

Anachronic Tertiary Studies in Software Engineering: An Exploratory Quaternary Study

Valdemar Vicente Graciano Neto
Federal University of Goiás
Goiânia, Goiás, Brazil
valdemarneto@ufg.br

Célia Laís Rodrigues
Federal University of Goiás
Goiânia, Goiás, Brazil
celialais@egresso.ufg.br

Fernando Kenji Kamei
Federal Institute of Alagoas
Maceió, Alagoas, Brazil
fernando.kenji@ifal.edu.br

Juliano Lopes de Oliveira
Federal University of Goiás
Goiânia, Goiás, Brazil
juliano@inf.ufg.br

Eliomar Araújo de Lima
Federal University of Goiás
Goiânia, Goiás, Brazil
eliomar.lima@ufg.br

Mohamad Kassab
Penn State University
Malvern, Pennsylvania, United States
muk36@psu.edu

Roberto Oliveira
State University of Goiás
Posse, Goiás, Brazil
roberto.oliveira@ueg.br

ABSTRACT

Systematic literature reviews tentatively describe the state of the art in a given research area. However, the continuous publication of new primary and secondary studies following the release of a tertiary study can make the communication of results not integrally representative in regards to the advances achieved by that time. Consequently, using such a study as a reference within specific bodies of knowledge may introduce imprecision, both in terms of its subareas and with respect to new methodologies, languages, and tools. Thus, a review of tertiary studies (what could be understood as a quaternary study) could contribute to show the representativeness of the reported findings in comparison to the state of the art and also to compile a set of perceptions that could not be previously achieved. In that direction, the main contribution of this paper is presenting the findings from an analysis of 34 software engineering tertiary studies published between 2009 and 2021. The results indicate that over 60% of the studies demonstrate varying degrees of anachronism due to the publication of primary and secondary studies following the publication of the tertiary study or even due to a time elapse between its conduction and its publication.

KEYWORDS

Quaternary studies, literature review, systematic review

ACM Reference Format:

Valdemar Vicente Graciano Neto, Célia Laís Rodrigues, Fernando Kenji Kamei, Juliano Lopes de Oliveira, Eliomar Araújo de Lima, Mohamad Kassab, and Roberto

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2023 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM... \$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

Oliveira. 2023. Anachronic Tertiary Studies in Software Engineering: An Exploratory Quaternary Study. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference (Conference'17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 8 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Systematic Literature Reviews (SLR) are roughly important for the science advance, particularly in Software Engineering. They use to consume a considerable effort, but also bring important insights for the state of the art. Tertiary Studies (TS¹) are a particular type of SLR that gather and consolidate knowledge from multiple secondary studies, potentially reflecting the state of the art on specific domains [35]. For instance, Cadavid et al. (2020) [7] is a insightful tertiary study that aggregates secondary studies concerning Systems-of-Systems (SoS) Architecting. The study was well-conducted and revealed us that, although the study included a secondary study published in 2015 [22] that maps the architectural description languages (ADL) for SoS, it did not incorporate a significant ADL developed explicitly for SoS, published in the subsequent year (2016) in a primary study [42]. This finding does not invalidate or question the results communicated by the authors. However, it allows us to illustrate an important (and known) side effect of TS or of any SLR: a possible gap (and a temporal void) between the year of publication of literature review (2015, in that case) and possible advances (primary studies) that appear in the following years until its publication (2020, in that case).

The need to update SLRs is a well-discussed topic in the literature [16, 19, 38, 39, 53, 54]. In general, the current studies investigate when, how and why to update SLR at the level of a secondary study. We are not aware of initiatives that investigate what should justify the update of TS. While TS will not likely be the sole source of reference in an R&D project (since Rapid Reviews are the approach often adopted for that purpose [8, 9]), the accidental obsolescence stemming from the inherent characteristics of such studies could lead to drawbacks. For instance, reliance on anachronic

¹Henceforth, this acronym will be interchangeably used to express both singular and plural forms: Tertiary study and Tertiary studies.

technology or methodologies that do not align with the most recent advances in the field could undermine decision-making.

To enlighten this issue, the main contribution of this vision paper is to communicate **preliminary results** of a review of TS, what could be called as a quaternary study. Focusing on the analysis of TS exclusively, the **novelty of this research is threefold**: 1) to shed light in a discussion about what a quaternary study in software engineering could be; 2) externalize a study that exclusively addresses TS and investigates which of them had primary and secondary studies published after their publication and were not necessarily included/considered; 3) reflect about what updating TS would mean and the differences between updating a secondary study and a TS, given that the current state of the art only deals with updating SLR (secondary studies). For that purpose, we conducted a quaternary study, that is, a systematic literature review that includes only TS in software engineering. From 206 studies initially retrieved from two scientific databases, 34 studies were included and analyzed. Results reveal that 60% (21 of 34) TS analyzed may have some degree of anachronism due to primary and secondary studies published (and not considered in the TS) after the publication of the analyzed studies.

This paper is structured as follows: Section 2 provides background and related work. Section 3 presents the review protocol, details about the conduction, and results reporting. Section 4 discusses the advances so far and Section 5 brings final remarks.

2 BACKGROUND

Evidence-Based Software Engineering (ESBE) is a research paradigm rooted in the principles of evidence-based practice and systematic literature reviews. Primary studies are peer-reviewed empirical studies that aim to investigate specific research questions and to describe evidence-based practices. They can report results of controlled experiments, case studies, surveys and other primary sources of research data [31, 44]. Secondary studies identify, analyze and evaluate primary studies that can answer research questions to systematically synthesize evidence about that domain [32]. TS are *systematic reviews of secondary studies* that raise, analyze, catalog and synthesize research data and scientific evidences exclusively from secondary studies [31]. TS in Software Engineering started with the works of Kitchenham et al. [33, 34] and, according to Garousi and Mäntylä [21], the number of secondary studies reviewed by a TS varies from 12 to 116.

