

# Central European Conference on Information and Intelligent Systems

CECIIS



23<sup>rd</sup>  
International Conference  
2012

Organized by:  
University of Zagreb,  
Faculty of Organization and Informatics  
Varaždin, Croatia

September 19<sup>th</sup> - 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012  
Varaždin, Croatia

ISSN 1847-2001 (Print)  
ISSN 1848-2295 (Online)

UDC 004:007

University of Zagreb  
Faculty of Organization and Informatics Varaždin

# Central European Conference on Information and Intelligent Systems

CECIIS



23<sup>rd</sup> International Conference

September 19<sup>th</sup> - 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012  
Varaždin, Croatia

Varaždin, 2012.

**Publisher**

University of Zagreb  
Faculty of Organization and Informatics  
Varaždin  
Pavlinska 2  
HR-42 000 Varaždin, Croatia

**Contact**

e-mail: [ceciis@foi.hr](mailto:ceciis@foi.hr)  
phone: +385 42 390 851  
fax: +385 42 213 413  
web: [www.ceciis.foi.hr](http://www.ceciis.foi.hr)  
fb: [www.facebook.com/ceciis.foi](http://www.facebook.com/ceciis.foi)

**For Publisher**

Vjeran Strahonja (University of Zagreb, Faculty of Organization and Informatics)

**Editors**

Tihomir Hunjak (University of Zagreb, Faculty of Organization and Informatics)  
Sandra Lovrenčić (University of Zagreb, Faculty of Organization and Informatics)  
Igor Tomičić (University of Zagreb, Faculty of Organization and Informatics)

**Editors In Cooperation with:**

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Institut für Informatik und Gesellschaft, Germany  
Karl-Franzens Universität Graz, Institut für Informationswissenschaft, Austria  
University of Zagreb, Faculty of Transport and Traffic Science, Croatia  
University of Maribor, Faculty of Economics and Business, Slovenia  
University of Maribor, Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Slovenia

**Publishing Board**

Igor Tomičić (University of Zagreb, Faculty of Organization and Informatics)  
Bernarda Kos (University of Zagreb, Faculty of Organization and Informatics)  
Marko Jurišić (University of Zagreb, Faculty of Organization and Informatics)

**This publication is partially financed by:**

Ministry of Science, Education and Sport, Republic of Croatia  
University of Zagreb, Croatia  
Varaždin County

All rights reserved. No parts of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

**ISSN 1847-2001** (Print)  
**ISSN 1848-2295** (Online)

# Contents

Index of Authors	V
Preface	VII

## Invited Lectures

Ján Paralič <b>Business information systems - experiences from Slovakia</b>	3
Matjaž B. Jurič <b>Impact of SOA on Information System Development</b>	9

## Data and Knowledge Bases

Ivan Opalički, Sandra Lovrenčić <b>How Well are Domain and Upper Ontologies Connected?</b>	17
Tomislav Belcar, Sandra Lovrenčić <b>Use of Description Logics Expressive Power in Ontologies</b>	23
Marko Maliković, Mirko Čubrilo, Predrag Janičić <b>Formalization of a Strategy for the KRK Chess Endgame</b>	29
Dominika Jurovatá, Michal Kebísek, Júlia Kurnátová <b>Application of Knowledge Discovery in Databases Process in the Production Systems</b>	37
Júlia Kurnátová, Dominika Jurovatá, Pavel Važan <b>Evaluation of strategies control of production system according to gained knowledge</b>	43
Markus Schatten, Krešimir Ivković <b>Regular Path Expressions for Querying Semistructured Data - Implementation in Prolog</b>	49
Bogdan Okreša Đurić, Markus Schatten <b>Modeling Multiagent Knowledge Systems Based on Implicit Culture</b>	57
Markus Schatten <b>Complex Analytical Method for Self-organizing Multiagent Systems</b>	63
Visnja Ognjenovic, Vladimir Brtko, Ivana Berkovic, Eleonora Brtko <b>Comparison of the classification rules generated by See 5.0 and SSCO Systems</b>	71
Dušan Munđar, Darko Matotek, Marija Jakuš <b>Quantitative research methods participation in the information sciences papers in Croatia</b>	77

## Education for Information Society

Anita Papic, Jadranka Stojanovski <b>Information Services in Academic Libraries: Browsing Services vs. Searching Services</b>	85
Radovan Vrana <b>Making the Internet a safer place: students' perceptions about Internet security threats</b>	91
Adis Medić <b>Improvement of Web Services at the local level in Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>	99
Tanja Sraka Mohar, Dejan Sraka, Branko Kaučič <b>Analysing blended based learning systems</b>	107
Marjan Krasna, Tomaz Bratina, Branko Kaucic <b>Transition from traditional to electronic testing</b>	115
Ana Ćorić, Elisabeth Pergler <b>Team Communication via Facebook: Success or Failure?</b>	123
Bojan Vukšić, Nikola Krajačić, Boris Tomaš <b>Augmented reality in high school education</b>	131
Jasmina Pivar, Ivan Malbašić, Jelena Horvat <b>Literature Analysis of Transfer and Learning Tacit Knowledge</b>	137
Andi Jambrošić, Blaž Rodič <b>E-learning and the quality of primary schools in Slovenia</b>	147
Nikola Krajačić, Iva Gregurec, Boris Tomaš <b>Skills Framework for a Social Age - SFSA</b>	157
Goran Hajdin, Kristina Špernjak, Matija Šaško <b>Higher Education Employability in Croatia – Analysis from 2002 to 2011</b>	165
Melita Milić, Igor Škorić <b>The impact of school and home environment on computer attitude</b>	173
Ivana Marić, Petra Barišić, Ivana Jurjević <b>Knowledge and skills needed in knowledge economy</b>	181
Ezmolda Barolli, Violeta Vidaček-Hainš, Albana Gorishti, Jozef Bushati <b>Reflections about learning and teaching through ICT in Balkan countries</b>	187
Andreja Kovačić, Goran Bubaš, Tihomir Orehovački <b>Integrating culture into a Business English course: Students' perspective on a collaborative online writing project</b>	195

