# Reviews sent to CEP2GROUP1

By Group 2


Anton Geneser Matzen
202008936@post.au.dk
Std.nr: 202008936
Au-id: 683185

Emil Hilligsøe Lauritsen
202004154@post.au.dk
Std.nr: 202004154
Au-id: 668867

Martin Michaelsen
202007433@post.au.dk
Std.nr: 202007433
Au-id: 672598

Kevin Vollesen Schønberg
202007282@post.au.dk
Std.nr: 202007282
Au-id: 674059

M3 Requirements specifications iteration 2

Responsible: Oliver Rosengreen Henriksen, Mikkel Silkeborg, Asbjørn Verner Nielsen & Asbjørn Lykke Ditlev

Peer reviewers: Anton Matzen, Martin Michaelsen, Emil Lauritsen, Kevin Schønberg & Sebastian Berg (Group 2).

Date: 01/03-2022

Result Approved with suggestions for change

Grade 7

Feedback

The layout of the requirements specification document makes it easy to understand what parts are which, but if you include a figure, it would be nice if you were to explain it a bit more. Commenting on the different steps and actors, just to make everything clear.

It would be better to give some kind of indication about which functional requirement the different use cases cover. So as to ensure understandability and that all of your functional requirements are covered in the use cases. Furthermore we were told to design our functional requirements as use cases where you have split them up into two sections where there doesn't seem to be a direct connection between them.

Stick to the same kind of language when describing the use cases. Make sure to not to use different terms describing the same function in the use cases. Such as using “on” and “enabled” to describe the same state. If this is not the case please explain what the differences are. Do not split up your use cases so they do not match the functional requirements and make sure use cases are also described. In the end all the use cases overlap and they do not cover all the functional requirements. An example would be a use case of the time requirements which are never discussed.

To give a specific example your first and last functional requirements are not covered by your use cases.

M7 Finalise 3rd iteration of requirements specifications

Responsible: Oliver Rosengreen Henriksen, Mikkel Silkeborg, Asbjørn Verner Nielsen & Asbjørn Lykke Ditlev

Peer reviewers: Anton Matzen, Martin Michaelsen, Emil Lauritsen & Kevin Schønberg (Group 2).

Date: 06/04-2022

Result Approved with suggestions for change

Grade 10

Feedback
The functional requirements and use cases are now much more coherent. The use case diagrams function well to enhance the understanding of the use cases.

However the 6th and 8th functional requirements are still not covered in the use cases explicitly. You could for example explicitly mention that instead of ‘logging’ the data you store it in a database.

Some cohesion between the use cases would benefit the readability and understandability of your requirement specifications. What is meant by this is to utilise one use case as a precondition for another, if possible. As well as having the additional benefit of not creating too large of a use case such as your use case 4, which is excessively large.

Overall great requirements specifications with a few minor issues.

M5 Finalize version 2 of architectural design specification

Responsible: Oliver Rosengreen Henriksen, Mikkel Silkeborg, Asbjørn Verner Nielsen & Asbjørn Lykke Ditlev

Peer reviewers: Anton Matzen, Martin Michaelsen, Emil Lauritsen & Kevin Schønberg (Group 2).

Date: 22/03-2022

Result: Approved with minor suggestions for change

Grade: 10

Feedback:
On figure 1, There is not really anything that explains the logic of going from one state to another.

On figure 2, The box is an indicator of the LEDs running. The LED is indicated to be turned on before it receives the "Enable LED" signal. The same is the case for when it is turned off. Also the sensor can't be turned on/off so your sensor is always on. The controller/RPI can ignore events from the sensor in the desired interval.