## REVIEW DOCUMENT

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Start Date: | 17/12/2023 | |
| Project Name: SamWise | Number of Pages: | |
| Product Name: SamWise | Product Definition: | |
| Roles: | Review Leader: | Ezgi Tunalı |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Reviewers: | *1. Ezgi Tunalı* | *3. Umut Güler* |
| | | *2. Ezgi Erkaş* | *4. Mustafa Zemin* |

| Review Materials: | ●   *Vision (V)*<br>●   *Glossary (G)*<br>●   *Use Case Model (U)*<br>●   *System-Wide Requirements (S)*<br>●   *Risk List (R)*<br>●   *Project Plan (P)*<br>●   *Work Items List (W)*<br>●   *Next Iteration's Plan (N)*<br>●   *Architecture Notebook (A)*<br>●   *Test Documents (T)*<br>●   *Design (D)*<br>●   *Test Log (TL)*<br>●   *Test Script (TS)*<br>●   *Sequence Diagram (SD)* |
|---|---|

**Total Number of Errors: 30**

| Assessment Status: | ACCEPTED<br>  as it is<br>___ with rework | REJECTED<br>  review again |
|---|---|---|

### ERROR TYPES

| Error Type Number | Error Type Definition | Number of Errors Found |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc) | 3 |
| 2 | Inconsistency with the standards | 3 |
| 3 | Uncertain | 4 |
| 4 | Incorrect | 3 |
| 5 | Inapplicable | 0 |
| 6 | Internal Inconsistency | 0 |
| 7 | External Inconsistency | 2 |
| 8 | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | 11 |
| 9 | Other | 4 |
| | **TOTAL** | 30 |
| Importance Types | Importance Type | Number of Errors Found |
| | Little | 9 |
| | Medium | 14 |
| | Important | 7 |
| | **TOTAL** | 30 |

| No | Reviewed Material ID | Section | Page | Line/ No | Error Type | Importa nce | Explanation | Correction Status | Correction Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | D | | 8 | | External Inconsistency | Little | The term UUID can be added to the glossary. | Accepted | Glossary added. |
| 2 | D | | 3 | | Incorrect | High | Structure, behavior and example parts were written for layers. Those parts should be written for use cases. | Accepted | Use cases and sequence diagrams are updated. |
| 3 | D | | | | Incomplete/Insu fficient/Missing | High | Additional scenarios parts are missing for the use cases. | Accepted | MSS/Basic Flow with User, Behavior, Attribute, Relationship subsections were added to the UC Realizations. Sequence diagrams are updated. |
| 4 | D | | | | External Inconsistency | Medium | Use cases which are not realized in this iteration are also written in this iteration's design document. | Accepted | Use Cases that are not in the scope of Iteration 1-3 were removed. |
| 5 | U | UC7 - Write Review | Page12 | BasicFlow - 1 | Uncertain | Medium | the first step "accesses the service appointment page." should be clarified in pre conditions. How is the use landed on this page ? | Accepted | UC#7 MSS start was clarified. |
| 6 | U | UC8 - Make Proposal | Page 13 | Title | Other | Little | Make Discount Proposal may be a better title. Alternative flow includes cancellation of the discount proposal, and the main scenario seems based on this goal | Reject | We decided not to change the title. The other comment on the alternative flow is not clear. |
| 7 | U | UC9 - Manage Service | Page 15 | Context | Other | Medium | At least the creating service should be a separate use case, edit and delete may remain but creation serves for a different goal. | Partially Accepted | Based on Altan Hoca's responses during the review, it is not necessary to separate the use case since the preconditions are acceptable for create, manage, and delete scenarios. The MSS and Extensions were edited for clarification. |

