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Positive aspects

In general the sequence diagram is very well described: all implementations are clear, and the entirety of the communication has been covered totally and in a very clear way. Overall very good.

Negative Aspects

The only few remarks we can possibly make are:

-Socket connections are not covered in any way whatsoever, so we are wondering if the choice was to not implement it.

-Also we are not really sure about the format of the messages exchanged: we believe they are simple strings, which would not be optimal (Json could be used).

-Finally, overall the protocol seems a little too sequential, as the user is "forced" to only send inputs that differ in each phase, not allowing for a free game experience.

Architecture comparison

While you focused mainly on the RMI communication protocol, we actually have implemented mainly the TCP connections: with this big main difference aside, the protocols are quite similar in the type of messages sent. However there are some differences in the way phases are handled: our users can chat before the game starts, and after the game has been initialized the game phase is recognized by the server and checked whenever a package is coming, so we actually deal with all possible packages straight from the start.