**Comment Follow-up**

**Project Title: Resource Management System for EMPDE**

Here are the comments and questions raised during project presentation and on the project documentation, along with their corresponding updates, explanations and responses.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Comment | Font, Spacing and Alignment Issues on Approval, Acknowledgment, Executive Summary and Abbreviation Pages |
| Update | Fixed with Times New Roman, Proper Alignment and Spacing as suggested |
| Remark |  |
| 2 | Comment | Chapter-wise numbering for Figure and Table like Figure 2.1, Table 3.1 |
| Update | Updated List of Tables and Figures chapter-wise as recommended. |
| Remark |  |
| 3 | Comment | Table of Contents: Introductory Pages should be Roman Page Numbers and Missing Contents and Numbering in List of Contents |
| Update | Introductory Pages numbered in Roman Number, Chapter One starts with Page 1, Fixed Missing Content and Numbering in Table of Contents. |
| Remark |  |
| 4 | Comment | \*State General Objective as Title of Project (compile it)  \*Use ‘To’ as a prefix for all Specific Objective  \*Why Two Systems for One Organization? |
| Update | \*General Objective compiled and updated as Title of the Project  \* Added the prefix ‘To’ for Specific Objectives  \*Because it is developed modularly and with the intention of more modules to be integrated later (scalable), so specifying each module as system would cohere with the ERP principles and these were the basic/pillar and first determined required modules from the analysis. |
| Remark |  |
| 5 | Comment | In Scope, compile features as subsystems |
| Update | Updated feature description as primary subsystems detailing features |
| Remark |  |
| 6 | Comment | Bulky Statement of the Problem, Shorten it. Focus on negative aspects |
| Update | Updated statement of the problem, by summarizing the paragraphs and shrinking it from 2 pages to 1 page. |
| Remark |  |
| 7 | Comment | Fix Citation Formats |
| Update | \*Citation used in the documentation is APA citation standards [1](https://www.guide2research.com/research/how-to-cite-a-research-paper) | [2](https://www.unr.edu/writing-speaking-center/student-resources/writing-speaking-resources/apa-7-in-text-citations) | [3](https://www.scribbr.com/apa-style/in-text-citation/#:~:text=Get%20started!-,APA%20in%2Dtext%20citations%20with%20multiple%20authors,%2C%20meaning%20%E2%80%9Cand%20others%E2%80%9D.)  \*Mixed in-text citation with parenthetical and narrative citation is acceptable, even recommended for readability.  \*In-text citation instances:  -Lee (2016) investigated or (Lee, 2016) for Single Author  -Two Authors use – ‘and ‘  -For Three to Five Authors use “et al.”  \*Referenced materials are cited with In-text citation for thesis/ dissertations and with Numbers [1] for webpages.  \*List of References provides web references as per number and Bibliography provides an alphabetized list of thesis and papers; both follow APA standards. |
| Remark |  |
| 8 | Comment | \*Why 2 Use cases diagrams?  \*Unnecessary System Boundary lines  \*Log In use case Issue |
| Update | \*There are two use case diagrams because of the two separate modules of the proposed system. Representing each module of a system with its own use case diagram is acceptable if the module is not feasible (wide) to be represented by a system boundary in a single use case.  >>> The use case diagrams follow the principle of drawing the diagram such as -as simple as possible, if too many use cases, represent only the essential ones, a use case diagram should describe at least one module of a system, and another use case diagram implicitly relating to the whole system should follow for other modules.  >>> Thus, there are 2 use case diagrams for each module (HR and Finance) of the proposed system, as it was simpler, clearer and viable to represent them as such.  \*2 unnecessary outer system boundaries are removed from the use case diagram.  \*According to UML 2.4 Use case diagramming standard, well-known use case such as sign up and login can be represented with a system boundary to minimize the crossing lines complexity inside the diagram. Provided that, the inner system boundary on the 2 use case diagrams labeled –‘Authentication Access – Log in’ is utilized as such that a use case Log In is invoked for any lines that cross the boundary to reach the use cases.  >>>Please note, that the detailed textual step by step descriptions of every Use Case are the even more important part, rather than the diagram itself. Where Log In is stated as a precondition for all. |
| Remark |  |
| 9 | Comment | No need of Literature Review (Section: 2.6. Review of Related Systems); this is a project not a research. |
| Update | \*The section is not intended as a literature reviews at least not in the sense of research study. It was included by recommendation of the Project Advisor.  \*It was understood that description of existing system includes analyzing related system that might compete with the proposed system.  \*It was necessary in the analysis phase to answer three basic questions:  1. How is such system designed and developed? In order to follow principles of ERP system and It is required when transitioning from paper-based to computerized system, to follow accepted rules and approaches.  2. How is this proposed system different or better than other available system? Analyze related system to derive features and differences, analyze cost, pros and cons. |
