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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Specific Requirement | Defect | Severity |
| Cover | Probably need the revision history on the cover—for ease of access. Will it be easy to harmonise the revision history throughout the document in each page footer? | Minor |
| Cover | “Software Requirements Specification”? Is that right? | Minor |
| Cover | “Web site” is listed here as two words. The Oxford English Dictionary 2015 allows for “website” to be spelled as one word only, without the space between “web” and “site.” http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/website?q=web+site | Minor |
| Page 1 | Despite the document being listed as V1.1, there is no record of a V1.0—or even V1.1—in the “Revision History” table, nor do there accompany these any entries for “Description”, “Author”, “Comments”. | Critical |
| Page 2 | The Table of Contents specifies “1.3 Definitions, Acronyms, and Abbreviations” for page 3. Page 3 specifies “Definitions, Acronyms, and Abbreviations” after 1.4 instead of 1.3, inconsistently. | Major. |
| Page 2 | The Table of Contents references “2.2 Product Functions”; “2.3 User Characteristics”; and “2.4 General Constraints” as being on page 3. These sections do not feature on page 3 or anywhere in the document, and it may be the case that they do not fit in the given space at all, which could have the effect of changing the pagination for the rest of the document by shifting the other sections down. | Critical |
| Page 2 | Numbering is majorly off. | Critical |
| Page 2 | Notice how the the 3.1s are actually 4s. | Major. |
| Page 2 | The 3.1 General User interface requirements should have a proper return space under it to match other titles of the font size. | Minor. |
| Page 2 | AND they’re also listed with code numbers--which AREN’T printed on the table of contents. Those code numbers, moreover, are erroneous, pages 4,5,6,7,8. | Critical |
| Page 2 | Contact page and Forgot Password page listed as being page 7 in contents. They’re actually on page 6. | Major. |
| Page 2 | Ordering Pizza page said to be on page 8, but it is actually on page 7. | Major. |
| Page 2 | Schedule page in contents listed as being on page 9 but it is actually on the same page as Ordering Pizza—which is 7. | Major. |
| Page 2 | Order receipt page and My Account - reset password page are said to be on page 9—said to be on same page as Schedule. They are in fact on page 8. | Major. |
| Page 2 | The “Non-Functional Requirements” outlined in the Contents as being on page 10 alone in fact straddle both pages 8 and 9—and this is not reflected in the contents. | Major. |
| Page 2 | The “Non-Functional Requirements” has subsections in the document proper—3.2.1 to 3.25—that are not listed on the contents. | Major. |
| Page 3:  1.1 | “This Software Requirement Specification”. The title and the harmonised title for the document is “Software Requirements Specification.” With an ’S’. | Minor. |
| Page 3:  1.1 | “for the Pizza IT.” Likely should read “Pizza IT Company” to marry with the title page. On the other hand, maybe the title page is wrong and the company is, as the logo suggests, simply Pizza IT. In which case, the title page has an error. | Minor. |
| Page 3:  1.1 | “in order to”. The sentence wording here does not clarify whether the requirements are listed in order—i.e. in logical sequence—so that design can be enabled; or if they are listed simply to enable. | Minor. |
| Page 3:  1.1 | Despite the heading reading “purpose”, no purpose is given in section 1.1. 1.1 is dedicated to describing the intended audience of the spec. | Minor. |
| Page 3: 1.1 | Who are “representatives” of Pizza IT and the Firebrand Company? Perhaps this should be clarified. | Minor. |
| Page 3:1.1 | Firebrand Company does not align with information given elsewhere in the document. If it does, outside sources suggest that company should be capitalised. | Minor. |
