|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **REVIEW DOCUMENT** | | | | | | | |
| Start Date: 09.04.2020 | | | |  | | | |
| Project Name: Rocket Sports Reservation System | | | | Number of Pages: 83 | | | |
| Product Name: Online reservation and management system | | | | Product Definition: An online management tool that members of a sports center can set their sports routine and managers can manage the facility | | | |
| Roles: | Review Leader: | | | İmge Özbay | | | |
| Reviewers: | | | *1. Övül Cebe* | | | *3.* |
| *2. Tina Afshar* | | | *4.* |
| Review Materials: | * *Vision (V)* * *Glossary (G)* * *Use Case Model (U)* * *System-Wide Requirements (S)* * *Risk List (R)* * *Project Plan (P)* * *Work Items List (W)* * *Next Iteration’s Plan (N)* * *Test Cases (T)* * *Architecture Notebook (A)* | | | | | | |
| Total Number of Errors: | | | | | | | |
| Assessment Status: | | | ACCEPTED  \_\_\_ as it is  \_x\_ with rework | | REJECTED  \_\_\_\_ review again | | |
| ERROR TYPES | | | | | | | |
| Error Type Number | | Error Type Definition | | | | Number of Errors Found | |
| 1 | | Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc) | | | | - | |
| 2 | | Inconsistency with the standards | | | | 5 | |
| 3 | | Uncertain | | | | 2 | |
| 4 | | Incorrect | | | | 2 | |
| 5 | | Inapplicable | | | | 1 | |
| 6 | | Internal Inconsistency | | | | - | |
| 7 | | External Inconsistency | | | | - | |
| 8 | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | | | | 10 | |
| 9 | | Other | | | | 5 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 25 | |
| Importance Types | | Importance Type | | | | Number of Errors Found | |
|  | | Little | | | | 6 | |
|  | | Medium | | | | 10 | |
|  | | Important | | | | 9 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 25 | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Reviewed**  **Material**  **ID** | **Section** | **Page** | **Line/**  **No** | **Error**  **Type** | **Importance** | **Explanation** | **Correction Status** | **Correction**  **Explanation** |
| 1 | **Arch. Notebook** | 2 | 3 | - | 8 | Medium | Expected lifetime of the system and technologies changes over time is not mentioned since these will have a significant effect on the structure of the system. |  |  |
| 2 | **Arch. Notebook** | 2 | 3 | - | 8 | Medium | Hardware dependency were not mentioned either |  |  |
| 3 | **Arch. Notebook** | 3 | 3 | 6,7 | 9 | Medium | Not related to architectural design |  |  |
| 4 | **Arch. Notebook** | 5 | 4 | All | 8 | Important | Not justifying architectural decisions |  |  |
| 5 | **Arch. Notebook** | 6 | 4 | - | 4 | Important | Pair programming is not an architectural mechanism. It is an agile software development technique in which two programmers work together at one workstation. |  |  |
| 6 | **Arch. Notebook** | 7 | 5 | All | 9 | Medium | It is not necessary to put design diagrams(sequence diagrams) in Key abstractions. Domain model is enough for this part. |  |  |
| 7 | **Arch. Notebook** | 9 | 12 | - | 9 | Important | Class diagrams should be mentioned here |  |  |
| 8 | **Arch. Notebook** | 9 | 12 | - | 9 | Important | Sequence diagrams should be mentioned here |  |  |
| 9 | **Arch. Notebook** | 9 | 13 | - | 2 | Medium | Deployment view does not represent the first release which is a desktop version of the application. |  |  |
| 10 | **Test Cases** | - | - | - | 8 | Important | When filling email;  email: a@1.com entry is accepted by the system.  or 123@123.com is accepted.  There should be a test case about it. |  |  |
| 11 | **Test Cases** | - | - | - | 5 | Medium | Clicking to Sign up page is not applicable because when opening the application, the Sign up page appears as main page. |  |  |
| 12 | **Test Cases** | - | - | All | 8 | Important | There is no fail/pass criteria. |  |  |
| 13 | **Test Cases** | - | - | - | 8 | Medium | Phone number text box accepts string type of data. This should be included in a test case scenario. |  |  |
| 14 | **Test Cases** | - | - | - | 8 | Important | There is no test case related with password and reenter password textbox equality check mechanism. |  |  |
| 15 | **Test Cases** | - | - | - | 8 | Medium | It is not clear how to open the Login page.  There is no explanation about the “ I am already a user” button. |  |  |
| 16 | **Test Cases** | - | - | - | 4 | Important | There is no “Login” button. There is “Sign in” button. |  |  |
| 17 | **Test Cases** | - | - | - | 2 | Medium | It is written that password length should be 6 characters long in System Wide Requirements Specification document. But it is not tested in test cases. System Wide Requirements Specification document and test cases are not suitable for the password concept. |  |  |
| 18 | **Test Cases** | - | - | - | 2 | Little | There is no test case related to character length of password. When writing 1 character long password, it is accepted. |  |  |
| 19 | **Executable** | - | - | - | 9 | Little | When selecting M for gender; it does not write it to the box. It shows “...”. |  |  |
| 20 | **Iteration Plan2** | 3 | 4 | - | 8 | Important | Hours worked should be written since Iteration 2 is finished. |  |  |
| 21 | **Iteration Plan2** | 6 | 6 | 4 | 3 | Little | “Extension” word is not mentioned in the use case descriptions. |  |  |
| 22 | **Iteration Plan3** | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | Little | “Extensions” is not a clear statement. |  |  |
| 23 | **System wide requirements** | - | - | - | 2 | Little | Age constraint is not consistent to the age mentioned in the application(it is mentioned 9 in the system wide requirement but in the system you cannot open an account below age 10) |  |  |
| 24 | **System wide requirements** | 6 | 8 | 4 | 2 | Medium | It should be mentioned that in the first release, the system will work as a desktop application. |  |  |
| 25 | **Project Plan** | 4 | 8 | - | 8 | Little | Objectives for the transition phase should be mentioned even though we are not covering it in this project. At least you could mention the Coarse-grained ones and for the Date. An assumed time might be written any changes in dates might be applied later |  |  |