

# An Integer Programming Model for Embedding Social Values into Software Requirement Selection

Davoud Mougouei  
University of Wollongong, Australia

## Abstract

The existing software requirement selection methods have mainly focused on optimizing the economic value of a software product while ignoring its social values and their long-term impacts on the society. Social values however, are also important and need to be taken into account in software requirement selection. Moreover, social values of software requirements may change in the presence or absence of other requirements due to the *value dependencies* among those requirements. These dependencies are imprecise and hard to specify in software projects. This paper presents an *Integer Programming* (IP) model for the integration of social values and dependencies among them into software requirement selection. We further, account for the imprecision of social values and dependencies among them using the algebraic structure of fuzzy graphs.

**Keywords** Integer Programming, Social Values, Fuzzy, Software Requirement Selection

## I. INTRODUCTION

Software requirement selection [32], also known as *Software Release Planning* [3], [1], [9], is to find an optimal subset of requirements with the highest economic value while respecting the project constraints [5]. Thus, the optimization models of the existing requirement selection methods aim to optimize the economic value of a software product without caring for its social values and the long-term impacts of those values on the society [14], [24], [23], [10]. To consider social values in software requirement selection, these values need to be integrated into the optimization models of requirement selection methods. A sample map of the economic and social values in software products is demonstrated in Figure 1.

It is widely known that in a software project the economic values of the selected requirements may positively or negatively depend on the presence or absence of other requirements [17], [16], [13], [33], [25], [12], [18] in the selected subset of requirements, i.e. *Optimal Subset*. Analogously, there are also dependencies among social values of requirements in the sense that the presence or absence of certain requirements may impact the social values of other requirements due to the relationships and conflicts among those requirements.

Hence, it is important that we take into account dependencies among social values as well as the dependencies among economic values of requirements in the optimization models of software requirement selection methods. Dependencies among social values and dependencies among economic values are all referred to as value dependencies for the ease of reference in this paper. Moreover, as observed by Carlshamre *et al.* [4], requirement dependencies in general and value dependencies in particular are *fuzzy* [4] in the sense that the strengths those dependencies are imprecise and vary [5], [21], [22], [4] from large to insignificant [28] in real-world projects. Hence, it is important to consider not only the existence but the strengths of value dependencies and the imprecision of those dependencies in software projects.




Fig. 1: A map of social values appeared in [7].

In this paper we present an integer programming method [19] for considering the economic and social values with dependencies among those values in software requirement selection. In doing so, we have developed an optimization model that allows for embedding social values and dependencies among them into software requirement selection. The model is referred to as the *Society-Oriented Requirement Selection (SORS)*. We have further made use of a variation of fuzzy graphs, referred to as the *Value Dependency Graphs (VDGs)*, which was developed in our earlier work [17], [15] for modeling value dependencies in the problem of binary knapsack with dependent item values.

## II. MODELING ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL VALUE DEPENDENCIES

In this section we discuss modeling economic and social value dependencies by value dependency graphs (VDGs) introduced in [19]. The algebraic structure of VDGs are used for computing the influences of the requirements of a software project on the social values of each other.

### A. Value Dependency Graphs

Value dependency graphs were initially presented in [15] for modeling value dependencies among items of a knapsack in the binary knapsack problem with dependent item values. In this paper we use VDGs for modeling economic and social value dependencies and their characteristics (quality and strength). A brief definition of VDG is provided in Definition 1.

**Definition 1.** *Value Dependency Graph (VDG)* is a signed directed fuzzy graph [29]  $G = (R, \sigma, \rho)$  where, requirements  $R : \{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$  constitutes the graph nodes. Also, qualitative function  $\sigma(r_i, r_j) \rightarrow \{+, -, \pm\}$  and the membership function  $\rho : (r_i, r_j) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  denote qualities and strengths of an explicit value dependency (edge of the graph) from  $r_i$  to  $r_j$  respectively. Moreover,  $\rho(r_i, r_j) = 0$  and  $\sigma(r_i, r_j) = \pm$  specify the absence of any explicit value dependency from  $r_i$  to  $r_j$ .