## Information and Communication Technologies

Ivan Vuljak, Renata Mekovec <b>E-service Quality of Faculty Web Portals: Exploring the Students' Perspective</b>	205
Iva Gregurec, Petra Grd <b>Search Engine Optimization (SEO): Website analysis of selected faculties in Croatia</b>	211
Katarina Topolko, Dijana Oreški, Jelena Horvat <b>Multi-criteria Modeling of Postgraduate Students Bank Selection</b>	219
Nikola Ivković, Danijel Radošević, Ivan Magdalenić <b>Towards Automatic Generation of Parallel Programs</b>	227
Matija Kapić, Iva Gregurec, Alen Delić <b>Behavior of Varaždin Secondary Level Education Students on Facebook</b>	233
Robert Fabac, Ivana Šarić <b>Virtual Organizations in Croatia: The Case of Bjelovar-Bilogora County</b>	239
Valerija Bubljić, Jadranka Zimmermann <b>The Role of ICT in Croatian Small Enterprises</b>	247

Milorad Nikitović, Vjeran Strahonja <b>Analysis of factors influencing the success of implementation of ERP systems based on self-assessment</b>	257
Dijana Posavec <b>ICT in the printing processes normative standardization of the printing processes by the use of ICT</b>	265
Leo Sinjeri, Neven Vrček, Goran Bubaš <b>Maturity of towns' Web sites in Croatia according to the evolutionary e-Government Maturity Model</b>	273
Michael Harnisch, Thomas Puchleitner <b>Patronizing Information Units</b>	279
Robertina Zdjelar <b>The Balanced Scorecard Method as Background for e-Government in Regional Government</b>	287

## Information Systems Security

Christian Flender, Martin Peters, Günter Müller <b>Measuring Consumer Information Deficits in Transactions of Data-centric Services</b>	299
Davor Maček, Ivan Magdalenić, Nikola Ivković <b>Risk Assessment of the Bank's Noncompliance with Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard</b>	305
Olivera Grljević, Zita Bošnjak, Renata Mekovec <b>Privacy Preservation in Social Network Analysis</b>	313
Tomislav Fotak, Petra Koruga, Miroslav Bača <b>Trends in Hand Geometry Biometrics</b>	319
Jasmin Ćosić, Zoran Ćosić <b>The Necessity of Developing an Digital Evidence Ontology</b>	325
Kruno Golubić, Hrvoje Stančić <b>Clearing and Sanitization of Media Used for Digital Storage: Towards Recommendations for Secure Deleting of Digital Files</b>	331
Velibor Božić <b>Risk management in Informatization</b>	337
Zrinka Lovrić <b>Model of Simplified Implementation of PCI DSS by Using ISO 27001 Standard</b>	347

## Intelligent Information Systems

Slaven Smojver <b>Analysis of Banking Supervision via Inspection Game and Agent-Based Modeling</b>	355
Luka Pavlič, Marjan Heričko, Maja Pušnik <b>Improving e-Services Adoption With Semantic e-Services Platform and Question-Based Approach</b>	363
Darko Galinec, Danijel Macanga <b>Observe, Orient, Decide and Act Cycle and Pattern-Based Strategy: Characteristics and Complementation</b>	371
Jasmina Magdić, Željka Car <b>Model for Implementing Customer Relationship Management System</b>	379
Karol Furdík, Gabriel Lukáč <b>Events Processing and Device Interoperability in a Smart Office IoT Application</b>	387
Alen Delić, Natalia Nađ, Tonimir Kišasondi <b>Analysis of user needs to create specific learning environments</b>	395
Mario Brčić, Damir Kalpić, Krešimir Fertalj <b>Resource Constrained Project Scheduling under Uncertainty: A Survey</b>	401

## Intelligent Transport Systems

Edouard Ivanjko, Marko Matulin, Štefica Mrvelj <b>Dynamic capacity allocation of tollbooth plaza based on fuzzy logic</b>	413
Tonči Carić, Juraj Fosin, Mario Buntić <b>Regional Pre-trip Sales Force Routing Derived From Multi-source Weber Problem</b>	421
Ljupko Šimunović, Velimir Anđelić, Ivan Pavlinušić <b>Blind people guidance system</b>	427
Hrvoje Haramina, Milivoj Mandić, Edouard Ivanjko <b>Appliance of Intelligent Transportation Systems within the Moving Block Technology</b>	433

