

# Autorenhinweise Technical Case Report

## Was ist ein technischer Fallbericht (Technical Case Reports)?

Ein technischer Fallbericht (Technical Case Report) soll vergleichbar zu Case Reports in der klinischen Medizin sein. Wie in der klinischen Medizin werden Fallberichte besonders nach Originalität und Erkenntnisgewinn und damit einen Mehrwert für die Leser\*innen bewertet. Kriterien für die Akzeptanz sind daher die Originalität und Innovation der Lösung und / oder der Erkenntnisgewinn und die kritische Analyse und Reflektion (Lessons learned). Berichte über unerwartete Probleme, Misserfolge oder unerwartete Erfolgsfaktoren. Reine Konzeptpapiere werden nicht als Case Report akzeptiert.

## Kriterien für die Begutachtung

Fallberichte sind im engeren Sinne keine wissenschaftlichen Arbeiten. Auf der anderen Seite sind größere IT-Projekte komplex und werden vor allem nicht so häufig durchgeführt, dass dies eine systematische Forschung ermöglicht. Daher sind hier kritische Fallberichte, insbesondere über Fehler und Misserfolge und die kritische Reflektion über deren Ursachen wichtig, um daraus für zukünftige Projekte lernen zu können. Daher ist bei der Begutachtung darauf zu achten, dass Fallberichte entweder über eine besonders innovative Lösung oder über neue Erkenntnisse in den Lessons Learned berichten. "Normale" Entwicklungen ohne für zukünftige Projekte relevante Erkenntnisse sollten nicht als Technical Case Report angenommen werden.

## Checkliste für Technical Case Reports

Chapter	Subchapter	Content	Review-Criterias
Title		A brief and concise title: process or project from which something was learned and the addition: "- technical case report" or "- lessons learned".	
Introduction	Background	A brief introduction to the context and tasks of the system to be created so be presented.	Is the issue relevant for this conference?
	Objectives and Requirements	Project goal and the resulting requirements addressed by the development described in this manuscript. What was the goal of the project described in the case report? What requirements must the system to be developed meet?	Are these comprehensible requirements? Are all described requirements addressed in concept and implementation?
State of the art	Related Work	Overview about related and previous Work.	Is the state of the art described briefly but understandably, completely and correctly?
	Short Commings	Describe the delta between the requirements and the solutions available or described to date.	Why is a new concept necessary?
Concept		Description of the choosen approach, e.G. projectplan, system- or software architecture. Details of all critical points and the reasons for the choosen approach. The chosen approach shall be compared with other options and the reasons for the decisions explained.	Is the concept described in an understandable and comprehensible way?
Implementation	Solution description	Describe your implementation and experience with the chosen approach. This can include screen-shots of the user interface.	Can the result, or the solution be reproduced.
	System in Use	Objectively verifiable facts, such as number of users, information about recorded or processed data.	Is it possible to recognize on the basis of objective key figures whether and if so how intensively the solution was used?
Lessons learned		Have all the requirements of 1.2 been met? What can you learn from this project? What kind of support can be given for similar projects? Which concepts should you adopt, which ones should not? Consider your approach to existing solutions: What are the innovations of this approach compared to the state of the art? What are the strengths and weaknesses of this approach compared to other approaches	<b>Most important section:</b> The reviewers are encouraged to take a close look at this section. The focus will be set on the critical consideration of the chosen approach in comparison to other approaches and the degree of innovation. Critical observations of failures, unexpected problems, or unplanned success factors are more likely to be accepted.
Conclusion		What are the core statements of your approach? Which are the most important lessons learned?	Are the conclusion coherent and concise?
Declaration		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conflict of interests</li> <li>• Contributions of the authors</li> <li>• Acknowledgement</li> </ul>	
References		Please follow the citation instructions provided by IoS Press or GMS MIBE	