| Page 3: 1.1 | The description is unnecessarily prolix, violating the category of clear, terse, precise and simple. It could be reworded as “The users of this document are: 1). representatives of Pizza IT and Firebrand Web Design; and 2.) the independent test team employed to test the site. | Minor - |
| Page 3: 1.2 | Scope should probably not be broken down into (1) and (2). It is thematically inconsistent with the rest of the document. Take, for example, Product Perspective, where points of a joined theme flow one after another under the appropriate rubric. Point 2 elucidates point 1 and defines it—it is not a disparate objective, as the numbering may imply. | Minor - |
| Page 3: 1.2 | There is a return space entered on point (2) between “for and “later.” This is a formatting error which connotes the same problem as a spelling mistake. | Minor. |
| Page 3: 1.2 | Superfluous words. “To be produced” recurs in the scope section. A finer reading may be, simply, “The site will enable”, rather than echoing (1). | Minor - |
| Page 3: 1.2 | “Pizzas” is spelled with a capital here, while it should be lowercase. | Minor. |
| Page 3: 1.2 | “The company targets Computing students at QUB.” Myriad issues here: QUB is an acronym that has not been expanded hitherto, contravening the review checklist. Secondly, it is not feasible to test the line 1.3 misnomered as 1.4. | Major. |
| Page 3: 1.4 | Oxford English Dictionary lists “website” as one word, not two. | Minor. |
| Page 3: 2 | General description  “General” implies ambiguity. It appears inoffensive here in this capacity but “Product Description” clarifies the target and narrows down the scope of the section. | Minor. |
| Page 3: 2.2-2.4 | 2.2-2.4 missing | Major. |
| Page 3: 2.1 | 2.1 - “Product Perspective” does not give a firm idea of what the section entails. There is recursion of information with Scope. | Minor. |
| Page 3: 2.1 | 2.1 - “Pizzas” once again spelled with a capital when it should be lowercase. | Minor. |
| Page 3: 2.1 | 2.1 - Contravenes the implementation-free rule: we cannot test that payment is made when the customer calls to collect. | Major. |
| Page 4: 3.1 | 3.1’s sections are numbered wrongly. 4.1.1 instead of 3.1.1 and so forth. | Major. |
| Page 4 | All Functional Requirements subheadings should be numbered down the 3 scale to mirror Non-Functional Requirements. i.e. Website pages should be 3.2; Navigation 3.3, and so on. | Major. |
| Page 5 | After the “Login page” subheading, more than one return key tap has separated a subheading from the descriptions. This continues until “Contact page”, but the old one key tap return space returns at “Forgot Password page”. More than one space returns to use from Ordering Pizza page until My Account - rest password. One space for return should be implemented throughout. | Major. |
| Page 4, above 4.1.5 | Web site pages: - should read website pages, all one word. | Minor. |
| 4.1.2 | Full stop missing at the end of 4.1.2. | Minor - |
| Page 4 | Navigation subheading has too big a colon after it. | Minor. |
| Page 4, 4.1.3 | 4.1.3 - Ambiguity: what constitutes appropriate validation? | Major. |
| Page 4: 4.1.4 | 4.1.4 - “May” identified as weasel word in lecture—ambiguous. Either a web page must have a title or the pages that do are specified. | Major. |
| Page 4: 4.1.5 | 4.1.5 - There should be a colon after “the following functional web pages”. | Minor. |
| Page 4: 4.1.5 | 4.1.5 - Ambiguous: “My Account - rest password” should be framed as “My Account” and “Reset Password” or “My Account, from which to access Reset Password.” Reset Password perhaps warrants capital starting letters to mirror the others. Apply change to 4.1.6. | Major. |
| Page 4: 4.1.6 | 4.1.6 - Missing full stop at end of “rest password.” | Minor. |
| Page 4: 4.1.7 | 4.1.7 - Ambiguous. What is a “common navigation area”? Define further. Difficult to implement with definition. | Major. |
| Page 4: 4.1.8 | 4.1.8 - Minor - Should be a colon after “the following pages”. | Minor. |
| Page 4: 4.1.9 | 4.1.9 reads - “shall be able to direct navigate”. Should read “directly navigate.” | Minor. |
| Page 4: 4.1.10 | 4.1.10 - Critical - “directly navigate to the Manage page.” The Manage page does not exist in the document proper nor in the contents. | Critical. |
