

## Requirements Phase Defects

### Review Form

Document Title:	Review for “MonitorizareTemeLaborator”	
Reviewer Name:	Alexandru Negru, Emanuel Pop	
Review date:	08.03.2023	

Crt. No.	Checked Item	Doc. page/line	Comments/ improvements
1	D_01	LabAssiAsseRequirements line 4	The data types for the input fields are not specified. We don't know what type of information to expect.
2	D_01	LabAssiAsseRequirements line 7	The data types for the input fields are not specified. We don't know what type of information to expect.
3	D_04	LabAssiAsseRequirements	No specified behaviour for input validation. We don't know what to do in case the data would crash the program.
4	D_02	LabAssiAsseRequirements	Email subject missing information.
5	D_01	LabAssiAsseRequirements	lacks information about user interface: no input type specified, nor GUI, nor parameters
6	D_02	LabAssiAsseRequirements	There are no requirements for the authentication and authorization of the users who can access the application. It is unclear who can perform the CRUD operations on the student entity and who can add, modify, and delete laboratory themes, grades, and feedback.
7	D_03	LabAssiAsseRequirements	The feedback field in F5 is not well defined, and it is not clear what information should be provided in this field.
8	D_04	LabAssiAsseRequirements	It is not mentioned how the initial state of the system will be set up. For example, what will be the initial content of the Students.txt, Assignment.txt, and Catalog.txt files?
9	D_05	LabAssiAsseRequirements	The functions F8 and F9 are missing.

Effort to review document (hours):0.2

Improved program features:

- Displaying all students
- Displaying all homework
- Displaying all the grades
- Add a student
- Add a homework
- Delete a student
- Grade a student
- Delete homework
- Update student data
- Extend homework deadline – Does not work properly!

## Unit Design Phase Defects

### Review Form

Document Title:	Review for “MonitorizareTemeLaborator”	
Reviewer Name:	Alexandru Negru, Emanuel Pop	
Review date:	08.03.2023	

Crt. No.	Checked Item	Doc. page/line	Comments/ improvements
1	D_07	Whole source code	Comments in the source code are rather sparse.
2	D_06	Whole source code	Changes to the program might require a high level of restructuration
3	D_01	Data saving	No database is used
4	D_03	Design document	The design document provides very little information on how errors should be handled.
5	D_02	Whole source code	It is not clear from the code whether all requirements have been accounted for in the architecture. There is no explicit reference to requirements, and it is not clear how they have been incorporated into the architecture.
6	D_05	Whole source code	The used language for the code is split between Romanian and English. The design specifications are in English and the implementation is in Romanian.
7	D_04	Design document	Even if the design file specifies some certain use cases, it does not mention a design pattern.
8	D_05	Whole source code	Code lacks documentation
9	D_02	Design document	The email feature is not mentioned anywhere in the design scheme.
10	D_02	Design document	Chapter 1 – Functional Requirements doesn’t present all the requirements and
11	D_01	Design document	The design doesn’t specify anything about how the data can be handled by which user; there is no login system, apart from the mention of the “teacher actor”

Effort to review document (hours): 2

## Coding Phase Defects

### Review Form

Document Title:	Review for “MonitorizareTemLaborator”	
Reviewer Name:	Alexandru Negru, Emanuel Pop	
Review date:	08.03.2023	

Crt. No.	Checked Item	Doc. page/line	Comments/ improvements
1	D_07	Whole Source Code	Code lacks comments.
2	D_02	UI	The code appears to be missing a section that handles GUI input
3	D_06	Whole Source Code	Naming is not clear, and it skips from Romanian to English very often.
4	D_05	Service	Multiple parameter assignments are unchecked
5	D_01	Extend homework	The functionality does not seem to work.
6	D_04	UI	Even if not an error, the way “cmd” is used can be cumbersome. The usage of numbered case is counter-intuitive.
7	D_01	domain	multiple methods are never used
8	D_05	Repositories	these classes are never used further in the code
9	D_01	Validator	Duplicate conditions that throw different exceptions
10	D_04	Validation	Student name is not validated properly.
11	D_01	Whole source code	Code lacks functionalities present in the requirement. Also, the code does present more functionalities than specified in the design document.
12	D_07	Whole Source Code	Classes, methods and functions lack documentation.
13	D_04	Validation	Incorrectly formatted input files cause the application to crash
14	D_04	UI	If there are no entries in the app, it won't show a message.

Effort to review document (hours): 2