## Software Engineering

Zlatko Stapić, Eva García López, Antonio García Cabot, Luis de Marcos Ortega, Vjeran Strahonja <b>Performing systematic literature review in software engineering</b>	441
Ivan Luković, Sonja Ristić, Aleksandar Popović, Pavle Mogin <b>An approach to the platform independent specification of a business application</b>	449
Darko Andročec, Dragutin Kermek <b>Useful Patterns for BPEL Developers</b>	457
Zdravko Roško <b>Strategy Pattern as a Variability Enabling Mechanism in Product Line Architecture</b>	463
Matija Tomašković, Ruben Picek <b>Automatic Conversion of Desktop Applications to Java Web Technology</b>	473
Marko Velić, Ivan Padavić, Željko Dobrović <b>Metamodel of agile project management and the process of building with LEGO® bricks</b>	481
<b>Author Guidelines</b>	491

## Index of Authors

- Andročec, Darko 457  
Anđelić, Velimir 427  
Bača, Miroslav 319  
Barišić, Petra 181  
Barolli, Ezmolda 187  
Belcar, Tomislav 23  
Berkovic, Ivana 71  
Bošnjak, Zita 313  
Božić, Velibor 337  
Bratina, Tomaz 115  
Brčić, Mario 401  
Brtko, Vladimir 71  
Brtko, Eleonora 71  
Bubaš, Goran 195, 273  
Bublić, Valerija 247  
Buntić, Mario 421  
Bushati, Jozef 187  
Car, Željka 379  
Carić, Tonči 421  
Ćorić, Ana 123  
Ćosić, Jasmin 325  
Ćosić, Zoran 325  
Čubrilo, Mirko 29  
de Marcos Ortega, Luis 441  
Delić, Alen 233, 395  
Dobrović, Željko 481  
Fabac, Robert 239  
Fertalj, Krešimir 401  
Flender, Christian 299  
Fosin, Juraj 421  
Fotak, Tomislav 319  
Furdík, Karol 387  
Galinec, Darko 371  
García Cabot, Antonio 441  
García López, Eva 441  
Golubić, Kruno 331  
Gorishti, Albana 187  
Grd, Petra 211, 319  
Gregurec, Iva 157, 211, 233  
Grljević, Olivera 313  
Hajdin, Goran 165  
Haramina, Hrvoje 433  
Harnisch, Michael 279  
Heričko, Marjan 363  
Horvat, Jelena 137, 219  
Ivanjko, Edouard 413, 433  
Ivković, Krešimir 49  
Ivković, Nikola 227, 305  
Jakuš, Marija 77  
Jambrošić, Andi 147  
Janičić, Predrag 29  
Jurič, Matjaž B. 9  
Jurjević, Ivana 181  
Jurovata, Dominika 37, 43  
Kalpić, Damir 401  
Kapić, Matija 233  
Kaučić, Branko 107, 115  
Kebísek, Michal 37  
Kermek, Dragutin 447  
Kišasondi, Tonimir 395  
Kovačić, Andreja 195  
Krajačić, Nikola 131, 157  
Krasna, Marjan 115  
Kurnátová, Júlia 37, 43  
Lovrenčić, Sandra 17, 23  
Lovrić, Zrinka 347  
Lukáč, Gabriel 387  
Luković, Ivan 449  
Macanga, Danijel 371  
Maček, Davor 305  
Magdalenic, Ivan 227, 305  
Magdić, Jasmina 379  
Malbašić, Ivan 137  
Maliković, Marko 29  
Mandić, Milivoj 433  
Marić, Ivana 181  
Matotek, Darko 77  
Matulin, Marko 413  
Medić, Adis 99  
Mekovec, Renata 205, 313  
Milić, Melita 173  
Mogin, Pavle 449  
Mrvelj, Štefica 413  
Müller, Günter 299  
Munđar, Dušan 77  
Nađ, Natalia 395  
Nikitović, Milorad 257  
Ognjenovic, Visnja 71  
Okreša Đurić, Bogdan 57  
Opalički, Ivan 17  
Orehovacki, Tihomir 195  
Oreški, Dijana 219  
Padavić, Ivan 481  
Papic, Anita 85



Paralič, Ján 3  
Pavlič, Luka 363  
Pavlinušić, Ivan 427  
Pergler, Elisabeth 123  
Peters, Martin 299  
Picek, Ruben 473  
Pivar, Jasmina 137  
Popović, Aleksandar 449  
Posavec, Dijana 265  
Puchleitner, Thomas 279  
Pušnik, Maja 363  
Radošević, Danijel 227  
Ristić, Sonja 449  
Rodič, Blaž 147  
Roško, Zdravko 463  
Šarić, Ivana 239  
Šaško, Matija 165  
Schatten, Markus 49, 57, 63  
Šimunović, Ljupko 427  
Sinjeri, Leo 273  
Škorić, Igor 173  
Smojver, Slaven 355  
Špernjak, Kristina 165  
Sraka, Dejan 107  
Sraka Mohar, Tanja 107  
Stančić, Hrvoje 331  
Stapić, Zlatko 441  
Stojanovski, Jadranka 85  
Strahonja, Vjeran 257, 441  
Tomaš, Boris 131, 157  
Tomašković, Matija 473  
Topolko, Katarina 211  
Važan, Pavel 43  
Velić, Marko 481  
Vidacek-Hains, Violeta 187  
Vrana, Radovan 91  
Vrček, Neven 273  
Vukšić, Bojan 131  
Vuljak, Ivan 205  
Zdjelar, Robertina 287  
Zimmermann, Jadranka 247

## PREFACE

The 23<sup>rd</sup> Central European Conference on Information and Intelligent Systems (CECIIS 2012) was organized and hosted by the Faculty of Organization and Informatics, Varaždin, Croatia, from 19-21 September 2012. The most important aim of CECIIS is to strengthen the interface between researchers involved in the development and application of methods and techniques in the field of information and intelligent systems.

