Workshop 1 Grade 2 peer review

Work: *Jan Karlsson*
Lnu name: *jk222zx*

Peer reviewer: Henry Pap
Lnu name: hp222fq

The positives

- All of the association names start with a capital letter which by Larman [1, p153] is the correct way.

The negatives

- The association names are too long and do not correctly follow Larman's [1, p152] guideline as they are more or less like verb-description instead of only verb.
- The attribute notation string, float gives off a software feeling to the model. Although these are not entirely wrong they are considered as default, at least string, Larman [1, p159].
- The conceptual class naming/terms are not so good, especially when it comes to BerthRegistration. There are duplicate classes that seems to serve different purpose and can be bit misleading.
- There should be a conceptual class for boat itself as it matches a 'physical object" in Larman's [1, p140] table of common categories.

As a developer this model is quite messy to look at and it would force me to look into the requirements again which should be the domain models purpose to not. In the view of the secretary it is quite clear that he/she will be handling the clubcalendar and the berth assignments which is very good. I would almost approve this model but to do this, boat and berth should be a bit more organized.

References

1. Larman C. Applying UML and Patterns 3rd Ed, 2005, ISBN: *0-13-148906-2*
2. Karlsson J. Workshop 1 Grade 2, 2016,
    https://github.com/jk222zx/public/blob/1DV607/DomainModel_grade2_rev4.jpg