Assunto	**Your ICBC 2020 paper 203493**
De	ICBC 2020 <jems@sbc.org.br>
Para	<patricia.vilain@ufsc.br>
Cópia	John Mylopoulos <jm@cs.toronto.edu>
Data	09/02/2020 01:37

Dear Dr. Patricia Vilain:

Congratulations - your paper "A preliminary study on using acceptance tests for representing business requirements of smart contracts" for ICBC 2020 has been accepted to the Short Paper track of the 2020 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain and Cryptocurrency (ICBC 2020). The paper reviewers and the wider ICBC 2020 Technical Program Committee have recognized your work as being of significant potential interest to the ICBC 2020 attendees.

We received a record number of submissions (203 in total), which meant that many high quality submissions could not be accepted as full papers. We invite you to present your work during the ICBC 2020 conference and to submit your revised short paper (4 pages maximum, excluding references) for inclusion in the conference proceedings. Short papers will be presented orally as part of the single track technical program.

All submitted papers underwent a review process with a minimum of 3 reviews for each paper, but usually 4-5 reviews for each paper. TPC discussions took place in an online TPC meeting held on 6 February 2020. Every submission was discussed taking into account its content and the reviews.

The reviews are below or can be found at
https://jems.sbc.org.br/PaperShow.cgi?m=203493

We ask you to address the suggestions raised by the reviewers. The ICBC 2020 TPC Co-Chairs will check that this has been performed adequately.

The deadline for you to finalize and submit your camera-ready manuscript is *** 9 March 2020 ***.

It must be formatted according to the instructions that are available at the "Authors" section of the ICBC 2020 website -
https://icbc2020.ieee-icbc.org/camera-ready-upload-0, where further information regarding the upload of your camera-ready manuscript and its presentation during the Conference, will also be made available.

Please note that IEEE Communications Society policies require that at least one co-author of the paper be registered for the conference, in order for the paper to appear in the proceedings and in IEEE Xplore. The paper must be presented at the conference, otherwise it will be excluded from IEEE Xplore. Registration details are available at
https://icbc2020.ieee-icbc.org/registration. Note that, the deadline for author registration is *** 6 March 2020 ***.

Again, congratulations on your fine work and thank you for sharing your contribution and expertise with the ICBC community. We look forward to meeting you in Toronto in May. In addition to a strong technical program, we have excellent keynotes including Ethereum Founder Vitalik Buterin, Blockchain Revolution author Don Tapscott, Dinesh Shah Director at Bank of Canada and a fourth pending, and social events at the Hockey Hall of Fame and CN Tower, in the vibrant city of Toronto, a global hub for blockchain activity.

Best regards,

Andreas Veneris, University of Toronto, Canada
Salil Kanhere, UNSW Sydney, Australia
William Knottenbelt, Imperial College, UK
Grigore Rosu, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA

ICBC 2020 Technical Program Committee Co-Chairs

===== Review =====

*** 2: Relevance (): 1:Out of Scope 2:Somewhat Relevant 3:Highly
Relevant

Evaluation=Somewhat Relevant (2)

*** 3: Technical Content and Originality (): 1:Poor 2:Fair 3:Good
4:Excellent

Evaluation=Good (3)

*** 4: Organization and Presentation (): 1:Unacceptable 2:Poor 3:Good
4:Excellent

Evaluation=Good (3)

*** 5: Reference to Related Work (): 1:Unacceptable 2:Poor 3:Good
4:Excellent

Evaluation=Good (3)

*** 6: Overall Recommendation about accepting the contribution ():
1:Strong Reject – I have strong arguments against acceptance 2:Weak
Reject – I will not fight strongly against it 3:Weak Accept – I will not
fight strongly in favour of acceptance 4:Strong Accept – I have strong
arguments in favour of acceptance

Evaluation=Weak Accept – I will not fight strongly in favour of acceptance (3)

*** 7: Poster acceptance (If this paper happens to be rejected, please
express your opinion on accepting it as a poster.): 1: Strong Reject – I
have strong arguments against accepting this work as a poster 2: Weak
Reject – I will not fight strongly against accepting this work as a
poster 3: Weak Accept – I will not fight strongly in favor of accepting
this work as a poster 4: Strong Accept – I have strong arguments in
favor of accepting this work as a poster

Evaluation=Weak Accept – I will not fight strongly in favor of accepting this work as a
poster (3)

*** 8 (What are the major strengths of this paper?): The paper addresses
a practically relevant question, namely whether acceptance testing
techniques are being used for representing business requirements of
smart contracts, and if so, which techniques are used.

The results are head-scratching, because acceptance techniques are
barely used. That should worry proponents of smart contract
applications.

*** 9 (What are the major shortcomings of this paper?): I am wondering
whether a single example is sufficient to convince readers to use
acceptance tests. The authors should think about more arguments or a
variety of examples to support the usage of acceptance testing
techniques.