This proceedings presents 62 scientific papers that were reviewed by the international Program Committee and divided into seven sections: Education for Information Society, Information Systems Security, Information and Communication Technologies, Data and Knowledge Bases, Intelligent Information Systems, Intelligent Transport Systems and Software Engineering. Selected papers will be further reviewed by two independent international reviewers with the possibility of being extended and included in the Journal of Organizational and Information Sciences (JIOS), the international scientific journal published by the Faculty of Organization and Informatics. The proceedings also contains two invited lectures that were delivered by eminent experts in their respective fields.

Within the 23<sup>rd</sup> edition, the Conference also offered several accompanying events. For the second time the Students poster and presentation section as well as the FOI Security Symposium (FSec) were held. 11 poster abstracts and 22 FSec presentations are published separately on-line.

For the first time FOI Mobile and embedded development Symposium (f-moed) was held as well as Scientific-practical seminar Mathematics and the ICT.

We would like to thank all the authors, presenters, reviewers, session chairs and attendees and, above all, our invited speakers. We acknowledge the help that the Faculty of Organization and Informatics provided, which was very important for the overall success of the Conference. We would like to extend our appreciation to the Program and Organizing Committee members.

Finally, we are most grateful to all our sponsors for their financial and material support.

We are confident that inside these covers you will find relevant and interesting papers in the field of information and intelligent systems. We also look forward to your participation in one of many CECIIS conferences to come.

September 2012

On the behalf of  
Program and Organizing Committees  
Tihomir Hunjak & Sandra Lovrenčić



# Performing systematic literature review in software engineering

**Zlatko Stapić**

Faculty of Organization and  
Informatics

University of Zagreb

Pavlinka 2, 42000 Varaždin,  
Croatia

zlatko.stapic@foi.hr

**Eva García López, Antonio García Cabot**

**Luis de Marcos Ortega**

Computer Science Department

University of Alcalá

Ctra. Barcelona km 33.6, 28871  
Alcalá de Henares (Madrid), Spain

{eva.garcial, a.garciac,  
luis.demarcos}@uah.es

**Vjeran Strahonja**

Faculty of Organization and  
Informatics

University of Zagreb

Pavlinka 2, 42000 Varaždin,  
Croatia

vjeran.strahonja@foi.hr

**Abstract.** *In the field of software engineering (SE) the first primary studies about Systematic Literature Review (SLR) have been conducted during the last decade. By adapting guidelines from other disciplines Kitchenham in 2004 created guidelines on performing the SLR in a field of SE. Since then the SLR is used in SE regularly, but many obstacles still remain.*

*This paper aims to give an short but complete overview of all phases and stages that should be undertaken in SLR, and although based on mentioned guidelines, this paper takes into consideration feedback and experiences reported by other authors and discusses the possible approaches along with advantages and disadvantages of the method.*

**Keywords.** systematic literature review, SLR, overview, software engineering

## 1 Introduction

In order to perform comprehensive and thorough analysis of existing research about a given topic, a systematic approach should be undertaken and existing methodologies should be reviewed in such a manner which will result in a solid basis for the rest of the research. Such analysis could be undertaken by performing different methods and approaches, such as systematic literature review, systematic mapping studies, tertiary reviews discussed by [1], or narrative review, conceptual review, rapid review and several other types presented by [2].

In general, whenever a literature review is performed it could be done by a systematic (following stated procedures and steps) or unsystematic (just reading and taking notes) approach. There are different reasons to perform *systematic literature review* (SLR). The most common reason is to

summarize the existing evidence concerning a treatment or a technology. SLR could also be used to identify any gaps in current research in order to suggest areas for further investigation or to provide a framework/background in order to appropriately position new research activities. In addition, there are other general reasons to use a systematic rather than unsystematic approach, such as the purpose of the research, the scientific approach, the quality expectations or the existence of previous researches on the selected topic.

According to [3] the key feature that distinguishes SLR from traditional narrative reviews lies in their explicit attempt to minimize the chances of making wrong conclusions which could be the result of biases either in primary studies or in the review process itself.

The summary of possible activities that should be undertaken in order to perform a systematic literature review in the field of *software engineering* (SE) is presented in this paper and is based on guidelines presented in [1] as well as on additional discussions from other authors which are cited in the text.

The paper is divided into following sections. Section 2 gives an overview of the phases and activities of SLR, the section 3 focuses on a SLR performed by a single researcher (e.g. PhD student), section 4 discusses advantages and disadvantages of SLR and section 5 concludes the paper.

## 2 Systematic literature review in SE

The method that has been more widely used for different analysis in the field of software engineering is Systematic Literature Review (SLR). "A systematic literature review is a means of evaluating and interpreting all available research relevant to a particular research question, topic area, or phenomenon of interest. Systematic reviews aim to present a fair evaluation of a research topic by using a

trustworthy, rigorous, and auditable methodology” [1].

