| **REVIEW DOCUMENT** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Start Date: 18.12.2023 | | | |  | | | |
| Project Name: ReserveWell | | | | Number of Pages: 7 | | | |
| Product Name: Iteration 3 product | | | | Product Definition: Last elaboration iteration. | | | |
| Roles: | Review Leader: | | | Aslı Başak Civek | | | |
| Reviewers: | | | *1. Abdullah Talat Ahmed Al-Zariqi* | | | *3. Merve Mavi* |
| *2. Aslı Başak Civek* | | | *4. Tarık Demirtaş* |
| 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)* * *Architecture Notebook (A)* * *Current Iteration Plan (I)* * *Test Documents (T)* * *Design (D)* | | | | | | |
| 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) | | | | 3 | |
| 2 | | Inconsistency with the standards | | | | 17 | |
| 3 | | Uncertain | | | | 3 | |
| 4 | | Incorrect | | | | 1 | |
| 5 | | Inapplicable | | | | - | |
| 6 | | Internal Inconsistency | | | | 5 | |
| 7 | | External Inconsistency | | | | 1 | |
| 8 | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | | | | 25 | |
| 9 | | Other | | | | 1 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 56 | |
| Importance Types | | Importance Type | | | | Number of Errors Found | |
|  | | Little | | | | 13 | |
|  | | Medium | | | | 23 | |
|  | | Important | | | | 20 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 56 | |

