|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **REVIEW DOCUMENT** | | | | | | | |
| Start Date: 06-11-2023 | | | |  | | | |
| Project Name: Reserve Master | | | | Number of Pages: 3 | | | |
| Product Name: Reserve Master | | | | Product Definition: Web and Mobile application to facilitate Restaurant Reservation | | | |
| Roles: | Review Leader: | | |  | | | |
| Reviewers: | | | *1. Annie Yang* | | | *3. Özde Uysal* |
| *2. Elif Şayli* | | | *4. Betül Ergin* |
| 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)* | | | | | | |
| Total Number of Errors: 23 | | | | | | | |
| Assessment Status: | | | ACCEPTED  \_x\_\_ as it is  \_\_\_ with rework | | REJECTED  \_\_\_\_ review again | | |
| ERROR TYPES | | | | | | | |
| Error Type Number | | Error Type Definition | | | | Number of Errors Found | |
| 1 | | Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc) | | | | 3 | |
| 2 | | Inconsistency with the standards | | | | 2 | |
| 3 | | Uncertain | | | | 2 | |
| 4 | | Incorrect | | | | 1 | |
| 5 | | Inapplicable | | | | 0 | |
| 6 | | Internal Inconsistency | | | | 2 | |
| 7 | | External Inconsistency | | | | 0 | |
| 8 | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | | | | 10 | |
| 9 | | Other | | | | 3 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 23 | |
| Importance Types | | Importance Type | | | | Number of Errors Found | |
|  | | Little | | | | 7 | |
|  | | Medium | | | | 13 | |
|  | | Important | | | | 3 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 23 | |

| **No** | **Reviewed**  **Material**  **ID** | **Section** | **Page** | **Line/**  **No** | **Error**  **Type** | **Importance** | **Explanation** | **Correction Status** | **Correction**  **Explanation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **U** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | Important | There should be other actors like employees in the use case diagram. | Accepted | Waitstaff actor is added to the use case diagram. |
| 2 | **U** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Important | There should be one general use case diagram for all actors. | Accepted | There is one comprehensive use case diagram |
| 3 | **U** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Important | The use cases don't have a diagram name. | Accepted | Diagram name is added |
| 4 | **U** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Little | There are inconsistencies between naming with little and big letters like “Choose whether to be put in waitlist” and “Enter Credit Card Information”. | Accepted | Updated |
| 5 | **U** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | Medium | Restaurant Manager UseCase Diagram doesn’t have “extends” and “includes” features. | Accepted | See new version of the use case diagram. |
| 6 | **S** | 3.2.2 | 3 | 24 | 8 | Medium | In the part of Frequency of Severity of Failures, there should be numerical values to increase readability of sections. | Accepted | Added |
| 7 | **S** | 3.1.3 | 3 | 10 | 3 | Medium | The requirement for the system to adhere to "accepted usability standards" is uncertain. | Accepted | Made more obvious |
| 8 | **S** | 2.9 | 2 | 12 | 8 | Medium | It would be helpful to provide more specific metrics for scalability and performance, such as the maximum number of concurrent users that the system should be able to support and the average response time for different types of requests. | Accepted | Added numerical values |
| 9 | **P** | 3 | 5 | 3 | 8 | Little | The specifics of how the point system will be used for estimating size and other relevant measurements could be more clearly described. | Accepted | Point system is explained in more detail |
| 10 | **P** | 5 | 6 | 24 | 8 | Medium | The section lacks details about data backup and recovery procedures in the database considerations. | Rejected | The necessary details are explained in system wide requirements |
| 11 | **R** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | Medium | The values assigned appear reasonable but should be regularly reviewed and adjusted as the project progresses and more information becomes available. | Feedback | No correction needed right  now |
| 12 | **W** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | Medium | The plan should outline detailed testing strategies, including unit testing, integration testing, and user acceptance testing. | Accepted | Implementations and test plans are added. |
| 13 | **W** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | Little | Comprehensive documentation, including user manuals, technical documentation, and system architecture diagrams, could be added. It would be beneficial for onboarding new team members, troubleshooting, and future maintenance. | Rejected | It was written as a feedback, these later phase activities will be added in next iterations. |
| 14 | **W** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | Little | The plan could address the long-term sustainability of the system, including considerations for future upgrades, scalability, and technology stack choices that allow for future expansion. | Rejected | It was written as a feedback. Some are considered in system-wide requirements and vision document. Some will be considered according to the progress and needs. |
| 15 | **W** | 1 | 1 | 38 | 8 | Medium | A deployment plan into production environment is needed. | Accepted | Initial deployment plan is added. |
| 16 | **N** | 1 | 1 | 7 | 6 | Little | "Define Objects, Attributes, and Methods" is mentioned both as a high-level objective and a work item assignment. | Feedback | You may include this objective either as high level or in work items. |
| 17 | **N** | 4 | 3 | 2 | 8 | Medium | The issues mentioned in the plan lack specific plans for resolution. For instance, the issue related to the order of restaurants on the interface is marked as "Open," but there is no clear plan outlined to resolve this ambiguity. A specific action plan and timeline should be provided for each open issue. | Feedback | You may include action plans for open items. |
| 18 | **N** | 6 | 4 | 6 | 8 | Medium | The assessment section lacks a concrete evaluation of completed work items against the planned objectives. | Feedback | You may include the assessment for the completed work items. |
| 19 | **N** | 3 | 2 | 6 | 1 | Little | Data base and "attributes" should be corrected to "database" and "attributes." | Feedback | "Data base" is detected in different documents (work items list) as well. |
| 20 | **V** | 3 | 5 | 1 | 9 | Medium | In Stakeholder Summary, it could be helpful to add Data Protection Regulatory Bodies as Stakeholders since they also impact and influence Security and Privacy decisions. | Accepted | Added |
| 21 | **V** | 5 | 10 | 18 | 3 | Medium | “Depending on the location of it, the system should support a diverse user segment” | Accepted | Clarified |
| 22 | **G** | 2 | 2 | 17 | 9 | Medium | It could be helpful to define “Reservation” since it is an important and frequently used term throughout the documents and system. | Feedback |  |
| 23 | **G** | 2 | 2 | 10 | 1 | Little | “Responsible for connect to the bank’s system” | Feedback | Should be “Responsible for connecting to the bank’s system.” |