

ICSOFT 2025 - Paper #73

Paper Title: *Generation of IT Project Documentation Elements from a Model Transformation Chain*

General Assessment (Please assign scores using the following criteria (1=weakest; 6=strongest))

Relevance (Paper fits one or more of the topic areas?): 4
Originality (Newness of the ideas expressed): 2
Technical Quality (Theoretical soundness/methodology): 2
Significance (Is the problem worth the given attention?): 4
Presentation (Structure/Length/English): 3
Overall Rating (Weighted value of above items): 3

Reviewer (self)

Reviewer's knowledge of the area and confidence (on the scores assigned): Average

Improvement Suggestions (for authors to consider in the camera-ready version. Additional detail in "Observations")

Abstract and Introduction are adequate? Yes
Needs more experimental results? Yes
Needs comparative evaluation? Yes
Improve critical discussion ? (validation): Yes
Figures are adequate ? (in number and quality): Yes
Conclusions/Future Work are convincing? Yes
References are up-to-date and appropriate? No
Paper formatting needs adjustment? No
Improve English? No

My recommendation is: Weak Reject

Detailed comments to authors, including aspects that must be improved in the camera-ready version of the paper:

SUMMARY: The paper proposes an approach based on model transformation chains to generate documentation artefacts for IT projects.

COMMENTS: The paper is about a relevant problem. The issue of simplifying the generation of documentation of IT systems and keeping them consistent is recognized. However, the paper addresses the problem in too generic and abstract manner. More details are needed on how transformations are practically implemented, orchestrated, and chained. The lack of discussion about existing works addressing the problem of chaining model transformations represents a significant limitation of the work.

It's essential to clarify the limitations and challenges of the proposed approaches. In the introduction, the authors refer to solutions elicited in 133 studies without explaining the role of such solutions in the definition of the proposed approach.

With the advent of LLMs for code generation and documentation extraction, the authors should include a comparison of the outcomes produced with the proposed approach with existing baselines. Moreover, how do we evaluate the quality of the generated documentation?

Some technologies and tools are mentioned without proper context or explanation of relevance, such as Jura, Trello, Papyrus, MagicDraw, etc.

Overall, while the paper addresses an important issue, significant improvements in clarity, technical depth, novelty demonstration, and state-of-the-art comparison are needed to show the contribution's strengths properly.

Confidential comments, not to be sent to authors: