# Summary of Changes Made for Revision 1 (All Documents)

All documents have been revised to reflect the finished product. In addition to this, all documents have been made consistent with and traceable between each other.

Note that the comments made by Dan are addressed in the order that they occurred in the revision 0 submission. See the revision 0 documents to view these comments in their original context.

## Problem Statement

### Changes made in response to Dr. Smith’s comments:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Number** | **Dr. Smith’s comment** | **Change made** |

### Changes made in response to Dan’s comments:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Number** | **Dan’s comment** | **Change made** |

## Software Requirements Specification

### Changes made in response to Dr. Smith’s comments:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Number** | **Dr. Smith’s comment** | **Change made** |
| S1 | Requirements document plan should identify risk to be tested during PoC demo.  -- from lecture notes 05 | Added risks that PoC demo addressed. |
| S2 | “The software must support all major PC operating systems” is not a constraint; it is also ambiguous  -- from lecture notes 07 | Removed from constraints; already had as a non-functional requirement |
| S3 | Future developers are a commonly missing stakeholder  -- from lecture notes 07 | Added future developers to stakeholders |

### Changes made in response to Dan’s comments:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Number** | **Dan’s comment** | **Change made** |
| D1 | don't say “type” unless you're following it with “of” | Section rewritten, this sentence no longer exists, but noted |
| D2 | Sounds very generic. You should be trying to set your game world apart. Is there a story? Theme? Some stylistic elements that are constrained? | The section has been updated and the questions posed by Dan have been answered to provide a less generic description of the game world. |
| D3 | You have no constraints on the input type. This should be reflected in the diagram. | A constraint on input types (mouse, keyboard) was added instead of changing the diagram |
|  | What about upgrading the hero? Completing the game? etc. | Hero upgrades have been removed from the game. Level completion use case added. |
|  | How many levels will there be? How does the player progress? What happens if the player beats the game? | Requirements for number of levels and level completion added. |
|  | All of your requirements (bar one) are high priority. This should not be the case | Modified functional requirement priorities; added new priority level “very high”; many of the functional requirements have high or very high priorities since they are critical for the game to work properly |
|  | What is the theme of the game? Is there a certain aesthetic you are aiming to achieve? | Added look and feel non-functional requirements for the theme and aesthetic of the game. |
|  | What about finding your theme or determining how to create the RPG elements? | Theme has been decided and is incorporated into the document; the RPG genre aspect has been scrapped |
|  | What about open-source games created in Chipmunk2D? | Added open source Chipmunk2D games. |
|  | Are you sure?  -- this was in response to claiming no risks involved with the project | Added risks that PoC demo addressed. |

### Other changes:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Number** | **Reason** | **Change made** |
| O1 | Changes in requirements due to modified project scope | Modifications/deletions/additions to requirements, use cases, events |

## Test Plan

### Changes made in response to Dr. Smith’s comments:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Number** | **Dr. Smith’s comment** | **Change made** |
| S1 | During meeting it was mentioned that we could reduce our automated testing to a limited set of tests that | Automated test cases reduced to a small set of input and physics/collision tests; addition of some manual tests to compensate |

### Changes made in response to Dan’s comments:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Number** | **Dan’s comment** | **Change made** |
| D1 | Your demonstration plan and proof of concept test could be merged into one section as they are describing the same thing. The PoC Test subsection is fairly sparse on its own | Sections have been merged |
| D2 | You should specify which of your test cases cover which of your requirements and then check to ensure all of your requirements are being covered. If they aren't, then you should create more test cases. Currently this section isn't really saying anything new. | Section has been rewritten to be a trace between requirements and tests; all requirements are covered by test cases |
|  | Do you have any tests for invalid inputs (other than saving/loading)? | We do not have any tests for invalid inputs (saving and loading was scrapped); the game will only respond to inputs that are expected (all other inputs are ignored) and since the only expected inputs are mouse and keyboard clicks, they cannot be invalid  Perhaps related to this: the game loads data files that are hardcoded (textures, meshes, stages, etc) – if these files are missing, error messages are reported and the game will exit (except for missing sounds – the game just doesn’t load the sound). Testing wasn’t really needed for this because it will only fail if the file is not found (and from many experiences with not copying over updated data files, it definitely works) |
|  | As it reads now, it seems that the hero character will have all weapons available  to them at all times. Is this intended? If not, you need more test cases. | The weapons are no longer a part of the game |

### Other changes:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Number** | **Reason** | **Change made** |
| O1 | Changes to test cases due to modified project scope | Modifications/deletions/additions to test cases |
| O2 | User experience survey not carried out due to time constraints | User experience survey designated as future plan in timeline |

## Design Document

### Changes made in response to Dr. Smith’s comments:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Number** | **Dr. Smith’s comment** | **Change made** |

### Changes made in response to Dan’s comments:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Number** | **Dan’s comment** | **Change made** |

### Other changes:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Number** | **Reason** | **Change made** |
| O1 | Further decomposition of system into additional modules | Added new classes, updated uses diagram, updated MIS/MID |

## User Guide

### Other changes:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Number** | **Reason** | **Change made** |
| O1 | Some hazards not implemented in final version | Removed references to the unimplemented hazards |
| O2 | User experience survey | Removed sections that were to be updated after user experience survey |
| O3 | Legal and copyright info missing (from marking scheme) | Added legal and copyright info |

## Test Report

### Changes made in response to Dr. Smith’s comments:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Number** | **Dr. Smith’s comment** | **Change made** |

### Changes made in response to Dan’s comments:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Number** | **Dan’s comment** | **Change made** |