Workshop 2

Peer review for Rasmus Eneman’s group

By Juhani Aavanen and Eddy Proca

Test the runnable version of the application in a realistic way. Note any problems/bugs.

The app runs smoothly and the instructions inside the app are clear. The console doesn’t clear on page changes which makes it difficult to get a clear view of the information. The order that new members are added in seems a bit arbitrary. There is good error handling and the user is prevented from entering any values that are not permitted. There is a return feature that allows the user to go back to the previous page which is quite useful.

Try to compile/use the source code using the instructions provided. Can you get it up and running? Is anything problematic? Are there steps missing or assumptions made?

There are no instruction on how to run the app and which files are necessary. Experienced users can probably figure out how to use the files, but some users may run into some issues.

Does the implementation and diagrams conform (do they show the same thing)? Are there any missing relations? Relations in the wrong direction?

The implementation and diagrams seem to conform. There are separate sequence diagrams for each requirement which makes them easy to read through.

Is the requirement of a unique member id correctly done?

The unique ID fulfils the requirements. However, it is a bit too long to be useful.

What is the quality of the implementation/source code?

The code is of high quality and follows modern code standards. Variables and methods are well named which makes up for the lack of comments. There is no duplication and only a few pieces of dead code.

What is the quality of the design? Is it Object Oriented?

The code is of high quality and it is object oriented. It follows the Model-View-Controller design pattern. Objects are sent to the database rather than keys/ids. We could not find any static or global variables nor any hidden dependencies.

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

The diagrams helped us get a good overview of the code design and made it easier to find what we were looking for in the code.

What are the strong points of the design/implementation, what do you think is really good and why?
The code is easy to understand and uses small classes with specific purposes. The app was easy to use and accomplished all necessary tasks. The file structure made it easy to navigate the code.

What are the weaknesses of the design/implementation, what do you think should be changed and why?
The user interface could be improved by clearing the console on each page change, arranging the members in a more predictable manner and using shorter unique member IDs.

Do you think the design/implementation has passed the grade 3 criteria?
We believe that all requirements for grade 3 were met.