## 2.1 The history of SLR

The guideline for systematic reviews that aimed to help software engineering researchers was proposed by Kitchenham in [4] and was created as adaptation of several existing guidelines from other disciplines, mainly medicine. Although the three proposed phases of systematic review (planning the review, conducting the review and reporting the review) in general were not criticized, some authors [5] [6] [7] found that Kitchenham described them at a relatively high level and partially inappropriate to conduct for researchers in the field of software engineering. In favor of this goes the fact that Kitchenham in 2007 published a new version of technology report [1] with the aim to propose new and more comprehensive guidelines of performing a systematic literature review for researchers and PhD students in the field of software engineering. The basis for this guideline remained the same: existing guidelines used by medical researchers, but was reinforced by several books and discussions with researchers from other fields.

## 2.2 Performing SLR in software engineering

General steps of the methodology of SLR are defined by [1] and are as follows:

### Phase 1: Planning the review

- Identification of the need for a review
- Commissioning a review (optional)
- Specifying the research question(s)
- Developing a review protocol
- Evaluating the review protocol (recommended)

### Phase 2: Conducting the review

- Identification of research
- Selection of primary studies
- Study quality assessment
- Data extraction and monitoring
- Data synthesis

### Phase 3: Reporting the review

- Specifying dissemination mechanisms
- Formatting the main report
- Evaluating the report (recommended)

Above mentioned stages and phases are not literally sequential as some of them could be repeated more than once and might involve iteration or reimplementation. Additionally, a negative evaluation result means a repetition of the part or of the whole process.

It is important to notice that even experienced scientists often have to change or adapt review protocol. For some authors this is the reason to criticize the methodology of existing reviews of not being completely objective or even conducting a fake

rational design process. On the other side, there are authors, for example [7], who discuss the need of the protocol even if it is a subject of constant changes through the whole systematic review process. General and strong conclusion of the authors who performed a SLR is that the protocol is needed and that it increases the quality of the process.

## 2.3 Planning the review

The results of this phase should be a clearly defined review protocol containing the purpose and the procedures of the review. The summary of each step of this phase is presented below.

*Identification of the need for a review* arises from the preliminary research in the topic area. It is important to identify and review existing systematic reviews on the same topic. The review of existing SLRs is usually undertaken against appropriate and previously created evaluation criteria. The most common practice is to create a checklist or set of questions that should be examined for every existing SLR. There are several checklists proposed by different authors or organizations, such as [8], and depending on the level of complexity they usually use concepts of quality of defined inclusion and exclusion criteria or the level of literature and relevant studies coverage along with assessment of quality of included studies.

*Commissioning a review* is an optional task and whether or not will be performed is determined by the type and the stakeholders of the review process. When performing this step, the organization must provide a commissioning document (that will contain all important information about the required work such as project name, review questions, timetable and budget) or dissemination strategy.

*Specifying the research questions* is probably most important part of systematic review process as it is the base for all other activities. The research question will define which primary studies include or exclude from review, it will define data that should be extracted from the reviewed literature. The defined research question should be answered in the final systematic literature review report. There are several types of research questions that could be stated in the domain of software engineering. These questions may concern, for example, effect of software engineering technology, cost and risk factors, the impact of technology on different concepts et cetera, and the type of a question sometimes can determine the guidelines and procedures to be used. According to Kitchenham, it is important to create a right question, i.e. the question that is meaningful and important to practitioners and researchers, that will lead either to changes in current SE practice or to increased confidence in the value of current practice, or that will identify discrepancies between commonly held beliefs and reality. Finally, the right questions could be the questions that are primarily of interest to researchers

in order to identify and scope the future research activities.

*Developing a review protocol* is considered as the most important activity of the whole planning phase as it determines the rest of the SLR process. The output of this activity should be a detailed review protocol that specifies the methods that will be used to perform a planned systematic review.

Creating a protocol prior to systematic review is necessary to reduce the possibility of researcher bias. Staples and Niazi [7] claim that review protocol, as a concrete and formal plan of the systematic review, usually insinuates and suggests the structure of the final report. Protocol should also describe the background context for the research, the specific research questions, the planned search strategy, criteria for publication selection, the treatment of publication quality assessment, the data extraction plan, the data synthesis plan and a project plan. In general, these parts are definition of whole systematic review process, and usually it is impossible to predict all elements and obstacles in it. That is why some authors, for example [7], discuss that a protocol is a subject of constant changes through the whole systematic review process, but any changes made on protocol during the execution phases must be documented and properly reported.

In the guidelines, Kitchenham suggests that aspects of the protocol should be piloted during its development. In particular, the search terms, selection criteria, and data extraction procedures should be tried out before finalizing the protocol. In order to make the protocol definition activities less difficult, Biolchini [5] created a review protocol template which could be used in this stage.

*Evaluating the review protocol* is not necessary, but is a recommended step in the SLR process in order to improve its quality as the protocol is a critical element of any systematic review. The researchers must take into consideration several aspects (purpose of the research, desired quality, time, financial construction etc.) in order to agree with a procedure for evaluating the protocol.

In regards to these, there are several methods of evaluating a review protocol which could be used, such as author's review, peer review, review by supervisor, review by external experts or test of protocol execution.

