**Jack Perott-Webb Peer Review**

The first ”part” of the domain model, titled Calendar/User Setup Domain Model has good readability, which leads me to believe that a domain expert such as an secretary or the treasurer, would understand that part of the model. However, my first impression of the part of the model labeled Boat Management Domain Model is quite messy, and hard to grasp. I intend to re-iterate this point later on.

Returning to the Calendar/User Setup Domain, the names are in fact nouns, as Larman [1] suggests one should do, when considering them as conceptual classes. Member, Secretary, User, Calendar Event and Login Details are found in the problem description or use cases [2]. However, I cannot find any mention of any need for recording Event History, which conflicts with Larman’s [3] guidelines: “Do not add things that are not there”. Furthermore, I do not understand the relationship between User and Event History – does the User manage the vent history? I would argue that they would not. Do they view the history? If so, is that relevant to the model? I would like some context, in form of an association name.

Concerning association names, a slightly less important note I made was that association names should be verb-phrases [4], so instead of Viewer, and Editor, I would change them to View respectively Editor. The same applies to Editor, Provider and Referenced becoming Edits, Provides and References in the Boat Management Domain Model. Another query that popped up, when studying this model was: Should User Login Details have some form of association to User, seeing as the name implies that it is the user’s details. Of course, naming the relationship would break another one of Larman’s guidelines, stating “Association names such as ‘has’ or ‘Uses’ are usually poor” [5]. I would argue, however, that sometimes, rules are made to be broken.

On a more positive note, the subclasses Meeting and Competition appear to be correctly defined, according to the example provided by Larman [6], which I myself did not add into my domain. I found it to be a nice touch, provided that it is considered to be significant to the model.

However, I’m not sure the conceptual class System should be included, as I would consider a system a software component, and Larman states that a Domain Model is “a visualization of things in a real-situation domain of interest, not of software objects” [7]. There are ways to describe the unreal world, according to Larman [8], by listening to the core vocabulary and concepts of that domain. The name ‘System’ however is vague – what kind of system? What does it to? Is it a database-system? If so database systems are not to be included in domain models, according to Larman [9]. Consider if there any way to describe the system with vocabulary specific to the domain, to perhaps further specify how the system is relevant to the domain and if not, perhaps it should not be there at all.

The reason I found the Boat Management Domain Model hard to read initially, which lead me to think that a Domain Expert would not grasp it, has several aspects.

Firstly, there are many associations between few classes. For example I found the relationship between User and Mooring Availability (with the association name ‘Applicant For’) to be a bit too explicit, and making it redundant in my eyes.

Also I do not understand what the conceptual classes Protocols and Account System are meant to describe, as they are not found in the problem description or use cases, which again conflicts with the “don’t add things”-rule. Protocols are used as an example by Larman to exemplify how to describe the ‘unreal world’ using vocabulary in the domain of telecommunication [10]. I do not; however understand its place in this model. The name account system draws to mind sales, accounting and such, although in its relation with Boat Details, that does not make much sense. Perhaps I am dense but I fail to comprehend their role in the domain.

Furthermore, in your assumption, it is stated that “Secretary does not personally approve every boat and berth”. However it is stated in Use Case 8.3 that “The Secretary approves the proposal” implying that the secretary does approve boat allocation.

In conclusion, the readability of the domain model describing Calendar/User Setup is fine, but the Boat Management Domain was not easy to comprehend. The association names are easy to correct but I do think that the conceptual class System should be re-evaluated, as well as Protocols and Account System – or renamed at the very least. This would be beneficiary for both the domain expert and developers understanding of the domain.
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