# Many Voices Publishing Platform Technology Review

D. Kevin McGrath & Dr. Kirsten Winters - CS461 Fall 2016 Commix

Steven Powers, Josh Matteson, Evan Tschuy

#### **Abstract**

The Many Voices Publishing Platform uses a variety of technologies to handle different aspects of the project, from the user interface to the backend database operations. These technologies enable to the Many Voices Publishing Platform to succeed in delivering a working platform for textbook collaboration.

# CONTENTS

1	Technology Review				
	1.1	Introduction	2		
	1.2	Steven	2		
		1.2.1 User Interface	2		
		1.2.2 Documentation	6		
		1.2.3 Inclusive Design	7		
	1.3	Josh	7		
		1.3.1 Testing	7		
		1.3.2 User Authentication	7		
		1.3.3 Server and Data Storing	7		
	1.4	Evan	7		
		1.4.1 Technology 1	7		
		1.4.2 Technology 2	7		
		1.4.3 Technology 3	7		

## 1 TECHNOLOGY REVIEW

- I. Introduction to entire tech review, including authorship of each section
  - II. Technologies 1-9 (each person responsible for 3)
  - (1) Technology 1
  - a. Options 1, 2, and 3
  - b. Goals for use in design
  - c. Criteria being evaluated (e.g., cost, availability, speed, security, etc)
  - d. Table comparing option 1, option 2, option 3 based on criteria
  - e. Discussion
  - f. Selection of best option based on criteria
  - (2) Technology 2
  - a. Options 1, 2, and 3
  - b. Goals for use in design
  - c. Criteria being evaluated (e.g., cost, availability, speed, security, etc)
  - d. Table comparing option 1, option 2, option 3 based on criteria
  - e. Discussion
  - f. Selection of best option based on criteria
  - (3) Technology 3
  - a. Options 1, 2, and 3
  - b. Goals
  - c. Criteria
  - d. Table
  - e. Discussion
  - f. Selection of best option based on criteria
  - (4) .etc.
  - III. Conclusion
  - IV. Bibliography

#### 1.1 Introduction

The MVP Platform is being developed for the purpose of fixing the problems currently associated with the textbook market. We will accomplish this by giving the MVP Platform an easy to use interface, a search bar with a built in results pane, source control, and many other features. Authorship is divided by subsection header.

### 1.2 Steven

#### 1.2.1 User Interface

Option 1 - React

React is a JavaScript rendering engine that is developed by Facebook. Originally used with Instagram, React is often paired with Redux for added functionality. React is a popular JavaScript library meant for building user interfaces that is component based.

Option 2 - Aurelia

Aurelia is a newer JavaScript client framework for mobile, desktop, and the web, by using simplistic integration.

Option 3 - Ember

Ember uses web components and templates to increase productivity.

Option 4 - Angular2

Angular2 is a project started by Google for their internal Green Tea project. Angular2 is a widely documented JavaScript cross-platform library that is used to create native mobile and desktop web applications.

Goals

The use of this technology will aid in the development of the user interface. Having a beautiful and scalable user interface will help users interact with the platform more easily, on whatever device they choose to use it on.

## **Evaluation Criteria**

The options are evaluated on

- Ease of Use
- File Size
- Features
- Performance
- Standards Compliance
- Non-Compliance
- Release
- License

Option Comparison

Option Compan	15011			
	React	Aurelia	Ember	Angular 2
Ease of Use	Substantial	Simple setup us-	Simple setup us-	Substantial
	setup required	ing NPM and in-	ing NPM and in-	setup required
	for working	stallation	stallation	for working
	system, lots of			system, lots of
	documentation			documentation
	and tutorials.			and tutorials.
File Size	156kb to ???kb,	323kb	435kb	1023kb
	due to added			
	frameworks			
Features	View rendering	Router,	Router, HTTP	Router, HTTP
	engine with plu-	Animation,	Client	Client
	gin frameworks	HTTP Client		
Performance	45-50	90-150 (Higher	60-100	80-130 (Higher
(Paints per		end with		end with
Second)		additional		additional
		plugins)		plugins)
Standards	ES 2015	HTML, ES	HTML, ES 2015	ES 2016
Compliance		2016, Web		
		Components		
Non-	JSX	N/A	N/A	NG2 Markup,
Compliance				Dart
Release	15.x	Beta	2.x	Release
				Candidate
License	BSD	MIT	MIT	MIT

#### Discussion

All of the chosen options have their pros and cons for our web application. All of them however would be a learning and research experience. Angular2 and React have the benefit of being created by large software companies, Google and Facebook respectively. This means that there will be large adoption and documentation / tutorials available. Aurelia and Ember seem to be easier to implement however, they are much newer products and they have a smaller adoption population. This could prove troublesome if we run into problems. If our implementation ends up being a fork of Ward Cunningham's Federated Wiki, then this decision will be null most likely.

## Selection

Initially we were set on using Angular2 as part of the team has experience using this JavaScript library, before meeting with our client. Angular2 has a wide adoption and is used by Google for internal projects so the longevity of the framework is expected to last. With this in mind, we plan to use Angular2 if we need to use a JavaScript framework for our user interface.

# 1.2.2 Documentation

1.2.3 Inclusive Design

# 1.3 Josh

- 1.3.1 Testing
- 1.3.2 User Authentication
- 1.3.3 Server and Data Storing

# 1.4 Evan

- 1.4.1 Technology 1
- 1.4.2 Technology 2
- 1.4.3 Technology 3