Peer-Review 2 - Review Report

DAT232 / DIT285 Advanced requirements engineering

Reviewer group name: Group 22
Reviewed group name: Group 14
Reviewed document: group14_Requirement_Document-1

Review Planning Report:

We will use the checklist from the lecture, Fig 9.2A-9.4A, to plan the review.

Content
- **Background:** Check that the system scope and purpose are clearly described.
- **Business goals, tracing in the report:** Verify that goals can be traced to specific requirements.
- **Stakeholders and rationale:** Ensure all stakeholders are identified and each requirement has justification.
- **Completeness:** Check that all key functional and non-functional requirements are included.

Structure
- **Number and ID:** There is a unique ID for each requirement.
- **Testability:** Requirements are able to be tested, measured.
- **Consistency:** Consistency in the requirements, language and structure.
- **Organization:** Is the report structured in a good way with tables, sections etc.

Consistency
- **No contradictions:** Are the requirements aligned with each other, no contradiction.
- **Model alignment:** Are ER-diagrams, use case diagrams well aligned.
- **Terminology:** Consistency in terminology.
- **Cross-chapter check:** Ensure consistency between sections (Function requirements, System requirements, Quality requirements).

Surroundings
- **Risk assessment:** Identify potential technical or business risks.
- **Meaningful:** Are requirements meaningful and realistic?

CRUD Matrix
- Check Create, Read, Update, Delete for every Entity.

Prioritized List of Issues:

The priority scale used is P0-P5, where the P0 is the most critical and P5 is optional improvements.

- P0 = Critical / must fix immediately
- P1 = Very high priority
- P2 = High priority
- P3 = Medium priority
- P4 = Low priority
- P5 = Suggestion / optional improvement

Contents check	Observations - found & missing	Problem?	Priority
Version History	Missing	Missing Version History part to record process of report.	P0
Context Diagram	Missing	Missing some stakeholders(university etc.) in Context Diagram. And it's better to have a boundary to define a scope.	P1
2.2 Functional Requirements - AI feature	Unclear	The details of the AI Function ("use of AI to create customize badges") lacks definition	P2
Business Case - investment gain	Contradicting the survey	The business goal to make a profit of the app mentions to have premium subscriptions, but in the survey people answered that they stopped using similar apps because of paywall access.	P4
2.2 Functional Requirements - Motivational feature	Unmeasureable	Phrases like "the pet encourages the user" are not testable. Any kind of behavioral criteria are missing.	P3
2.3 Quality Requirements	Missing Verification Method	Numeric targets are present but any kind of testing procedure or	P3

		measurements are not provided with each QR.	

Structure check	Observations - found & missing	Problem?	Priority
1.2.1, 2.2, 2.4 3.1	Missing IDs, traceability	Missing IDs on many requirements which makes the report have weak traceability. Would be helpful for clarity with identification for each requirement, and also easier to connect them with each other.	P0
2.2 Measure of Functional requirements	Missing	Some functional requirements lack measurable success criteria(quantitative thresholds).	P0
3.4 Acceptance Tests	Missing	The section is left blank. No validation or test cases are mentioned,	P1
1.3 Core functionality	Found	Some use cases are long with a lot of different actions in one. Could be beneficial to divide some of them into more. For example UC1, UC3, UC5.	P3
1.3 Core functionality	Found and missing	I feel like the table with the use cases are redundant to the text above. It confuses me since there is not that detailed information about each use case in the table. If it's necessary, UC7 and UC8 are missing in the table.	P3

| 2.3 Detailed QR | Found | No problem but the QR are very clear and good. Very consistent in the structure and everyone is measurable in a good way. | - |

Consistency check	Observations - found & missing	Problem?	Priority
2.1.1 ER-Diagram	Inconsistent	The description of the ER diagram is inconsistent with the actual diagram(The diagram is Class diagram).	P0
2.3.6	Inconsistent and contradicting traceability	QR-06 is referring to the business goal trust, but there are no BG about trust	P0
1.3-3.1	Inconsistent naming	Terms such as "Virtual Pet", "Vpet", "Game", "AI Companion"are used continuously with proper definition.	P4

Surroundings check	Observations - found & missing	Problem?	Priority
2.1 Data Requirements	Missing Security details	Database Encryption, access control or data storage policies are missing. This leads to a weak environmental explanation.	P1
3.3 Detailed Data Requirements			

CRUD Matrix:

Entity **Task**	User	Task	Subscription	Virtual Pet	Item	Category	Admin
Registration/Login	C R						
Task Management		C R U D				R	
View Statistics	R	R					
Interact with Virtual Pet				R U	R		
Change Task Status		U					
Customize Virtual pet				U			
Manage Subscription			C R				
Delete Account	D						

In the CRUD Matrix above, we marked each entity mentioned in the Requirement Document along with its related CRUD operations that we have funded. You could use this to supplement the functional requirements that you think necessary. (Since we think it is not necessary to list all of CRUD operations for every entity, you could determine them based on your own considerations.)