Members: Erika Achig, Angel Aguire,Carolina Alvarado, Bryan Azuero,Bryan Castro.

NRC: 2858

Inspector group name: CrSystem (Group 1)

Group 7 review(RS_and_ITsolutions...DevsJAVA)

General Objectives

- Find the errors and give constructive criticisms so that there can be an improvement when performing the same processes again.

Specific Objectives

- Perform an inspection of group number 7 following the rubric already established
- Comment the code with the observations, most important errors found.
- Give constructive feedback about bad programming practices

Development

1. **GitHub(100).**

In the first item, the GitHub repository is well developed and structured, there is no error in this section.

Rating 100/100

2. **Problem Definition(20)**

The text is sufficiently conscientious but in the few lines of explanation that it has, it does not present the problem as it is, but rather it takes several unnecessary turns that do not add anything to the general theme.The creation of this project has several observations since it

does not have a certain size of a company, since this system would not work in the same way for a large company as for a small one.

The problem to be solved should be more precise, concise and the ideas should be clear so that they can be understood by different people.

Rating 17/20

3. **Object List (20)**

   All possible classes declared in the description of the problem are in the list, also if they match those used in the two diagrams.

   Exist a direct relationship between the object list and the problem definition

   Most declared client class use a synonym so there are no misunderstandings.

Rating 20/20

4. **Use Case Diagram(20)**

The use case described must express a only functional requirement

The diagram is well done in a general way but if it is observed in a more specific way, the administrator does not concentrate so many functions in himself, for which he should have more internal officials in the program other than the administrator

Rating 18/20

5. **Class Diagram(50)**

For the most part, the class diagram is fine except for a few small details which are used in the code later

Rating 50/50

6. **IEEE830 (20)**

Rating 20/20

7. **Letter of Intent(20)**

It is well structured but at the time of giving the requirements and some specifications of the application used, there are some spaces that are not understood very well due to the language that was used to define them.

The text basically presented is called a binding contract which does not specify under what rules and what freedoms the user has when making use of or accepting what is described above

The introductory part lacks The reason and importance of the research on this topic and what are the purposes and expected scope

Exist a relationship between the requirements and the clases

Rating 20/20

8. **Code Consistency (Inspection) (50).**

The consistency of the code is quite good since it is very organized and structured, the code is not very neglected, there are small errors in the code for example in some variables and in the methods some are not in the singular.

In the classes it is necessary to declare the other methods that arise in the class diagram.

Rating 50/50

9. **Validation(System vs UC vs IEE830)(20)**

   With the class diagram it also varies since in the programmed classes some functions are missing that are established in the class diagram.

   A large part if it consists of the IEEE 830 format but in the code it is a client and in the IEEE 830 Format it is costumer.

   The functions can be fulfilled by anyone unlike what it says in the 830 that only the administrator can

   * Rating 19/20

10. **Verification(Running + Json)(100)**

The project if it is running satisfactorily meeting the minimum requirements which are to save the data in Json format.

Rating 100/100

RS_and_ITsolutions...DevsJAVA

Max	CRITERIA	GRADE	COMMENTS	
100	Git hub	100		
20	Problem Definition	17		
20	Objet List	20		
20	Use Case Diagram	18		
50	Class Diagram	50		
20	IEEE 830	20		
20	Letter of Intent	20		
50	Code constency (Inspection)	50		
20	Validation(Systeam vs Uc vs IEEE830)	19		
100	Verification (Running + JsonFiles)	100		
420		414		

GitHub	100
Problem Definition	17
Object List	20
Use Case Diagram	18
Class Diagram	50
IEEE830	20
Letter of Intent	20
Code Consistency	50
Validation (System vs UC vs IEEE830)	19
Verification (Running + JsonFiles)	100
Total	414