Observations (GRADE)

1. Grade Grade

Attribute studentId:

- ➤ Diagram: studentId : String
- ➤ Code: private String studentId;
- Remark: There is no discrepancy. The name and type of the attribute match between diagram and code.

Attribute subjectCode:

- Diagram: subjectCode : String
- Code: private String subjectCode;
- Remark: No discrepancy. Attribute name and type match between diagram and code.

Attribute grade:

- Diagram: grade : double
- > Code: private double grade;
- Remark: No discrepancy. The name and type of the attribute match between the diagram and the code.

• Uncommunicative Names

The names studentId, subjectCode and grade are clear and communicative.

• Inconsistent Names

Names are consistent throughout the code.

• Long Methods

Methods are short and specific.

• Duplicate Code -There is no duplicate code in the code.

There is no duplicate code in the Grade class.

• Class Explosion

There is no sign of a class explosion. The Grade class is concrete and specific.

• Large Classes

The Grade class is small and focused on a single responsibility.

• Conditional Complexity

There is no complex conditional logic in the class.

• Redundant or Meaningless Comments

Initial comments automatically generated by NetBeans do not add value to the code.

Recommendation: Remove automatic comments generated by NetBeans and add meaningful comments where necessary.

Dead Code

There is no dead code in the Grade class.

• Speculative Generality

The Grade class shows no signs of speculative generality.

Additional Recommendations

• Use of Gson Annotations:

Expose annotations are used correctly.

Recommendation: verify that all properties to be serialised or deserialised are correctly annotated.

Data Validation:

The grade value is not being validated, which could allow values outside an expected range (e.g. negative grades or greater than the maximum allowed value).

Observations (Subject)

2. Class Subject

Attribute code:

Diagram: code : String

➤ Code: private String code;

Remark: There is no discrepancy. The name and type of the attribute match between diagram and code.

Attribute name:

Diagram: name : String

➤ Code: private String name;

Remark: No discrepancy. The name and type of the attribute match between the diagram and the code.

Attribute credits:

> Diagram: credits: int

➤ Code: private int credits;

Remark: No discrepancy. The name and type of the attribute match between the diagram and the code.

• Uncommunicative Names

Code, name and credits names are clear and communicative.

• Inconsistent Names

Names are consistent throughout the code.

Long Methods

Methods are short and specific.

• Duplicate Code

There is no duplicate code in the Subject class.

• Class Explosion

There is no sign of a class explosion. The Subject class is concrete and specific.

Large Classes

The Subject class is small and focused on a single responsibility.

• Conditional Complexity

There is no complex conditional logic in the class.

• Redundant or Meaningless Comments

Initial comments automatically generated by NetBeans do not add value to the code.

Recommendation: Remove the automatic comments generated by NetBeans and add meaningful comments where necessary.

• Dead Code

There is no dead code in the Subject class.

• Speculative Generality

The Subject class shows no signs of speculative generality.

Additional Recommendations

• Use of Gson Annotations

The @Expose annotations are used correctly.

Recommendation: Verify that all properties to be serialised or descrialised are correctly annotated.

• Data Validation:

The value of credits is not being validated, which could allow values outside an expected range (e.g. negative credits).

Recommendation: Implement validations to ensure that credits values are valid.

Observations (IndividualActivity)

3. Class Individual Activity

Attribute grade:

- > Diagram: Attribute name is not explicitly specified, but grade: double is assumed.
- > Code: private double grade;
- Remark: There is no discrepancy. The name and type of the attribute match the expectation based on the implicit diagram.

• Uncommunicative Names

The name of the IndividualActivity class and the name of the grade attribute are clear and communicative.

• Inconsistent Names

Names are consistent throughout the code.

• Long Methods

Methods are short and specific.

• **Duplicate Code**

There is no duplicate code in the Individual Activity class.

• Class Explosion

There is no sign of a class explosion. The Individual Activity class is concrete and specific.

Large Classes

The Individual Activity class is small and focused on a single responsibility.

• Conditional Complexity

There is no complex conditional logic in the class.

• Redundant or Meaningless Comments

Initial comments automatically generated by NetBeans do not add value to the code. *Recommendation:* Remove the automatic comments generated by NetBeans and add meaningful comments where necessary.

Dead Code

There is no dead code in the Individual Activity class.

• Speculative Generality

The Individual Activity class shows no signs of speculative generality.

Additional Recommendations

• Data Validation:

The grade value is not being validated, which could allow values outside an expected range (e.g. negative grades or above the maximum allowed).

Recommendation: Implement validations to ensure that grade values are valid.

Observations (QuimestralExam)

4. QuimestralExam class

Attribute grade:

- Diagram: Attribute name is not explicitly specified, but grade: double is assumed.
- > Code: private double grade;
- Remark: There is no discrepancy. The name and type of the attribute match the expectation based on the implicit diagram.

• Uncommunicative Names

The name of the QuimestralExam class and the name of the grade attribute are clear and communicative.

• Inconsistent Names

Names are consistent throughout the code.

Long Methods

Methods are short and specific.

• **Duplicate Code**

There is no duplicate code in the QuarterlyExam class.

• Class Explosion

There is no sign of a class explosion. The QuarterlyExam class is concrete and specific.

• Large Classes

The QuarterlyExam class is small and focused on a single responsibility.

• Conditional Complexity

There is no complex conditional logic in the class.

• Redundant or Meaningless Comments

Initial comments automatically generated by NetBeans do not add value to the code. *Recommendation:* Remove automatic comments generated by NetBeans and add

meaningful comments where necessary.

• Dead Code

There is no dead code in the QuarterlyExam class.

• Speculative Generality

The QuarterlyExam class shows no signs of speculative generality.

Additional Recommendations

• Data validation:

The grade value is not being validated, which could allow values outside an expected range (e.g. negative grades or above the maximum allowed).

Recommendation: Implement validations to ensure that grade values are valid.