

Peer Review, Workshop 1
Group 2: Ludvig Magnusson, Johan Rovala, Ayaz Ali
By: John Herrlin, Rasmus Sjöström

As a developer would the model help you and why/why not?

The model gives a good overview of the domain and shows Association Notations according to Larman [1, Part 3, Chapter 9.14] in a proper way. The model gives a clear, non-confusing first impression which makes it comfortable to visualize in practise.

Do you think a domain expert (for example the Secretary) would understand the model why/why not?

We do not think a domain expert would have any difficulties understanding the model due to its clear associations and simple classes. The naming of the selected classes are done well in regards of using existing terms within this particular domain, as suggested in [1, Part 3, Chapter 9.10].

What are the strong points of the model, what do you think is really good and why?

This model's strongest attributes are definitely its "clarity-by-simplicity", with only a few classes and associations which together still makes up for a robust picture of the domain as a whole.

What are the weaknesses of the model, what do you think should be changed and why?

The weaker parts of the model is some of the attributes. We feel that detailed attributes such as for instance "serial number", "image" or "size" could create more confusion than clarity since we failed to see how these attributes were really relevant to this type of model.

Do you think the model has passed the grade 2 (passing grade) criteria?

Yes. The model fulfills its purpose, and is easy to understand.

References:

1. Larman C. , Applying UML and Patterns 3rd Ed, 2005, ISBN: 0131489062

