

A Metascience Study of the Impact of Low-Code Techniques in Modeling Publications

Mauro Dalle Lucca Tosi
Luxembourg Institute of Science and
Technology
Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg
mauro.dalle-lucca-tosi@list.lu

Javier Luis Cánovas Izquierdo
IN3 – UOC
Barcelona, Spain
jcanovasi@uoc.edu

Jordi Cabot
Luxembourg Institute of Science and
Technology
University of Luxembourg
Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg
jordi-cabot@list.lu

ABSTRACT

In the last years, model-related publications have been exploring the application of modeling techniques in different domains. Initially focused on UML and the Model-Driven Architecture approach, the literature has been evolving towards the usage of more general concepts such as Model-Driven Development or Model-Driven Engineering. With the emergence of Low-Code software development platforms, the modeling community has been studying how these two fields may combine and benefit from each other, thus leading to the publication of a number of works in recent years. In this paper, we present a metascience study of Low-Code. Our study has a two-fold approach: (1) to examine the composition (size and diversity) of the emerging Low-Code community; and (2) to investigate how this community differs from the “classical” model-driven community in terms of people, venues, and types of publications. Through this study, we aim to benefit the low-code community by helping them better understand its relationship with the broader modeling community. Ultimately, we hope to trigger a discussion about the current and possible future evolution of the low-code community as part of its consolidation as a new research field.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **General and reference** → **Surveys and overviews; Metrics; • Social and professional topics** → **Professional topics.**

KEYWORDS

Metascience, Scientometrics, Low-Code, Model-Driven Engineering

1 INTRODUCTION

In the last decades, the Software Engineering (SE) community has demonstrated the importance and benefits of adopting (standard) modeling paradigms to optimize the software development and maintenance processes [3, 7]. Over the years, paradigms such as Model-Driven Architecture (MDA) [16], Model-Driven Development (MDD) [14], Model-Driven Engineering (MDE) [10], Model-Based Architecture (MBA) [2], and Model-Driven Software Engineering (MDSE) [3] have established themselves as de facto standards in the SE community. Based on their broad adoption and wide recognition by researchers and practitioners, we refer to them in this paper as traditional or classical Modeling paradigms.

More recently, the “Low-Code” software development approach has gained traction. Low-Code promotes the development of software in a simplified manner, commonly involving a graphical user interface and requiring minimal coding skills from the user [17].

Unlike from traditional Modeling paradigms, Low-Code offers a much lower entry barrier and learning curve. The term “Low-Code” was coined by Forrester Research in 2014 [13] but first appeared in the scientific literature in 2017 [1], gaining attention in the research community after the work by Zolotas *et al.* [19] in 2018.

Despite the potential technical differences between the two concepts, both Low-Code and traditional Modeling share commonalities and the goal to accelerate the creation of software systems [4, 6]. But beyond the technical aspects, it is also interesting to see if we can observe differences in the communities supporting each paradigm. This analysis could benefit both communities, especially to help them better understand their relationship and, therefore, their potential synergies and growth opportunities.

In this sense, this paper presents a metascience study over the Low-Code field. In particular, (1) we examine the composition of the emerging Low-Code community, analyzing its size and diversity; and (2) we investigate how this community differs from the traditional Modeling community in terms of people, venues, and types of publications. To this end, we analyze the evolution of the number of Low-Code and traditional Modeling publications, the correlation between the most productive and influential authors in both fields, the most popular venues and publication types for Low-Code articles, among other factors.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the methodology of our study, including the research questions, data collection, and threats to validity. Section 3 presents the answers to the research questions, and Section 4 discusses some insights derived from the data analysis. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper and outlines the future work.

2 METHODOLOGY

In this section, we describe how our study has been set up. We first present the research questions, and then the data collection and analysis process applied to answer them.

2.1 Research Questions

The objectives of our study are to examine the composition of the Low-Code community and to investigate how it differs from the traditional Modeling community. In particular, we aim to answer the following research questions:

RQ1 How publications related to Low-Code techniques have evolved over time? This research question aims to identify the starting point of Low-Code publications and their evolution over time. Furthermore, we are interested in studying how Low-Code publication evolution compares to those publications related to modeling.

(title:(`"TERM"`) OR abstract:(`"TERM"`) OR
keyword:(`"TERM"`) OR field_of_study:(`"TERM"`))

Figure 1: Search query used for data collection.

RQ2 How are authors distributed across publications related to Low-Code techniques and modeling? We focus on the authors involved in both paradigms, and study author’s metrics (e.g., number of publications or h-index) to understand their profile. In particular, we aim to compare relevant authors coming from each field, and also those that have contributed to both fields.