| Page 4: 4.1.10 | 4.1.10 is not atomic; the requirement starting “In addition” should be a separate point in and of itself, being unrelated to the rest of 4.1.10. | Major. |
| Page 4: 4.1.11 | 4.1.11 - Spelled is “Forgot password”; the page proper is entitled “Forgot Password”, with “p” being afforded a capital. | Minor. |
| Page 4: 4.1.11 | 4.1.11 - Minor and likely not operatively dangerous, but “may” has been frowned on before and should be clarified with specifics or with the word “must”. Context gives an impression of the correct reading—but it’s not worth the risk. | Minor. |
| Page 4: 4.1.11 | 4.1.11 - Critical. Very likely a misspelling here, or at the very least lack of atomicity by virtue of contradiction. Forgot password is said only to be directly accessible from Logout page. No logout page is mentioned in the contents or spec itself. Moreover, it contradicts the requirement in Login page below which is supposed to include direct link to FP. | Critical |
| Page 5: 4.1.14 | 4.1.14 - full stop missing at end. | Minor. |
| Page 5: 4.1.14 | 4.1.14 - “Register” should be replaced with “Registration” to marry with the subsequent subheading and references in the rest of the doc, specifically 4.1.5 which also reads “Registration.” | Major. |
| Page 5: 4.1.15 | 4.1.15 - Incorrect: “The system shall enable registered users to register” does not make sense. Perhaps it intends to say “unregistered” users. | Critical. |
| Page 5: 4.1.15 | 4.1.15 - Necessary requirement violated: clearance given for two separate email addresses, when only a valid unique should suffice. | Major. |
| Page 5: 4.1.15 | 4.1.15 - “Appropriate error messages and validation should be shown if required.” Perhaps not awful but further clarification is indexed to render this unambiguous. What is APPROPRIATE? | Critical |
| Page 5: 4.1.16b | 4.1.16 b- “Appropriate message”. What is appropriate? Ambiguous. | Major. |
| Page 5: 4.1.19 | 4.1.19 - what textual info? Ambiguous. Testable? | Major. |
| Page 5: 4.1.20 | 4.1.20 - google map should be “Google map”. | Minor/ Major. |
| Page 5: 4.1.20 | 4.1.20 - needs full stop after map) | Minor. |
| Page 5: 4.1.21 | 4.1.21 - “Quick pizza links section” seems to mean “Quick pizza links” section. | Minor. |
| Page 5: 4.1.21 | 4.1.21 - check, but I’m not sure hyphens are valid web-links. | Minor. |
| Page 5: 4.1.21 | 4.1.21 - erroneous space between pizza and -the  zazzle doesn’t have http:// nor .html  remove the forward slash at .net/ | Major. |
| Page 6: 4.1.22 | 4.1.22: No colon at end of details. | Minor. |
| Page 6: 4.1.22 | Remove the unnecessary space after the last email and Address. | Minor. |
| Page 6: 4.1.23 | 4.1.23 - Unnecessary two spaces between email and message. | Minor. |
| Page 6: 4.1.23 | 4.1.23 - Can we test this? | Minor. |
| Page 6: 4.1.24 | 4.1.24 - “as soon as possible” is untestable. | Critical |
| Page 6: 4.1.24 | 4.1.24 - “appropriate validation” is defined here, but “including” should be replaced with “the following validation.” | Major. |
| Page 6-7: 4.1.24 - 25 | Why is there such a big gap between FP and ordering? Formatting error. | Minor. |
| Page 7: 4.1.30 | 4.1.30 - “Ordering page enable”— should enable. | Minor. |
| Page 7 | gap between ordering pizza page and schedule page inconsistent | Minor. |
| Page 7: 4.1.31 | 4.1.31 - superfluous “for collection” violates simplicity and precision. | Minor. |
| Page 7: 4.1.31 | 4.1.31 - no full stop. | Minor. |
| Page 7: 4.1.31 | 4.1.31 - requirement 3.1.29 does not exist. | Major. |
| Page 8: 4.1.34 | 4.1.34 - add “page”. | Major. |
| Page 8: 4.1.35 | 4.1.35 - should read “their” current email; “appropriate message” should probably give specifics; what is appropriate? Ambiguous. Same applies for the case afterwards. | Critical |
| Page 8: 3.2 section | 3.2 N-F R should not be 3.2  3.2.1 Not feasible. All of it.  3.2.2 what parts are restricted? | Critical |
| Page 8 & 9 | Requirement 3.2.4 is repeated twice in the document proper, page 8 and 9, with a different requirement in each page. One should be 3.2.5 and the last 3.2.6. | Major. |