

## Comments on UI Spec for CS22120 Group 11

### Quality Assurance

Repo: Good top-level structure.

Good config\_refs file

Blogs: asb20, jag77: only 3 blogs and dep22 only 2 blogs.

Bhw: would expect at least one blog for March

Remove cwl!

How is the team leader supposed to keep track of effort if people don't fill in their blogs?

Why is there a .DS\_Store file in some folders? Use .gitignore to stop pushing of those files.

Minutes: Inconsistent file names for the tutorial meetings. Fix.

Formal review minutes: make all the checklist items from SE.QA.07 explicit in the minutes so that you can show that you dealt with every item, even if to say nothing to do.

Why show the group membership every week.. You should know each other by now.

Matters arising section is not being used correctly. The easy way to do it is to copy and paste new business from the previous week up into this weeks matters arising and to start afresh in the New business section.

Src folder is good.

Why are there no folders under dev? SE.QA.08 explicitly says there should be tutorial folders under dev where materials to be presented in the tutorial are stored.

Docs has a weird temp file. Remove.

During the seminar I asked groups to also add pdf versions of the files in order to avoid formatting issues between different versions of Word etc.

UI spec formatting: Copyright should be 2022.

Was it really only one author?

The status says for review rather than release. Was it not released? Same issue with header.

Correct version number if it really is Release.

Doc history is okay.

References section should also refer to SE.QA.04.

From now on use the Word or Latex templates provided on Blackboard. Inconsistent numbers of blank line after some sections.

Avoid section headings on a page that have no text below, i.e. at the bottom of the page.

### UI material - document

#### Typical users:

Why have a bullet point next to Players?

The second type feels incomplete. Also doesn't have full stop!

What about accessibility? I would imagine that those who are colour blind or partially sighted will have UI requirements.

**Use cases:**

Nice to see the diagram. Use `---<<include>>---` where one UC uses another.

You might as well add the UC numbers next to each use case in the list.

UC numbering is okay, although you don't need 1.1. Just use 1, 2 etc except where sub use cases (so 3.1 and 3.2 instead of 1.3.1, 1.3.2). Please add the name of the UC after the number, otherwise I keep having to refer back.

Good cross-referencing between UCs.

A major omission is the lack of FRs. Every UC should refer to at least one FR to show that it is relevant. Otherwise you might add features that were not asked for. Also it means that you can quickly check that all FRs are covered.

Good detail in the descriptions. Well done. That said, be careful not to be too specific about the appearance of the UI, e.g. saying top left. That is so that you can change the UI design without having to change the UI spec.

Make the UC names verb-based phrases in every case. So Trading ports should be Trade at enemy port and Treasure island, Obtain chance card (or similar). I don't want to see any noun-based UC names.

**Error conditions:**

The section title is wrong.

Don't make them UCs. Instead give them EC numbers, e.g. EC1, EC2... That way you can refer to them explicitly from the presentation.

"name that isn't too long". That's too vague. Have it straight away rather than in the example later on. Perhaps blank names is more of an issue.

You don't need to have instructions here for the developer. Just say what happens if there is incorrect user input or environment issues (e.g. crashes, lack of file space...).

So in 1.3.1 "The loser must make a move..." Instead say what happens if they don't make a move. Or you could say they are forced to and no other input option is allowed.

Avoid using the word "should". Use "must" or "shall". These are stronger.

**UI Material - presentation**

Good to see reference to FRs, but also include references to UC numbers. Every slide must be linked to a UC and FRs.

Not so keen on seeing hand drawn bits of UI. Other groups didn't do this. It looks less professional. You want something that guides the implementation really well. Perhaps it will be enough. Hum.

Have better annotations on each slide. See the examples given in the talk (L1B) on UI presentation where it includes: Task, Action, Result annotations.

Attacking as two forms: landing on and crossing over.

There are typos in some annotations.

Avoid saying "I" in annotations. No personal pronouns please.