| **REVIEW DOCUMENT** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Start Date: 27-11-2023 | | | |  | | | |
| Project Name: Hungerger | | | | Number of Pages: 5 | | | |
| Product Name: Hungerger | | | | Product Definition: Iteration 2 Documents | | | |
| Roles: | Review Leader: | | |  | | | |
| Reviewers: | | | *1. Annie Yang* | | | *3. Özde Uysal* |
| *2. Elif Şayli* | | |  |
| Review Materials: | * *Vision (V)* * *Glossary (G)* * *Use Case Model (U)* * *System-Wide Requirements (S)* * *Risk List (R)* * *Project Plan (P)* * *Work Items List (W)* * *Next Iteration’s Plan (N)* | | | | | | |
| Total Number of Errors: 40 | | | | | | | |
| Assessment Status: | | | ACCEPTED  \_\_\_ as it is  \_\_\_ with rework | | REJECTED  \_\_\_\_ review again | | |
| ERROR TYPES | | | | | | | |
| Error Type Number | | Error Type Definition | | | | Number of Errors Found | |
| 1 | | Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc) | | | | 4 | |
| 2 | | Inconsistency with the standards | | | | 1 | |
| 3 | | Uncertain | | | | 8 | |
| 4 | | Incorrect | | | | 5 | |
| 5 | | Inapplicable | | | | 0 | |
| 6 | | Internal Inconsistency | | | | 4 | |
| 7 | | External Inconsistency | | | | 2 | |
| 8 | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | | | | 14 | |
| 9 | | Other | | | | 2 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 40 | |
| Importance Types | | Importance Type | | | | Number of Errors Found | |
|  | | Little | | | | 8 | |
|  | | Medium | | | | 14 | |
|  | | Important | | | | 18 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 40 | |

| **No** | **Reviewed**  **Material**  **ID** | **Section** | **Page** | **Line/**  **No** | **Error**  **Type** | **Importance** | **Explanation** | **Correction Status** | **Correction**  **Explanation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Architectural notebook | 2 | 1 |  | 4 | Important | The paragraph outlines the basic structure and performance goals of the proposed system,there is no identification about issues that will drive the philosophy. | CORRECTED | Philosophy behind using key architectural patterns have been given. |
| 2 | Architectural notebook | 3.1.2 |  |  | 3 | Medium | It would be more realistic to specify a response time that is achievable given the system's hardware and software limitations. | CORRECTED | Hardware limitations are given with the context of AWS |
| 3 | Architectural notebook | 3.1.1 |  |  | 3 | Medium | It would be more helpful to specify the types of mobile and personal PC devices operating systems like (Windows, macOS, iOS, Android) | CORRECTED | Key browser targets and reasonings are given as a list item |
| 4 | Architectural notebook | 6 |  |  | 8 | Medium | According to your implementation, external API integration is an architectural mechanism. | REJECTED | Addition of external APIs is mentioned. |
| 5 | Architectural notebook | 6 |  |  | 8 | Medium | According to your implementation, data storage and management is an architectural mechanism. | REJECTED | The data storage and management is mentioned. |
| 6 | Architectural notebook | 6 |  |  | 8 | Medium | According to your implementation, security mechanisms are an architectural mechanism. | CORRECTED | Hashing and HTTPS encrypted communication methods are given in Mechanism 4 |
| 7 | Architectural notebook | 8 | 1 |  | 4 | Important | In "Model" section, it says that the model defines the "rules for data manipulation". The model should encapsulate the data and its structure, but it should not define the rules for how that data is manipulated | REJECTED | The given detail is correct. |
| 8 | Architectural notebook | 8 |  |  | 4 | Important | In "View" section, it says that the view "receives input from users and forwards it to the Controller for processing". The view should not be responsible for handling user input. Instead, user input should be handled by the controller, and the view should only be responsible for displaying data and responding to events. | REJECTED | The given detail is correct. |
| 9 | Architectural notebook | 8 |  |  | 8 | Important | Specify the technologies or frameworks that will be used for each component which are clearly defined at 3.2 dependencies part. | CORRECTED | Added Flask and explanation as the third paragraph in the Section 8. |
| 10 | Architecture Notebook | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | Medium | The constraints are not clear in this part. | CORRECTED | The key reasoning behind using a load balancer and a secondary server is defined. And mechanism clarified in the first list item. |
| 11 | General |  |  |  | 8 | Important | There is no deployment diagram. | CORRECTED | Deployment diagram is added to Physical View |
| 12 | General |  |  |  | 8 | Important | There is no user interface designs. | CORRECTED | The user interfaces are added as png files from Google Chrome. |
| 13 | General |  |  |  | 8 | Important | There is no domain model. | CORRECTED | Domain model is added. |
| 14 | P |  |  |  | 6 | Important | The deployment section is too brief. It would be more helpful to provide more details about the iteration plan and how the app will be deployed. Iteration plans also don’t have deployment parts. | CORRECTED | Covered in 11th review item. |
| 15 | General |  |  |  | 8 | Important | There is no data model | REJECTED | There are two data models. You can check our ER diagram and Relational model.  Related diagrams has been embedded to architectural notebook though. |
| 16 | CreateRecipe\_SequenceDiagram | 1 | 1 | N/A | 8 | Important | The diagram is missing Activation Bars, which is the box placed on the lifeline. It is used to indicate that an object is active (or instantiated) during an interaction between two objects. The length of the rectangle indicates the duration of the objects staying active. | CORRECTED | Added activation bars |