Given the large number of SLR published over the years in Software Engineering (SE) and the relatively low number of updated SLR, many SLRs in SE are potentially anachronic, which can importantly affect the current understanding of the state-of-the-art in those SLRs' research topics, as stated by Mendes et al. (2020) [39]. In the same study, the authors recall the definition of what can be considered **an update of a SLR**, extracted from the report of a panel with experts in that subject [19]: *an update of a SLR [is defined] as a new edition of a published SLR with changes that can include new data, new methods, or new analyses to the previous edition. An update asks a similar question with regard to the participants, intervention, comparisons, and outcomes (PICO) and has similar objectives; thus, it has similar inclusion criteria. These inclusion criteria can be modified in the light of developments within the topic*

area with new interventions, new standards, and new approaches. Updates will include a new search for potentially relevant studies and incorporate any eligible studies or data; and adjust the findings and conclusions as appropriate.

In their study, Mendes et al. (2020) [39] included and analyzed studies under three categories: i) systematic review about when and how to update SLRs; ii) techniques to identify new evidence related to previously published SLRs; and iii) decision mechanisms (factors or decision tree) to decide whether an SLR needs updating. The authors also gather factors that can affect the decision as to whether an SLR update is needed, and they are: a) The SLR's topic is still relevant, and some preliminary searches suggest that there are new studies suitable for inclusion; b) The SLR's topic is relatively new, and the original SLR included limited data. An update should be done if it is acknowledged that such an update would provide valuable additional information; c) Large volumes of information have been published over a short timescale; and d) Large influential studies were published and may affect the original SLR's conclusions.

The authors also recall the decision framework (third-party decision framework, known as 3PDF) proposed by Garner et al. [19], which include the following steps to analyze if an SLR should be updated: Step 1) Assessing how current/actual the SLR is by looking at its topic's relevance for research and practice, including an analysis of the impact on research and/or practice (using metrics such as citations via sites such as Google Scholar), and finally whether the SLR was carried out properly and using a sound methodology; Step 2) identifying if there are any new methods proposed and/or new studies published after the SLR's publication, with Step 2.b specifically analyzing whether new additional studies were found; and Step 3) assessing whether the adoption of new methods and/or new studies may affect the conclusions when compared to the conclusions from the original SLR, and/or the original SLR's credibility.

The main conclusions of the authors were (i) 14 of the 20 SE SLR updates did not need updating; and (ii) the main decision driver to whether an SLR should be updated or not was Step 1b - the SLR's contribution to research and practice. We perceive that all the findings so far are related to SLR as secondary studies, but that the need to update TS have not been largely discussed.

Related Work. During our investigation, we encountered a sole study that also undertook the examination of TS. Published in October 2021, the study conducted by Napoleao et al. [40] aimed to survey and analyze TS with the objective of formulating a more suitable search string to effectively identify secondary studies within SR. Other prior studies also investigated the up-to-date state of literature reviews and how/when to update them [17, 39]. However, we are not aware of other studies that exclusively review TS and/or investigate the nature of what could be considered as a quaternary study.

3 A REVIEW OF TERTIARY STUDIES IN SOFTWARE ENGINEERING

For building upon the concept of updating a TS, we proposed the term *anachronic*² to describe a TS that potentially need an update. In a first moment, we consider a TS can be considered *anachronic* for two likely reasons: by the emergence of new secondary studies of that topic that were not included; or by including older secondary studies that do not take into account advances reported in primary studies published in subsequent years. A TS, from our point of view, can be considered anachronistic when it analyzes a specific time frame, potentially neglecting relevant studies in that area, which may indicate it needs some further evidence to support its results or that some of its included secondary studies may need updating in light of criteria defined by the state of the art on SLR updating.

This section describes the protocol designed and used to conduct our quaternary study. Our protocol followed the guidelines of Kitchenham and Charles [31], structured in *Planning*, *Conduction*, and *Reporting*, involving five researchers.

3.1 Step 1: Planning (Study Protocol)

As stated earlier, the primary aim of this research was twofold: (i) to examine the current state of tertiary studies within the Software Engineering area, and (ii) to gain enhanced insights into the fundamental attributes that may define a quaternary study. Research Questions (RQ) were elaborated to address the former, whilst an analysis and discussion of the results can help us to conjecture insights for the latter. The following research questions (RQ) were raised:

RQ1: What are the covered areas in tertiary studies? Rationale: This question aims to identify which areas and subareas have the highest volume of tertiary studies.

RQ2: What is the year of the oldest and most recent secondary study analyzed by the included tertiary studies? Rationale: The year of publication allows us to investigate, identify and compare existing secondary and primary studies on the same area.

RQ3: Are there secondary studies published after the TS in the same area that might make it anachronic? If yes, what is the year of publication? Rationale: By answering this question, we aim to identify whether the TS has evidence that it may be anachronic due to the existence of secondary studies in the same area and identify the time difference between the publication of the TS analyzed and the secondary study found.

RQ4: Are there primary studies published after the TS in the same area that might make it anachronic? If yes, what is the year of publication? Rationale: We aimed at discovering whether the included TS had evidence that might be anachronic due to the existence of primary studies in the same area.

Search Strategy. The search strategy chosen was an automatic search performed in two databases (namely ACM Digital Library³

²Anachronism is the concept that refers to using the concepts and ideas of a given time to analyze the facts of another time. In our context, we use this concept to denote a possible chronological inconsistency, as in the case of TS that include secondary studies which may potentially required updating. Other terms for Anachronic include anachronical, anachronous and anachronistic.

³<https://dl.acm.org/>

and IEEE Xplore⁴). According to Dyba *et al.* [43] and Kitchenham and Charters [31], these publication databases are some of the most relevant sources in the Computer Science and Information Systems areas. Only these two databases were chosen due to the exploratory nature of this study.

