|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **REVIEW DOCUMENT** | | | | | | | |
| Start Date: 27.11.23 | | | |  | | | |
| Project Name: Samwise | | | | Number of Pages: 56 | | | |
| Product Name: Iteration 2 | | | | Product Definition: Samwise Service App | | | |
| Roles: | Review Leader: | | | Aslı Başak Civek | | | |
| Reviewers: | | | *1. Abdullah Talat Ahmed Al-Zariqi* | | | *3. Merve Mavi* |
| *2. Aslı Başak Civek* | | | *4. Tarık Demirtaş* |
| 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)* * *Architecture Notebook* (A) * *Test Cases (T)* * *Executables (E)* * *Implementation (I)* | | | | | | |
| Total Number of Errors: 42 | | | | | | | |
| 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) | | | | - | |
| 2 | | Inconsistency with the standards | | | | 13 | |
| 3 | | Uncertain | | | | 3 | |
| 4 | | Incorrect | | | | 7 | |
| 5 | | Inapplicable | | | | - | |
| 6 | | Internal Inconsistency | | | | 1 | |
| 7 | | External Inconsistency | | | | - | |
| 8 | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | | | | 18 | |
| 9 | | Other | | | | - | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 42 | |
| Importance Types | | Importance Type | | | | Number of Errors Found | |
| - | | Little | | | | - | |
| 2,3,4,6,8 | | Medium | | | | 34 | |
| 3, 4, 8 | | Important | | | | 8 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 42 | |

| **No** | **Reviewed**  **Material**  **ID** | **Section** | **Page** | **Line/**  **No** | **Error**  **Type** | **Importance** | **Explanation** | **Correction Status** | **Correction**  **Explanation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **P** | 4.1, 4.2 | 3 | I4 | 4 | Important | There should be a transition phase at the end of the project, not at the end of each release. |  |  |
| 2 | **P** | 5 | 4 |  | 3 | Important | Please, specify which cloud technologies and microservice tools you will use to deploy the project. |  |  |
| 3 | **P** | 6 | 4 |  | 8 | Medium | Please, update the lessons learned. It mentioned that you will update the lessons learned while considering iteration outcomes at the end of this iteration. |  |  |
| 4 | **P** | Header | 1 |  | 8 | Medium | The revision table is missing |  |  |
| 5 | **I** | 3 | 1 |  | 8 | Medium | Please update empty fields. If they are subtasks of technical research, please show that with indentation. |  |  |
| 6 | **I** | 4 | 3 |  | 8 | Medium | Please, update the issues mentioned. if the issues still persist, please write a description. |  |  |
| 7 | **I** | Header | 1 |  | 8 | Medium | The revision table is missing for the Iteration Plan 2 |  |  |
| 8 | **N** | Header | 1 |  | 8 | Medium | The revision table is missing for the Iteration Plan 3 |  |  |
| 9 | **R** | SamwiseRiskList\_v1.2 | 1 | 7 | 6 | Medium | The legal team is not defined in the stakeholders section of the vision document. |  |  |
| 10 | **I,E,T** |  |  |  | 8 | Important | No Executable was provided, Readme do not provide a way to run the app, and no backend code was found. |  |  |
| 11 | **U** |  |  |  | 8 | Important | The use case diagram is missing in the Iteration2 folder. |  |  |
| 12 | **U** | Header | 1 |  | 8 | Important | The revision table is missing |  |  |
| 13 | **U** | General |  |  | 8 | Medium | There are 12 use cases, but only 4 of them were written in a fully dressed style. You should at least write half of it in this iteration. |  |  |
| 14 | **U** | General |  |  | 8 | Medium | The brief descriptions of use cases 6-12 should be broadened to include happy path scenarios. |  |  |
| 15 | **U** | 1 | 1 | 1.4 | 4 | Medium | The basic flow should not include additional steps (for example 6.1) |  |  |
