

Reviewed by:

Johan Gudmundsson, jg222sh, johan.gudmundsson2012@gmail.com

Beppe Karlsson, bk222bh, bk222bh@student.lnu.se

As a developer would the model help you and why/why not?

The model does describe the domain in a good way, and would help us as developers to understand the overview of the domain, even if I do think some things in the model could have been a little bit clearer, see below:

The description of the associations are mostly good and the use of multiplicity makes the relationship between conceptual classes clear and easy to understand, and they do follow the guidelines setup by Larman [1, Chapter 9.14 Applying UML: Multiplicity], how ever some associations are a bit unclear. For example who uses the Calendar and Calendar Event? when following the model it is easy to understand who is managing these, but who are viewing them? What is the point of the Calendar Event? I would suggest you take another look at [1, Chapter 9.14 Associations, Guideline: When to Show an Association?] We also feel that the use of both lines and arrows for associations was a bit confusing at first when trying to understand the model.

As developers we would also have liked if the model was a bit clearer on the user roles and their associations, for example who at the boat club is managing the Calendar and Calendar Event? We would say this is something that would be good to remember as stated by Larman in his guidelines [1, Chapter 9.14 Associations, Guideline: When to Show an Association?]

With that said, it is possible that the user roles should have been their own conceptual classes following the guidelines by Larman[1, Chapter 9.12 Guideline: A Common Mistake with Attributes vs Classes]. And if chosen to have user roles as an attribute then it would have helped us as developers if the attribute somehow showed the different user roles and also showed the associations between each user role and the conceptual classes. [1, Chapter 9.14 Associations, Guideline: When to Show an Association?]

Do you think a domain expert (for example the Secretary) would understand the model why/why not?

We would say both yes and no. We do think a domain expert for example the Secretary would understand the model in general since it in most cases has very clear conceptual classes and associations. The model does how ever at one point use different wording then the problem describing, "Mooring" instead of "Berth" and we do think that this might be a bit confusing for the domain expert. we would suggest to use the noun method to find conceptual classes as described by Larman [1, Chapter 9.5 Guideline: How to Find Conceptual Classes].

It might also be a little bit hard for the secretary to understand her own role in the domain

Reviewed by:

Johan Gudmundsson, jg222sh, johan.gudmundsson2012@gmail.com

Beppe Karlsson, bk222bh, bk222bh@student.lnu.se

model, since she might not understand that she is included in userRole who does not have any associations to the calendar in the model. We think it would increase the understanding if the "Member" class was split up into a separate conceptual class for each user role following the guidelines set up by Larman [1, Chapter 9.12 Guideline: A Common Mistake with Attributes vs. Classes]. A good thing to have in mind is to think as a mapmaker and make the model reflect the "real world" in good way, as stated by Larman [1, Chapter 9.19 Guideline: Think Like a Mapmaker; Use Domain Terms].

But as we said at the start, most of the descriptions and associations are clear and show what is needed to understand the general thing about the domain.

What are the strong points of the model, what do you think is really good and why?

The absolute best thing about the model is the use of multiplicity since this makes the associations between conceptual classes very clear.

The names of the associations and the conceptual classes are also very good and clear in most cases, which makes the model easy to understand and follow.

What are the weaknesses of the model, what do you think should be changed and why?

Since you only use different wording from the problem description and arrows once, we would suggest you change these. We don't think they are the weakest points in the model, but they are pretty easy to fix. And from my point of view as a developer this would make the model stronger and easier to understand.

A more important change is to put some thought if the Secretary really is a member, or is she apart of the Boat Club? Or would it be best to split up all the user roles as separate conceptual classes? It would also be good with clearer associations between Member and Calendar Event and also Between Secretary and Calendar and Calendar Event.

Do you think the model has passed the grade 2 (passing grade) criteria?

Reviewed by:

Johan Gudmundsson, jg222sh, johan.gudmundsson2012@gmail.com

Beppe Karlsson, bk222bh, bk222bh@student.lnu.se

Yes, the model describes the domain in a clear and good way and would have passed the criteria for passing grade.

However, with suggested changes above it would definitely pass passing grade since it would make the model a lot stronger, especially the associations between the different userRoles.

References

1. Larman, Craig. 2015. Applying UML and Patterns (Third Edition)