### B. Economic and Social Value Dependencies in VDGs

Definition 2 provides a more comprehensive definition of value dependencies that includes both explicit and implicit dependencies among requirements of a software product based on the algebraic structure of fuzzy graphs.

**Definition 2.** *Value Dependencies.* A value dependency in a value dependency graph  $G = (R, \sigma, \rho)$  is defined as a sequence of requirements  $d_i : (r(0), \dots, r(k))$  such that  $\forall r(j) \in d_i, 1 \leq j \leq k$  we have  $\rho(r(j-1), r(j)) \neq 0$ .  $j \geq 0$  is the sequence of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  requirement (node) denoted as  $r(j)$  on the dependency path. A consecutive pair  $(r(j-1), r(j))$  specifies an explicit value dependency.

$$\forall d_i : (r(0), \dots, r(k)) : \rho(d_i) = \bigwedge_{j=1}^k \rho(r(j-1), r(j)) \quad (1)$$

$$\forall d_i : (r(0), \dots, r(k)) : \sigma(d_i) = \prod_{j=1}^k \sigma(r(j-1), r(j)) \quad (2)$$

Equation (1) computes the strength of a value dependency  $d_i : (r(0), \dots, r(k))$  by finding the strength of the weakest of the  $k$  explicit dependencies on  $d_i$ . Fuzzy operator  $\wedge$  denotes Zadeh's [31] AND operation (infimum). On the other hand, the quality (positive or negative) of a value dependency  $d_i : (r(0), \dots, r(k))$  is calculated by qualitative serial inference [6], [30], [11] as given by (2) and Table I.

TABLE I: Qualitative Serial Inference in VDGs.

$\sigma(r(j-1), r(j), r(j+1))$	$\sigma(r(j), r(j+1))$		
	+	-	$\pm$
$\sigma(r(j-1), r(j))$	+	+	$\pm$
	-	-	$\pm$
	$\pm$	$\pm$	$\pm$

Let  $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_m\}$  be the set of all value dependencies from  $r_i \in R$  to  $r_j \in R$  in a VDG  $G = (R, \sigma, \rho)$ , where positive and negative dependencies can simultaneously exist from  $r_i$  to  $r_j$ . The strength of all positive value dependency from  $r_i$  to  $r_j$  is denoted by  $\rho^{+\infty}(r_i, r_j)$  and calculated by (3), that is to find the strength of the strongest positive dependency [26] from  $r_i$  to  $r_j$ . Fuzzy operators  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$  denote Zadeh's [31] fuzzy AND (taking minimum) and fuzzy OR (taking maximum) operations respectively. In a similar way, the strength of negative value dependency from  $r_i$  to  $r_j$  is denoted by  $\rho^{-\infty}(r_i, r_j)$  and calculated by (4).

$$\rho^{+\infty}(r_i, r_j) = \bigvee_{d_m \in D, \sigma(d_m)=+} \rho(d_m) \quad (3)$$

$$\rho^{-\infty}(r_i, r_j) = \bigvee_{d_m \in D, \sigma(d_m)=-} \rho(d_m) \quad (4)$$

A brute-force approach to computing  $\rho^{+\infty}(r_i, r_j)$  or  $\rho^{-\infty}(r_i, r_j)$  needs to calculate the strengths of all paths from  $r_i$  to  $r_j$  which is of complexity of  $O(n!)$  for  $n$  requirements (VDG nodes). To avoid such complexity, we have formulated the problem of calculating  $\rho^{+\infty}(r_i, r_j)$  and  $\rho^{-\infty}(r_i, r_j)$  as a widest path problem (also known as the maximum capacity path problem [27]) which can be solved in polynomial time by Floyd-Warshall algorithm [8].

In this regard, we devised a modified version of Floyd-Warshall algorithm (Algorithm 1) that computes  $\rho^{+\infty}(r_i, r_j)$  and  $\rho^{-\infty}(r_i, r_j)$  for all pairs of requirements  $(r_i, r_j)$ ,  $r_i, r_j \in R : \{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$  with the time bound of  $O(n^3)$ . For each pair of requirements  $(r_i, r_j)$  in a VDG  $G = (R, \sigma, \rho)$ , lines 20 to 37 of Algorithm 1 find the strength of all positive value dependencies and the strength of all negative value dependencies from  $r_i$  to  $r_j$ .