RQ3 What are the most common publication type and venue for Low-Code publications? This research question helps to characterize the current typical contribution for Low-Code publications.

2.2 Data Collection & Analysis

To perform our study, we follow a process composed of three steps, namely: (1) data collection, (2) data cleaning & validation, and (3) data analysis. In the following, we briefly describe how we conducted each step.

Data Collection. This step is responsible for obtaining a list of all the publications related to Low-Code and the following traditional Modeling paradigms: Model-Driven Architecture (MDA), Model-Driven Development (MDD), Model-Driven Engineering (MDE), Model-Based Architecture (MBA), and Model-Driven Software Engineering (MDSE). To this aim, we relied on LENS.ORG¹, a web platform that aggregates and makes available to the public scholarly metadata information from diverse sources such as ORCID², CrossRef³, and PubMed⁴.

We built and ran the search query shown in Figure 1 substituting “TERM” by our fields of interest. As a result, we obtained 1,146 results when substituting “TERM” by “low-code”, 14 by “lowcode”, 3,174 by “model-driven architecture”, 3,947 by “model-driven development”, 5,107 by “model-driven engineering”, 197 by “model-based architecture”, and 415 by “model-driven software engineering”. Note that, the character “.” is automatically converted to a space during the query execution and that our results were obtained after disabling the automatic stemming of the searched terms. This step was performed on May, 29th 2024, and therefore our results evaluate the publication history until this day.

Data Cleaning & Validation. In this step, we ensure that all documents in our collection are related to the Low-Code field and their metadata information is validated. First, we merged the publications collected with the terms “low-code” and “lowcode”. Then, we manually analyzed each publication to confirm it was related to the topic covered in this meta-analysis. This cleaning step was crucial, removing 391 publications mentioning the searched term in a different context, e.g., “This paper presents new methods for low code frequency and high code frequency testing.” [15]. Next, we removed publications not available to the public and pre-prints that had already been published elsewhere (duplicates). This second cleaning step removed 44 publication records, resulting in a

Low-Code collection of 725 papers. It is important to note that this step was not performed on the traditional modeling collections due to the lower probability of finding such terms in different contexts and the impracticality of manually cleaning such larger collections.

During the validation of the metadata, we first revised the types of the publications. We performed this to guarantee that: (1) conference proceedings and journals published as books did not have their papers classified as book chapters; (2) symposiums, workshops, and conference papers were classified under “conference proceedings”; and (3) bachelor, master, and doctoral thesis were classified as “dissertation”. Additionally, we added authors to four publications that were authorless. Finally, we standardize the name of publication venues, removing their edition and year.

Data Analysis. This step is responsible for extracting insights from the data collected and cleaned in the previous steps. To answer RQ1, we analyzed the number of papers published per year related to Low-Code and traditional modeling paradigms. We compared the trends of Low-Code publications with those from individual modeling paradigms and with all paradigms combined.

Next, focusing on RQ2, we compared the number of authors who have published in Low-Code, modeling, and both areas. We also identified the most productive and most influential authors within their fields and compared them to identify if both areas shared those important authors. An author’s productivity was determined by the number of publications in the field being analyzed. An author’s influence was determined by their h-index within the analyzed field, specifically the number of publications in the analyzed field in which the author was cited at least as many times.

At last, to answer RQ3, we counted and compared the number of Low-Code books, book chapters, journal articles, conference proceedings, preprints, dissertations, and other types of publications. We additionally counted and compared the number of Low-Code papers published by each journal and conference.

2.3 Threats to Validity

Our study is subjected to several threats to validity, namely: (1) internal validity, which is related to the inferences we made; and (2) external validity, which discusses the generalization of our findings.

Regarding the internal validity, publications related to Low-Code and Modeling paradigms that did not include the searched terms in their title, abstract, keywords, or field of study were not considered in our analysis. Another threat is related to the curation of the collected publications. The cleaning and validation of Low-Code publications were performed manually, thus potentially leading to misclassified articles and metadata. On the other hand, Modeling publications were not cleaned and validated, which may have left non-relevant publications in the datasets. Finally, authors are identified solely by their names, and therefore authors indexed with different names in distinct publications are considered different persons in our analysis. Similarly, different authors indexed by the same name are considered the same person in our analysis.

