

# Reflection and Traceability Report on Plutos

Team #10, Plutos

Payton Chan

Eric Chen

Fondson Lu

Jason Tan

Angela Wang



# 1 Changes in Response to Feedback

## 1.1 SRS and Hazard Analysis

Table 1: SRS Issues

Issue Number	Source	Issue Title	Addressed?	PR	Comments
<a href="#">105</a>	TA	docs(SRS): Include formal/math specs	✓	<a href="#">300</a>	Added formal math specifications in SRS for OCR model, data constraints, budget calculation and receipt/receipt item data definitions
<a href="#">106</a>	TA	docs(SRS): Add section for "normal operation"	✓	<a href="#">317</a>	Added section for normal operation and use case diagram
<a href="#">107</a>	TA	docs(SRS): Add section for undesired event handling	✓	<a href="#">308</a>	Added section
<a href="#">108</a>	TA	docs(SRS): Add fit criteria to requirements	✓	<a href="#">310</a>	Added fit criteria
<a href="#">109</a>	TA	docs(SRS): Link requirements to rationale section	✓	<a href="#">303</a>	Linked requirements to rationale section
<a href="#">110</a>	TA	docs(SRS): Link likely and unlikely changes to requirements	✓	<a href="#">303</a>	Linked requirements to un/likely changes
<a href="#">38</a>	Peer Review	peer-review[team 23]: OCR system accuracy	✓	—	This was a question, which was answered as a comment in the issue.
<a href="#">39</a>	Peer Review	peer-review[team 23]: OCR pipeline privacy	✓	—	This was a question, which was answered as a comment in the issue.
<a href="#">40</a>	Peer Review	peer-review[team 23]: release platform	✓	<a href="#">310</a>	Changes made
<a href="#">41</a>	Peer Review	peer-review[team23]: Non-Functional Requirements Verifiability	✓	<a href="#">179</a>	Added details to requirements
<a href="#">42</a>	Peer Review	peer-review[team 23]: Ambiguous Response Time Specifications	✓	<a href="#">179</a>	Added details to specifications
<a href="#">43</a>	Peer Review	peer-review[team 23]: Item Recognition and Categorization Requirements	✓	<a href="#">299</a>	Slightly reworded requirements to make them more clear, but the issue was more of a clarification question than feedback
<a href="#">44</a>	Peer Review	peer-review[team 23]: Data retention and Deletion Policies	✓	<a href="#">179</a>	Added more details on policies

Table 2: Hazard Analysis Issues

Issue Number	Source	Issue Title	Addressed?	PR	Comments
<a href="#">111</a>	TA	docs(hazards): Add list of tables	✓	<a href="#">288</a>	Added table
<a href="#">112</a>	TA	docs(hazards): Put constants in constants section	✓	<a href="#">288</a>	Referred to symbolic constants
<a href="#">113</a>	TA	docs(hazards): Fix hazard recommended action	✓	<a href="#">299</a>	Changed recommended action
<a href="#">51</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review (hazards) - Expand Analysis on External System Interactions	✓	<a href="#">311</a>	Added assumption for external systems
<a href="#">52</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review (hazards) - Enhance Network Failure Handling and Data Integrity Measures	✓	<a href="#">185</a>	Added more details
<a href="#">53</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review (hazards) - Improve Hazard Mitigation User Feedback	✓	—	Was already addressed, left comment on issue
<a href="#">54</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review (hazards) - some assumptions needed for user end equipment	✓	<a href="#">187</a>	Added suggested assumptions
<a href="#">55</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review (hazards) - concern about problem resolution	✓	<a href="#">187</a>	Added suggested changes



## 1.2 Design and Design Documentation

Table 3: Design Doc Issues

Issue Number	Source	Issue Title	Addressed?	PR	Comments
<a href="#">233</a>	TA	docs(design): add tests to CI	✓	<a href="#">262</a> , <a href="#">264</a> , <a href="#">258</a>	Added tests to CI
<a href="#">234</a>	TA	docs(design): DetDesDoc syntax - change naming and data types	✓	<a href="#">247</a>	Added suggested changes
<a href="#">235</a>	TA	docs(design): DetDesDoc syntax - add transaction class	✓	<a href="#">313</a>	Updated design docs
<a href="#">236</a>	TA	docs(design): DetDesDoc semantics - add more details to ML/categorization module	✓	<a href="#">247</a>	Added details
<a href="#">237</a>	TA	docs(design): DetDesDoc semantics - add details about calculations	✓	<a href="#">247</a>	Added math specification
<a href="#">238</a>	TA	DetDesDoc semantics - add state diagram	✓	<a href="#">302</a>	Added state diagram to Figma
<a href="#">239</a>	TA	DetDesDoc semantics - add 'main' UI module	✓	<a href="#">302</a>	Adjusted DAG diagram and added Main UI module to module hierarchy and DAG
<a href="#">240</a>	TA	DetDesDoc semantics - exception handling specs	✓	<a href="#">302</a>	Added exception handling section for item misclassification
<a href="#">158</a>	Peer Review	Module hierarchy diagram Link Issue	✓	<a href="#">302</a>	Adjusted DAG diagram
<a href="#">159</a>	Peer Review	OCR Processing Module Issue	✓	<a href="#">302</a>	Added exception handling section for OCR module
<a href="#">160</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review - Limited Discussion on Module-Level Secrets	✓	<a href="#">313</a>	Added module secrets to image processing and categorization modules
<a href="#">161</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review - Limited Error Handling Descriptions	×		
<a href="#">162</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review - Ambiguity in Access Routine Semantics	✓	<a href="#">320</a>	Added some more details on state. Many of the modules do not have an attached state though so they do not have the pre/post conditions set.
<a href="#">163</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review - Hyperlink in section 5	✓	<a href="#">186</a>	Fixed