---

**Algorithm 1:** Calculating Strengths of Value Dependencies.

---

**Input:** VDG  $G = (R, \sigma, \rho)$   
**Output:**  $\rho^{+\infty}, \rho^{-\infty}$

```

1: for each  $r_i \in R$  do
2:   for each  $r_j \in R$  do
3:      $\rho^{+\infty}(r_i, r_j) \leftarrow \rho^{-\infty}(r_i, r_j) \leftarrow -\infty$ 
4:   end for
5: end for
6: for each  $r_i \in R$  do
7:    $\rho(r_i, r_i)^{+\infty} \leftarrow \rho(r_i, r_i)^{-\infty} \leftarrow 0$ 
8: end for
9: for each  $r_i \in R$  do
10:  for each  $r_j \in R$  do
11:   if  $\sigma(r_i, r_j) = +$  then
12:     $\rho^{+\infty}(r_i, r_j) \leftarrow \rho(r_i, r_j)$ 
13:   else if  $\sigma(r_i, r_j) = -$  then
14:     $\rho^{-\infty}(r_i, r_j) \leftarrow \rho(r_i, r_j)$ 
15:   end if
16: end for
17: end for
18: for each  $r_k \in R$  do
19:  for each  $r_i \in R$  do
20:   for each  $r_j \in R$  do
21:    if  $\min(\rho(r_i, r_k)^{+\infty}, \rho(r_k, r_j)^{+\infty}) > \rho^{+\infty}(r_i, r_j)$  then
22:      $\rho^{+\infty}(r_i, r_j) \leftarrow \min(\rho(r_i, r_k)^{+\infty}, \rho(r_k, r_j)^{+\infty})$ 
23:    end if
24:    if  $\min(\rho(r_i, r_k)^{-\infty}, \rho(r_k, r_j)^{-\infty}) > \rho^{-\infty}(r_i, r_j)$  then
25:      $\rho^{-\infty}(r_i, r_j) \leftarrow \min(\rho(r_i, r_k)^{-\infty}, \rho(r_k, r_j)^{-\infty})$ 
26:    end if
27:    if  $\min(\rho(r_i, r_k)^{+\infty}, \rho(r_k, r_j)^{-\infty}) > \rho^{-\infty}(r_i, r_j)$  then
28:      $\rho^{-\infty}(r_i, r_j) \leftarrow \min(\rho(r_i, r_k)^{+\infty}, \rho(r_k, r_j)^{-\infty})$ 
29:    end if
30:    if  $\min(\rho(r_i, r_k)^{-\infty}, \rho(r_k, r_j)^{+\infty}) > \rho^{+\infty}(r_i, r_j)$  then
31:      $\rho^{+\infty}(r_i, r_j) \leftarrow \min(\rho(r_i, r_k)^{-\infty}, \rho(r_k, r_j)^{+\infty})$ 
32:    end if
33:   end for
34: end for
35: end for

```

---

$$I_{i,j} = \rho^{+\infty}(r_i, r_j) - \rho^{-\infty}(r_i, r_j) \quad (5)$$

The overall strength of all positive and negative value dependencies from  $r_i$  to  $r_j$  is referred to as the *Overall Influence* of  $r_j$  on the value of  $r_i$  and denoted by  $I_{i,j}$ .  $I_{i,j}$  as given by (5) is calculated by subtracting the strength of all negative value dependencies from  $r_i$  to  $r_j$  ( $\rho(r_i, r_j)^{-\infty}$ ) from the strength of all positive value dependencies from  $r_i$  to  $r_j$  ( $\rho(r_i, r_j)^{+\infty}$ ). It is clear that  $I_{i,j} \in [-1, 1]$ .  $I_{i,j} > 0$  states that  $r_j$  influences the value of  $r_i$  in a positive way whereas  $I_{i,j} < 0$  indicates that the ultimate influence of  $r_j$  on  $r_i$  is negative.

