

Peer review

On the domain model of Beppe Karlsson and Johan Gudmundsson

Authors: Athanasios Bozios, Christina Koukou, Ningrui Chen

Introduction

Our group gathered to discuss and comment on the Domain model of students Beppe Karlsson and Johan Gudmundsson. The purpose of this meeting was to review the Domain Model and make suggestions in order to improve it, according to the instructions that were given and our personal point of view. The suggestions are presented as a list below. We must note that these suggestions represent our own point of view and according to Larman [1, p.168] "there is no such thing as a single correct domain model".

List of suggestions:

- 1) The conceptual class of the "Treasurer" is possibly missing from the model, since he is one of the 3 roles that need to authenticate themselves to the system.

As far as authentication is concerned, we didn't notice any authentication attributes (username, password) in Member/Secretary classes.

- 2) Registering a boat should probably have a date, in order to fulfill the off-season/pre-season requirements, possibly as an attribute of the boat class. Also, registration should update the fee for the member, depending on the season. Although it may not be that important, it is described in the requirements, and could possibly be solved with a simple fee attribute inside boat class.

- 3) Creating multiple associations between a pair of classes (like member and boat, member and calendarEvent, secretary and calendarEvent), could help to describe distinctly different relationships between two classes (e.g. add/change/register boat are 3 different relationships between boat and member).

The associations are distinctly different relations which must be shown separately, as it is stated in Larman's book [1, p.155].

- 4) Boat class seems to be missing some attributes which are described in the requirements (like size, boat type and image). On the same note, calendarEvent class is missing the "title" attribute.

Larman [1, p.158] suggests that we should include attributes that the requirements suggest.

- 5) "Contains", The delineation of association between CalendarEvent and Calendar class, is quite general. And "Needs", The delineation of association between Boat and Berth class, has the same problem.

The naming of these associations is not quite good. The names should enhance understanding of the model and be meaningful, Larman [1, p.152].

- 6) The secretary appears to be "listing" the CalendarEvents, an association that doesn't seem to appear in the requirements(maybe it is implied)

Questions:

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

Yes, this domain model is helpful and makes it easy to understand the requirements of the boat club's system.

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

Yes. We think this domain model is simple enough for an expert to understand it.

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

This domain model is simple and easy enough to understand. We think the conceptual classes are selected and named accurately. The multiplicities of the associations between classes are also correct.

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

According to the requirements, we think it misses one class and some attributes. Multiple distinct associations and more accurate association naming could make the model even more clear and accurate.

- 5) Do you think the model has passes the grade 2(passing grade) criteria?

Yes. This domain model definitely passes the grade 2 criteria. All our suggestions are focused on things that our group generally considered as minor. We did not detect any serious issues.

References section.

- 1) Larman C., Applying UML and Patterns 3rd Ed, 2005, ISBN: 0131489062