1. Question Formularization
  - 1.1. Question Focus
  - 1.2. Question Quality and Amplitude
    - Problem
    - Question
    - Keywords and Synonyms
    - Intervention
    - Control
    - Effect
    - Outcome Measure
    - Population
    - Application
    - Experimental Design
2. Sources Selection
  - 2.1. Sources Selection Criteria Definition
  - 2.2. Studies Languages
  - 2.3. Sources Identification
    - Sources Search Methods
    - Search String
    - Sources List
  - 2.4. Sources Selection after Evaluation
  - 2.5. References Checking
3. Studies Selection
  - 3.1. Studies Definition
    - Studies Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria Definition
    - Studies Types Definition
    - Procedures for Studies Selection
  - 3.2. Selection Execution
    - Initial Studies Selection
    - Studies Quality Evaluation
    - Selection Review
4. Information Extraction
  - 4.1. Information Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria Definition
  - 4.2. Data Extraction Forms
  - 4.3. Extraction Execution
    - Objective Results Extraction
      - i) Study Identification
      - ii) Study Methodology
      - iii) Study Results
      - iv) Study Problems
    - Subjective Results Extraction
      - i) Information through authors
      - ii) General Impressions and Abstractions
  - 4.4. Resolution of divergences among reviewers
5. Results Summarization
  - 5.1. Results Statistical Calculus
  - 5.2. Results Presentation in Tables
  - 5.3. Sensitivity Analysis
  - 5.4. Plotting
  - 5.5. Final Comments
    - Number of Studies
    - Search, Selection and Extraction Bias
    - Publication Bias
    - Inter-Reviewers Variation
    - Results Application
    - Recommendations

Figure 1 - Protocol template proposed by Biolchini et al. in [5]

## 2.4. Conducting the review

According to Kitchenham's guidelines, conducting the review phase consists of five obligatory stages:

*Identification of research* is a first step in conducting a review that will result in a list of entire population of publications relevant to the research questions and obtained by performing a search strategy. The search strategy should be the same as



stated in the review protocol, and it should be stated in such a manner that it allows the study to be replicable and open to external review. It is also good to break down a research question and to identify initial search strings according to population, intervention, comparison, outcomes, context and study design. Additionally, it is important to create a list of synonyms, abbreviations and alternative spellings. Process of performing a SLR must be transparent and replicable. This means that the whole process should be properly documented: the review must be documented, the search should be documented and unfiltered search results should be saved and retained for possible reanalysis, and any changes in review protocol made during this or any other subsequent stage should also be documented. An important prerequisite for repeatability of research is that the data that are the subject of analysis are time-stamped. Many of these documents will not be presented in the final report but could also be published and a reference to them could be available in the final report.

In an attempt to perform an exhaustive search Brereton et al. [9] identified seven electronic sources as most relevant sources to Software Engineers (IEEEExplore, ACM Digital Library, Google Scholar, Citeseer library, INSPEC, ScienceDirect and EI Compendex), and they also discuss about considering the use of additional sources (SpringerLink, Web of Science and SCOPUS) from publishers or bibliographical databases. Several authors also tried to identify a list of relevant journals and conferences in the field of software engineering, for example, [10] and [1] obtained a list of relevant journals and conferences.

*Selection of primary studies* is performed on all identified (potentially relevant) studies by applying an inclusion and exclusion criteria in order to assess their actual relevance. The selection criteria are also decided during the protocol definition but if necessary they can be redefined during this process. The identification of research will usually end up with a great number of articles that do not answer to the

research question (because the keywords may have different meanings or may be used in the studies that are not in the focus of SLR research topic). The *inclusion criteria* will define which of these studies to include in the set of relevant ones, and the *exclusion criteria* could be applied on the already selected studies in order to identify those that do not meet additional conditions; or on the initial list of studies in order to remove irrelevant ones. Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be based on the research question, but could be defined based on study types. For example, only quantitative studies will be taken into consideration.

*Study quality assessment* is the second most important part of this phase. The idea of this process is to analyze and assess the quality of each primarily selected study in order to be finally included in data extraction and reporting process. In general, the aim of assessing the quality is to make sure that the study findings are relevant and unbiased. However, this is not a simple process as, according to Kitchenham, there is no agreed definition of study “quality”. Some authors, for example [8], discuss that the study quality assessment procedures mainly depend on the type of the study. The following elements should be assessed regardless of the study type:

- Appropriateness of study design to the research objective.
- Risk of bias.
- Choice of outcome measure.
- Statistical issues.
- Quality of reporting and intervention.
- Generalizability.

The most usual tool (quality instrument) used to assess the quality of studies is *checklist*. Usage of checklists ensures that all assessed studies are evaluated critically and in a standardized way. According to [8] there are many different checklists and scales already available, and they can be used or adapted to meet the requirements of the review, but also a usual way is to create a new detailed checklist which will cover the bias and validity in the focus of specific research. In the literature several types of biases are recognized that should be addressed in a *checklist*. According to Kitchenham, checklist should also include consideration of biases and validity problems that can occur at the different stages of the study (design, conduct, analysis and conclusions). An accumulated list of questions was created in [1] and organized with respect to study stage and study type. The total of 59 questions is divided into four mentioned stages and cover quantitative empirical studies, correlation (observational) studies, surveys and experiments. This example checklist should not be used literally, but rather as a pool of questions in order to use, for specific study, only appropriate ones. The same process was conducted on qualitative studies, and resulted in 18 questions that could be used. Simple examples of quality assessment of SE studies are presented in [3], [11], [12], [13] and [14].