We used the following search string: “tertiary studies”. Then, any eventual tertiary study from other areas could be excluded during the selection step. To answer the research questions RQ3 and RQ4, searches were carried out in the same libraries where the tertiary studies were collected, IEEE Xplorer and ACM Digital Library. The search strings used to raise the secondary and primary studies were the same used in the tertiary study being analyzed in addition with the keywords presented by that TS.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria. The Inclusion Criterion (IC) used to include relevant studies in our quaternary study was this only one: **IC1:** The study is a tertiary study in software engineering. Conversely, the Exclusion Criteria (EC) used to exclude the non-relevant studies are: **(EC1)** The study is not a tertiary study in software engineering; **(EC2)** The study is written in a language other than English; and **(EC3)** The full text is not available.

3.2 Step 2: Conduction

The conduction took place between September 2021 and January 2022. During this phase, studies were selected and evaluated according to the protocol.

Studies Selection: The automatic search was performed. As a result, 206 potentially relevant studies were selected. We removed duplicated ones and analyzed the remainder. Titles, abstracts, and keywords were read, and IC/EC were applied. The introduction and conclusion sections of each study were also considered and the full text (if necessary). The studies should be tertiary studies and address at least one of the disciplines of SWEBOK [50], or those not covered in SWEBOK yet, such as Systems of Systems, or Software Ecosystems, Software Domains, or other important areas for Software Engineering. As a result of this first selection activity, 34 tertiary studies ranging from 2009 to 2021 were included for data extraction.

Most of the studies excluded during the selection step were primary or secondary studies that only mentioned the term ‘tertiary study’, or studies that used the term *tertiary* to denote the third level of formal studies (higher education at the university, in undergraduate courses). An ID was created for each included study to facilitate its identification and citation. The ID starts with a character referring to the type of publication – ‘C’ for a conference, ‘P’ for periodical (journal), ‘W’ for a workshop, and ‘S’ for symposium – followed by the publication year and a unique sequential number from 000 to 034, chronologically ordered, in Appendix A.

Data Extraction. The form shown in Table 1 was used to support a systematic data extraction from the included TS.

3.3 Step 3: Reporting

After the identification and selection of pertinent TS, we examined each study in its entirety to address the posed RQs. Specifically, for addressing research question RQ3, in addition to the thorough examination of the selected tertiary studies, supplementary searches

⁴<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/>

Table 1: Data extraction form for selected TS.

#	Question
1	Study title:
2	Study ID:
3	Study authors:
4	Year of publication:
5	What are the publication years of the most recent and oldest secondary studies included?
6	Venue (Conference/Journal/Magazine):
7	What area does the study address?
8	What subarea does the study address?
9	Were there already TS in the same area previously published?
10	Are there secondary studies published after the publication of the included TS? If yes, what is its publication year?
11	Are there any primary studies published after the publication of the included TS? If yes, what year of publication?

were performed within the ACM Digital Library and IEEE Explorer repositories. These additional searches aimed to identify relevant primary, secondary, and TS published subsequently to the publication of the included TS.

RQ1: What are the covered areas in TS?

The most discussed area in the included TS was Evidence-Based Software Engineering, with 17 studies (50% of them) [S2019-008, C2016-011, C2020-013, S2009-015, C2015-018, C2015-022, C2018-023, C202019-024, C2019-025, W2014-026, C2017-027, C2017-028, C2018-029, C2012-030, C2013-032, and C2013-034], followed by Software Construction (7 studies, 20.58%) [C2020-002, C2012-004, C2011-006, C2017-007, C2012-009, C2012-010, and C2017-033], Software Requirements, with four studies (11.76%) [C2014-001, C2021-014, C2020-016, and W2018-031], Systems Architecture (three studies, 8.82%) [C2021-003, C2020-005, and S2020-021] and Software Maintenance with two studies (5.88%) [C2021-019 and C2017-020]. Other areas addressed in at least one of the studies were Human-Computer Interaction [C2020-017], Software Quality [C2021-019], and IoT [C2018-012]. Therefore, 70% of the selected tertiary studies addressed evidence-based software engineering or software construction.

The other subareas covered in only one of the TS are: blockchain and sustainability [C2021-005], blockchain and IoT [C2020-005], software effort [S2017-007], Validity Threat Assessment [C2016-011], Startup Ecosystems [C2020-016], Assistive Technology for Autism [C2020-017], Code Smells [C2021-019], Software Product Line [C2017-020], Microservices [S2020-021], Quality Assessment [C2015-022], Meta Ethnography [C2019-025], Evidence Distribution and *Pareto's Law* [W2014-026], Research Methodology [C2017-027], Meta Modeling [C2017-028], Qualitative Research [C2018-029], Requirements Validation [W2018-031] and the Influence of Human Factors on Software Development [S2021-033].

RQ2: What is the year of the oldest and most recent secondary study analyzed by the included tertiary study?

The oldest secondary study used in one of the analyzed TS was published in 2004 and the most recent one in 2021. In Table 2, we show the list of the oldest secondary study and the most recent one that was included in each TS analyzed. The aim of this RQ

was verifying the time lapse between the publication of the secondary studies considered and the year of publication of the analyzed TS. We observed that, in some of the most recent secondary studies considered by a TS, a time-lapse greater than one year exists. This happens in the studies C2020-002, C2012-004, C2020-013, S2009-015, C2015-018, C2015-022, C2019-024, C2019-025, W2014-026, C2018-029, W2018-031, C2013-032 and S2021-034. A large time lapse between the secondary studies considered by the analyzed TS may be indicative of possible anachronism, as occurred in the case of Cadavid et al. [7].

Table 2: Years of publication of the oldest and most recent secondary studies considered by each tertiary study.