### 1.3 VnV Plan and Report

Table 4: VnV Plan Issues

Issue Number	Source	Issue Title	Addressed?	PR	Comments
<a href="#">118</a>	TA	docs(vnv): add captions for tables	✓	<a href="#">241</a>	Added captions
<a href="#">119</a>	TA	docs(vnv): add to testing plan	✓	<a href="#">290</a>	Adjust functional testing criteria.
<a href="#">120</a>	TA	docs(vnv): system tests for FRs	✓	<a href="#">290</a>	Adjust control of system tests.
<a href="#">121</a>	TA	docs(vnvplan): specify usability survey as extra	✓	—	Switched Extra2 to user manual
<a href="#">71</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review - Acronyms table missing content	✓	<a href="#">188</a>	Added missing acronyms
<a href="#">72</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review - Enhance Usability and OCR Accuracy Test Scenarios	✓	<a href="#">188</a>	Added details
<a href="#">73</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review - Incomplete Error Handling and Recovery Test Cases	✓	<a href="#">194</a> , <a href="#">197</a>	Added more details
<a href="#">74</a>	Peer Review	Automated Testing and Verification Tools	×	—	Daily sanity checks aren't necessary as we are running the tests and linter pipelines on every PR. This will ensure that the app/features work seamlessly after every change.
<a href="#">75</a>	Peer Review	Load Testing for Concurrent Users	✓	—	Already addressed in initial version of VnVPlan 'Performance tests can be conducted to measure the app's speed and reliability, especially when processing large receipts or handling multiple users'.
<a href="#">85</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review - Enhance Testing for Data Persistence During App Crashes	✓	<a href="#">312</a>	Added Usability Test to cover data retention during unexpected crashes.



Table 5: VnV Report Issues

Issue Number	Source	Issue Title	Addressed?	PR	Comments
<a href="#">304</a>	TA	docs(vnv report): add more details to verifiability of tests	✓	<a href="#">316</a>	Add specific test details
<a href="#">265</a>	Peer Review	Peer Review - The lost xlsx file in hyperlink	✓	<a href="#">291</a>	Fixed
<a href="#">266</a>	Peer Review	Missing Functionality	✓	<a href="#">306</a>	A couple of the FRs weren't implemented yet during the initial draft of VnVReport - they have now been implemented. As for account update and notifications, we felt that for the scope of the project, these functionalities would be able to be implemented later.
<a href="#">267</a>	Peer Review	Reduced accuracy	✓	<a href="#">306</a>	Added more reasoning as to why we decreased accuracy threshold.
<a href="#">268</a>	Peer Review	Reduced accuracy	✓	<a href="#">316</a>	Multiple NFRs have already been tested (NFR-ACC-1, NFR-ACC-3, NFR-MTB-1) before this issue. Added details to some more NFRs in new PR.
<a href="#">269</a>	Peer Review	Lack of Detailed Analysis for Performance Test Omissions	✓	<a href="#">318</a>	Added rationale to test case omission
<a href="#">270</a>	Peer Review	Unclear Implications of Security and Legal Compliance Testing	✓	<a href="#">309</a>	Added more details

## 2 Challenge Level and Extras

### 2.1 Challenge Level

The expected challenge level is **general**. The primary challenge of the project is developing a machine learning model that can accurately parse items from a picture of a receipt, and to categorize them into appropriate spending categories. This requires a strong understanding of training and tuning models on image data to achieve high accuracy. Additionally, different items across various stores may have similar names or be difficult to recognize, which adds to the complexity of the task. The other part of the project is to develop a user-friendly mobile application, which is a more general software engineering component.

### 2.2 Extras

1. **Requirements elicitation report:** We have conducted interviews and a survey to gather requirements from potential users to determine user needs and preferences, and document the findings in a report. See [Requirements Elicitation Report](#).
2. **User manual:** We have created a user manual to help users understand how to use the application and its features. See [User Manual](#).

