

Peer review

to Mitja Tim Rijavec Bruneus from Seldin Music and Rasmus Gazelius Skedinger
1DV607, Workshop 1, grade 2

Our suggestions to improve your domain model.

- This domain model has parts from a design model and a domain model. For instance it has aggregation and inheritance which doesn't help to understand the problem domain.
- The treasurer is not mentioned in any point of grade 2. It is hard to understand what purpose the treasurer has in this domain model.
- This domain model is focusing more on software then modeling the problem at hand. It has inheritance and aggregation which is generally not part of the domain model.
- Calendar is more complex then it should be. For instance why is member requesting list-events but when requesting event it goes directly between member and event. If the Views association would have reading direction arrow it might have clarified the understanding of the calendar.
- YachtClub in your domain model is not supposed to organize the calendar according to grade 2.
- The naming is good in general, but some are not like the association between YachtClub and Berth called Has-at-disposal.
- Some associations does not have any multiplicity.
- In general the model describes the problem domain but it could use some clean up, for instance the boat registration is a bit confusing if you take in consideration off-season registration and pre-season registration which should not have the same berth assignment as when its season.

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

If I would just get this domain model without the use cases it would take me some time to understand what problem domain you where trying to convey.

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

We don't think the treasurer would know what his/her role is in this domain model nor would we expect the secretary to fully understand what role in the boat registration.

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

In general associations have good naming convention with multiplicity and reading direction arrows. We recognize that you understand that some kind of system assigns the berth and the secretary just approves of what the system is suggesting.

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

We would recommend improving points mentioned above.

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

In general we think the model has almost all the important elements for a pass but could use some modifications as mentioned above for clarification, for the sake of understanding it easier.

References

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