|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **REVIEW DOCUMENT** | | | | | | | |
| Start Date: 26.11.2023 | | | |  | | | |
| Project Name: ToGather | | | | Number of Pages: | | | |
| Product Name: ToGather | | | | Product Definition: | | | |
| Roles: | Review Leader: | | | Ezgi Tunalı | | | |
| Reviewers: | | | *1. Ezgi Tunalı* | | | *3. Umut Güler* |
| *2. Ezgi Erkaş* | | | *4. Mustafa Zemin* |
| Review Materials: | * *Vision (V)* * *Glossary (G)* * *Use Case Model (U)* * *System-Wide Requirements (S)* * *Risk List (R)* * *Project Plan (P)* * *Work Items List (W)* * *Next Iteration’s Plan (N)* * *Architecture Notebook (A)* * *Design (D)* * *Implementation (I)* * *Executables (E)* | | | | | | |
| Total Number of Errors: 3 | | | | | | | |
| Assessment Status: | | | ACCEPTED  15 as it is  0\_ with rework | | REJECTED  15 review again | | |
| ERROR TYPES | | | | | | | |
| Error Type Number | | Error Type Definition | | | | Number of Errors Found | |
| 1 | | Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc) | | | | 6 | |
| 2 | | Inconsistency with the standards | | | | 2 | |
| 3 | | Uncertain | | | |  | |
| 4 | | Incorrect | | | |  | |
| 5 | | Inapplicable | | | | 3 | |
| 6 | | Internal Inconsistency | | | | 3 | |
| 7 | | External Inconsistency | | | | 1 | |
| 8 | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | | | | 12 | |
| 9 | | Other | | | | 3 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 30 | |
| Importance Types | | Importance Type | | | | Number of Errors Found | |
|  | | Little | | | | 15 | |
|  | | Medium | | | | 9 | |
|  | | Important | | | | 6 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 30 | |

| **No** | **Reviewed**  **Material**  **ID** | **Section** | **Page** | **Line/**  **No** | **Error**  **Type** | **Importance** | **Explanation** | **Correction Status** | **Correction**  **Explanation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **N** | **Iteration Plan 2** |  |  | **Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing** | **High** | **Assessment against evaluation criteria, other concerns and deviation, and Work Items: Planned compared to actually completed parts are missing. Some of the evaluation criteria such as test results can be evaluated.** | Accepted | Suggestion applied. |
| **2** | **N** | **Iteration Plan 3** |  |  | **Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing** | **High** | **Although it is written that 7 of the use cases will be developed, 11 use cases are said to be written in fully dressed style.** | Rejected | Use cases can be written in fully-dressed style before they are developed. |
| **3** | **N** | **Iteration Plan 3** |  |  | **Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing** | **Medium** | **Assessment against evaluation criteria, other concerns and deviation parts are missing** | Accepted | Suggestion applied. |
| **4** | **U** | **UC\_Create Task** |  |  | **Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc)** | **Little** | **In the sentence of “Users must be Logged-in to the ToGather App” uppercase L can be written as lowercase letter.** | Accepted | Suggestion applied |
| **5** | **U** | **UC\_Remove Task** |  |  | **Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing** | **Medium** | **There can be written an extension for the scenario user chooses wrong task to remove** | Accepted | According to the class discussion, we conclude that, system can ask about whether the user is sure or not. So, UC updated this way. |
| **6** | **U** | **UC\_Update Task** |  |  | **Other** | **Little** | **The version and the date of the document is old.** | Rejected | 15/11/2023 (Rev 1.0) is the latest version of the document and there are no updates since then. |
| **7** | **U** | **Brief** |  |  | **Inapplicable** | **High** | **The brief document is missing under v2, so the feedback is provided according to the document under v1 folder.** | Accepted | Since there were no updates on brief use case document, we didn’t put it into v2 documents. |
| **8** | **U** | **Brief** |  | **5.14, 5.15, 5.16, 5.19** | **Internal Inconsistency** | **Little** | **Some use cases include if phrases. Each use case should be written for the main success scenario, for consistency maybe.** | Rejected | We used if statements in some parts of the document, but we didn’t consider them as extensions. We wrote brief use cases according to the main success scenarios, so we don’t think there are any inconsistencies. |
| **9** | **U** | **Brief** |  | **Revision** | **Other** | **Little** | **Writing changes explicitly may be better for the traceability.** | Rejected | We give reference to the related review report for the changes in the revision table, in which the applied changes are written in detail. So we didn’t think it was needed to write it again in the revision table explicitly. |
| **10** | **U** | **4 (set profile)** |  | **Revision** | **Other** | **Little** | **Writing changes explicitly may be better for the traceability.** | Rejected | We give reference to the related review report for the changes in the revision table, in which the applied changes are written in detail. So we didn’t think it was needed to write it again in the revision table explicitly. |
| **11** | **G** | **Glossary** |  |  | **Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc)** | **Little** | **In the following sentence “a” should be used instead of “an”.**  **It is an content”** | Accepted | Suggestion applied. |
| **12** | **G** | **Glossary** |  |  | **Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc)** | **Little** | **While most of the terms start with uppercase letter, some of them start with lowercase.** | Accepted | Suggestion applied. |
| **13** | **D** | **Design** |  |  | **Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing** | **High** | **Subsystms part is missing. There can be a subsystem like User Authentication and Authorization Subsystem, schedule management system.** | Rejected | There are no subsystems in our system. |
| **14** | **D** | **Design** |  |  | **Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing** | **Medium** | **Additional scenarios part is missing.** | Rejected | Since the heading is “Basic Scenario”, we thought that MSS is enough for this part. |