## 3 Design Iteration (LO11 (PrototypeIterate))

[Explain how you arrived at your final design and implementation. How did the design evolve from the first version to the final version? —TPLT]

[Don't just say what you changed, say why you changed it. The needs of the client should be part of the explanation. For example, if you made changes in response to usability testing, explain what the testing found and what changes it led to. —TPLT]

## 4 Design Decisions (LO12)

[Reflect and justify your design decisions. How did limitations, assumptions, and constraints influence your decisions? Discuss each of these separately. —TPLT]

## 5 Economic Considerations (LO23)

There is a clear growing market for budgeting and personal finance tools, especially amongst university students and young adults. Young adults often face financial challenges during their early years of living independently, and are also often unaware of the costs of living, driving the need for budgeting tools. However, being university students and young adults ourselves, we understand the barrier to entry to start budgeting is high. As well, current budgeting tools

are often too complex and overwhelming for young adults to use, which is what drives the need for Plutos – a simple yet effective way to track expenses and budget using receipt photo scanning.

Marketing Plutos would involve a combination of digital outreach and grass-roots efforts. This could include social media advertising (especially on platforms like Instagram and TikTok), collaborations with student organizations, and targeted campaigns during back-to-school periods. Additionally, in-person promotion at campus events and integration with student services at universities could help increase visibility and adoption.

Since the overhead cost of developing and maintaining Plutos is low, we would host the product on Google Play Store and Apple App Store for free because we understand students wouldn't want to pay for a budgeting tool. However, we would offer a premium tier to allow users to utilize additional features such as advanced analytics, bank account integration, budgeting suggestions and exporting budgeting data to a PDF or CSV. We estimate the cost of premium services to be \$1.99/month and with 105 monthly users, we'd be able to make money and cover the costs of maintaining the app (since the app is low cost and will only require \$210/month to operate).

We believe this target is feasible as we have already surveyed 20 students and all of them expressed interest in using Plutos. With a potential user base of 40,000 students just at McMaster University alone and our marketing plan, we believe that everyone can use Plutos immediately.

## **6 Reflection on Project Management (LO24)**

### **6.1 How Does Your Project Management Compare to Your Development Plan**

Our team followed the development plan as outlined in the SRS Development Plan section. We adhered to the planned meetings, communication methods, assigned roles, and workflow structure. The project was structured into phases, and we prioritized high-priority functional requirements as scheduled. While some deadlines were subject to change, we adapted accordingly to ensure steady progress.

At the start of the project, we had a general idea of using an OCR model to extract data from receipts, but we weren't committed to a specific tool. Throughout the development process, we experimented with a few different OCR models to see which one would work best for our needs. After testing and comparing results, we ultimately decided to use Tesseract, which is an open-source OCR engine developed by Google.

Tesseract provided the balance we were looking for in terms of accuracy and ease of integration. While some of the other models we tried had certain strengths, Tesseract performed consistently across a wide range of receipt types, and it was easier to work with in our app's pipeline. Even though we didn't plan on using it from the beginning, the decision to pivot toward Tesseract ended up

being a good one for the project.

## 6.2 What Went Well?

Our capstone group worked well together, maintaining strong organization and collaboration throughout the project. Meetings and clear communication ensured that everyone stayed on track with their tasks. Each team member effectively contributed to their assigned roles, which helped keep development on schedule.

A key success was the OCR model used to parse receipts. It met our expected accuracy, allowing us to extract and categorize receipt data effectively. This was essential for the project's goal of creating an innovative expense-tracking budgeting app.

## 6.3 What Went Wrong?

Like any project, we encountered some challenges along the way. There were occasional difficulties in coordinating schedules, especially when balancing course-work with project deadlines.

In terms of workflow, there were moments where certain tasks took longer than expected due to debugging and integration challenges. However, the team adapted and adjusted the timeline as needed.

In terms of tools, one of the main challenges was our initial unfamiliarity with OCR models. Since most of us had limited prior experience working with OCR technology, there was a learning curve when it came to understanding how different models worked, how to train or fine-tune them, and how to handle various types of receipt formats. It took time to experiment with different models and figure out how to integrate them into our pipeline effectively.

## 6.4 What Would you Do Differently Next Time?

For future projects, we would aim to refine our approach to time management by setting aside more buffer time for debugging and testing. While our communication was strong, we could improve further by implementing more structured progress tracking to ensure that any potential delays are addressed earlier.

# 7 Reflection on Capstone

[This question focuses on what you learned during the course of the capstone project. —TPLT]

## 7.1 Which Courses Were Relevant

[Which of the courses you have taken were relevant for the capstone project? —TPLT]

## 7.2 Knowledge/Skills Outside of Courses

[What skills/knowledge did you need to acquire for your capstone project that was outside of the courses you took? —TPLT]