|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **REVIEW DOCUMENT** | | | | | | | |
| Start Date: 16.12.2023 | | | |  | | | |
| Project Name: ToGather | | | | Number of Pages: 4 | | | |
| Product Name: ToGather | | | | Product Definition: Iteration 3 Work Products | | | |
| Roles: | Review Leader: | | |  | | | |
| Reviewers: | | | *1. Annie Yang* | | | *3. Özde Uysal* |
| *2. Elif Şayli* | | |  |
| 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)* | | | | | | |
| Total Number of Errors: 36 | | | | | | | |
| Assessment Status: | | | ACCEPTED  \_x\_\_ as it is  \_\_\_ with rework | | REJECTED  \_\_\_\_ review again | | |
| ERROR TYPES | | | | | | | |
| Error Type Number | | Error Type Definition | | | | Number of Errors Found | |
| 1 | | Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc) | | | | 16 | |
| 2 | | Inconsistency with the standards | | | | - | |
| 3 | | Uncertain | | | | 5 | |
| 4 | | Incorrect | | | | - | |
| 5 | | Inapplicable | | | | - | |
| 6 | | Internal Inconsistency | | | | 2 | |
| 7 | | External Inconsistency | | | | - | |
| 8 | | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | | | | 12 | |
| 9 | | Other | | | | 1 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 36 | |
| Importance Types | | Importance Type | | | | Number of Errors Found | |
|  | | Little | | | | 20 | |
|  | | Medium | | | | 15 | |
|  | | Important | | | | 1 | |
|  | | **TOTAL** | | | | 36 | |

| **No** | **Reviewed**  **Material**  **ID** | **Section** | **Page** | **Line/**  **No** | **Error**  **Type** | **Importance** | **Explanation** | **Correction Status** | **Correction**  **Explanation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | UC\_Brief | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 | Medium | There are 19 use cases in total, but there are 11 use cases which are fully dressed. | Rejected | Our plan is to write 11 use cases in fully-dressed style for Release 1. |
| 2 | UC\_Brief | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 | Medium | There is no System Admin as an actor to manage the platform. | Rejected | We would consider this for Release 2. |
| 3 | UC\_Brief | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 | Medium | In the use case diagram, the primary actor is User. But, in the Actors part primary actors are Professionals and University Students. If their involvements in the use cases are the same, you may integrate these two in the User actor. | Accepted | In section 4 of uc\_brief document, “4.1 User” heading is added for Professionals and University Students. |
| 4 | UC\_Create Task | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | Medium | First step is written as “User wants to create a task”, but the user’s action to create a task should be written. | Accepted | This feedback is also another way of writing use cases, but our style is also accepted by the advisor, so we don’t make any changes. |
| 5 | UC\_Create Community | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | Medium | First step is written as “User wants to create a community”, but the user’s action to create a community should be written. | Accepted | This feedback is also another way of writing use cases, but our style is also accepted by the advisor, so we don’t make any changes. |
| 6 | UC\_Add Friend | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | Medium | First step is written as “User wants to add other users as friend”, but the user’s action to add friend should be written. | Accepted | This feedback is also another way of writing use cases, but our style is also accepted by the advisor, so we don’t make any changes. |
| 7 | Sequence Diagrams | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | Medium | All the use cases don’t have sequence diagrams. | Rejected | We draw sequence diagrams when we realize use cases, so we will have 11 sequence diagrams by the end of Iteration 4. Since we realized 7 of them for now, we have 7 sequence diagrams. |
| 8 | all\_drawings | Set User Profile | 2 | n/a | 8 | Medium | It could be helpful to depict steps 1-4 from the MSS:   * get User profile and the System returning the profile * select update and System presenting form | Rejected | We only considered application logic for this use case. We didn’t consider the interaction between User and System (UI view) in diagrams. |
| 9 | UC\_Create Task Sequence Diagram | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | Medium | All the main success scenarios are not represented. | Rejected | We only considered application logic for this use case. We didn’t consider the interaction between User and System (UI view) in diagrams. |
| 10 | uc\_handle\_friendship\_request | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | Little | “how the use handle” should be “how the user handles” | Accepted | Changes applied |
