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|  | **Document Title:** | **LabAssiAsseRequirements** | |
|  | **Reviewer Name:** | **Burian Raul, Cernov Alexandru** | |
|  | **Review date:** | **02.03.2020** |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Crt. No.** | **Checked Item** | **Doc. page/line** | **Comments/ improvements** |
| 1 | Saving info about grades | 1 | How the saved grades file is formatted D\_01 |
| 2 | NameStudent.txt | 1 | In the case in which the lab wasn’t delivered, there are no information about how to format “NumberOfTheDeliveredWeek” D\_02 |
| 3 | Filtering criteria | 1 | Filtering criteria is not specified D\_01 |
| 4 | How to use the application | 1 | How the user will interact with the application is not specified, D\_06 |
| 5 | Motivations | 1 | How to mark a student that he was motivated for an assignment |
| 6 | NameStudent email | 1 | Day of the week not specified D\_01 |
| 7 | Deadline day | 1 | In which day of the week is the week end considered D\_01 |
| 8 |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |
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|  | **Reviewer Name:** | **Burian Raul, Cernov Alexandru** | |
|  | **Review date:** | **15.03.2020** |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Crt. No.** | **Checked Item** | **Doc. page/line** | **Comments/ improvements** |
| 1 | ClassNames | Domain package | Classes both in English and Romanian D\_06 |
| 2 | Specification | Project except CRUD repository | No specification through comments is present in the Project D\_07 |
| 3 | Error handling | Repository package | Printing the stack trace is not useful as and error handling tool for the end user D\_03 |
| 4 | Action history | Service/repository | No logging for action history is present D\_07 |
| 5 | Reusable code | Service | Only the XML repository is used in the service, hard to rewrite code to use other repository, D\_06 |
| 6 | Sevice design patterns | Service | In the service we could have used a strategy design pattern to specify the type of repository used D\_04 |
| 7 |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |
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|  | **Effort to review document (hours): 0.5h** | |  |
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| **Crt. No.** | **Checked Item** | **Doc. page/line** | **Comments/ improvements** |
| 1 | Nota Validator | Validation.NotaValidator | Duplicate condition between the first 2 ifs(lines 7-9) D\_07 |
| 2 | Service logic | Service.Service | Lines 115-120: why is current week 39 special, logic unclear, no documentation about that D\_01 |
| 3 | Data types | Service.Service 130 | Use of raw data types instead of using template arguments D\_06 |
| 4 | Console cases | Console.UI | Could have used an enum for the different cases to better understand what each case is |
| 5 | Commented code | Repository.NotaFileRepository | A whole function of commented code is kept D\_07 |
| 6 |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |
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