| 16 | **U** | 1 | 1 | 1.4.4 | 2 | Medium | You could write use cases in UI-free/essential style, instead of describing the user interface. For example “see schedule button” can be removed. |  |  |
| 17 | **U** | 1 | 1 | 1.4 | 2 | Medium | You should keep the scenarios between 3-9 steps. |  |  |
| 18 | **U** | 1 | 1 | 1.5 | 8 | Medium | You may add an “at any time” alternative flow. For example, a user should be able to cancel their operation at any step. |  |  |
| 19 | **U** | 1 | 2 | 1.5/ 7a | 4 | Medium | Steps 1-5 may be given in the glossary instead of here. |  |  |
| 20 | **U** | 1 | 2 | 1.5/ 7b | 2 | Medium | You could write use cases in UI free/essential style, instead of describing the user interface. |  |  |
| 21 | **U** | 1 | 2 | 1.7.3 | 2 | Medium | It may be given in the glossary instead. |  |  |
| 22 | **U** | 2 | 3 | 2.3.3 | 4 | Medium | This could be what starts the use case, not a precondition. |  |  |
| 23 | **U** | 2 | 3 | 2.4.2 | 2 | Medium | “search” option describes the UI, you may want to keep it more general. |  |  |
| 24 | **U** | 2 | 3 | 2.4.3 | 2 | Medium | Some information can be given in the glossary instead. |  |  |
| 25 | **U** | 2 | 3 | 2.5 | 8 | Medium | You could add an “at any time” alternative flow. For example, a user should be able to cancel their operation at any step. |  |  |
| 26 | **U** | 2 | 3 | 2.4 | 2 | Medium | UC2: You could write use cases in UI free/essential style, instead of describing the user interface. |  |  |
| 27 | **U** | 2 | 3 | 2.4 | 2 | Medium | There is a problem with the numbering. |  |  |
| 28 | **U** | 3 | 5 | 3.2 | 8 | Medium | There could be more actors. For example, a payment authority. |  |  |
| 29 | **U** | 3 | 5 | 3.4.1 | 2 | Medium | “payment section” describes the UI, which you should avoid in the use cases. |  |  |
| 30 | **U** | 3 | 5 | 3.4.3 | 2 | Medium | You could provide this information in the glossary, and keep the use case simple. |  |  |
| 31 | **U** | 3 | 5 | 3.4.4 | 2 | Medium | You could provide this information in the glossary, and keep the use case simple. |  |  |
| 32 | **U** | 3 | 5 | 3.4 | 2 | Medium | There is a problem with the numbering. |  |  |
| 33 | **U** | 3 | 5 | 3.5/4a | 8 | Medium | You could add this as an “at any time” alternative flow. For example, a user should be able to cancel their operation at any step. |  |  |
| 34 | **U** | 4 | 7 | 4.4 | 2 | Medium | These steps are describing the UI, which you should avoid in the use cases. |  |  |
| 35 | **U** | 4 | 7 | 4.5 | 8 | Medium | You could add an “at any time” alternative flow. For example, the service provider should be able to cancel their operation at any step. |  |  |
| 36 | **U** | 4 | 8 | 4.9.1 | 4 | Medium | “intuitive and user-friendly” are not testable statements. |  |  |
| 37 | **W** |  | 1 | 12-34 | 4 | Important | “State” of the work items for the second iteration is still at the open state and “hours worked” is 0 for all of them. |  |  |
| 38 | **W** |  | 1 | 35-48 | 4 | Medium | “State” of the work items for the third iteration is still at the open state, they might be in Open state. |  |  |
| 39 | **A** | 2 | 1 | 7-20 | 3 | Medium | There is no indication of a followed pattern for low level (SOLID Principles) or high levels design (MVC, Layered Architecture etc.) |  |  |
| 40 | **A** | 4 | 2 | 18-23, 25 | 3 | Medium | Business Rules and System Constraints are not clearly Architecturally Significant Requirements |  |  |
| 41 | **A** | 4 | 2-3 | 2.18-3.4 | 8 | Important | Most of the Architecturally Significant Requirements and how they are addressed through the architectural design are missing. |  |  |
| 42 | **A** | 7 | 5 | 9th from Bottom | 8 | Important | There is no definition of Review within the Glossary Document. |  |  |