### C. The Proposed Integer Programming Model

We consider two types of values in our proposed optimization model (SORS). First is the economic value, which is manifested in terms of revenue/profit. Second is the class of social values, which includes all types of social values as depicted in Figure 1. For the sake of notational convenience we specify the economic value of a software requirement  $r_i$  by  $v_{i,1}$  while the social values of  $r_i$  are specified by  $v_{i,2}, \dots, v_{i,k_u}$ .  $k_u$  gives the total number of values including the economic value.

$$\theta_{i,k} = \bigvee_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{x_j(|I_{i,j,k}| - I_{i,j,k}) + (1 - x_j)(|I_{i,j,k}| + I_{i,j,k})}{2} \right) = \bigvee_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{|I_{i,j,k}| + (1 - 2x_j)I_{i,j,k}}{2} \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (6)$$

$$x_j \in \{0, 1\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n \quad (7)$$

In order to account for the impact of value dependencies on different types of value we use the algebraic structure of fuzzy graphs for computing the penalties of ignoring (selecting) positive (negative) value dependencies of a requirement on its economic/social values. For a type  $k$  value (6)-(7) compute the penalty of ignoring (selecting) requirements with positive (negative) influence on the values of the selected requirements.  $\theta_{i,k}$  in this equation denotes the penalty for the type  $k$  value of a requirement  $r_i$ ,  $n$  denotes the number of requirements and  $x_j$  specifies whether a requirement  $r_j$  is selected ( $x_j = 1$ ) or not ( $x_j = 0$ ). Also,  $I_{i,j,k}$ , as in (5), gives the positive or negative influence of  $r_i$  on the type  $k$  value of  $r_j$ .

We made use of the algebraic structure of fuzzy graphs for computing the influences of requirements on the values of each other as explained in Section II. Accordingly,  $\theta_{i,k}$  is computed using the fuzzy OR operator which is to take supremum over the strengths of all ignored positive dependencies and selected negative dependencies of  $r_i$  for its corresponding type  $k$  value dependency graph.

Equations (8)-(19) give our proposed integer programming model [20], [2]. In these equations,  $x_i$  is a selection variable denoting whether a requirement  $r_i$  is selected ( $x_i = 1$ ) or ignored ( $x_i = 0$ ). Also  $\theta_{i,k}$  in (6) specifies the penalty for the type  $k$  value of a requirement  $r_i$ , which is the extent to which the type  $k$  value of  $r_i$  is impacted by ignoring (selecting) requirements with positive (negative) influences on the value of  $r_i$ . Also,  $k_u$  specifies the total number of value types including the economic value while  $k_1$  specifies the economic value.

Constraint (9) specifies all constraints related to social values, i.e. *Social Constraints*, except for the economic value, which is embedded into the objective function.  $\alpha_k$  in (9) denotes the required lower bound for each social value. Finding proper values for  $\alpha_k$  is specially important for reconciling conflicts among social values when satisfaction of one value conflicts with satisfaction of another one.  $\alpha_k$  can be modified in such cases to suit value preferences of stakeholders.

Constraint (10) ensures that the total cost of the requirements does not exceed the project budget  $b$ . Also, (11) in the proposed optimization model accounts for precedence dependencies among requirements and the value implications of those dependencies, which may impact all value types of values. Precedence dependencies mainly include requirement dependencies of type *Requires*, where one requirement intrinsically requires the other one, and *Conflicts-With*, where one requirement intrinsically conflicts with the other one.

$$\text{Maximize } \sum_{i=1}^n x_i v_{i,1} - y_i v_{i,1} \quad (8)$$

$$\text{Subject to } \sum_{i=1}^n x_i v_{i,k} - y_i v_{i,k} \geq \alpha_k, \quad k = 2, \dots, k_u \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i x_i \leq b \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{cases} x_i \leq x_j & r_j \text{ precedes } r_i \\ x_i \leq 1 - x_j & r_i \text{ conflicts with } r_j, i \neq j = 1, \dots, n \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

$$\theta_{i,k} \geq \left( \frac{|I_{i,j,k}| + (1 - 2x_j)I_{i,j,k}}{2} \right), \quad i \neq j = 1, \dots, n, k = 1, \dots, k_u \quad (12)$$

$$-g_i \leq x_i \leq g_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (13)$$

$$1 - (1 - g_i) \leq x_i \leq 1 + (1 - g_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (14)$$

$$-g_i \leq y_i \leq g_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (15)$$

$$-(1 - g_i) \leq (y_i - \theta_i) \leq (1 - g_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (16)$$

$$0 \leq y_i \leq 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (17)$$

$$0 \leq \theta_i \leq 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (18)$$

$$x_i, g_i \in \{0, 1\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (19)$$