Figure 2 - Example of study selection process [3]

*Data extraction and monitoring* as a next stage aims to accurately and without bias record the appropriate information from selected papers. Researchers usually, during the protocol definition phase, define extraction forms which are used in this activity. The design of data extraction forms is not a trivial task while forms should be designed to collect all information needed to address the review questions and the study quality criteria. Basically, data extraction forms should contain questions needed to answer the review questions and quality evaluation criteria. There is no firm guidance on how to define these questions as they are different for every specific SLR process. On the other side, there are several elements that are considered to be common to all forms in order to provide standard information. According to Kitchenham these elements could be: name of the reviewer; date of data extraction; title, authors, journal, publications details; and space for additional notes. Combining the examples presented in [1] and [15] we can conclude that in general, data extraction form could include the following parts (sections): extraction information (data extractor, data checker and date of extraction), general study information (study identifier, title and publication details), questions to answer review questions, questions to assess study quality, and data summary. It is important not to include multiple studies with same data in a systematic review in order to avoid results with bias. This could be a serious threat if different sets of publications are analyzed by different researchers. On the other side, it is also important to contact the authors if it is identified that some data are missing or they were poorly reported. Examples on data extraction could be found in [14], [15] and [16].

*Data synthesis* is the final step in the review conduction phase. During this activity extracted data are collected and summarized. In general, there are two types of data synthesis: descriptive (narrative) synthesis and quantitative synthesis [8]. In order to draw reliable conclusions, synthesis should consider the strength of evidence, explore consistency and discuss inconsistencies. The synthesis approach should be defined by the protocol and is determined by the type of research questions, but also by the type of available studies and by the quality of data. For example, it is not wise to perform a statistical analysis on the numerical data if used publications are not randomized or do not cover whole population, or if there are studies with poor quality and with the biased results. In addition, according to guidance of Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) [8], narrative and quantitative approaches are not mutually exclusive, and according to [9] "software engineering systematic reviews are likely to be qualitative in nature". Regardless of the synthesis type, the synthesis should begin with a creation of a summary of included studies. The studies included in the review are usually presented in a table which covers all their important details (type, interventions, number and

characteristics of participants, outcomes etc.). In the same (or in another) table could be also presented elements of study quality and risk of bias. Additionally, this descriptive process should be explicit rigorous and should help to conclude if the studies are similar and reliable to synthesize [8]. Kitchenham [1] also adds that the extracted data should be tabulated in a consistent manner with the review questions and structured to highlight similarities and differences between study outcomes. When systematic literature review includes quantitative and qualitative studies, Kitchenham suggests that researchers should "synthesize the quantitative and qualitative studies separately, and then attempt to integrate the results by investigating whether the qualitative results can help explain the quantitative results". When there is a considerable difference in the quality of studies, Kitchenham suggests the sensitivity analysis to be performed in order to determine if the low quality publications have significant impact on synthesis results. Sensitivity analysis could also be performed on different subsets of primary studies to determine the robustness of results. Examples of different methods and approaches of presentation of systematized data could be found in Chapter 1.3.5. of [8].

## 2.5. Reporting the review

The aim of the final phase of the systematic literature review process is to write the results of the review in a form suitable to dissemination channel and target audience or parties. The results are usually written in a form of a systematic review report.

*Specifying dissemination strategy and mechanisms* is usually performed during the project commissioning activities, or if there was no commissioning phase, then dissemination strategy and mechanisms should be defined in the review protocol. Kitchenham discusses that apart from disseminating the results in academic journals and conferences, scientists should consider performing other dissemination activities that might include direct communication with affected bodies, publishing the results on web pages, posters or practitioner-oriented magazines etc. If the results are to be published in a conference or journal, or any other publication with restricted number of pages, then the reference to a document (technical report, PhD thesis or similar) that contains all information should be provided.

*Formatting the main report* is a stage in which Kitchenham adopted the suggested structure of systematic review report given in CRD's guidelines from 2001. Although the mentioned original guidelines are updated in [8], the version presented by Kitchenham is sufficient in the field of software engineering.

*Evaluating the report* is the final step in the systematic literature review process. This activity depends mainly on the type of the publication. Papers



submitted to the scientific conference or scientific journal will be reviewed by independent peer reviewers. Doctoral dissertations will be reviewed by supervisors and by the committee during the examination process. Finally, if the publication is a technical review, it is also advisable to subject the materials to an independent evaluation. In this case, this final review could be done by the same expert panel that was created to review the research protocol. The results of the review, if negative, could require repetition of one or more phases in the systematic literature review process.

### 3 Light SLR

Described *Systematic Literature Review* process is defined in such way to be undertaken by large group of researchers, and this raises the question if these guidelines could be used while single researcher (like PhD student) performs SLR. The authors of the guidelines conclude that not all of the mentioned stages (activities) are obliged to be performed if a PhD student is performing a research, so they proposed a light version of the SLR process containing the most important steps:

- Developing a protocol
- Defining the research question(s).
- Specifying what will be done to address the problem of a single researcher applying inclusion/exclusion criteria and undertaking all the data extraction.
- Defining the search strategy.
- Defining the data to be extracted from each primary study including quality data.
- Maintaining lists of included and excluded studies.
- Using the data synthesis guidelines.
- Using the reporting guidelines.

Although the version of the process is *light*, the mentioned tasks should be performed according to the guidelines and should take into consideration the notes guidelines' authors gave for PhD students and single researchers.

### 4 Discussion

As every other method and approach, SLR also has several advantages and disadvantages. Kitchenham identified three main groups of advantages of using systematic literature review. (1) The methodology is well-defined; (2) it enables researchers to provide the information available in the wide range of sources; (3) and in the case of quantitative data, it is possible to perform some meta-analysis and to extract information that single study cannot provide [1]. Additionally, if compared to unstructured methods, like simple literature review, the SLR has many

advantages (described in the SLR process) that make the results of such analysis more reliable and more likely to be unbiased.