Study ID	Time interval of the secondary studies considered in the included TS	Study ID	Time interval of the secondary studies considered in the included TS
C2014-001	2006-2014	C2015-018	2003-2013
C2020-002	2013-2018	C2021-019	2015-2020
C2021-003	2018-2020	C2017-020	2008-2016
C2012-004	2006-2010	S2020-021	2016-2019
C2020-005	2016-2020	C2015-022	2007-2009
C2011-006	2008-2011	C2018-023	2016-2017
C2017-007	2006-2016	C2019-024	2004-2010
S2019-008	2009-2019	W2014-026	2004-2012
C2012-009	2009-2011	C2017-027	2004-2016
C2012-010	2005-2011	C2017-028	2005-2016
C2016-011	2004-2015	C2017-028	2005-2016
C2018-012	2013-2017	C2018-029	2005-2015
C2020-013	2004-2012	C2012-030	2004-2011
C2021-014	2009-2021	W2018-031	2002-2008
S2009-015	2004-2007	C2013-032	2005-2011
C2020-016	2016-2019	S2021-033	2018-2020
C2020-017	2015-2019	S2021-034	2017-2019

RQ3: Are there secondary studies published after the TS in the same area that might make it anachronic? If yes, what is the year of publication?

To verify whether the TS and the secondary studies included by them really dealt with the same area, a complete reading of the TS was carried out and the summary, introduction, and results items of each secondary study surveyed were read. The full report with each case of secondary studies published in the same area (after the publication of a TS that did not consider it) of each TS included and analyzed here can be found in an external link⁵, in Portuguese.

We found that the area addressed in at least one of the 34 selected TS was already addressed in a secondary study that was published after the year of publication of the analyzed TS. This occurs in the areas that were addressed by 22 TS: C2014-001, C2020-002, C2012-004, C2020-005, C2011-006, C2014-007, S2019-008, C2012-009, C2012-010, C2016-011, C2012-012, S2009-015, C2020-017, C2015-018, C2017-020, S2020-021, C2015-022, C2017-027, C2018-029, C2012-030, and C2013-032. Therefore, 64.70% of the TS selected may be out of date due to the existence of secondary studies that addressed

⁵bit.ly/3MRHcRd

the same area but were published after the publication of that TS. Among the analyzed TS that show some degree of anachronism, four were published in 2020, two in 2019, two in 2018, three in 2017, one in 2016, two in 2015, one in 2014, one in 2013, four in 2012, one in 2011 and one in 2009. This reveals that even recent studies were potentially anachronistic soon after they were published.

RQ4: Are there primary studies published after the TS in the same area that might make it anachronistic? If yes, what is the year of publication?

When it comes to primary studies, the same area addressed in at least one of the 34 studies has also been addressed in primary studies that were published after the TS was analyzed. This occurs in the areas that were addressed by 23 studies: C2014-001, C2020-002, C2012-004, C2020-005, C2011-006, C2014-007, S2019-008, C2012-009, C2012-010, C2016-011, C2012-012, C2020-013, S2009-015, C2020-017, C2015-018, C2017-020, S2020-021, C2015-022, C2019-024, C2017-029, C2012-030, and C2013-032. Therefore, 67.64% of the tertiary studies selected may be out of date due to the existence of primary studies that addressed the same area but were published in a year after the year of publication of the tertiary study. A percentage 2.86% greater than that was detected in the answer to question RQ3. The area most covered by these tertiary studies is also evidence-based software engineering which was addressed in nine studies, software construction addressed in six studies, systems architecture in two studies, and software requirements in two studies. In addition to these areas, human-computer interaction and software maintenance were addressed in at least one of the studies. Among the analyzed TS that show some degree of anachronism, as there are primary studies that were published in later years but addressing the same area as at least one of the mentioned TS, five were published in 2020, two in 2019, two in 2018, three in 2017, one in 2016, two in 2015, one in 2014, one in 2013, four in 2012, one in 2011 and one in 2009. An example is the study C2014-001, which addressed mapping studies in requirements engineering and this same area was addressed in the following primary study published after the publication of study C2014-001 [23]. Similarly, each case is discussed in detail in a full report available in an external link⁶, in Portuguese.

4 DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Systematic studies take time to be conducted/concluded and the publication process in journals is also time-consuming. Examples include Tore Dybå and Torgeir Dingsøy [14], published in 2008, but which covers studies up to 2005; and Kamei [28], with studies included up to 2018, but published in 2021. We conjecture that reviews on theoretic topics maybe can be anachronistic more slowly than those associated with technologies. The main findings (F_n) of this study are: (F_1) 60% (21 out of) the 34 TS analyzed show evidence that may have some degree of anachronism because of primary and secondary studies published (and not considered in the TS) after their publication. Those novel studies could have presented new results, concepts, and models from those contained in the analyzed TS; (F_2) Among the 21 TS that show evidence of a greater degree of anachronism because there are both primary

and secondary studies in the same area published after the TS publication, in 71.42% [C2014-001, C2020-002, C2012-004, C2017-007, S2009-008, C2012-009, C2012-010, C2018-012, C2020-017, C2017-020, S2020-022, C2019-024, C2017-027, C2012-030, and C2013-032] of the cases, these primary and secondary studies were published in the next year after the publication of the analyzed TS; and (F_3) Most of the TS that did not present evidence of anachronism, as expected, were published in 2021 [C2021-003, C2021-014, C2021-019, C2021-020, C2021-033, and S2021-035], except for W2014-026, C2017-028, C2018-023, C2019-025, C2020-016. Then, recent TS will be less subject to anachronism, since there was not enough time for the publication of other studies that outdate the TS until the search is executed. Another possible reason is the **specificity of the topic** covered in the TS. We claim that specific topics tend to not being anachronistic fastly due to the scarcity of novel studies (mainly secondary studies). For instance, some of the topics covered among the not anachronistic TS involve requirements engineering in startups, meta-ethnography in software engineering, Model-Based Systematic Review, and Pareto's law in software engineering.

