

# Verification and Validation Report: Software Engineering

Team #22, TeleHealth Insights  
Mitchell Weingust  
Parisha Nizam  
Promish Kandel  
Jasmine Sun-Hu

March 10, 2025

# 1 Revision History

Date	Version	Notes
Date 1	1.0	Notes
Date 2	1.1	Notes

## 2 Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms

symbol	description
T	Test

[symbols, abbreviations or acronyms – you can reference the SRS tables if needed —SS]

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Revision History</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Functional Requirements Evaluation</b>	<b>1</b>
3.1	Authentication . . . . .	1
3.2	Data Collection and Storage . . . . .	1
3.3	Video and Audio Data Analysis . . . . .	3
3.4	Data Processing and Display . . . . .	4
3.5	System Set Up . . . . .	4
3.6	Assessment Interface . . . . .	5
<b>4</b>	<b>Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1	Look and Feel Requirements . . . . .	5
4.2	Usability and Humanity . . . . .	6
4.3	Performance . . . . .	6
4.4	Operational and Environmental . . . . .	11
4.5	Maintainability and Support . . . . .	11
4.6	Cultural . . . . .	11
4.7	Security . . . . .	12
4.8	Compliance . . . . .	12
<b>5</b>	<b>Comparison to Existing Implementation</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Unit Testing</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Changes Due to Testing</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Automated Testing</b>	<b>13</b>
8.1	Linters . . . . .	13
8.2	Unit Testing . . . . .	13
8.3	Continuous Integration . . . . .	14
<b>9</b>	<b>Trace to Requirements</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Trace to Modules</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Code Coverage Metrics</b>	<b>14</b>

**List of Tables**

**List of Figures**

This document contains the team's verification and validation report for the TeleHealth Insights project. This document features functional requirements evaluation, nonfunctional requirements evaluation, unit testing, changes due to testing, automated testing, trace to requirements, trace to modules, and code coverage metrics.

## 3 Functional Requirements Evaluation

The following section covers all the functional requirements tests specified in the project's VnV Plan document. The coverage can be traced in Table X.

### 3.1 Authentication

The test cases below focus on ensuring users can safely and securely login, create and access their accounts without worrying about others accessing their information.

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-A1

**Input:** Selection of Parent account role for login

**Expected Output:** The expected result is the Parent account role is selected and User is brought to the Parent login screen

**Actual Output:**

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** FR-A1

### 3.2 Data Collection and Storage

The test cases below focus on ensuring data is collected and stored correctly. We test to make sure no identifiable information is stored in the database and we also check that all multimedia data is linked correctly to user assignment.

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-DSC1

**Input:** Insertion of multimedia files into the database

**Expected Output:** A success message in the console for both storing and retrieving the data; the retrieved files are uncorrupted and match the original files

**Actual Output:** A success message in the console and a link to multimedia file

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** FR-DSC1

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-DSC2

**Input:** Insertion of a test assessment session with video, audio files, flagged occurrences, and timestamps for each assessment question

**Expected Output:** Creation of a JSON file containing the flagged occurrences and timestamps stored alongside the session data

**Actual Output:** A JSON file was created in AWS with the correct expected output

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** FR-DSC2

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-DSC3

**Input:** Attempted insertion of a record containing personally identifiable information (e.g. address)

**Expected Output:** The console throws an error as no such field exists for personal information

**Actual Output:** The database throws an invalid payload error

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** FR-DSC3

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-DSC4

**Input:** Insertion of multiple sessions, each tagged with a unique user identifier

**Expected Output:** All session data is stored and correctly grouped under their respective unique user identifiers

**Actual Output:** The database creates folders based on the unique identifiers

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** FR-DSC4

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-DSC5

**Input:** Insertion of an assessment report linked to a patient's unique identifier

**Expected Output:** The report is successfully stored, linked to the corresponding patient identifier

**Actual Output:** The assessment is put into the correct folder and is added to the JSON that links multimedia to assignment

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** FR-DSC5

### 3.3 Video and Audio Data Analysis

The test cases below ensure that both video and audio data is correctly accessed, processed and stored in its respective user folder with no errors.

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-VDA1

**Input:** Request by the analysis model to access video and audio data from a completed session



**Expected Output:** All requested videos and audio files are processed successfully with a corresponding success message logged

**Actual Output:** A success message in the console after video and audio are finished processing

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** FR-ST-VDA1

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-VDA2, FR-ST-VDA3

**Input:** Video and audio data containing speech disturbances, interruptions, and other irregularities for analysis

**Expected Output:** A JSON file is generated that records the number of disturbances

**Actual Output:** A JSON file is created in the correct user folder with a link to the video and contains bias timestamps

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** FR-ST-VDA2, FR-ST-VDA3

### 3.4 Data Processing and Display

The test cases below

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-A1

**Input:** Selection of Parent account role for login

**Expected Output:** The expected result is the Parent account role is selected and User is brought to the Parent login screen

**Actual Output:**

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** FR-A1

### 3.5 System Set Up

The test cases below

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-A1

**Input:** Selection of Parent account role for login

**Expected Output:** The expected result is the Parent account role is selected and User is brought to the Parent login screen

**Actual Output:**

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** FR-A1

### 3.6 Assessment Interface

The test cases below

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-A1

**Input:** Selection of Parent account role for login

**Expected Output:** The expected result is the Parent account role is selected and User is brought to the Parent login screen

**Actual Output:**

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** FR-A1

## 4 Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation

The following section covers all the nonfunctional requirements specified in the project's VnV Plan document. The coverage can be traced in Table X.