As for the external validity, our results are based on the data collected from LENS.ORG in May 2024, and therefore our results may not represent the entire history of publications related to Low-Code and modeling paradigms. Furthermore, our results should not be

¹<https://www.lens.org/>

²<https://orcid.org/>

³<https://www.crossref.org/>

⁴<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>

directly generalized to other types of publications without proper comparison and validation.

3 RESULTS

3.1 RQ1: Evolution of Low-Code Publications

To study the evolution of Low-Code publications, we analyzed the number of publications per year involving these publications and those related to traditional Modeling paradigms. In particular, we covered the following modeling paradigms: Model-Driven Architecture (MDA), Model-Driven Development (MDD), Model-Driven Engineering (MDE), Model-Based Architecture (MBA), and Model-Driven Software Engineering (MDSE). We analyzed the evolution of publications from 2000 to 2024.

Figure 2 shows the results of the analysis. As can be seen, the number of papers on traditional Modeling paradigms were increasing from 2000 to 2013 and then started to decrease. Papers on MDA were the first to appear, followed by works on MDD and MDE, with MDE papers showing the longest presence in the literature. Note that the number of papers focusing on MBA and MDSE has always been low for the period analyzed. During the decrease in traditional Modeling papers, the number of Low-Code papers started to increase in 2018, with a steep rise until 2024, the last year of our analysis. Since 2022, the presence of Low-Code papers has been higher than the presence of any other individual modeling-related term.




Figure 2: Publications per year involving Low-Code and traditional Modeling paradigms.

To better compare the evolution of Low-Code and traditional Modeling papers, Figure 3 shows the number of publications per year for three main groups: (1) Low-Code papers, (2) traditional Modeling papers, and (3) papers involving both Low-Code and traditional Modeling paradigms. As can be seen, the growing trend of Low-Code papers overpasses the number of traditional Modeling papers in 2023, with 294 Low-Code papers and 291 Modeling papers. On the other hand, the number of papers involving both paradigms is still negligible.

Answer to RQ1: First Low-Code publications appeared in 2017 and its presence in the literature has been increasing since then with a steep rise. In 2023, the number of Low-Code papers overpassed the number of traditional Modeling papers.




Figure 3: Combined publications per year involving Low-Code, and traditional Modeling paradigms.

3.2 RQ2: Authorship Analysis

To study the distribution of authors in Low-Code and traditional Modeling, we first identified all authors who are currently active in those areas. We determined that an author is active if the author had at least one publication in either Low-Code or Modeling since 2018. In Figure 4a we illustrate the distribution of active authors in the studied areas. As can be seen, the overlap of authors who published in both traditional Modeling and Low-Code is relatively small. Specifically, only around 16% of Low-Code authors have also authored a publication related to traditional Modeling. We believe that this may be due to the interdisciplinarity of Low-Code papers, which, despite being mostly related to Computer Science, often use Low-Code as a tool in distinct scientific fields such as Medicine [11], Meteorology [18], Business [12], among others [8, 9].

After analyzing all active authors in both areas, we decided to compare only the most productive and influential active authors. Figure 4b illustrates the overlap of the 25 most influential authors in Low-Code and Modeling. Higher than in the previous analysis, we can observe 28% of overlap between the most influential authors in Low-Code and Modeling. Moreover, in Figure 5 we illustrate the distribution of authors based on their productivity in Low-Code and traditional Modeling.




Figure 4: Authors with publications involving Low-Code and traditional Modeling that published in those areas from 2018.




Figure 5: Heatmap of active authors by number of publications in Low-Code and traditional Modeling paradigms.

From Figure 5 we can observe that half of the 18 most productive Low-Code authors (with at least 5 publications) are also highly productive in the Modeling community (with at least 16 publications). On the other hand, we can also observe that 4 of those 18 authors in Low-Code have no publications in traditional modeling.

Answer to RQ2: The overlap of authors who published in both traditional Modeling and Low-Code is small, around 16% of the analyzed authors. Furthermore, 10 of the most influential and productive authors in Low-Code have the same profile in the traditional Modeling community. On the other hand, there are also authors who are highly productive in Low-Code but have no publications in traditional Modeling.

3.3 RQ3: Low-Code Publication Profiling

To better understand where Low-Code articles are being published, we illustrate in Figure 6 the distribution of the number of Low-Code articles published by type of venue. As can be seen, from 725 Low-Code publications analyzed, 48% of them were published in conference proceedings (including workshops and symposiums), followed by 33% in academic journals, with the remaining 19% distributed across books, preprints, dissertations, and others. Interestingly, only 47 Low-Code articles (less than 7%) are preprints that have not been officially published, which are mostly stored on ARXIV but are also available on ZENODO and other pre-print servers. Notably, only 16 of these 47 were made available before 2023.




