

Feedback 4

Overall

Good choice to follow the scale from the paper. You might consider defining levels 2 and 4 for the sake of completeness. It looks like you merged the evaluation of design 1 and 2, perhaps because the changes were small, but we think it would be good to separate them as it helps highlight changes between the first and second design.

Components

We think that explanations for components are not clear enough. As an example, we do not understand what “event broker for bla bla” refers to. Since we couldn’t find it in the document, we think it might be an unfinished placeholder. If that is the actual name, a reference to a figure or subsection would help solve some of the confusion.

Evaluation

In the paper and the lecture slides the rankings are usually grouped by component with the associated qualities. Your version groups by quality instead. While this is not confusing, it deviates from the structure of aSQA which could be an issue if the examiners are strict.

Steps 5,6 and 7 are hard to follow, since it is unclear what is being done. The “overall evaluation” section seems to include content from steps 5 and 6, but it is hard to tell since no actual items are added to the backlog.

You also seem to be missing round two of the evaluation.

Conclusion

This section is nice. We like that you went from an actor model to a hybrid approach using both load balancers and actors. It shows that your architecture is continuously evolving to address the drawbacks of using a single strategy.

Backlog

Your backlog is good, but you might consider tying it directly to the conclusion by adding work to be done in the architectural backlog. The final date listed as 17.03 gives the impression that the evaluation did not lead to any new tasks.