| 11 | uc\_handle\_friendship\_request | 4.2 | 1 | 23 | 6 | Medium | It states: “The use case resumes at step 4.” however if step 4 in the main success scenario is resumed (“System indicates accepting request.”), then that is inconsistent with rejecting the request. | Accepted | One more step is added to the extension scenario. |
| 12 | uc\_handle\_friendship\_request | 5.1 | 1 | 26 | 1 | Little | “Friendship requests are handling.” should be changed to “Friendship requests are handled.” | Accepted | Changes applied |
| 13 | uc\_remove\_friend | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | Little | “how the user remove other” should be changed to “how the user removes other”. | Accepted | Changes applied |
| 14 | uc\_remove\_friend | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | Medium | It could be beneficial to define Friend/Friendship in Glossary. | Accepted | Changes applied |
| 15 | uc\_remove\_task | 6.1 | 1 | 24 | 1 | Little | A double negative is used. “User will see the calendar without removed task.” can be changed to “The task that was removed is no longer visible on the calendar.” | Accepted | Changes applied |
| 16 | uc\_set\_user\_profile | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | Little | “how the user set their” should be changed to “how the user sets their”. | Accepted | Changes applied |
| 17 | Test Cases | All | All | All | 8 | Little | You can add use case numbers/names for ease of tracking. |  | Changes applied |
| 18 | Glossary | Header | 1 | 1 | 8 | Medium | The revision table is missing for the Glossary. | Rejected | We already have revision table in Glossary. |
| 19 | Glossary | 1 | 1 | 11 | 1 | Little | Change “Web service that provide” to “Web service that provides.” | Accepted | Changes applied |
| 20 | Glossary | 1 | 1 | 22 | 1 | Little | Spelling error: “distributed network of serves” should be “distributed network of servers”. | Accepted | Changes applied |
| 21 | Glossary | 1 | 2 | 20 | 1 | Little | Tense error: “Third party institution that provide” should be changed to “Third party institution that provides”. | Accepted | Changes applied |
| 22 | Glossary | 1 | 2 | 28 | 1 | Little | Spelling error: “certain subject” should be changed to “certain subjects”. | Accepted | Changes applied |
| 23 | Glossary | 1 | 3 | 10 | 1 | Little | Spelling error: “ detects user’s time zone and sync” should be changed to “ detects a user’s time zone and syncs”. | Accepted | Changes applied |
| 24 | Glossary | 1 | 3 | 27 | 1 | Little | Tense error: “institution that provide marketplace” should be changed to “institution that provides a marketplace” | Accepted | Changes applied |
| 25 | Glossary | 1 | 3 | 29 | 1 | Little | “working on a certain company” should be changed to “working in a certain company” | Accepted | Changes applied |
| 26 | Glossary | 1 | 4 | 28 | 1 | Little | “A automated” should be changed to “An automated” | Accepted | Changes applied |
| 27 | Glossary | 1 | 4 | 44 | 1 | Little | “Institution which provide product” should change to “Institution which provides product” | Accepted | Changes applied |
| 28 | Risk List | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | Little | Order Magnitude from largest to smallest | Rejected | We ordered risks according to Impact, which was also a review given to us in previous iterations. |
| 29 | Risk List | 1 | 1 | 6 | 8 | Little | Marketing Team is not defined in Glossary or Vision | Accepted | Owners are revised in risk\_list document. |
| 30 | Risk List | 1 | 1 | 7 | 8 | Little | Algorithm Designer is not defined in Glossary or Vision | Accepted | Owners are revised in risk\_list document. |
| 31 | Vision | 1 | 1 | 8 | 1 | Little | “In the following, the problem is stated” should be changed to “In the following, the problem is stated…” | Rejected | We explained the sections in one sentence as short summaries. |
| 32 | Architecture Notebook | 5 | 3 |  | 3 | Important | In the justification part, explain why React Native is chosen over other mobile development frameworks? or moment.js library should be compared to other options that could be valuable. | Accepted | In applicable parts, assessed alternatives and decision criteria added. |
| 33 | Architecture Notebook | 6 | 6 |  | 3 | Medium | The protocols used for data exchange between APIs and the security measures implemented for data transformation can be mentioned. | Accepted | Protocols are not defined right now. We will define them in further releases. |
| 34 | Architecture Notebook | 4 | 2 |  | 6 | Medium | TG-Req-001 and TG-Req-103 are very similar. | Rejected | These requirements are different, as we discussed in review session. |
| 35 | Design |  |  |  | 8 | Medium | There are no subsystems within the system. Maybe, design structure components seem like subsystems. | Rejected | There are no subsystems, we have one single system, as approved by the advisor. |
| 36 | Design |  |  |  | 1 | Little | "servet o" should be "serve to" in the sentence | Accepted | Changes applied |