Overall:

1. What do you think are the main strengths of this News and Views article?

*The main strength of the report is it covers a large context of software engineering as well as project management information. The report suggests a large amount of software engineering practices and methodologies supported by credible resources. All of the practices are also exhaustively explained in the Project Practice Guide. In all the recommendations were made, the writers have made a good effort linking them to the project attributes. Hence, readers can have a good understanding of why these particular practices match the project.*

1. What are your main suggestions for improvement to this article?

*In order to improve this article. Some sections such as Managing Change, the writers can go more further in detail.*

1. Did you feel that the article had good flow and structure? Was it easy to follow the author's train of thought from one paragraph to the next?

*The report generally has a good flow and structure, all the documents are linked together. The main report also reminds readers to refer to the Project Practice Guide, Project Tool Guide and the Tool Learning Package regularly. Additionally, the headers and indentation can aid readers to understand the report structure.*

1. Has the article been carefully proofread - is it free of grammatical and typographical errors?

*This report has been proofread quite carefully. However, there are still some minor grammatical and typographical errors.*

1. Is the balance between the different sections about right? Or has too much space perhaps been allocated to one section (e.g. background) at the expense of another (e.g. results)?

*The balance between different sections is about right with the background and the result both have a similar length. However, they are relatively short if compares to the main recommendation section.*

Structured

1. Was the title short, informative and catchy?

*Yes/No: the title itself is short, and informative enough. Title for the report is accepted and understandable, also all the name of each section enable the reader to get general idea/information of each topic is about.*

1. Does the 3-line summary adequately relay the essentials of the study (problem - solution - wider implications)?

*Yes/No. Each of the section in the report is well-written. The information in each of the section is following the pattern: introduction, definition of each terms, how to use, explanation and recommendation. This contribute to fluency and readable of the information, that make the reader feel interested in reading it.*

1. Is the problem clearly stated? Does it agree with your own understanding, from reading the paper?

*Yes/No. This report is more about to introduce about the project case and provide a set of practices to suite that case based on proven academic and scientific technique of software engineering. The writer brought good knowledge for each of the section with careful thoughts and consideration. From my understanding and experience in software practice, I mostly agree with the writer about methodology terms and tools guide that are used. However, I think this report didn’t state clearly about the problems that may arise in the project.*

1. As a reader, did you feel that enough background information was provided to allow you to understand the study's key outcomes?

*Yes/No. From the beginning the writer introduced quite well about the project situation, and went through concepts about Agile/Scrum methodology, Testing, Changes & Planning with definition and reasons for using it. I think the writer gave enough information in each of the section that helps me to get a clear picture of the study’s key outcome.*

1. Have the key results of the study been outlined? Is all the information necessary?

*Yes/No. The key result of the study is to provide the organization a good methodology with tools for them to achieve their goal, that has been outlined well in this study. All the information in the report is relevant and worthy. However, I believe the change management plan might need to describe such as one specific change with an act of action to fix that change as an example, that will make the report more comprehensive.*

1. Has the author made an attempt to critically appraise an aspect of the study?

*Yes/No. The writer of this report has investigated clearly each aspect of the study with definition, explanation, recommendation. The writer successfully made an attempt to explain why Agile methodology (Scrum) is recommended for project. In addition, the writer has also stated in term of expanding of project, the way of how to manage the team framework structure. Overall this report is a well-suited practice for the project case. I believe any minor of the report shall be fixed in the long run of project duration.*

1. Is the importance of the study placed into perspective?

*Yes/No. The importance of the study has been placed into perspective.*

Feedback form

1. This review helped me improve my News and Views article

*This reviews helped the team to fix their weaknesses in writing professional reports. It showed that the problem statement should be done better than just stating it out. The review also highlighted what have the report achieved and some areas that can still be improved furthermore*

1. This review was:
2. **Balanced**: it highlighted both strengths, and areas for improvement

*Strongly agree / Agree / No opinion / Disagree /Strongly disagree*

1. **Insightful**: the review pointed out things I hadn’t thought of myself

*Strongly agree / Agree / No opinion / Disagree /Strongly disagree*

1. **Helpful**: it contains specific suggestions that I will be able to implement

*Strongly agree / Agree / No opinion / Disagree /Strongly disagree*

1. **Authoritative**: the review had read the literature and knew their stuff

*Strongly agree / Agree / No opinion / Disagree /Strongly disagree*

1. **Clear**: the review was well-written and easy to understand

*Strongly agree / Agree / No opinion / Disagree /Strongly disagree*

1. I would take the opportunity to participate in peer review again

Questionnaire

Pre-review survey questions:

1. Have you had any previous experiences critically reviewing the work of peers (fellow students) in your University studies?

*Yes – a few times / Just once / No / Not sure*

1. As a learning tool, I expect that peer review will be:

*Very useful / Useful / No opinion / Not very useful / Useless*

1. I expect I will learn most from:

*Writing reviews of the work of other students / Receiving reviews of my own work / Equal value from writing & receiving reviews / Not sure*

1. I think my peers are well-qualified to provide me with critical feedback on my own work.

*Strongly agree / Agree / No opinion / Disagree / Strongly disagree*

1. Please list any concerns you may have about the peer review process.

*Misunderstanding, Conflicts may arise such as other member may disagree with you or they ignore the problem and don’t listen to your ideas/opinion.*

Post-review survey questions:

1. What is the year of your study at Auckland University of Technology?

*We consist of one final year student who is doing her BCIS project and 2 second-year student. All of us is majoring in Software Development.*

1. As a learning tool, I found the peer review process to be:

*Very useful / Useful / No opinion / Not very useful / Useless*

*I found the peer review process is very useful technique for everyone in the team got the chance to verify the work of other member with valued opinion, and thoughtful suggestion. Peer review process enhance the productivity of the team development progress, strengthen team member collaboration skill, also it is where your discussion can be taken carefully.*

1. I found that I learned most from:

*Writing reviews of the work of other students / Receiving reviews of my own work / Equal value from writing & receiving reviews / Not sure*

*We all both have learned by reviewing other works and receiving reviews of others. It is a good combination and both creates a great opportunity to improve our writing skills.*

1. I think my peers did a good job of providing me with critical feedback on my own work

*Strongly agree / Agree / No opinion / Disagree / Strongly disagree*

*Our peers helped us a lot in improving my weakness and identifying the important areas that we have not paid enough attention too. It also provides us the skill to better proof read our works.*

1. I think that I improved my written work as a result of the reviews that I received or wrote

*Strongly agree / Agree / No opinion / Disagree /Strongly disagree*

*Based on the figured out improvement area, we all improved our written work and being less likely to commit the same mistakes in the future.*

1. Please list any comments you may have about the peer review process

*The peer review process was nicely executed by all team members. This peer review is the result of all members by reviewing their own as well as other members work. We have tried our best to follow the peer review guideline and carried out the process with all our determination and serious manners.*
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