Figure 6: Types of Low-Code publications with their corresponding publication counts.

Finally, from 484 venues analyzed, we illustrate the 10 with the most Low-Code publications in Figure 7. The most popular venue for Low-Code articles is ACM/IEEE International Conference on Model-Driven Engineering Languages and Systems Companion (MODELS-C), with almost five times more Low-Code papers than other formal publication venues. It is important to note that MODELS-C is the proceedings dedicated to workshops and other collocated tracks within the MODELS conference. Following MODELS-C, we have ARXIV with almost 40 publications, which is followed by conference proceedings in Business Information Processing and Computer Science, and the Software and Systems Modeling journal.




Figure 7: Top 10 venues with the highest number of Low-Code publications.

Answer to RQ3: Low-Code publications are mostly published in conference proceedings, with 48% of the articles being published in this type of venue. The most popular venue for Low-Code articles is ACM/IEEE International Conference on Model-Driven Engineering Languages and Systems Companion (MODELS-C), with almost five times more Low-Code papers than other formal publication venues.

4 DISCUSSION

Beyond the main conclusions reported so far, we would like to highlight some additional insights derived from the results.

Size of the overall modeling community. In five years, the yearly number of Low-Code papers has reached a value higher than the yearly sum of all Modeling papers. This phenomenon occurred not just due to the high interest in Low-Code in the last few years but also due to the decreased interest in traditional Modeling. These movements in publication behavior may reveal a migration pattern that requires further validation. In fact, despite this significant high interest in Low-Code, the total number of Modeling papers (when adding both Low-Code and traditional Modeling) still does not reach the all-time high of the Modeling community (around 2011). This can be partially caused by the fragmentation of the Modeling field in terms of topics (MDA, MDE, MDD, etc.), which can have harmed its adoption as the diversity of terms hinders a broader recognition of the field, compared to the situation where

a single term concentrates the full attention of the community. Therefore, Low-Code is helping the Modeling community recover and regain the interest of authors, which still has not reached the former interest that it once had.

Workshops and ARXIV as entry points for Low-Code. Our results reveal that Low-Code is entering the Modeling community via workshops, mainly from the MODELS conference. We believe that this behavior aligns with typical scientific publication procedures, where novel applications, usually from other domains, approach new disciplines, but it requires further validation. On the other hand, the high presence of publications on ARXIV may demonstrate new trends in publishing research work. Consequently, we anticipate more Low-Code publications being presented at main conferences and journals, given the increasing attention the topic is receiving from researchers both within and outside the modeling community.

Do not reinvent the wheel. The fact that there is a 28% of overlap between the most influential authors in Low-Code and Modeling may reveal that senior authors from the Modeling community are adopting the Low-Code terminology and techniques, and, consequently, influencing younger co-authors. For this reason, we emphasize the importance of senior researchers teaching the younger members of the community about the usefulness of knowing existent modeling publications and their terminologies to avoid reinventing the wheel.

Open community. Low-Code platforms are often used to produce software in diverse areas apart from Computer Science such as Medicine, Meteorology, Business, among many others. Accordingly, we observe that publications related to these software applications are commonly the first experience of authors with modeling-related publications. This finding may indicate that the Low-Code community does not suffer from the “close community” issue we see in some well established conferences [5]. Moreover, despite these publications not necessarily being a big leap for the state-of-the-art or state-of-the-technique in Low-Code, they exemplify the lower entry barrier and learning curve required from Low-Code platforms compared to traditional coding. We believe it also exemplifies the importance of such platforms in democratizing technological advances in various areas, which can be initiated not just by experts but also by non-technical users.

5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have studied how Low-Code has increased in popularity over the last decade. This increase is assisting the Modeling community to regain some of the attention it has been losing since 2012. In our results, we identified the composition of the Low-Code community, discussed important trends, and highlighted its similarities and differences compared to the traditional Modeling community. Ultimately, from our results, we expect to trigger discussions about the future of Low-Code and help the community to identify what it wants to become as it consolidates itself. In a couple of years, we plan to repeat this metascience study to observe whether the trends we have identified continue to hold true and whether authors that today are found in the intersection of both communities will eventually migrate to Low-Code or keep themselves publishing in both research paradigms.