*** 10 (Comments for the authors (provide any detailed comments to
improve the paper; also comment on any missing related work)): I am
wondering whether a single example is sufficient to convince readers to
use acceptance tests. The authors should think about more arguments or a
variety of examples to support the usage of acceptance testing
techniques.

```
===== Review =====


*** 2: Relevance (): 1:Out of Scope 2:Somewhat Relevant 3:Highly
Relevant

Evaluation=Highly Relevant (3)

*** 3: Technical Content and Originality (): 1:Poor 2:Fair 3:Good
4:Excellent

Evaluation=Fair (2)

*** 4: Organization and Presentation (): 1:Unacceptable 2:Poor 3:Good
4:Excellent

Evaluation=Poor (2)

*** 5: Reference to Related Work (): 1:Unacceptable 2:Poor 3:Good
4:Excellent

Evaluation=Good (3)

*** 6: Overall Recommendation about accepting the contribution ():
1:Strong Reject – I have strong arguments against acceptance 2:Weak
Reject – I will not fight strongly against it 3:Weak Accept – I will not
fight strongly in favour of acceptance 4:Strong Accept – I have strong
arguments in favour of acceptance

Evaluation=Weak Reject – I will not fight strongly against it (2)

*** 7: Poster acceptance (If this paper happens to be rejected, please
express your opinion on accepting it as a poster.): 1: Strong Reject – I
have strong arguments against accepting this work as a poster 2: Weak
Reject – I will not fight strongly against accepting this work as a
poster 3: Weak Accept – I will not fight strongly in favor of accepting
this work as a poster 4: Strong Accept – I have strong arguments in
favor of accepting this work as a poster

Evaluation=Strong Accept – I have strong arguments in favor of accepting this work as a
poster (4)

*** 8 (What are the major strengths of this paper?): This paper presents
a study on the acceptance  testing  techniques  are  being  used for
representing  business  requirements  of  smart  contracts. The goal of
this work is to investigate the use of acceptance testing techniques to
specify the requirements of smart contracts. In order to represent
business requirements of smart contracts the authors proposed to use
the  BDD  notation  to  represent the requirements  of  a  smart
contract  deployed  in  the  Hyperledger blockchain.  The authors showed
that it  is  possible  to  use acceptance tests to represent business
requirements, such as the obligations  and  powers  of  a  smart
contract. The study is based on real databases such as ACM Digital
Library, IEEEXplore DigitalLibrary, Scopus, Springer, and Google
Scholar.

*** 9 (What are the major shortcomings of this paper?): The paper is
well written but there are grammatical typos in several sections.
Reviewing this paper triggered a set of questions about the experiments.
 A comparaison between the performance on different blockchain platforms
will be appreciated.

*** 10 (Comments for the authors (provide any detailed comments to
improve the paper; also comment on any missing related work)): What are
the future works? There is no future work in the paper. The abstract is
a little bit long. I suggest to accepte this paper as a poster since is
no real oiginality from research point of view.
```

```
===== Review =====
```

*** 2: Relevance (): 1:Out of Scope 2:Somewhat Relevant 3:Highly
Relevant

Evaluation=Highly Relevant (3)

*** 3: Technical Content and Originality (): 1:Poor 2:Fair 3:Good
4:Excellent

Evaluation=Good (3)

*** 4: Organization and Presentation (): 1:Unacceptable 2:Poor 3:Good
4:Excellent

Evaluation=Good (3)

*** 5: Reference to Related Work (): 1:Unacceptable 2:Poor 3:Good
4:Excellent

Evaluation=Excellent (4)

*** 6: Overall Recommendation about accepting the contribution ():
1:Strong Reject – I have strong arguments against acceptance 2:Weak
Reject – I will not fight strongly against it 3:Weak Accept – I will not
fight strongly in favour of acceptance 4:Strong Accept – I have strong
arguments in favour of acceptance

Evaluation=Strong Accept – I have strong arguments in favour of acceptance (4)

*** 7: Poster acceptance (If this paper happens to be rejected, please
express your opinion on accepting it as a poster.): 1: Strong Reject – I
have strong arguments against accepting this work as a poster 2: Weak
Reject – I will not fight strongly against accepting this work as a
poster 3: Weak Accept – I will not fight strongly in favor of accepting
this work as a poster 4: Strong Accept – I have strong arguments in
favor of accepting this work as a poster

Evaluation=Strong Accept – I have strong arguments in favor of accepting this work as a
poster (4)

*** 8 (What are the major strengths of this paper?): – Discuss about
smart contracts – Sufficient abstract given, and explain thoroughly. –
Give detail explanation about the introduction of the systems. – Brief
literature review given. – Security analysis given. – Good amount of
comparison given.

*** 9 (What are the major shortcomings of this paper?): – Required to
add some more latest keywords. – English sentences should be check. some
places missing. – Add more related reference and some good papers in
reference section. – Plagiarism should be check. – Conclusion should be
more specific.

*** 10 (Comments for the authors (provide any detailed comments to
improve the paper; also comment on any missing related work)): –
Required to add some more latest keywords. – English sentences should be
check. some places missing. – Add more related reference and some good
papers in reference section. – Plagiarism should be check. – Conclusion
should be more specific.