In (8)-(19) we have either  $a : (x_i = 0, y_i = 0)$ , or  $b : (x_i = 1, y_i = \theta_{i,k})$  occur. To capture the relation between  $\theta_{i,k}$  and  $y_i$  in a linear form, we have made use of an auxiliary variable  $g_i = \{0, 1\}$  and (13)-(19). As such, we have either  $(g_i = 0) \rightarrow a$ , or  $(g_i = 1) \rightarrow b$ . The selection model (8)-(19) therefore is a linear model as it has a linear objective function with linear inequality constraints.

### III. SUMMARY AND FUTURE WORK

This paper presented an integer programming model, referred to as SORS (Society-Oriented Requirement Selection), for taking into account social values as well as the dependencies among those values in software requirement selection. The model is linear and therefore scalable to software projects with large number of requirements. We used the algebraic structure of fuzzy graphs for capturing the imprecision of value dependencies.

This paper can be extended in several directions. Identification of dependencies among social values, for instance, is one important research direction as value dependencies serve as the input for our proposed requirement selection model. Measuring social values is also another important aspect of this research, which is particularly required for specifying the lower-bounds of the social constraints in the optimization model of the SORS. Moreover, it is important to develop such identification and measurement techniques in full participation with stakeholders of software products as social values may change across different classes of stakeholders. In this regard, establishing a collaborative platform for participatory development of standards for identification and measuring social values can be of significant benefit.

