

Peer-Review 2: Protocollo di Comunicazione

Antonio Mercurio, Michele Lorenzo Miranda, Alessandro Mosconi

Gruppo 41

Valutazione della documentazione del protocollo di comunicazione del gruppo 42.

Lati positivi

The sequence diagrams are well done: in every scenario the team represented the communication and interaction of the server with multiple clients. The overall document was easy to read and understand.

Lati negativi

We think that the communication protocol is good, but there are small suggestions that we would like to point out:

1. **Error management:** we think that errors might be handled in a more detailed way instead of sending a NACK message for every kind of issue (i.e. the player couldn't join because the match already started, because there are no seats left, etc..)
2. **Communication type:** how does the communication work? JSON, XML? The types of the messages' arguments are not specified, although most of the times they were comprehensible. We think that underlying these aspects would help a lot the readability of the document.
3. **Turn management:** we did not understand how the game phases are handled. When does a turn finish? It might be that there's this piece of the mechanics still missing.

Confronto

One of the biggest differences between the two protocols is that the one designed by team 41 is able to send multiple messages concurrently, which is something we did not think of and that at the moment we are not capable of doing.

Our sequence diagrams did not cover all the possible scenarios and we will surely fix and enrich our communication protocol by taking some hints from this one.

Regarding the ping procedure we have put ping messages both from the client and for the server, instead of pinging only from the server to the client.

Another difference we want to underline is that the other group's server sends a message to the client to let it know that the previous message has been received.

The way we designed it, instead, is by only sending error messages: we assume that, in the case the communication is working as expected, the client receives the next phase's message instead of an acknowledgment one.