| 17 | CreateRecipe\_SequenceDiagram | 1 | 1 | N/A | 4 | Medium | There are 2 life lines for each object. There should only be 1 lifeline. | CORRECTED | Amended by keeping one lifeline for each object. |
| 18 | CreateRecipe\_SequenceDiagram | 1 | 1 | N/A | 4 | Medium | A return message is used to indicate that the message receiver is done processing the message and is returning control over to the message caller. The return message should be a dashed line and not a bold line. | CORRECTED | Amended by replacing solid line for return messages by a dashed line |
| 19 | Vision\_Hungerger | 2.2 Product Position Statement | 3 | 13 | 9 | Important | Decompose and separate food enthusiasts and food industry influences into their separate Product Position Statement tables. | PARTIALLY ACCEPTED  & CORRECTED | They have similar interests, therefore one card is enough. But we separated them to prevent confusion. |
| 20 | risk\_list\_tpl | Magnitude | 1 | 2 | 9 | Medium | Order the Magnitude from highest (largest) to lowest (smallest) values. | CORRECTED |  |
| 21 | uc\_specification\_Brief | Supplementary Requirements | 4 | 14 | 8 | Important | Supplementary Requirement WC-11 is referenced in 12 Update to Verified Account but doesn’t exist in the Supplementary Requirements section. | CORRECTED |  |
| 22 | Test Cases | General | General | General | 2 | Medium | The test case file does not have the same format with OpenUP. | CORRECTED |  |
| 23 | Test Cases | Login Page | Login Page | TC\_LOGIN\_01 | 8 | Important | There is only the test case for success scenario. Test cases for error scenarios should be added. For instance, when the user enters the wrong username and password, does the application give the right error message? | CORRECTED |  |
| 24 | Test Cases | Register Page | Register Page | TC\_REGISTER\_01 | 8 | Important | There is only the test case for success scenario. Test cases for error scenarios should be added. | CORRECTED |  |
| 25 | Test Cases | Create Recipe | Create Recipe | TC\_RECIPE\_02 | 3 | Medium | It is not clear if the user failed to post a recipe or the system failed to give an error. | CORRECTED |  |
| 26 | Test Cases | Feed | Feed | TC\_LOGIN\_01 | 8 | Important | There is only the test case for success scenario. Test cases for error scenarios should be added. | CORRECTED |  |
| 27 | Test Cases | Feed | Feed | TC\_LOGIN\_01 | 6 | Little | Test Case ID for the Feed Page is the same with the Test Case ID of Login Page. (TC\_LOGIN\_01) | CORRECTED |  |
| 28 | ER Diagram | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | Medium | There is a (0,N) relationship between reg\_user and creates, (1,1) relationship between creates and recipes. This is unclear. | REJECTED | Cardinality shows the minimum and maximum number of entity occurrences. One user can create min 0 and max N recipes. One recipe is created by min 1 and max 1 user. This notation is correct. |
| 29 | ER Diagram | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | Little | user\_id, user\_name and email are underlined attributes of the user, but only user\_id can be the primary key. | REJECTED | An entity can have more than one key attribute and each key attribute must be underlined. In ER diagram, underline doesn’t mean primary key, it means key attribute. |
| 30 | ER Diagram | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | Little | ing\_id and ing\_name are underlined attributes of ingredients, but only ing\_id can be the primary key. | REJECTED | An entity can have more than one key attribute and each key attribute must be underlined. In ER diagram, underline doesn’t mean primary key, it means key attribute. |
| 31 | Relational Model | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | Medium | In rates and comments tables, rec\_id should be added and be the foreign key rather than rec\_name. | CORRECTED | rec\_name has been changed. |
| 32 | UC1\_CreateAccount | Stakeholders and Interests | 1 | 5 | 6 | Medium | In the Glossary, User is defined as “User: People who have an account on the system.” Since the primary actor doesn’t have an account on the system yet and wants to create an account, would they still be considered a User or is unregistered user more reflective? | CORRECTED | “Visitor” was added to the use case as a primary actor. |
| 33 | UC1\_CreateAccount | 5. d. Account exists | 3 | 12 | 3 | Little | Clarify “check the password renewal”. Is it the same as password reset? | CORRECTED | They are the same. Added to the supplementary requirements for clarification. |
| 34 | UC1\_CreateAccount | Supplementary Requirements | 3 | 32 | 1 | Little | Better to use “character length” instead of “character size.” | CORRECTED |  |
| 35 | UC1\_CreateAccount | Supplementary Requirements | 4 | 1 | 1 | Little | Better to use “character length” instead of “character size.” | CORRECTED |  |
| 36 | UC2\_EditProfile | Supplementary Requirements | 4 | 18 | 1 | Little | Better to use “character length” instead of “character size.” | CORRECTED |  |
| 37 | UC2\_EditProfile | Supplementary Requirements | 4 | 20 | 1 | Little | Better to use “character length” instead of “character size.” | CORRECTED |  |
| 38 | UC3\_DeleteAccount | Main Success Scenario (or Basic Flow) | 2 | 7 | 8 | Important | Since it states “The system directs the User to the visitor interface”, the Primary Actor or Stakeholders and Interests section should include Visitor. Another reason is because the User becomes a Visitor after they delete their account. | CORRECTED |  |
| 39 | generalusecase | Visitor | General | General | 7 | Important | Primary Actor includes Visitor with a use case called “Create Profile” but this is inconsistent with the UC1\_CreateAccount in which the use case identifies the User as creating the account. | CORRECTED |  |
| 40 | generalusecase | Visitor | General | General | 7 | Important | “Create Profile” name is inconsistent with fully dressed use case name “Create Account.” | CORRECTED |  |