

Requirements phase defects

Review form

Document title	Project_RequirementsDocument_LabAssiAss eProjectV01.docx
Reviewer name	Putura Emanuel-Vasile, Rusu Radu
Review date	03.03.2023

Crt. No.	Checked Item	Doc Page/line	Comments/ Improvements
1	D_01	Page 4, FR 6.0	Missing definition for motivation
2	D_01	Page 3, 1.2	Missing definition of properties for entities
3	D_06	Page 4, FR 1.1	Missing laboratory theme definition, maybe they meant assignment
4	D_03	Page 4, FR 6.0	Requirement describes two requirements
5	D_05	Page 4, FR 7.0	Missing definition for criteria
6	D_02	Page 4	Missing requirement to implement CRUD for assignments or grades – only Create and Update are explicitly stated

7	D_05	Page 4, FR 2.0	Penalty mentioned in file but not in requirement; missing penalty definition
8	D_01	Page 4, FR 3.0	Subject used instead of assignment
9	D_01	Page 4, FR 6.0	Notes used instead of grades
10	D_06	Page 4	FR 5.0 mentions a NameStudent.txt file, meaning each student would have their own file – however, at 3.4 a single file is mentioned (“stored in file”) - unclear if multiple files should be used (in which case there is a problem if multiple students have the same name), or the file should be created on the spot
11	D_01	Page 4, FR 5.0	Contents of the NameStudent file are undefined
Effort to review document (hours)			1

Unit design phase defects

Review form

Document title	Project_AnalysisDesignDocument_LabAssiA sseProjectV01.docx
Reviewer name	Putura Emanuel-Vasile, Rusu Radu
Review date	16.03.2023

Crt. No.	Checked Item	Doc Page/line	Comments/ Improvements
1	D_02	Page 3, 1	Missing functional requirements
2	D_01	Page 3, 3	Missing numbering for the use cases
3	D_02	Page 3, 3	Missing use case descriptions
4	D_01	Page 3, 3	Ambiguous preconditions, regarding how the entity fields should be specified
5	D_01	Page 3, 3	Ambiguous error handling. Missing error messages, unclear description of the cases when the user input would produce errors.
6	D_06	Page 7, 4.4.1	Incorrect/ambiguous user and system needs
7	D_07	Page 8	Invalid aggregation

			relationship between service and repository (i.e., the service aggregates the repository, not the opposite, like the diagram suggests).
8	D_07	Page 10, 5.2	Sequence diagram no. 1 is incorrect. The system is not supposed to create any courses after adding a new student.
Effort to review document (hours)			1

Coding phase defects

Review form

Document title	Project_AnalysisDesignDocument_LabAssiA sseProjectV01.docx
Reviewer name	Putura Emanuel-Vasile, Rusu Radu
Review date	16.03.2023

Crt. No.	Checked Item	Doc Page/line	Comments/ Improvements
1	D_04	Page 5, 4.5	Both success and error messages are shown if the validation of an entity fails
2	D_01	Page 5, 4.5	The validator classes should raise exceptions with all the errors related to the entity fields (currently, they work in a first-come-first-served manner: only the first error is printed to the user).
3	D_07	Page 5, 4.3	Missing attributes for the Student entity in the source code (i.e., attributes <i>email</i> and <i>professor name</i> are missing)
4	D_07	Page 3-4	Incoherent error handling for the first two use cases: if a string value is given when an integer is

			expected (e.g., for the student's group), the application crashes
5	D_04	Page 5, 4.5	Both success and error messages are shown if the validation of an entity fails
6	D_07	Page 6	Class diagram requirements are not fully respected (e.g., the source code contains XML and file specialized repositories, which are not present in the class diagram).
7	D_07	Page 8	Switching from XML repository to a different type (e.g., file repository) asks for multiple code changes, since the service repository fields are of XML Repo type. This breaks several GRASP principles specified in the analysis document, including <i>low coupling</i> and <i>polymorphism</i> . Consider using polymorphism and keep references to

			abstract CRUD repository classes. instead.
8	D_07	Page 8	Serialization and deserialization of the entities should ideally not be part of responsibilities of the repository. Strategy design pattern could be a possible approach.
Effort to review document (hours)			2