REFERENCES

- [1] Benedict Baldwin and Sebastian Kopkin. 2017. *Hur Ställer Sig Professionella Utvecklare Till Att Använda Low Code Plattformar i Sitt Arbete?* Bachelor’s Thesis. Årebo University.
- [2] Barry Boehm and Dan Port. 1999. Conceptual Modeling Challenges for Model-based Architecting and Software Engineering. In *Conceptual Modeling: Current Issues and Future Directions*. Springer Science & Business Media, 24–43.
- [3] Marco Brambilla, Jordi Cabot, and Manuel Wimmer. 2017. *Model-driven software engineering in practice*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- [4] Jordi Cabot. 2020. Positioning of the low-code movement within the field of model-driven engineering. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems: Companion Proceedings (Virtual Event, Canada) (MODELS ’20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 76, 3 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3417990.3420210>
- [5] Jordi Cabot, Javier Luis Cánovas Izquierdo, and Valerio Cosentino. 2018. Are CS conferences (too) closed communities? *Commun. ACM* 61, 10 (2018), 32–34.
- [6] Davide Di Ruscio, Dimitris Kolovos, Juan de Lara, Alfonso Pierantonio, Massimo Tisi, and Manuel Wimmer. 2022. Low-code development and model-driven engineering: Two sides of the same coin? *Software and Systems Modeling* 21, 2 (2022), 437–446.
- [7] Wojciech J Dzidek, Erik Arisholm, and Lionel C Briand. 2008. A Realistic Empirical Evaluation of the Costs and Benefits of Uml in Software Maintenance. *IEEE Transactions on software engineering* 34, 3 (2008), 407–432.
- [8] Samuel Frade, Thomas Beale, and Ricardo J Cruz-Correia. 2022. Openehr Implementation Guide: Towards Standard Low-code Healthcare Systems. In *MEDINFO 2021: One World, One Health—Global Partnership for Digital Innovation*. IOS Press, 52–55.
- [9] Samy Garas and Susan L Wright. 2024. A Data Analytics Case Study Analyzing Irs Soi Migration Data Using no Code, Low Code Technologies. *Journal of Accounting Education* 66 (2024), 100885.
- [10] Stuart Kent. 2002. Model Driven Engineering. In *International conference on integrated formal methods*. Springer, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 286–298.
- [11] Carmelo Macri, Ian Teoh, Stephen Bacchi, Michelle Sun, Dinesh Selva, Robert Casson, and WengOnn Chan. 2022. Automated Identification of Clinical Procedures in Free-text Electronic Clinical Records with a Low-code Named Entity Recognition Workflow. *Methods of Information in Medicine* 61, 03/04 (2022), 084–089.
- [12] Siti Fatimah Abdul Razak, Yow Phey Ernn, Farah Izzati Yussoff, Umar Ali Bukar, and Sumendra Yogarayan. 2024. Enhancing Business Efficiency through Low-code/no-code Technology Adoption: Insights from an Extended Utaut Model. *Journal of Human, Earth, and Future* 5, 1 (2024), 85–99.
- [13] Clay Richardson, John R Rymer, Christopher Mines, Alex Cullen, and Dominique Whittaker. 2014. New Development Platforms Emerge for Customer-facing Applications. *Forrester: Cambridge, MA, USA* 15 (2014).
- [14] Bran Selic. 2003. The Pragmatics of Model-driven Development. *IEEE software* 20, 5 (2003), 19–25.
- [15] A Cruz Serra, Manuel Fonseca da Silva, Pedro M Ramos, Raul Carneiro Martins, Linus Michaeli, and Ján Saliga. 2005. Combined Spectral and Histogram Analysis for Fast Adc Testing. *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement* 54, 4 (2005), 1617–1623.
- [16] Richard Soley et al. 2000. Model Driven Architecture. *OMG white paper* 308, 308 (2000), 5.
- [17] Robert Waszkowski. 2019. Low-code Platform for Automating Business Processes in Manufacturing. *IFAC-PapersOnLine* 52, 10 (2019), 376–381.
- [18] Da Xu, Chao Sun, Guaiguai Liu, Jinting Bai, Yingjie Wang, and Mingjing Duan. 2022. Design and Implementation of a Low-code and No-code Platform Applied in Meteorological Monitoring Service. In *Int. Conf. on Advanced Infocomm Technology*. Springer, Springer Nature Singapore, 235–245.
- [19] Christoforos Zolotas, Kyriakos C Chatzidimitriou, and Andreas L Symeonidis. 2018. Restsec: a Low-code Platform for Generating Secure by Design Enterprise Services. *Enterprise Information Systems* 12, 8-9 (2018), 1007–1033.