**Peer review form: Final design** (5 marks)

This form is completed by the reviewer group.

**Reviewer Group #:** 5

We are reviewing the project developed by group #: 6

**Part 1: Non-functional Requirements (1 mark)**

Select **ONE** of the following options:

**1 mark** - **I was able to understand the relevance of non-functional requirements in the project**

**0.5 mark** - I was able to **partially** understand the relevance of non-functional requirements in the project

**0 mark** - I was **NOT** able to understand the relevance of non-functional requirements in the project

**Comments:**

|  |
| --- |
| *1 mark*  *The non-functional requirements could be better explained by showcasing their influence on the interaction between boundary, control, and entity classes in the architecture.* |

**Part 2: Non-functional requirements priority (1 mark)**

Select **ONE** of the following options:

**1 mark** – The **analysis is clear and well structured**; **conclusions are convincing**.

**0.5 mark** – Analysis/Conclusions are **partially convincing**.

**0 mark** - Analysis/Conclusions are **unclear**.

**Comments:**

|  |
| --- |
| *1 mark*  *The prioritization would be clearer if it explicitly linked each non-functional requirement to specific packages or classes, such as those in the boundary, control, or entity layers.* |

**Part 3: Final Software Architecture (2 marks)**

Select **ONE** of the following options:

**2 mark** – **The final design is consistent with non-functional requirements and related priority**

**1 mark** - The final design is **partially** consistent with non-functional requirements and related priority

**0 mark** - The final design is **NOT** consistent with non-functional requirements and related priority

**Comments:**

|  |
| --- |
| *2 mark*  *The architecture effectively integrates boundary, control, and entity classes, ensuring high cohesion and low coupling; however, the relationship mappings, such as associations or dependencies, could use further clarification.* |

**Part 4: Packaging/Testing (1 mark)**

Select **ONE** of the following options:

**1 mark** – **Package diagram is correct; evidence of testing is provided**

**0.5 mark** – **Minor issues** in packaging and/or testing

**0 mark** – **Major issues** in packaging/testing

**Comments:**

|  |
| --- |
| *1 mark*  *The packaging demonstrates a clear separation of concerns, with boundary, business logic, and data access layers encapsulated in distinct packages, adhering to common design patterns.* |