| **No** | **Reviewed**  **Material**  **ID** | **Section** | **Page** | **Line/**  **No** | **Error**  **Type** | **Importance** | **Explanation** | **Correction Status** | **Correction**  **Explanation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **A, G, I, N, S, T, V** | Revision table |  |  | 8 | Medium | It would be better to add the name of the person who made the revision to the table. |  |  |
|  | **D** | Revision table |  |  | 8 | Little | The revision table is missing in Design.pdf and Implementation.pdf. | Partially Accepted | Implementation didn’t have any review in the previous review. No revision. |
|  | **U** | UC1 | Heading |  | 6 | Little | The version number and date are different than the revision table. | Rejected | The dates are same. |
|  | **U** | UC2 | Heading |  | 6 | Little | The use case ID seems to be UC2, not UC1. |  | ?? |
|  | **U** | UC3, UC8, UC9, UC10, UC11, UC12, UC15, UC16 | Heading |  | 8 | Little | The version number is missing in the heading. | Rejected | We have the revision tables for this. It is more neat. |
|  | **U** | UC7, UC14 | Heading |  | 6 | Little | The version number and date are different than the revision table. |  | ?? |
|  | **U** | UC1, UC7 | Header |  | 8 | Medium | The use case names “Register” and “RegisterR” are not descriptive enough. | Accepted | The use case’s name has changed as “Register as Resturant Manager” |
|  | **U** | UC13 |  |  | 8 | Medium | There is no fully dressed UC13. | Accepted | Missing |
|  | **U** | UC1 | 1 |  | 2 | Important | The main success scenario is describing the UI.  item2: could be “Diner starts registering”  item3-4-5: it could be given as a single item like “diner enters their information”, then the information could be defined in the glossary.  item6: could be just “diner completes the registration”  item7: it could be “the system confirms the user” (in case the confirmation method is changed in the future) |  |  |
|  | **U** | UC2 | Preconditions |  | 8 | Little | If there would be at least one restaurant in the system, it would be easier to check the main success scenario. |  |  |
|  | **U** | UC2 | 2 |  | 2 | Important | The main success scenario is describing the UI.  item3: could be something like “diner enters reservation information”.  item5-6: could be merged into “diner enters their information”  item4-7: you could avoid statements like “clicking a button, ‘next’ button”.  item10: could be just “diner receives a confirmation” |  | Merge steps that don’t value actors actions. |
|  | **U** | UC2 | Extensions | 1a, 1b | 3 | Medium | If a membership is necessary for the reservation, it could be given as a precondition rather than extensions. | Rejected | It is optional, that’s why it is on the extensions. |
|  | **U** | UC2 | Extensions | 1b | 2 | Medium | item 1-4: could be given as a one line like “diner enters their information”. |  |  |
|  | **U** | UC3 | 2 |  | 2 | Medium | The main success scenario is describing the UI.  Check item 3 and item 6. | Accepted | UI Details are removed. |
|  | **U** | UC4 | 1 |  | 2 | Medium | The main success scenario is describing the UI.  Check item 2. |  |  |
|  | **U** | UC5 | 1 |  | 1 | Little | Typo in main succes scenario item 2. “fort he diner” -> “for the diner” |  |  |
|  | **U** | UC6 | 1 |  | 8 | Medium | Stakholders and interests:  “Restaurant” could be one of the stakeholders, since they are the ones rated. | Rejected | For this use case only the primary actor |
|  | **U** | UC6 | 1 |  | 4 | Medium | Stakholders and interests:  The interest of the Diner is to make ratings in this scenario, rather than making a reservation. |  | Olabilir emin olamadım |
|  | **U** | UC6 | 1 |  | 2 | Medium | The main success scenario is describing the UI.  Check item 5. |  |  |
|  | **U** | UC7 | 1 |  | 2 | Important | The main success scenario is describing the UI.  Check item 2, 7  item4-5-6: could be a single line like “Restaurant manager enters their information.” |  |  |
|  | **U** | UC8 | 2 |  | 2 | Medium | The main success scenario is describing the UI.  Check item 2 and 4. | Accepted | UI Details are removed. |
|  | **U, G** | UC8 | 2 |  | 2 | Medium | Extensions 2a.1. “filter list” details can be described in the glossary, or can be given as a supplementary requirement. | Accepted | Filter list, reservations page are added to glossary. |
|  | **U** | UC9 | 2 |  | 2 | Medium | The main success scenario is describing the UI.  Check item 2 and 4. |  | OKKK |
|  | **U** | UC10 | 2 |  | 2 | Medium | The main success scenario is describing the UI.  Check item 2 and 4. |  | OKKK |
|  | **U** | UC11 | 2 |  | 2 | Medium | The main success scenario is describing the UI.  Check item 2 and 4. |  | OKKK |
|  | **U** | UC12 | 2 |  | 2 | Medium | The main success scenario is describing the UI.  Check item 2. |  | OKKK |
|  | **U** | UC14 | 2 |  | 2 | Important | The main success scenario is describing the UI.  Check items 2, 8.  Also, items 4-5-6-7 could be given in a single line like “Waitstaff enters their information”. |  |  |
|  | **U** | UC14 | 2 |  | 1 | Little | “Frequency of occurrence” has been left highlighted. |  |  |
|  | **U** | UC15 | 2 |  | 2 | Medium | The main success scenario is describing the UI.  Check items 2, 4. |  | OKKK |
|  | **U** | UC16 | 2 |  | 2 | Medium | The main success scenario is describing the UI.  Check item 2. |  | OKKK. |
|  | **T, U, G** | Test Cases |  |  | 8 | Important | “Attempt to register with a password not meeting complexity criteria (e.g., too short, missing special characters).”  We could not find the complexity criteria for passwords. For example, what is “too short”?  It is not in the glossary, not in the supporting requirements or use cases. In use cases, it seems left as an open issue. |  | If missing say |
|  | **I** |  | 5 |  | 1 | Little | “achievced” -> “achieved” | Accepted | In the document the spelling of achieved has been fixed. |
|  | **I** | Issues | 4 |  | 3 | Medium | We should have updated the status of open issues at the end of iteration 3. I would suggest reassigning them to another iteration | Accepted | The open issue in the third iteration plan assigned to Iteration 4. |
|  | **I** | Assessments | 5 |  | 8 | Important | The iteration should be assessed in terms of the high-level objectives of this iteration. Revise the assessments table and break it down to the high-level objectives of this iteration. You can also add the software testing in the assessment section | Rejected | We have already high level objectives and their assessment. Also, in the evaluation against objectives part, the success rate of the tests was mentioned |
