# Received reviews and my feedback

## Review #0 on my file

**Comment on Clarity**
All the formalities are satisfied and the assignment looks very good when it comes to syntax and formal requirements as far as I can see. The language is English, the UML syntax is valid, naming is performed in a consistent manner. The diagram was easy to read and so was also the accompanying text. Descriptive names are used for classes and associations.

Grade 4.

**Comment on Completeness**
There are indeed two class diagrams of the right type present. All requirements are considered and it's easy to see which requirement is handled in which diagram. I'll go into some suggestions regarding what could be added, changed or removed in the next comment section.

Grade 3.

**Comment on Content**
The three main concepts (Member, Boat and Berth) are all handled in the model and the membership fee is also present. Reservation of a berth is part of the model but history of reservations is not handled (at least not in an obvious way). I would suggest some kind of allocation/rent/reservation-class with associations to the MembershipFee, Berth and Boat classes. In the list of conceptual categories that is presented in the course book (Larman 2004, p. 140-141) business transactions are described as critical, so it should at least be considered. Having a class for the transaction could maybe in part also solve the problem of having a history of past reservations. The berth fee could also be put in a separate class or maybe the MembershipFee could be remodeled to include date information as described by Larman (2004, p. 512-522). This would both be needed if the fee was to change and could in any case be useful since the fee is dependent on when the berth is rented. I think it was the right decision to write a separate domain model for the authenticate domain and schedule could also be a candidate for its own domain. Perhaps the Secretary isn't needed in the model – there are some parallels to the not modelled administrator in the schedule example used in the lectures. When it comes to attributes one could argue that something like the image of the boat is unnecessary in the domain model and doesn't add to the understanding of the problem. Larman (2004, p. 158) writes "Include requirements (for example, use cases) suggest […]" On the other hand – it is mentioned in the requirements and a further discussion with the users/experts might reveal its importance in some way which would justify it in the model. Lastly: it was very interesting to look at your model and I got several ideas on how I might improve my own model. Thank you!

Grade 3.

## My feedback on review #0:

Your review gave me a lot of helpful suggestions as to what might be missing in my domain model for it to contain all potential classes found in the problem description and use cases. I agree that the history of reservations are not handled in an obvious way in my domain model and that I should add a class for reservations.

I interpret your suggestion to add a class for transactions, is to handle the payment from a member to the boat club. If so, that class was omitted because it was not a part of the requirements for grade 2. Though I might have misunderstood you on that part.

These are my thoughts when it comes to the suggestion to edit the MembershipFee class:
The problem description states the following about the membership fee: "The fee consists of a fixed part and a variable part, where the variable component is dependent on the number and the size of the boats." This is what I based my MembershipFee class on. I did not include a date in the MembershipFee class, since neither the problem description nor the requirements stated that the MembershipFee would change during the season, other than when the variable part of the MembershipFee is changed due to a newly registered boat. Because of this, I see the suggested date attribute in MembershipFee as unnecessary.

I agree with making the Berth class attribute fee a separate class. It would make it more clear as to what is 'captured-on' the MembershipFee.

The rest of your suggestions I agree with. The Secretary might be unnecessary, but it is included in the domain model to make it easier for a rookie like me to better understand it. The Boat class attribute image could definitely be omitted depending on how important it is for the users/experts.

Your review was helpful, thorough and complete. It was interesting to hear your thoughts and to have another set of eyes looking at my domain model.

Grade 4.

# Review #1 on my file

**Comment on Clarity**
The models is understandable without the text. It would look better with a space after columns (e.g fixedCost:Money think about "fixedCost: Money") .

Grade 3.

**Comment on Completeness**
The zero before the * is not necessary see pdf-page 250 in Applying UML and patterns 3rd edition (figure 9.14). The other parts of the models looks good with the names and attributes which makes the model looks good.

Grade 3.

**Comment on Content**
Since The conceptual class BoatClub has a specific purpose I would recommend to keep it and membership fees is handled in the model. All three main concepts are included (Boat, Berth, Member). The model focus more on problem solving and does that very well.

Grade 3.

# My feedback on review #1:
I agree with the following things that you point out:
There definitely should be space between the attributes and their data types. I'm going to fix this.
Changing the 0..* to only * is also correct and something that I will do.

However, I do not agree with my model being more focused on problem solving than problem understanding. Problem solving is about *how* a system is supposed to do something (Design), as opposed to problem understanding that focuses on *what* a system is supposed to do (Analysis). I feel that my model is more focused on problem understanding and *what* the system is supposed to do, since it does not even contain any methods/operations/functions.

Your review was kind of short, but still points out some good things. I, for example, learned that I should not use 0..*, which is good to know. And that the notes I provided maybe was a bit redundant, since the information was already present in the model.

You get a 2, because your review is truthful and motivates the grading, but the text is sparse. Still, I understand that one can not write an essay just for the sake of making the review feel fuller.

Grade 2.

# Review #2 on my file

## Comment on Clarity
Language is generally good and easy to understand. Some verbs, however, do not describe clearly the relationships between classes (like has-amount and captured-on).

Grade 2.

## Comment on Completeness
The diagram is domain class diagram as describes real-world entities and relationships between them.

Grade 3.

## Comment on Content
- Model does not show directions. According to Chapter 9, Section 14 [1], arrows help indicate the direction to read. If not present, the convention is that directions go top to bottom and left to right
- BoatClub is not needed, as it doesn't help describe the problem domain.
- Model does not show history of reservations.

References
[1] C. Larman, Applying UML and Patterns: An Introduction to Object-Oriented Analysis and Design and Iterative Development (3rd Edition), Addison Wesley Professional, 2004.

Grade 3.

## My feedback on review #2:

I agree that the association between Berth captured-on MembershipFee might not clearly describe the relationship between the two classes. However, you did not give me any suggestion on how I could possibly fix the problem. Renamed the association? Made the berth fee into a separate class which in turn was captured-on the MembershipFee? I would have loved some suggestions on the Member has-amount MembershipFee also.

The reason the model does not show directions in the form of arrows is because it, as you stated with the help of your reference, already uses the top-to-bottom and left-to-right reading direction. In the cases that the direction is reversed, I have used an arrow. (See Berth and Secretary + Berth and MembershipFee)

I personally feel that the BoatClub class made the model easier to read, but I understand that to others it might seem redundant. So I partially agree with you on that one.

I also agree that the model does not show the history of reservations. I would have loved some suggestions to how to fix it and where it would fit in with the rest of the model.

Overall I feel that I have gotten some good pointers from you as to what is wrong or should be changed in my model, but less so *how* I should change it and how to make it better. Your review is sparse, but truthful and motivated the grading, hence the grade 2.

Grade 2.