

## Peer review for

Jakob Heyder and Walid Balegh

by Pär Eriksson and Oskar Emilsson

The domain model you have submitted is clear and quite easy to follow. The naming convention of the classes, attributes and association is good. Your domain model could very well pass grade 2, but there are a few things we would like to point out.

According to Larman, associations usually implies that a relationship needs to persist for some time [1, p246]. So for example, is there a need to preserve the “made-by” relationship between `Payment` and `Member`? In bigger projects, too many association lines can obscure information in the model [1, p247].

The `Calendar-Event` object *could* be split into two separate objects. An `Event` object could have information about an event, and then have a multiplicity association to a `Calendar` for example.

As a minor note, some directional arrows are facing the wrong way, more specifically the arrows for `Member` to `Calendar-Events` and between `Treasurer` and `Payment`.

The `Assignment-Rule` are somewhat confusing, what is the purpose and why is there a dotted line that connects an association.

We believe a domain expert, like the secretary, could understand the model thanks to the fact the model is small and doesn't have too many associations cluttering it. Good job!

## References

1. Larman C., Applying UML and Patterns 3rd Ed, 2005, ISBN: 0131489062