| **REVIEW DOCUMENT** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Start Date: | | | | 18/12/2023 | | | |
| Project Name: Hungerger | | | | Number of Pages: 3 | | | |
| Product Name: Hungerger | | | | Product Definition: | | | |
| Roles: | Review Leader: | | | ToGather | | | |
| Reviewers: | | | *1. Ebru KÜLTÜR BAŞARAN* | | | *3. Baran ÖZDEN* |
| *2. İpek ÇOBANOĞLU* | | | *4. Batuhan ŞENYÜZLÜ* |
| 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 (TC)* * *Design (D)* * *Test Log (TL)* * *Test Script (TS)* | | | | | | |
| Total Number of Errors: 47 | | | | | | | |
| 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) | | | | 0 | |
| 2 | | Inconsistency with the standards | | | | 7 | |
| 3 | | Uncertain | | | | 2 | |
| 4 | | Incorrect | | | | 5 | |
| 5 | | Inapplicable | | | | 0 | |
| 6 | | Internal Inconsistency | | | | 2 | |
| 7 | | External Inconsistency | | | | 0 | |
| 8 | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | | | | 6 | |
| 9 | | Other | | | | 4 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | **26** | |
| Importance Types | | Importance Type | | | | Number of Errors Found | |
|  | | Little | | | | 6 | |
|  | | Medium | | | | 9 | |
|  | | Important | | | | 11 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | **26** | |

| **No** | **Reviewed**  **Material**  **ID** | **Section** | **Page** | **Line/**  **No** | **Error**  **Type** | **Importance** | **Explanation** | **Correction Status** | **Correction**  **Explanation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Implementation | - | - | - | 2 | Medium | You should consider your coding style to improve readability and maintenance. There are inconsistent whitespaces between characters and function definitions, too long rows, etc. You can refer to PEP8 code formatting standard to style your code in a pythonic way. | CORRECTED | Comments have been added and long SQL Scripts have been planned to be reduced by utilization of an ORM |
| 2 | Implementation | - | - | - | 2 | Medium | Your backend code is contained in a single script which is not a best practice for a medium or large sized project. You can separate your code base into logically or functionally similar clusters which are apps or modules according to your design approach. | CORRECTED | Separated APIs into .py files through Flaskr outing |
| 3 | Implementation | - | - | - | 2 | Medium | You can add comments/docstrings and typehints to your functions to improve readability and ease of maintenance. | CORRECTED | Applied in No 1. |
| 4 | Implementation | - | - | - | 9 | Important | In the application, the recipe ID is meant to navigate to the recipe itself, but instead of that it tries to navigate to the user. | CORRECTED | Routes have been fixed for the resolution of this bug. |
| 5 | A | 3.2 | 4 | - | 9 | Little | 3.2.3 heading number is missing. | CORRECTED |  |
| 6 | A | 5 | 5-6 | - | 8 | Important | Design decisions are explained but they are not matched with the related requirements. If we can see which design decision is made for which requirement, it would be better for traceability. | CORRECTED | Added reference to the related requirement |
| 7 | A | 6- MVC | 6 | MVC | 2 | Medium | Using MVC approach is a design decision, you could also add it to section 5. | CORRECTED | Added MVC and NGINX Design decisions with their justifications |
| 8 | A | 6- Load Balancing | 6 | Load Balancing | 2 | Medium | Using NGINX is a design decision, you could also add it to section 5. | CORRECTED | Added MVC and NGINX Design decisions with their justifications |
| 9 | A | 8 | 8 | - | 8 | Important | Layers are not clearly stated and explained with their components. (Technical service layer explanation is missing, domain layer is not clear) | PENDING | Will be corrected in the next iteration. |
| 10 | A | 9 | 10 | Information view | 4 | Little | You could write “Data view” instead of “information view” | CORRECTED |  |
| 11 | A | 9 | - | - | 8 | Important | Logical view is missing | PENDING | Will be corrected in the next iteration. |