| 8 | U | UC9 - Manage Service | Page 15 | Preconditions | Spelling | Little | Third precondition has typo "Service ProviderProvider" | Accepted | Typo was corrected. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | | UC10 | Page 16 | Basic Flow - [1-3] | Incorrect | High | I think the first 3 steps should be in preconditions, otherwise it is redundant with use case 3. | Accepted | Steps 1-3 in MSS were removed to eliminate redundancy. |
| 10 | U | UC11 | Page 18 | Basic Flow | Incorrect | High | Basic flow is one-sided. At least there should be a system interaction when issues are resolved. After step4.This also causes disharmony between the UML and the basic flow. | Accepted | Basic flow of UC 11 is made two-sided. |
| 11 | U | UseCases - General | | Actors | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | Medium | Actors' intentions should be specified. | Accepted | Actors' intentions are added to the use cases. |
| 12 | SD | UC2-Sequence Diagram | Page 1 | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | Medium | In UC2, Although it is stated that filtering will be done after matching the service's criteria, in the sequence diagram service provider is not shown. | Accepted | Typo was corrected. |
| 13 | SD | UC3-Sequence Diagram | | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | Medium | There should be a payment authorization system to confirm the payment. | Accepted | Payment Authorization was added to the UC#3 Sequence Diagram. |
| 14 | U | UC3 | | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | Medium | | | |
| 15 | U | UC4 | Page 7 | | Other | Little | In the basic flow's step 4, accepting a proposal and confirming it can be written in separate steps. | Accepted | Use case was edited for separation of actions. |
| 16 | G | Glossary | | | Other | Little | For UC4-Sequence diagram proposal details can be specified in the glossary. | Accepted | The Proposal Details were specified in the Glossary. |
| 17 | U | UC5 | Page 9 | | Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc) | Little | Instead of "The objective registered account..", it should be "The objective of registered account.." | Accepted | Typo was corrected. |
| 18 | A | 3 | Page 2 | | Uncertain | Medium | Is 3.4 an assumption or a requirement? | Accepted | Assumption is deleted. |

| 19 | A | 3 | Page 2 | | Uncertain | Medium | Are 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 assumptions or decisions? | Accepted | Assumption section is reorganized. |
|----|---|---|--------|---|-----------|--------|------|----------|------|
| 20 | A | 5 | Page 3 | | Uncertain | Medium | It is unclear which are decisions, and which are constraints in "5. Decisions, constraints, and justifications" section. | Rejected | |
| 21 | A | 9 | Page 11 | | Inconsistency with the standards | Medium | Instead of the package diagram notation, UML deployment diagram should be used. | Rejected | |
| 22 | TL | 1 | Page 1 | | Spelling | Little | Some of the tables are enumerated as 1,0,0 instead of 1,2,3. | Accepted | Enumeration is corrected. |
| 23 | P | Project Plan - Revisions | Page 1 | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | Medium | In the revisions, the revised items/topics should be mentioned -at least in a general fashion-. | Accepted | More detail is added to Revision section. |
| 24 | P | Project Plan - Project Organization | Pages 1-2 | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | Little | The surnames of the team members should be included. | Accepted | Surnames of the team members are added. |

| 25 | P | Project Plan - Project Practices and Measurements | Page 2 | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | Medium | The practices and measurements can be explained in more detail. The development methodology, management practices, technical practices and progress tracking can be explained in this part. | Accepted | More detail is added to Project Practices and Measurements part. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26 | P | Project Plan - Project Milestones and Objectives | Pages 3-5 | | Inconsistency with the standards | High | If the project is divided into 2 parts, the second part should also adhere to the rules of UP. For example, the release should have an inception, elaboration, construction and transition phases in order. | Rejected | |
| 27 | E | Executables | | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | High | General error handling should be done properly for the best user experience. For example, when a server error occurs, the error message should be displayed, and the user should be redirected to a proper path. | Accepted | Error handling messages are updated. |
| 28 | E | Executables | | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | Medium | The directives on how to run the MySQL server should be given in more detail. | Accepted | ReadMe file is updated. |

| 29 | E | Executables | | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | High | The project should be deployed to the web with a deployment provider (e.g Netlify, Vercel) starting from the beginning of the project. External access to the project should be provided with this. | Rejected | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30 | E | Executables | | | Inconsistency with the standards | Little | In the create account page, the form that includes the inputs for the user credentials should be provided at the top parts of the page. | Rejected | This is design choice of development team. |