Review of: "Formal Verification of a Change Control Process in Project Management"

Stépane Morin-Pépin[1]

1 École de technologie supérieure, Université du Québec

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In the introduction, you mention the following:
“While this is perfectly good for most design purposes, there are some scenarios in which we need a more precise –even mathematical– expression of the process such that we can verify if its key properties are guaranteed”. Adding one or two concrete examples would help solidify your point of view.

The very first sentence at the beginning of the second paragraph “Background” (“In this section, we present previous work which gives the context and prerequisites for the application of our change process formal verification method.”) is redundant, since it is the definition of “background”, and we all know what it means.

I suggest that you put the second sentence of the second paragraph (“The ICC process consists of reviewing change requests, approving change requests, and updating the integrated plan for the project, the subsidiary plans, the product specifications, and the baselines of time, cost, and project quality [PMI, 17].”) at the beginning of the introduction. Since it’s the definition of an ICC process. It would be a good fit with the start of your paper.

I’m having difficulties understanding the goal of the figure 1. I’m guessing that it has something to do with the following sentence:
“We notice that the PMI PMBOK does not provide specific workflows for ICC, thus it is necessary to incorporate workflows from other sources, like ITIL [Rance, 11] in order to develop specific ICC workflows.” Adding a small description of what is missing, and where, would help the readers understand your point.

At the start of the fifth paragraph of the section 2.4 you make a reference to the “figure 2b” (“For the computation tree in fig 2b”), but there is no “figure 2b”. Should it be a reference to the “figure 3” instead?

In the section 3.3, you mentioned:
“We notice in the last line of the example code that expressions in NuSMV do not necessarily evaluate to a unique value as a result.” But, there is code before and after this sentence. That make it hard to identify which example code you are referring to.

The rest of your paper makes sence.