| Remark |  |
| 10 | Comment | Specify Data Collection methods as primary and secondary methods |
| Update | Fixed the description of data collection methods according to categories of these methods. Utilized data collection methods are separately identified as primary and secondary with their corresponding processes. |
| Remark |  |
| 11 | Comment | How Agile SDLCM as Development Methodology? |
| Update | As Primary and Secondary data collection methods for data collection, Object-Oriented approach for design methodology, Agile is used for Development methodology.  >>>As Agile software development is used as software development methodologies centered round the idea of iterative development, where requirements and solutions evolve through collaboration between self-organizing cross-functional teams. The ultimate value in Agile development is that it enables teams to deliver value faster, with greater quality and predictability, and greater aptitude to respond to change. |
| Remark |  |
| 12 | Comment | Schedule Feasibility and Political Feasibility |
| Update | \*As per the given outline, the discussed three feasibility studies: Technical, Operational and Economic Feasibility were adequate in our case.  -Other feasibility types (many more) were not included because there was no direct effect to raise them. Schedule feasibility is briefly explained as a Limitation and the project has no direct political inclination; it is only an enterprise system with little to no political dispositions that might need detail |
| Remark |  |
| 13 | Comment | Design HMVC Architecture Illustration by yourself |
| Update | Basic HMVC Architecture illustration is drawn by our self and replaced. |
| Remark |  |
| 14 | Comment | Spacing Issue on Subsystem Decomposition, Class Diagram, Data Dictionary pages (lowered and figure name inside the picture) |
| Update | This was an error while printing. Softcopy of the documentation provides a properly spaced and clear landscape view of the images.  \*Mixed page orientation in project documentation is acceptable to provide clear view and detail.  It will be fixed in upcoming printing with landscape orientation. |
| Remark |  |
| 15 | Comment | \*Include Multiplicity in Class Diagrams.  \*Why 2 Class Diagrams for single system? |
| Update | \*We have updated both class diagrams by including multiplicities for each relationship.  \*Again, this case follows from the two use cases drawn. As far as behavioral diagrams and object models are concerned; this per module class diagram and use case diagram is an approach used where the proposed system:  >> has modules that can be considered as standalone systems, which are each useful on their own, and just interact automated in a bigger overall system.  >>>There are different ways to approach this. One way may be to have a class diagram that shows classes from other modules, but leave off attributes and methods while showing class names and relevant relationships. Others may opt not to show classes that are not relevant to the part of the structural design being shown. We have left off classes from the other modules as they are implicitly indicated and arose using the core subsystems. |
| Remark |  |
| 16 | Comment | Add a brief description at the beginning of Sequence and Class Diagram sections |
| Update | Short description of how the class diagrams and sequence diagrams are derived is included at the beginning of those sections. |
| Remark |  |
| 17 | Comment | Identify the core/basic subsystems of the system |
| Update | Core or Basic Subsystems are specifically identified in a descriptive paragraph as well as subsystem services table. |
| Remark |  |
| 18 | Comment | Database design is not clearly visible and it doesn’t show much relationship between entities. |
| Update | This was an error while printing the document where it was supposed to be landscape oriented. It is clearer that way. As for not much relationship is presented; basic multiplicity relation is shown for the entities. This is a preliminary design, as more and more tables are added and derived as feature specialization and HMVC driven models’ progress. We will include a more current and sophisticated database design in upcoming checkpoints. And an Entity-Relationship (ER) Diagram can be included in the future to show more relationship among entities. |
| Remark |  |
| 19 | Comment | Deployment diagram |
| Update | \*As per the given project outline, hardware software mapping is the one indicated; that’s why we presented hardware software mapping instead of deployment diagram.  \*Also, Deployment Diagram and Hardware Software mapping more or less represent the same thing. Deployment Diagram is just the UML standard representation of Hardware Software mapping. That’s why only one is presented most of the time.  As indicated in these sources: [1](https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Hardware-software-mapping-of-the-system-shown-using-a-UML-deployment-diagram_fig2_311634500) | [2](https://creately.com/diagram/example/ilkxmfm33/Hardware%20and%20Software%20Mapping) | [3](https://creately.com/blog/diagrams/deployment-diagram-tutorial/) |
| Remark |  |