

PUSS214210

v. 0.1

Informal Review Protocol

Group 2

Responsible: Project management group

Authors: Project management group

2021-01-31

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Preparation	3
2.1	Picking reviewers	3
2.2	Submitting a document for review	3
3	Exectuion	4
3.1	Document Criteria	4
3.2	Code Criteria	4
4	Reporting results and correcting	5
4.1	Informal Review Meeting	5
4.2	Correcting Eventual Errors	5

1 Introduction

The goal of the informal review is to identify discrepancies between documents, grammatical errors and ambiguities. A document does *not* pass an informal review, it is only a system for detecting errors that would cause it to fail a formal review. Since most of the documents that are produced during a phase are dependant on other documents, the informal review covers every document written during the phase.

2 Preparation

2.1 Picking reviewers

PG is responsible for picking a set of reviewers from the subgroups. Documents should be reviewed by 3 people from a group that has not authored the document. The reviewers are to do their reviews independently. Reviewers should be rotated for an even work distribution.

2.2 Submitting a document for review

Every group makes sure that an up to date version of their document is available at latest 17:00 the day before the informal review meeting. Should the document be in an unfinished state at this time, authors will make a note covering what parts are unfinished. Unfinished parts of the document will be ignored by reviewers.

3 Execution

Documents and code have different criteria and should therefore be reviewed differently. Be sure to take notes whilst reading so that the authors can go over it later.

3.1 Document Criteria

- Is the document grammatically correct and adheres to our document standards?
- Does the document cover all the necessary points defined in the project tutorial?
- If the document is dependant on another document, do the contents of the document match? Meaning, is there any confusion as to how they relate to one and other.

3.2 Code Criteria

- Does the code follow the high level architecture defined by the System architecture group?
- Does the code adhere to our coding standard?
- Do comments follow the javadoc-convention?
- Does the software behave as expected?
- Is it possible to 'break' the software?

4 Reporting results and correcting

4.1 Informal Review Meeting

The result will be reported in a group-wide meeting. Every document gets 10-20 minutes of time. If the results warrant further discussion, the parties involved will continue the discussion after the meeting.

4.2 Correcting Eventual Errors

Informal reviews are scheduled to give authors enough time to correct errors before the hand in-deadline for formal reviews.