The nature of quaternary studies. Researchers broadly know that the type of information that can be obtained when conducting a systematic review (whether it is a secondary, tertiary, or quaternary study) depends on the questions posed and the depth of analysis, in addition to the systematic way in which it was conducted. Secondary studies are generally able to gather statistical evidence from an area and allow, for instance, a more accurate decision regarding the effectiveness of a drug to treat a disease (in the case of medicine) or the real impact of using a software development methodology, in the case of SE. When analyzing the TS included, we could observe that *TS offer a broader panorama of their area of investigation*. While secondary studies in SE raise the state of the art on more specific topics (for example, the architectural description activity in SoS in case of [7]), TS generally propose to map an area more broadly, such as Software Construction or Systems Architecture.

In turn, a quaternary study, when investigating TS, goes up one more level. We do not have a conclusive answer about the nature of quaternary studies, since even TS are still scarce in literature and their nature are also still under investigation. We understand that quaternary would be the last level of reviews, since it would probably not be necessary to conduct other quaternary studies, unless the number of tertiary studies in subareas of SE increase so much that makes it possible to exclude some of them and synthesize evidence from that subarea.

We could also see that several of them need to be updated since many of the included studies already have more than 10 years of publication, and consider secondary studies not updated from at least six years before it. Although a prior study recommended the 3PDF method to decide whether update a review or not [39], quaternary studies can be an alternative way to assess the need to update TS in particular. It was possible to observe from the quaternary study that there are sub-areas that had not been their TS updated for at least 15 years, evidencing a need and opportunities for research. While primary studies are published all the time, the phenomenon we observe is that many tertiary studies are born anachronistic.

⁶bit.ly/3MRHcRd

Complementing the Guidelines for the Conduction and Update of TS. A possible solution for TS anachronism, in addition to searches in digital libraries, could be the use of the *snowballing*, both *backward* and *forward*, to identify new and old primary and secondary studies that have not yet been found. Furthermore, a recommendation for those using TS as a source of knowledge is to verify the quality of the studies⁷, if it presents limitations and internal and external threats to validity. The conduction of Rapid Reviews is also an alternative to complement tertiary studies to check if there were important advances in the field after the publication of the included secondary studies. We also recommend that, before conducting a TS, researchers should analyze the addressed topic: if it updates frequently (a hot topic), they should be aware that the TS will be subject to become obsolete faster.

Threats to Validity. Some threats to the validity of our conclusions include (i) missing relevant studies (use of only two scientific databases), (ii) potential bias in study selection, (iii) reliability in the conduction and conclusions presented, and (iv) data extraction. The two databases are highly relevant sources in the Software Engineering areas, which reduces the threat; however, a complementary search could also be performed in other databases, such as Scopus⁸, Google Scholar⁹ and SOL/SBC¹⁰. To avoid a biased process, we defined RQs and derived IC and EC. The RQ and criteria are detailed enough to provide an assessment of how reliable is the final set of included studies, reducing the impact of the selection reliability threat. Moreover, the entire material used in the review is also available and can be scrutinized or even replicated. Regarding data extraction, we conducted consensus meetings until full agreements, increasing the reliability of the data extraction. Another threat to the validity is the fact that the search was conducted in January 2022. Then, studies published during the entire year of 2022 and 2023 were not considered here. An update in the search (as future work) could be performed to alleviate this threat.

5 FINAL REMARKS

The main contribution of this vision paper was presenting the results of a review of tertiary studies (aka a quaternary study) in software engineering. We analyzed tertiary studies (TS) in software engineering and the insights that could be provided by such type of analysis (a quaternary study). 206 studies were retrieved and 34 were included for analysis and extraction. The results indicate that 70% of selected tertiary studies addressed evidence-based software engineering or software construction and 60% of the TS analyzed in this work have evidence of some degree of anachronism. We also discussed the implications of the findings for the state of practice in the conduction of TS. Our results reveal that, in many cases, there were new studies published after the publication of a TS, which can serve as input to help decide, among the other factors foreseen by the 3PDF approach, whether those SLRs included should be updated or not, or whether even the TS should be updated. We also conclude that more studies and, possibly, guidelines are needed to decide whether to update tertiary studies or not.

⁷We also analyzed the quality of the TS included herein, as it can be checked in the provided external link.

⁸<https://www.elsevier.com/pt-br/solutions/scopus>

⁹<https://scholar.google.com/>

¹⁰<https://sol.sbc.org.br>

Future work includes replicating this study by considering more scientific databases and expanding the concept and maturity of quaternary studies and the proposition of a model of maturity for TS. Also, future investigation should gather evidence on the differences between secondary, tertiary, and quaternary studies and possible changes needed in current guidelines on WHEN and HOW to update systematic studies.