| 12 | A | 7 and 9 | 7 and 16 | Domain model and class diagram | 6 | Little | Domain model and class diagram are not compatible with each other. | REJECTED | Since the Visitor has no access to the system without an account, the account is part of the problem and is part of the domain model. |
| 13 | A | 7 and 9 | 7, 10, 15 and 16 | Use case diagram, Domain model, Class diagram and ER diagram | 6 | Medium | The relationship between User and Admin is not shown the same way in use case diagram, class diagram, ER diagram and domain model | CORRECTED |  |
| 14 | A | 9 | 13 and 14 | Sequence diagrams | 9 | Little | System and Database can be shown together as “System”. | PENDING | Will be corrected in the next iteration. |
| 15 | D | - | - | - | 8 | Important | Design document is not uploaded. | CORRECTED | We created one for realized use cases. |
| 16 | TS | - | - | Test Script 02 for Create Recipe | 8 | Medium | Even though TC\_RECIPE\_02 result is expected to be failed, it should still have a test script. | REJECTED | Since this one belongs to the iteration 2 test, it had a test script in the related document.  However, we merged the documents to enhance trackability. |
| 17 | TS | 2 | - | Test Script 01 for Create Recipe | 4 | Important | Test step 6 “The user uploads an image.” fails but it is shown as “P” in the document. | CORRECTED | The status was changed to “incomplete”.  P was changed to F. |
| 18 | TS | 3 | - | Test Script 03 for Create Recipe | 4 | Important | Test step 6 is shown as “F” but it passes. | REJECTED | The system should’ve shown an error message when the image is missing, but it does not. Therefore, the test is failed. |
| 19 | TS | 5 and 6 | - | TC\_EDIT\_RECIPE\_01 and TC\_EDIT\_RECIPE\_02 | 4 | Important | In test step 2 for TC\_EDIT\_RECIPE\_01 and TC\_EDIT\_RECIPE\_02, it says “The user clicks on the “Edit Recipe” button.” and it is shown as P. But in the application, “Edit Recipe” button is not found. So these test cases cannot be tested. | PENDING | We implemented the edit recipe part, but we could not show it due to some errors. It will be corrected in iteration 4. |
| 20 | TS | General | - | - | 4 | Medium | In all of the test scripts, main success scenario steps are written for precondition sections. | CORRECTED |  |
| 21 | TS and TC | General | - | - | 9 | Important | Some of the test cases are not tested and not mentioned in test scripts. | REJECTED | Since some tests belong to the previous iteration, their tests are presented in that iteration already.  However, we merged the documents to enhance trackability. |
| 22 | W | Iteration 3 | - | 43-48 | 3 | Important | Work items under “Authorize Admin” are not clear. If they are implemented, it cannot be tested without being admin and they don’t have test cases. | REJECTED | We implemented “Authorize Admin” work item. Their test cases belongs to the UC11\_ReportMisuse use case, which will be implemented and tested in Release 2.  We’ll provide admin authorization information on our GitHub page. |
| 23 | W | Iteration 3 | - | 41 | 8 | Little | If “Finish creating mySQL database” is finished, Hours Worked column should’t be 0. If it is not finished, its state shouldn’t be “Done”. | CORRECTED |  |
| 24 | U | General | - | - | 2 | Little | UC - all: in MSS and extension parts of the use cases, there are steps including "shall" statements. (For example, "the system shall display"). The statement can be change to "the system displays" which will better reflect the behavior of the system. | PARTIALLY ACCEPTED &  CORRECTED | We could not find “shall” statements in the MSS’s. But we corrected the ones in extensions. |
| 25 | A | Class and ER Diagrams | - | - | 2 | Medium | You implemented User and Admin as separate classes, but it could be better using a single User class and adding an is\_admin attribute, or using User, Roles, and User\_Roles classes/tables. | CORRECTED | UPDATED the Class Diagram with a composition type |
| 26 | A | Class Diagram | - | User Class | 3 | Important | There is an unnamed method of User. | CORRECTED | Added logout and Delete recipe |