

Reviews received from CEP2GROUP4

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

Iteration 1 of requirement (Wrong document sent)

M3 Finalize Iteration 2 of requirement specification

Responsible:

CEP2GROUP2

Peer

reviewer: William Zoffman Buchhave
& Steffen Torpe Simonsen. CEP2GROUP3

Date:25-02-2022

Result:

Approved with suggestions for changed

Grade:

4

Feedback:

Overall

the document is lacking in presentation. There are no indications or headers signifying where the use-cases are or where the requirement specification begins. Giving a short introduction to the project would go a long way in giving the reader a basis for understanding the requirements.

We

assume that the first part of the document has four use cases, in which case they are quite short and to the point - fleshing these out would make it easier for the reader to follow along.

Looking

at the requirements, we can see that the first one is missing and the fourth is not described. 4-8 have no indication of being functional or non-functional.

To

summarize, the requirements specification is quite bare-bones at this point. Looking through the milestones for this project, we believe that you were supposed to hand over the 2nd iteration of the requirements specification this week - which may perhaps explain the minimalistic nature of this requirement specification.

Iteration 2 of requirement Requirement documentation

Responsible:

CEP2GROUP2

Peer

reviewer: William Zoffman Buchhave
CEP2GROUP3

Date:24-03-2022

Result:

Approved

Grade:

7

Feedback:

Overordnet set en fin kravspecifikation.

UML-diagrammet er veludført og informativt.

Jeres use-cases er flot præsenteret og relevante for jeres produkt

Måden i sætter informationen op som tabeller eller lister er nem at finde rundt i og virker godt til effektivt at få vist det i skal vise. Det ville dog også være godt med noget forklarende tekst eller indledninger til de forskellige afsnit for at kæde dokumentet sammen.

Iteration 1/2 of Architectural design specification

Architectural design specification

Responsible:

CEP2GROUP2

Peer

reviewer: William Zoffman Buchhave

CEP2GROUP3

Date:24-03-2022

Result:

Approved

Grade:

7-10

Feedback:

God struktur overordnet set på dokumentet.

Jeres Sequence diagram er flot stillet op, godt forklaret og nemt at følge.

Jeg var lidt forvirret over jeres use-cases i første omgang, men det skyldtes at jeg kiggede på jeres Architectural design specification-dokument inden jeg kiggede på jeres kravspecifikation - men det gav fin mening da jeg så lige så efter i kravspecifikationen.

Ligesom jeres Sequence Diagram er både jeres Activity Diagram og jeres State Diagram rimeligt veludført og nemt at følge med i.

Jeres Class diagram kunne godt have været lidt mere tydeligt ved fx. at inkludere hvilken datatype de forskellige variabler er. Ikke at det i min mening er noget stort mangel, det ville bare gøre det en lille smule nemmere at få indsigt i hvordan systemet virker *blot* ved at kigge på klassediagrammet.