REFERENCES

- [1] Carina Alves, João Cunha, and João Araújo. 2020. On the Pragmatics of Requirements Engineering Practices in a Startup Ecosystem. In *Proc. of 28th RE*. IEEE, Zurich, Switzerland, 311–321.
- [2] Muneera Bano, Didar Zowghi, and Naveed Ikram. 2014. Systematic reviews in requirements engineering: A tertiary study. In *4th EmpiRE Workshop*. IEEE, Karlskrona, Sweden, 9–16.
- [3] Souvik Barat, Tony Clark, Balbir Barn, and Vinay Kulkarni. 2017. A Model-Based Approach to Systematic Review of Research Literature. In *ISEC '17*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 15–25.
- [4] José L. Barros-Justo, Fabiane B.V. Benitti, and Ania L. Cravero-Leal. 2018. Software patterns and requirements engineering activities in real-world settings: A systematic mapping study. *Computer Standards & Interfaces* 58 (2018), 23–42.
- [5] Egemen Bayram, Buket Doğan, and Volkan Tunali. 2020. Bibliometric Analysis of the Tertiary Study on Agile Software Development using Social Network Analysis. In *2020 ASYU*. IEEE, Istanbul, Turkey, 1–4.
- [6] David Budgen, Sarah Drummond, Pearl Brereton, and Nikki Holland. 2012. What Scope is There for Adopting Evidence-Informed Teaching in SE?. In *34th ICSE*. IEEE, Zurich Switzerland, 1205–1214.
- [7] Héctor Cadavid, Vasilios Andrikopoulos, and Paris Avgeriou. 2020. Architecting systems of systems: A tertiary study. *IST* 118 (2020), 106202.
- [8] Bruno Cartaxo, Gustavo Pinto, and Sergio Soares. 2018. The role of rapid reviews in supporting decision-making in software engineering practice. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Evaluation and Assessment in Software Engineering 2018*. 24–34.
- [9] Bruno Cartaxo, Gustavo Pinto, and Sergio Soares. 2020. Rapid reviews in software engineering. *Contemporary Empirical Methods in Software Engineering* (2020), 357–384.
- [10] Diego Ivo Campos Costa, Eduardo Pereira e Silva Filho, Reginaldo Florencio da Silva, Thiago Dias de C. Quaresma Gama, and Mariela I. Cortés. 2020. Microservice Architecture: A Tertiary Study. In *Proc. of the 14th SBCARS*. ACM, Natal, Brazil, 61–70.
- [11] Maya Daneva, Klaas Sikkil, Nelly Condori-Fernandez, and Andrea Herrmann. 2018. Experiences in Using Practitioner's Checklists to Evaluate the Industrial Relevance of Requirements Engineering Experiments. In *IEEE/ACM 6th CESI*. IEEE, New York, NY, USA, 5–12.
- [12] Paulo A. S. Duarte, Felipe M. Barreto, Paulo A. C. Aguiar, Jérôme Boudy, Rossana M. C. Andrade, and Windson Viana. 2018. AAL Platforms Challenges in IoT Era: A Tertiary Study. In *2018 13th SoSE*. IEEE, Paris, France, 106–113.
- [13] Eliezer Dutra, Bruna Diirr, and Gleison Santos. 2021. Human Factors and Their Influence on Software Development Teams - A Tertiary Study. In *Prof. of 35th SBES*. ACM, Joinville, Brazil, 442–451.
- [14] Tore Dybå and Torgeir Dingsøyr. 2008. Empirical studies of agile software development: A systematic review. *IST* 50, 9 (2008), 833–859.
- [15] João Carlos Epifânio and Lirene Fernandes da Silva. 2020. Scrutinizing Reviews on Computer Science Technologies for Autism: Issues and Challenges. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 32802–32815.
- [16] Katia Romero Felizardo, Anderson Y Iwazaki da Silva, Érica Ferreira de Souza, Nandamudi L Vijaykumar, and Elisa Yumi Nakagawa. 2018. Evaluating strategies for forward snowballing application to support secondary studies updates: emergent results. In *Proceedings of the xxxii brazilian symposium on software engineering*. 184–189.
- [17] Katia Romero Felizardo, Emilia Mendes, Marcos Kalinowski, Érica Ferreira Souza, and Nandamudi L. Vijaykumar. 2016. Using Forward Snowballing to Update Systematic Reviews in Software Engineering. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement (Ciudad Real, Spain) (ESEM '16)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, Article 53, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2961111.2962630>
- [18] Changlan Fu, He Zhang, Xin Huang, Xin Zhou, and Zhi Li. 2019. A Review of Meta-Ethnographies in Software Engineering. In *Proc. of EASE*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 68–77.
- [19] Paul Garner, Sally Hopewell, Jackie Chandler, Harriet MacLehose, Elie A Akl, Joseph Beyene, Stephanie Chang, Rachel Churchill, Karin Dearnness, Gordon Guyatt, et al. 2016. When and how to update systematic reviews: consensus and checklist. *bmj* 354 (2016).

