.2003.1241366">http://www.computer.org/portal/web/csdl/doi/10.1109/MS.2003.1241366</a>
Características propias del proceso o percibidas como propias del mismo	<i>...especially when developers see them as disconnected from their normal day-to-day development activities</i>	Shull, F., Feldmann, R. L., Seaman, C., Regardie, M., & Godfrey, S. (2010). Fully employing software inspections data. Innovations in Systems and Software Engineering. doi: 10.1007/s11334-010-0132-1.



## Mapeo sistemático de la literatura sobre la Adopción de Inspecciones de Software – Anexo: Resultados Detallados

<b>Codificación</b>	<b>Factor (citado)</b>	<b>Fuente</b>
Falta de tiempo asignado a las inspecciones durante la planificación	<i>(Un-clear) schedule in practice</i>	Xu, B. (2010). Cost Efficient Software Review in an E-Business Software Development Project. 2010 International Conference on E-Business and E-Government, 2680-2683. Ieee. doi:10.1109/ICEE.2010.677