|  | **I** | High level objectives | 1,2 |  | 8 | Important | According to the project plan the third iteration is supposed to be an elaboration iteration. However, we could not find the architecture design nor the completion of the requirement gathering in the high-level objectives of this iteration. | Accepted |  |
|  | **N** | Assessments | 5 |  | 8 | Important | The iteration should be assessed in terms of the high-level objectives of this iteration. Revise the assessments table and break it down to the high-level objectives of this iteration. You can also add the software testing in the assessment section | Rejected | In the next iteration plan, high level objectives are written. However, since fourth iteration has not been completed yet, assessment cannot be done. |
|  | **P** |  |  |  | 8 | Important | The “Project Plan” document is missing in the iteration 3 folder.  Upon inspection, we found the latest version of the project plan was published on November 2nd, in Iteration 2 folder. If that is true, please update the lessons learned section at the end of each iteration, and put it into Iteration 3 folder. | Accepted | Revised artifactste unutma |
|  | **A, U** |  | 10 |  | 3 | Medium | Does the use case view is for use case diagram?  If that is the case, it does not reflect the use cases fully. For example,  1- There is only one actor, “User”. There should be supporting actors like “payment authority”.  2- Not all use case names exist in the diagram.  Upon inspection, we found your use case diagram in iteration 2 folder. Please put that into your architecture notebook. | Accepted | Use case diagram and explanation is updated accordingly. |
|  | **A** | Revision table | 1 |  | 6 | Little | The format in the table is inconsistent with the general format. | Rejected | It is not. |
|  | **A** | Heading |  |  | 8 | Little | The version number is missing in the heading. | Accepted | Added. |
|  | **A** | 7 | 5 |  | 8 | Important | Some more concepts could be included in the domain model. For example, “Restaurant Manager”. | Accepted | Restaurant manager and waitstaff is added. |
|  | **A** | 7 | 5 |  | 8 | Important | The cardinalities are missing in the domain model. | Accepted | Added. |
|  | **A** | 7 | 5 |  | 8 | Important | The attributes seem insufficient. For example, the restaurant information is “restaurant name, cuisine, capacity, max group size, and short description” in your glossary, but your domain model does not reflect that information. | Accepted | Added. |
|  | **A, G** | 7 | 5 |  | 7 | Important | In the domain model, some attributes are missing in the glossary. For example, “Restaurant” has an “address” in your diagram, but it is not in the glossary. | Accepted | Address is discarded, description is used in the Restaurant collections. |
|  | **A** | 6 | 4-5 | - | 9 | Little | While the architecture supports scalability, consider leveraging auto-scaling of cloud services or a backup server with some load balancer to better manage sudden spikes in usage. | Rejected | Firebase supports load balancing. |
|  | **A** | 6 | 4-5 | - | 8 | Important | There should be an architectural mechanism to address your privacy and security requirements given in System-Wide Requirements 6.4 Page 7 | Accepted | A new architectural mechanism is added. |
|  | **A** | 9 | 6 |  | 8 | Important | Class diagram doesn’t exist in the Architectural views section. | Accepted | Added. |
|  | **A** | Assumpttions and Dependencies => Assumptions | 2 |  | 8 | Important | What is Moderate load. You can define it in terms of objective metrics (Concurrent connections, Requests per second …) of your choosing. | Accepted | Defined. |
|  | **A** | Assumpttions and Dependencies => Assumptions | 2 |  | 8 | Important | Please specify which standards you are adopting to achieve your architectural goals, for example, SO/IEC 27001 for security standards, ISTQB for testing … | Accepted | Specified. |
|  | **A** | Assumpttions and Dependencies => Dependencies | 2 |  | 8 | Important | you did not mention any external dependencies however on section 4 of the architectural notebook “Architecturally Significant Requirements” you mentioned the need to integrate with restaurant websites, and payment services | Accepted | Added. |
|  | **A** | Assumpttions and Dependencies => Dependencies | 2 |  | 8 | Medium | Since you are deploying the application on the cloud, you can add it as an infrastructure dependency. | Accepted | Added. |
|  | **A** | Assumpttions and Dependencies | 2 |  | 8 | Important | We feel that some architecturally significant assumptions were missing. For example, Number of concurrent users, performance assumptions, user behavior assumptions … | Accepted | 2.5.3 added to System Wide Req. document and referred in Arch. notebook document. |
|  | **A** | Decisions, constraints and Justification => Constraints => Scalability for traffic spikes | 4 |  | 8 | Medium | Please specify what technology will be used for Caching, load balancing, and autoscaling. I am assuming it is Firebase, but not clearly mentioned here | Accepted | Mentioned |
|  | **A** | Architictural Mechanisms | 4,5 |  | 8 | Important | Caching, load balancing, and autoscaling mechanisms should be explained in detail in this section. | Accepted | It is added in Architectural Mechanism section and explained in detail. |
|  | **A** | Architictural View => Operational View | 9 |  | 2 | Medium | Please revise the sequence diagram. The response line should be dashed, indicating the activity of each entity. | Accepted | Responses are dashed now. |
|  | **A, S, V,T** | Heading |  |  | 6 | Little | The version number is missing in the heading.  The date in the revision table and the date in the header are different. |  |  |

Class diagram should include funcitonalieties

Class diagram is for solution domain. Groups of classes in the logical view.

Herhalde restauranın capacity güncellenmesi falan yazmalıyız

Package diagram to show the decomposition, layers modules etc.

Kendime not, fark etmemişler ama implementation documenttaki restoran capacity - workhours arrayini falan design neye evrildiyse o şekilde güncelleyelim..

takip edebilmek için kendi maddelerimiz sarı ile renklendirdim. - tunalı

filter list: list/options of filters to select specific conditions.--OK

reservations page: the page where users’ reservations are displayed. It is diners’ reservations if the diner is logged in, whereas it is the restaurants’ reservations if the restaurant staff is logged in.--OK