- [20] Vahid Garousi and Michael Felderer. 2017. Experience-Based Guidelines for Effective and Efficient Data Extraction in Systematic Reviews in Software Engineering. In *EASE*. ACM, Karlskrona, Sweden, 170–179.
- [21] Vahid Garousi and Mika V. Mäntylä. 2016. A systematic literature review of literature reviews in software testing. *IST* 80 (2016), 195–216.
- [22] Milena Guessi, Valdemar Vicente Graciano Neto, Thiago Bianchi, Katia Romero Felizardo, Flávio Oquendo, and Elisa Yumi Nakagawa. 2015. A systematic literature review on the description of software architectures for systems of systems. In *SAC '15*. ACM, Salamanca, Spain, 1433–1440.
- [23] Hannes Holm, Teodor Somme stad, and Johan Bengtsson. 2015. Requirements engineering: The quest for the dependent variable. In *Proc. of 23rd RE*. IEEE, Ottawa, ON, Canada, 16–25.
- [24] Xin Huang, He Zhang, Xin Zhou, Muhammad Ali Babar, and Song Yang. 2018. Synthesizing Qualitative Research in Software Engineering: A Critical Review. In *Proc. of 40th ICSE*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1207–1218.
- [25] Salma Imtiaz, Muneera Bano, Naveed Ikram, and Mahmood Niazi. 2013. A Tertiary Study: Experiences of Conducting Systematic Literature Reviews in Software Engineering. In *Proc. of the 17th EASE*. ACM, Porto de Galinhas, Brazil, 177–182.
- [26] Shanshan Jiang, Kine Jakobsen, Letizia Jaccheri, and Jingyue Li. 2021. Blockchain and Sustainability: A Tertiary Study. In *BoKSS*. ACM/IEEE, Madrid, Spain, 7–8.
- [27] Fernando Kamei, Gustavo Pinto, Igor Wiese, Márcio Ribeiro, and Sérgio Soares. 2021. What Evidence We Would Miss If We Do Not Use Grey Literature?. In *Proc. of the 15th ACM/IEEE ESEM*. ACM, Bari, Italy, Article 24, 11 pages.
- [28] Fernando Kamei, Igor Wiese, Crescencio Lima, Ivanilton Polato, Vilmar Nepomuceno, Waldemar Ferreira, Márcio Ribeiro, Carolline Pena, Bruno Cartaxo, Gustavo Pinto, and Sérgio Soares. 2021. Grey Literature in Software Engineering: A critical review. *Inf. Softw. Technol.* 138 (2021), 106609.
- [29] Fernando Kenji Kamei. 2019. The Use of Grey Literature Review as Evidence for Practitioners. *SIGSOFT Softw. Eng. Notes* 44, 3 (2019), 23 pages.
- [30] Barbara Kitchenham, Pearl Brereton, Mark Turner, Mahmood Niazi, Stephen Linkman, Riallette Pretorius, and David Budgen. 2009. The impact of limited search procedures for systematic literature reviews – A participant-observer case study. In *3rd ESEM*. IEEE, Lake Buena Vista, USA, 336–345.
- [31] B. Kitchenham and S. Charters. 2007. *Guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering*. Technical Report EBSE 2007-001. Keele University and Durham University Joint Report.
- [32] B.A. Kitchenham, T. Dyba, and M. Jorgensen. 2004. Evidence-based software engineering. In *Proc. of 26th ICSE*. IEEE, Edinburgh, UK, 273–281.
- [33] Barbara Kitchenham, O. Pearl Brereton, David Budgen, Mark Turner, John Bailey, and Stephen Linkman. 2009. Systematic literature reviews in software engineering – A systematic literature review. *IST* 51, 1 (2009), 7–15.
- [34] Barbara Kitchenham, Riallette Pretorius, David Budgen, O. Pearl Brereton, Mark Turner, Mahmood Niazi, and Stephen Linkman. 2010. Systematic literature reviews in software engineering – A tertiary study. *IST* 52, 8 (2010), 792–805.
- [35] Taciana Novo Kudo, Renato Bulcão Neto, and Auri M. R. Vincenzi. 2020. Requirement patterns: a tertiary study and a research agenda. *IET Softw.* 14, 1 (2020), 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1049/IET-SEN.2019.0016>
- [36] C. Marimuthu and K. Chandrasekaran. 2017. Systematic Studies in Software Product Lines: A Tertiary Study. In *Proc. of SPLC '17*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 143–152.
- [37] Anna Beatriz Marques, Rosiane Rodrigues, and Tayana Conte. 2012. Systematic Literature Reviews in Distributed Software Development: A Tertiary Study. In *7th ICGSE*. IEEE, Porto Alegre, Brazil, 134–143.
- [38] Emilia Mendes, Katia Felizardo, Claes Wohlin, and Marcos Kalinowski. 2019. Search strategy to update systematic literature reviews in software engineering. In *2019 45th Euromicro Conference on Software Engineering and Advanced Applications (SEAA)*. IEEE, 355–362.
- [39] Emilia Mendes, Claes Wohlin, Katia Romero Felizardo, and Marcos Kalinowski. 2020. When to update systematic literature reviews in software engineering. *JSS* 167 (2020), 110607.
- [40] Bianca M. Napoleão, Katia R. Felizardo, Érica F. de Souza, Fabio Petrillo, Sylvain Hallé, Nandamudi L. Vijaykumar, and Elisa Y. Nakagawa. 2021. Establishing a Search String to Detect Secondary Studies in Software Engineering. In *47th Euromicro SEAA*. IEEE, Palermo, Italy, 9–16.
- [41] Geraldo Torres G. Neto, Wyllyams B. Santos, Patricia Takako Endo, and Roberta A.A. Fagundes. 2019. Multivocal literature reviews in software engineering: Preliminary findings from a tertiary study. In *2019 ESEM*. ACM/IEEE, Porto de Galinhas, Brazil, 1–6.
- [42] Flávio Oquendo. 2016b. Software Architecture Challenges and Emerging Research in Software-Intensive Systems-of-Systems. In *ECSA*. Springer, Copenhagen, Denmark, 3–21.
- [43] Kai Petersen, Sairam Vakkalanka, and Ludwik Kuzniarz. 2015. Guidelines for conducting systematic mapping studies in software engineering: An update. *IST* 64 (2015), 1–18.
- [44] Mark Petticrew and Helen Roberts. 2005. *Systematic Reviews in the Social Sciences: practical guide*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford.
- [45] Sree Kumar P. Pillai, S.D. Madhukumar, and T. Radharamanan. 2017. Consolidating evidence based studies in software cost/effort estimation – A tertiary study. In *TENCON 2017 - 2017 IEEE Region 10 Conference*. IEEE, Penang, Malaysia, 833–838.
- [46] Saim Qureshi, Saif Ur Rehman Khan, Javed Iqbal, and Inayat-Ur-Rehman. 2021. A Study on Mitigating the Communication and Coordination Challenges During Requirements Change Management in Global Software Development. *IEEE Access* 9 (2021), 88217–88242.
- [47] Norsaremah Salleh and Azlin Nordin. 2014. Trends and perceptions of evidence-based software engineering research in Malaysia. In *5th ICT4M*. IEEE, Kuching, Malaysia, 1–6.
- [48] Alinne C.C. dos Santos, Ivaldir H. de Farias Junior, Hermano P. de Moura, and Sabrina Marczak. 2012. A Systematic Tertiary Study of Communication in Distributed Software Development Projects. In *2012 ICGSE*. IEEE, Porto Alegre, Brazil, 182–182.
- [49] Paramvir Singh, Matthias Galster, and Karanpreet Singh. 2018. How Do Secondary Studies in Software Engineering Report Automated Searches? A Preliminary Analysis. In *22nd EASE*. ACM, New York, USA, 145–150.
- [50] SWEBOOK. 2004. *Guide to the Software Engineering Body of Knowledge*. IEEE Computer Society Products and Services, Los Alamos, USA.
- [51] Hao Tang, You Zhou, Xin Huang, and Guoping Rong. 2014. Does Pareto's Law Apply to Evidence Distribution in Software Engineering? An Initial Report. In *3rd EAST 2014*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 9–16.
- [52] J. M. Verner, O. P. Brereton, B. A. Kitchenham, M. Turner, and M. Niazi. 2012. Systematic literature reviews in global software development: A tertiary study. In *16th EASE 2012*. IEEE, Ciudad Real, Spain, 2–11.
- [53] Claes Wohlin, Marcos Kalinowski, Katia Romero Felizardo, and Emilia Mendes. 2022. Successful combination of database search and snowballing for identification of primary studies in systematic literature studies. *Information and Software Technology* 147 (2022), 106908.
- [54] Claes Wohlin, Emilia Mendes, Katia Romero Felizardo, and Marcos Kalinowski. 2020. Guidelines for the search strategy to update systematic literature reviews in software engineering. *Information and software technology* 127 (2020), 106366.
- [55] Qianwen Xu, Xiudi Chen, Shanshan Li, He Zhang, Muhammad Ali Babar, and Nguyen Khoi Tran. 2020. Blockchain-based Solutions for IoT: A Tertiary Study. In *20th QRS-C*. IEEE, Macau, China, 124–131.
- [56] R. Yaqoob, Sanaa, S. U. R. Khan, and M. A. Shah. 2021. TERTIARY STUDY ON LANDSCAPING THE REVIEW IN CODE SMELLS. In *CADE 2021*. IEEE, Online Conference, 131–136.
- [57] Affan Yasin, Rubia Fatima, Lijie Wen, Wasif Afzal, Muhammad Azhar, and Richard Torkar. 2020. On Using Grey Literature and Google Scholar in Systematic Literature Reviews in Software Engineering. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 36226–36243.
- [58] Xin Zhou, Yuqin Jin, He Zhang, Shanshan Li, and Xin Huang. 2016. A Map of Threats to Validity of Systematic Literature Reviews in Software Engineering. In *23rd APSEC*. IEEE, Hamilton, New Zealand, 153–160.
- [59] You Zhou, He Zhang, Xin Huang, Song Yang, Muhammad Ali Babar, and Hao Tang. 2015. Quality Assessment of Systematic Reviews in Software Engineering: A Tertiary Study. In *19th EASE*. ACM, Nanjing, China, 1–14.

