

Peer-Review 2: Protocollo di Comunicazione

Marco Grazi, Gloria Desideri, Lucia Famoso

Gruppo 53

Valutazione della documentazione del protocollo di comunicazione del gruppo 52.

Lati positivi

We found these Sequence Diagrams to be very well documented and comprehensive. We had no doubts while following the communication workflow Group 52 adopted and we consider it a valid structure to manage all the connection and game phases.

Lati negativi

There is not much negative to say, other than the fact that the sequence diagrams are at a higher level of abstraction than what we expected. The Server often makes requests to the Client which for us is a little bending of the server-client paradigm (in the sense that it should be the client to make requests to the server), but we still think this approach should work just fine.

Confronto

As hinted above, our sequence diagrams were on a lower level of abstraction, closer to the code implementation, but the communication workflow identified by Group 52 is very much the same as ours, granted some differences in the order of the messages.

We decided to go with a State Strategy to avoid having the server making requests to the client, as it is the case with Group 52 approach. It might be less intuitive, but we think it is more correct.