

## Ex-post Questionnaire

Please rate each criteria for all three scenario-test notations according to the following scale:

1 = very bad      2 = bad      3 = neutral      4 = good      5 = very good

Criterion	Natural-language	Diagrammatic	Fully-structured
<b>Clarity</b> Is the notation understandable regarding its syntax and semantics?			
<b>Completeness</b> Does the notation describe all necessary information to review the scenario test without consulting other information sources (e.g., the notation reference)?			
<b>Conciseness</b> Are the resulting scenario tests precise (e.g., no ambiguities in the description, no misinterpretations when reviewing the description)?			
<b>Expressiveness</b> Is the notation eligible to express model tests (e.g., tests on Ecore-based models)?			
<b>Generalizability</b> Is the notation eligible to express tests other than model tests (e.g., code-unit tests)?			
<b>Practicality</b> Does the notation require specific preparation (e.g., an extensive tutorial) and/or auxiliary materials (e.g., frequent use of notation reference)?			
<b>Scalability</b> Does the notation support increasingly complex scenario tests well (e.g., increasing test and/or model size, increasing number of test conditions)?			
<b>General rating</b> Overall, how did you like working with the notation?			

Please elaborate on your ratings above (e.g., why do you favor a particular notation?):

Anything else you would like to say (related to the scenario tests, improvements to the experiment etc.)?