A APPENDIX - INCLUDED TS

- [S2009-015] The impact of limited search procedures for systematic literature reviews: A participant-observer case study [30];
- [C2011-006] Signs of Agile Trends in Global Software Engineering Research: A Tertiary Study [4];
- [C2012-004] A Systematic Tertiary Study of Communication in Distributed Software Development Projects [48];
- [C2012-009] Systematic Literature Reviews in Distributed Software Development: A Tertiary Study [37];
- [C2012-010] Systematic literature reviews in global software development: A tertiary study [52];
- [C2012-030] What scope is there for adopting evidence-informed teaching in SE? [6];
- [C2013-032] A tertiary study - experiences of conducting systematic literature reviews in software engineering [25];
- [C2014-001] Systematic Reviews in Requirements Engineering: A Tertiary Study [2];
- [W2014-026] Does Pareto's law apply to evidence distribution in software engineering? an initial report [51];

- [C2015-018] Trends and perceptions of evidence-based software engineering research in Malaysia [47];
- [C2015-022] Quality assessment of systematic reviews in software engineering: a tertiary study [59];
- [C2016-011] A Map of Threats to Validity of Systematic Literature Reviews in Software Engineering [58];
- [C2017-007] Consolidating evidence based studies in software cost effort estimation: A tertiary study [45];
- [C2017-020] Systematic Studies in Software Product Lines: A Tertiary Study [36];
- [C2017-027] Experience-based guidelines for effective and efficient data extraction in systematic reviews in software engineering [20];
- [C2017-028] A Model-Based Approach to Systematic Review of Research Literature [3];
- [C2018-012] AAL Platforms Challenges in IoT Era: A Tertiary Study [12];
- [C2018-023] How do Secondary Studies in Software Engineering report Automated Searches? A Preliminary Analysis [49];
- [C2018-029] Synthesizing qualitative research in software engineering: a critical review [24];
- [W2018-031] Experiences in using practitioner's checklists to evaluate the industrial relevance of requirements engineering experiments [11];
- [S2019-008] Multivocal literature reviews in software engineering: Preliminary findings from a tertiary study [41];
- [C2019-024] The Use of Grey Literature Review as Evidence for Practitioners [29];
- [C2019-025] A Review of Meta-ethnographies in Software [18];
- [C2020-002] Bibliometric Analysis of the Tertiary Study on Agile Software Development using Social Network Analysis [5];
- [C2020-005] Blockchain-based Solutions for IoT: A Tertiary Study [55];
- [C2020-013] On Using Grey Literature and Google Scholar in Systematic Literature Reviews in Software Engineering [57];
- [C2020-016] On the Pragmatics of Requirements Engineering Practices in a Startup Ecosystem [1];
- [C2020-017] Scrutinizing Reviews on Computer Science Technologies for Autism: Issues and Challenges [15];
- [S2020-021] Microservice Architecture: A Tertiary Study [10];
- [C2021-003] Blockchain and Sustainability: A Tertiary [26];
- [C2021-014] A Study on Mitigating the Communication Coordination Challenges During Requirement Change Management in Global Software Development [46];
- [C2021-019] Tertiary Study on landscaping the review in code smells [56];
- [S2021-033] Human Factors and their Influence on Software Development Teams: A Tertiary Study [13];
- [S2021-034] What Evidence We Would Miss If We Do Not Use Grey Literature? [27];