On the other hand, major disadvantage of this approach is that it requires much more effort and time in comparison to simple literature review and this is exacerbated by large number of review points: search term pilot reviews, protocol reviews, initial selection reviews, final selection reviews, data extraction reviews, and data analysis reviews [7]. Kitchenham also adds that the usage of meta-analysis could be a disadvantage as it can detect small and unimportant biases.

Biolchini [5] states that a conduction of SLR in software engineering is much harder than in other disciplines, for example medicine. Same authors point out that the overall process is difficult to conduct, especially the activities of protocol development, searching and evaluating studies.

Additionally, execution of this method depends on solid literature coverage of the focused phenomenon, and subsequently it cannot be used to explore new, revolutionary, phenomena which are not well covered in literature.

Finally, even experienced authors are likely to change the review protocol during the implementation phase, and that brings the problem of documenting the whole process.

### 5 Conclusion

The method overview presented in this paper is based on the Kitchenham's guidelines presented in [1] and is expanded by reported feedback of the researchers, mainly from the field of software engineering.

The process of systematic literature review is not easy to perform, but the general opinion of the authors who have performed SLR is that this method is useful and could be used to decrease the biases and to increase the review quality. They also note that the usage of this method has significant obstacles in the field of software engineering in comparison to other fields, for example, the field of health sciences.

In order to overcome the obstacles specific for SE field, it is important to keep in mind that the scope of the review should be limited by choosing clear and narrow research questions and that the whole process should be in advance well defined by putting an considerable efforts in creation of feasible review protocol.

SLR can be a monolithic batch process, that periodically provides reports and digests but in terms of scientific research, much closer is a view on SLR as an interactive and iterative process.

As SLR method still emerges in the field of software engineering, the idea of publishing the replications of existing systematic reviews is welcomed, along with the idea of creation of centralized index of existing literature reviews.

## Acknowledgments

The research presented in this paper was conducted as a part of a PhD research and is partially funded by the scholarship granted to the first author from Croatian Science Foundation.

## References

- [1] B. Kitchenham and S. Charters, "Guidelines for performing Systematic Literature reviews in Software Engineering Version 2.3," Keele University and University of Durham, Technical report EBSE-2007-01, 2007.
- [2] M. Petticrew and H. Roberts, *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: a practical guide*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2005.
- [3] T. Dybå and T. Dingsøyr, "Strength of evidence in systematic reviews in software engineering," 2008, pp. 178–187.
- [4] B. Kitchenham, "Procedures for Performing Systematic Reviews," Software Engineering Group; National ICT Australia Ltd., Keele; Eversleigh, Technical report Keele University Technical Report TR/SE-0401; NICTA Technical Report 0400011T.1, 2004.
- [5] J. Biolchini, P. Gomes Mian, A. Candida Cruz Natali, and G. Horta Travassos, "Systematic Review in Software Engineering," PESC, Rio de Janeiro, Technical report RT - ES 679 / 05, 2005.
- [6] P. Mian, T. Conte, A. Natali, J. Biolchini, and G. Travassos, "A Systematic Review Process for Software Engineering," in *ESELAW '05: 2nd Experimental Software Engineering Latin American Workshop*, 2005.
- [7] M. Staples and M. Niazi, "Experiences using systematic review guidelines," *Journal of Systems and Software*, vol. 80, no. 9, pp. 1425–1437, 2007.
- [8] Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York, *Systematic reviews: CRD's guidance for undertaking reviews in health care*. York: Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, 2009.
- [9] P. Brereton, B. A. Kitchenham, D. Budgen, M. Turner, and M. Khalil, "Lessons from applying the systematic literature review process within the software engineering domain," *Journal of Systems and Software*, vol. 80, no. 4, pp. 571–583, 2007.
- [10] J. Hannay, D. Sjoberg, and T. Dyba, "A Systematic Review of Theory Use in Software Engineering Experiments," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 87–107, 2007.
- [11] B. Kitchenham, O. Pearl Brereton, D. Budgen, M. Turner, J. Bailey, and S. Linkman, "Systematic literature reviews in software engineering – A systematic literature review," *Information and Software Technology*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 7–15, 2009.
- [12] B. Kitchenham, R. Pretorius, D. Budgen, O. Pearl Brereton, M. Turner, M. Niazi, and S. Linkman, "Systematic literature reviews in software engineering - A tertiary study," *Information and Software Technology*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 792–805, 2010.
- [13] B. Kitchenham, P. Brereton, M. Turner, M. Niazi, S. Linkman, R. Pretorius, and D. Budgen, "The impact of limited search procedures for systematic literature reviews - A participant-observer case study," 2009, pp. 336–345.
- [14] M. Unterkalmsteiner, T. Gorschek, A. K. M. M. Islam, C. K. Cheng, R. B. Permadi, and R. Feldt, "Evaluation and Measurement of Software Process Improvement - A Systematic Literature Review," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2012.
- [15] M. Jørgensen, "Estimation of Software Development Work Effort: Evidence on Expert Judgment and Formal Models," *International Journal of Forecasting*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 449–462, 2007.
- [16] T. Dybå and T. Dingsøyr, "Empirical studies of agile software development: A systematic review," *Information and Software Technology*, vol. 50, no. 9–10, pp. 833–859, 2008.