Upload your file   Review   Give Feedback on Reviews   Check scores

Introduction   List of reviews   Read Review 0   Give Feedback on 0

View Reviews and Give Feedback on Reviews

During this phase you are to view the reviews your file has generated.

Warning: You need to submit feedback for this review.

Introduction

During this phase you are to view the reviews your file has generated. You should also grade these reviews and provide a comment on the reasoning behind your grading. Note that you should not provide personal information in these comments and you are anonymous for the student that reviewed your file. However, you are not anonymous to the teacher.

Upload your file   Review   Give Feedback on Reviews   Check scores

Introduction   List of reviews   Read Review 0   Give Feedback on 0

Your reviews

- Review # 0 (You have not given feedback on this review)
- Review # 1 (You have not given feedback on this review)
- Review # 2 (You have not given feedback on this review)
- Review # 3 (You have not given feedback on this review)

Review # 0 on your file

Comment on Clarity

For documentation/diagrams: Language is English and I couldn't find any bigger mistakes.

Notation and layout - The diagrams are easy to read and seems to be mostly correct. For the sequence diagram I would remove the start menu part and only have the input for the methods. So for input sequence diagram I would start at your 1.1.2. In Appling UML and Sequence patterns (3rd edition) page 275/960 the inputs from the user is lines without dots. And dotted lines are only used when a method is returning a value. I also think that instead of "insert option" it could be with the variable name and type.

Naming of classes follow the rules of thumb - Yes looks okay

For code:

Indentation and formatting of blocks is correct and consequent. - yes for the most part. However there are some minor things that can be fixed example from MemberCreationMenu there are some "{" with a space before and some without. You can have a space before all "{" or no space att all. Example "private boolean isValid(String input){" and "public void showInstruction( ) {".

Naming of classes/operations/attributes and arguments are consequent and use real words. - Yes, I find that the names are understandable.

The code is generally readable and understandable. - Yes

Comments are readable and in English - Yes. However some parts are having out commented that is not in use and seems to be comments made by one developer to the other developer working with the project before the final hand in just remove it. Example line 39 to 50 in the Member class.

Grade

2. Sufficient - Written in english, proper naming, and mostly correct UML notation. It may have defects/or be wrong but it is readable.

Comment on Completeness

Should contain at least one UML class diagram at the design level - Yes it has a classdiagram. I would add some more attributes and methods and not only the class names.

does

Should contain an executable version alternatively instructions on how to run the system - Yes, it does contain a runnable jar-file. It would have been nice with some simple instructions of how to run the jar-file.

Can you run the system? - Yes it works.

Are all requirements working in the running system? - No, from the requirements "Simple error handling. The application should not crash but it does not need to be user friendly." - It crashes when I try to add a boat to a non-existing member. This could easy be fixed with simple error handling. It also crashes when trying to show the lists when there is no members.
When I had created a member with 0 boats and then added a boat to the member the list still said that the member had 0 boats, so the info was not updated and it did not seem to be added. I cannot upgrade the name of the member.

I think that code is not finished and that the developers are aware of the problems and will go over the requirements and test the functions before the final hand in.

Grade

2. Sufficient - All artifacts are there and contains what it should but may have major defects or the system could not be run easily.

Comment on Content

~~printouts in the model, etc.~~ - Yes

Is the design and implementation object oriented? - Yes

I think this part was good and I cannot come up with any more improvements.

Grade

3. Good - A most of points mentioned are very well covered, but some are lacking.

Give feedback on the review:

You should respond to the review you are given.

- A good review should be truthful (correct)
- A good review should helpful give clues to what is good and what is not and suggest changes.
- A good review should be thorough and complete
- A good review may still be of a different oppinion than yours.

A bad grade does not automatically mean that you or the reviewer gets a low grade, it is an indication of that something is not right. If you think something is wrong with the review, state your view in the comments. Be polite. You are anonymous to the other student but

Upload your file   Review   Give Feedback on Reviews   Check scores

Introduction   List of reviews   Read Review 0   Give Feedback on 0

this reviewer would have liked?

Warning: This Feedback is not complete.

Comment on what you learned from this review also motivate your grading of this review.

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

(✓) Not graded yet

◯ 0. Not even an attempt - The review has no comments and grading is wrong.

◯ 1. Failed - Most of the review is not correct and fail to motivate the grading.

◯ 2. Sufficient - The review is truthful and motivates grading but the text is sparse, or the review does not seem thourough.

◯ 3. Good - The review is truthful and motivates the grading in a good way. A proper review!

◯ 4. Excellent - The review is truthful, thourough and motivates the grading in a good way. Also the review was helpful and I learned how to write better artifacts(strategy/plan/cases/report) from it

┌─────────────────────────────┐
│   Save review feedback   │
└─────────────────────────────┘

Upload your file   Review   Give Feedback on Reviews   Check scores

Introduction   List of reviews   Read Review 0   Give Feedback on 0

Peer review system

Developed in 2016 by Daniel Toll
in order to allow students to
share and review documents
anonymously.

Contact

Email   daniel.toll@lnu.se

Slack   https://coursepress.slack.com/messa