

## Peer Review – Workshop 1

I think the readability of your domain model is good, it's not cluttered as it is a model with few conceptual classes and more attributes. However I feel like this could also make it a little harder to understand.

In his book Craig Larman says [1, Ch 9.12] that "If we do not think of some conceptual class as a number or text in the real world, it is probably a conceptual class, not an attribute." Which means things like *Username* and *Cost* could be good attributes while for example *Role* should probably be its own conceptual class.

I think the overall naming is good because the names describe what they represent well and the associations follow Larman's guideline [1, Ch 9.14] of "Class name - Verb phrase - Class name" format.

Larman's book also says [1, Ch 9.14] that "multiple associations should be shown separately," which Tobias also said on his lecture [2] which would mean that the association between *User* and *Calendar* should maybe be split up.

I absolutely think a domain expert would understand this domain model as they already have an understanding of the requirements and the domain they're working in.

I don't know how useful it would be for a developer as the use cases aren't very clear.

Like I said above I believe the strong points of this model is that it is simple and easy to read while the biggest weakness is that it's not as easy to understand, for me at least, unless you read the document that followed with it.

The domain model covers all the requirements/use cases so in that regard, I think it passes the grade 2 grading criteria. However I think it could be made a bit easier to understand if it was more detailed, with more classes rather than attributes.

## References

1. Larman C, Applying UML and Patterns 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed, 2005, ISBN: 0131489062
2. Olsson T, L02 – Domain Modeling, 2016-08-31, [https://youtu.be/Aeu\\_Bd738SM?t=42m28s](https://youtu.be/Aeu_Bd738SM?t=42m28s)