Review of: *Volume II: Technical Concepts of Component-Based Software Engineering*, Part 2.
CS 590L – Winter 2004 (Instructor: Dr. Y. Lee)
Submitted by : Manish Mehta
Date: 01/21/2004

---

1. *What problems were addressed or surveyed by the authors?*
   The document surveyed the technical concepts of component-based software engineering. The authors addressed the technical concepts like components, component interfaces, contracts, certification, composition, component model and component frameworks. The authors also surveyed the motivation for CBSE.

2. *What solutions were proposed or surveyed by the authors?*
   Rather than giving a new solution to any problem, the authors attempt to survey and define the terminology used in CBSE precisely for their own future research. Other publications in the same area of research still have inconsistency in terminologies. The authors give their definitions and examples to fit their definitions in example models.

3. *What are the technical strengths and main contributions of the paper' proposed solution?*
   Mainly, this document attempts to define the technical concepts of CBSE. The authors have classified the key concepts of CBSE under different names. The authors define the terminologies and show the current status of technology with comparison tables for existing technologies. Also, the authors show alternatives for custom model and programmable middleware which makes adoption of CBSE somewhat convincible.

4. *What are the technical weaknesses of the paper's proposed solution?*
   As per the title of the document, I found that many concepts are trivial and abstract. Generally, technical concepts should be concretely defined. In many places in the document, authors mention that there are inconsistencies with the terminology in the area of CBSE. For a technical document, in my view, definitions should be generalized and used consistently with exceptions if required.

5. *What suggestions do you have to improve upon the paper's ideas?*
   As far as this document stays within SEI, CMU and used for there future research in CBSE, it can be accepted. But on the other hand, it is not acceptable to define some terminologies in your own way. I would rewrite this document to broaden the scope of definitions (Which will make it a little more abstract) but at the same time I would take specific examples to show the importance of key technical features. There are a lot of publications in this area with different models. Many of them are similar if not exactly the same. This document can also try to categorize models and frameworks.