| **15** | **W** | **WorkItemsList** |  |  | **Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing** | **Little** | **Some priority cells are blank, they should be filled.** | Rejected | Some of the work items are broken down into pieces and these child work items are dependent on the main item, so they don’t have their own priority values. |
| **16** | **P** | **Project Plan - Project Organization** | **1-2** |  | **Inconsistency with the standards** | **Little** | **The term “any role” for the role of the team members should be defined more implicitly, rather than being defined in the “title” part.** | Rejected | Team members’ primary roles are defined in parenthesis. Any role means team members can do other jobs other than their main responsibilities if needed. Also, responsibilities of primary roles are explained in detail in the table. |
| **17** | **P** | **Project Plan - Project milestones and objectives** | **3-6** |  | **Inconsistency with the standards** | **High** | **The iterations should continue (I6, I7 etc.) rather than dividing into releases. If the releases are considered as separate projects, the iterations should adhere to the standards, (e.g. in the elaboration phases, architectural design should be mentioned rather than continuing the use cases.)** | Accepted | Suggestion applied. |
| **18** | **P** | **Project Plan - Deployment** | **6** |  | **Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing** | **Medium** | **After Iteration 2, when the system architecture (including the technologies, frameworks etc.) is shaped, the “cloud providers” that will be used in the deployment process should be explained in more detail.** | Accepted | Suggestion applied. |
| **19** | **E** | **Executables** |  |  | **Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing** | **High** | **The directions on how to run the application locally on other computers should be explained in the README file for the reviewing purposes.** | Rejected | Running application locally is not a usage scenario of our application. |
| **20** | **E** | **Executables** |  |  | **External Inconsistency** | **Medium** | **In the design document, the UI is stated to be developed with React and React Native, however, the UI is developed with HTML, XML and CSS. If the migration is planned, it should be stated in detail.** | Rejected | Full frontend will be developed in next iterations. |
| **21** | **E** | **Executables** |  |  | **Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing** | **Medium** | **In the signup and login screens, the information that the user’s signup / login has failed is insufficient, leading to a poor user experience.** | Rejected | Full frontend will be developed in next iterations. |
| **22** | **E** | **Executables** |  |  | **Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing** | **Medium** | **Several errors that occur when signing up a user are not displayed in detail, leading to a misunderstanding in the user's point of view.** | Rejected | Full frontend will be developed in next iterations. |
| **23** | **E** | **Executables** |  |  | **Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing** | **Little** | **In the signup and login pages, there should be a “back” button which redirects the user back to the home page.** | Rejected | Full frontend will be developed in next iterations. |
| **24** | **E** | **Executables** |  |  | **Internal Inconsistency** | **Little** | **At several parts of the application, there exists a language inconsistency (Turkish is used rather than English as in the application).** | Rejected | Full frontend will be developed in next iterations. Behavior is caused by browser language. |
| **25** | **E** | **Executables** |  |  | **Internal Inconsistency** | **Little** | **The end dates of the tasks can be arranged as prior to the start dates, which should be prevented for a convenient user experience.** | Accepted | Logic applied and an exception is set to be thrown to the user in case of failure. |
| **26** | **A** | **1.Purpose** | **1** |  | **Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc)** | **Little** | **Original: "In Section 2, architectural goals and philosophy is mentioned."**  **Correction: "In Section 2, architectural goals and philosophy are mentioned."** | Accepted | Suggestion applied. |
| **27** | **A** | **2. Architectural Goals** | **1** |  | **Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing** | **Medium** | **Original: "The system doesn’t have a specific requirement about robustness for long-term maintenance."**  **Concern: The absence of a specific requirement for robustness in long-term maintenance may pose challenges. It's essential to explicitly address how the system will ensure reliability and maintainability over time.** | Accepted | Suggestion applied.  Cloud provider’s role in long term maintenance is mentioned. |
| **28** | **A** | **2. Architectural Goals** | **1** |  | **Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing** | **Medium** | **Original: "Performance of the system will be affected by the resource limitation of users’ devices."**  **Concern: The statement doesn't provide a solution or mitigation strategy for handling performance issues arising from resource limitations on users' devices. A clearer plan for addressing these challenges is necessary.** | Accepted | Sufficiency of resources are written as assumption in the 3rd part. |
| **29** | **A** | **5. Decisions** | **4** |  | **Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc)** | **Little** | **Original: "Load balancing and paralellism will be applied."**  **Correction: "Load balancing and parallelism will be applied."** | Accepted | Suggestion applied. |
| **30** | **S** | **3.4. Supportability** | **5** |  | **Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc)** | **Little** | **Original: "There should be an isolated test environment apart from the production environment for mitigating security vulnerabilities and deploy bug fixes."**  **Suggested: "There should be an isolated test environment apart from the production environment for mitigating security vulnerabilities and deploying bug fixes."** | Accepted | Suggestion applied. |