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. Ameller, C. Farré, X. Franch, and G. Rufian. A survey on software release planning models. In *Product-Focused Software Process Improvement: 17th International Conference, PROFES 2016, Trondheim, Norway, November 22-24, 2016, Proceedings*, pages 48–65. Springer, 2016.
- [2] C. H. Antunes, M. J. Alves, and J. Clímaco. *Multiobjective linear and integer programming*. Springer, 2016.
- [3] A. J. Bagnall, V. J. RaywardSmith, and I. M. Whittle. The next release problem. *Information and Software Technology*, 43(14):883–890, Dec. 2001.
- [4] P. Carlshamre, K. Sandahl, M. Lindvall, B. Regnell, and J. Natt och Dag. An industrial survey of requirements interdependencies in software product release planning. In *Fifth IEEE International Symposium on Requirements Engineering, 2001. Proceedings*, pages 84–91, 2001.
- [5] Å. G. Dahlstedt and A. Persson. Requirements interdependencies: state of the art and future challenges. In *Engineering and managing software requirements*, pages 95–116. Springer, 2005.
- [6] J. De Kleer and J. S. Brown. A qualitative physics based on confluences. *Artificial intelligence*, 24(1):7–83, 1984.
- [7] M. A. Ferrario, W. Simm, S. Forshaw, A. Gradinar, M. T. Smith, and I. Smith. Values-first se: research principles in practice. In *Software Engineering Companion (ICSE-C), IEEE/ACM International Conference on*, pages 553–562. IEEE, 2016.
- [8] R. W. Floyd. Algorithm 97: shortest path. *Communications of the ACM*, 5(6):345, 1962.
- [9] X. Franch and G. Ruhe. Software release planning. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Software Engineering Companion*, pages 894–895. ACM, 2016.
- [10] W. Hussain, D. Mougouei, and J. Whittle. Integrating social values into software design patterns. In *2018 IEEE/ACM International Workshop on Software Fairness (FairWare)*, pages 8–14. IEEE, 2018.
- [11] A. Kusiak and J. Wang. Dependency analysis in constraint negotiation. *Systems, Man and Cybernetics, IEEE Transactions on*, 25(9):1301–1313, 1995.
- [12] D. Mougouei. Factoring requirement dependencies in software requirement selection using graphs and integer programming. In *2016 31st IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 884–887. IEEE, 2016.
- [13] D. Mougouei. *A Mathematical Programming Approach to Considering Value Dependencies in Software Requirement Selection (Thesis)*. PhD thesis, Flinders University, School of Computer Science, Engineering and Mathematics., 2018.
- [14] D. Mougouei, H. Perera, W. Hussain, R. Shams, and J. Whittle. Operationalizing human values in software: A research roadmap. In *Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE 2018*, page 780–784, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [15] D. Mougouei and D. M. Powers. Modeling and selection of interdependent software requirements using fuzzy graphs. *International Journal of Fuzzy Systems*, pages 1–17, 2017.
- [16] D. Mougouei and D. M. Powers. Dependency-aware release planning for software projects using fuzzy graphs and integer programming. *Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems*, pages 3693–3707, 2019.
- [17] D. Mougouei and D. M. Powers. Dependency-aware software release planning through mining user preferences. *Soft Computing*, 2020.
- [18] D. Mougouei, D. M. W. Powers, and A. Moeini. Dependency-aware software release planning. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Software Engineering Companion, ICSE-C '17*, page 198–200. IEEE Press, 2017.
- [19] D. Mougouei, D. M. W. Powers, and A. Moeini. *An Integer Linear Programming Model for Binary Knapsack Problem with Dependent Item Values*, pages 144–154. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017.
- [20] Y. Nesterov. *Lectures on convex optimization*, volume 137. Springer, 2018.
- [21] A. Ngo-The and G. Ruhe. A systematic approach for solving the wicked problem of software release planning. *Soft Computing*, 12(1):95–108, 2008.
- [22] A. Ngo-The and M. O. Saliu. Measuring dependency constraint satisfaction in software release planning using dissimilarity of fuzzy graphs. In *Cognitive Informatics, 2005.(ICCI 2005). Fourth IEEE Conference on*, pages 301–307. IEEE, 2005.
- [23] H. Perera, W. Hussain, D. Mougouei, R. A. Shams, A. Nurwidyantoro, and J. Whittle. Towards integrating human values into software: Mapping principles and rights of gdpr to values. In *2019 IEEE 27th International Requirements Engineering Conference (RE)*, pages 404–409. IEEE, 2019.
- [24] H. Perera, A. Nurwidyantoro, W. Hussain, D. Mougouei, J. Whittle, R. A. Shams, and G. Oliver. A study on the prevalence of human values in software engineering publications, 2015-2018. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.07874*, 2019.
- [25] W. N. Robinson, S. D. Pawlowski, and V. Volkov. Requirements interaction management. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 35(2):132-190, June 2003.
- [26] A. Rosenfeld. Fuzzy graphs. *Fuzzy Sets and Their Applications*, 77:95, 1975.
- [27] V. Vassilevska, R. Williams, and R. Yuster. All-pairs bottleneck paths for general graphs in truly sub-cubic time. In *Proceedings of the thirty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 585–589. ACM, 2007.
- [28] J. Wang, J. Li, Q. Wang, H. Zhang, and H. Wang. A simulation approach for impact analysis of requirement volatility considering dependency change. *Requirements Engineering: Foundation for Software Quality*, pages 59–76, 2012.
- [29] S. Wasserman and K. Faust. *Social network analysis: Methods and applications*, volume 8. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [30] M. P. Wellman and M. Derthick. *Formulation of tradeoffs in planning under uncertainty*. Pitman London, 1990.
- [31] L. A. Zadeh. Fuzzy sets. *Inf. Comput.*, 8:338-353, Dec 1965.
- [32] J. Zhang, Y. Wang, and T. Xie. Software feature refinement prioritization based on online user review mining. *Information and Software Technology*, 108:30–34, 2019.

- [33] Y. Zhang, M. Harman, and S. L. Lim. Empirical evaluation of search based requirements interaction management. *Information and Software Technology*, 55(1):126 – 152, 2013. Special section: Best papers from the 2nd International Symposium on Search Based Software Engineering 2010.