### 4.1 Look and Feel Requirements

The test cases below

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-A1

**Input:** Selection of Parent account role for login

**Expected Output:** The expected result is the Parent account role is selected and User is brought to the Parent login screen

**Actual Output:**

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Nonfunctional Requirement(s):** FR-A1

## 4.2 Usability and Humanity

The test cases below

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-A1

**Input:** Selection of Parent account role for login

**Expected Output:** The expected result is the Parent account role is selected and User is brought to the Parent login screen

**Actual Output:**

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Nonfunctional Requirement(s):** FR-A1

## 4.3 Performance

The test cases outlined below ensure proper performance and stability of our system and database.

**Test Case Identifier:** PR-ST-SL1

**Input/Condition:** User navigates through various web pages.

**Expected Output/Results:** All web pages load completely with all functionalities within MAX\_LOAD\_TIME.

**Actual Output/Results:** All web pages load with correct data within MAX\_LOAD\_TIME.

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** PR-ST-SL1

**Test Case Identifier:** PR-ST-SL2

**Input/Condition:** A session is recorded during which two faces appear and a keyword is said.

**Expected Output/Results:** The latency between video and recorded playback remains below SHORT\_PROCESSING\_TIME.

**Actual Output/Results:** The latency is within the SHORT\_PROCESSING\_TIME when reviewing on clinician side

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** PR-ST-SL2

**Test Case Identifier:** PR-ST-SL3

**Input/Condition:** A video recorded during an assessment session is stored and later retrieved.

**Expected Output/Results:** The retrieved video meets or exceeds AVERAGE\_RESOLUTION.

**Actual Output/Results:** Video is AVERAGE\_RESOLUTION

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** PR-ST-SL3

**Test Case Identifier:** PR-ST-PA1

**Input/Condition:** Analysis model loaded with sample audio and video data containing known speech disturbances and multiple faces.

**Expected Output/Results:** The model detects speech and multiple faces with an accuracy of VERY\_HIGH\_SUCCESS\_RATE.

**Actual Output/Results:** The model detects multiple faces with

VERY\_HIGH\_SUCCESS\_RATE but not speeches

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** False

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** PR-ST-PA1

**Test Case Identifier:** PR-ST-PA3

**Input/Condition:** User performs actions in the recorded session

**Expected Output/Results:** The timestamps delay within SHORT\_PROCESSING\_TIME of the real-time action.

**Actual Output/Results:** The timestamps delay SHORT\_PROCESSING\_TIME

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** PR-ST-PA3

**Test Case Identifier:** PR-ST-PA4

**Input/Condition:** Manual verification of the answer key's accuracy.

**Expected Output/Results:** The expected output is that the answer key is MAX\_SUCCESS\_RATE.

**Actual Output/Results:** The answer key is MAX\_SUCCESS\_RATE.

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** PR-ST-PA4

**Test Case Identifier:** PR-ST-RFT1

**Input/Condition:** Simulate common user errors (e.g., invalid inputs).

**Expected Output/Results:** The system displays clear error messages for at least VERY\_HIGH\_SUCCESS\_RATE of the errors encountered.

**Actual Output/Results:** System gives correct feedback to user with a VERY\_HIGH\_SUCCESS\_RATE

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** PR-ST-RFT1

**Test Case Identifier:** PR-ST-RFT2

**Input/Condition:** Monthly data backup event.

**Expected Output/Results:** The expected output is that the system performs a data backup within a MONTHLY\_BACKUP timeframe on the first of each month.

**Actual Output/Results:** This test case is currently out of scope as we don't have enough data to verify it.

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** N/A

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** PR-ST-RFT2

**Test Case Identifier:** PR-ST-CR1

**Input/Condition:** System loaded with MIN\_USERS accounts.

**Expected Output/Results:** The expected result is that the system operates stably and manages all accounts without issues.

**Actual Output/Results:** System runs smoothly with MIN\_USERS accounts

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** PR-ST-CR1

**Test Case Identifier:** PR-ST-CR2

**Input/Condition:** Data stored in the database approaches the annual MIN\_STORAGE threshold.

**Expected Output/Results:** The system accommodates the data volume without performance degradation.

**Actual Output/Results:** The system accommodates the

MIN\_STORAGE threshold with room to increase data storage

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** PR-ST-CR2

**Test Case Identifier:** PR-ST-SE1

**Input/Condition:** Increase user base by  
YEARLY\_INCREASE\_PERCENTAGE.

**Expected Output/Results:** The expected result is that the system maintains performance while handling user growth.

**Actual Output/Results:** This test case is currently out of scope due to time constraints

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** N/A

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** PR-ST-SE1

**Test Case Identifier:** PR-ST-LR1

**Input/Condition:** Monitor system stability over successive updates on the release build.

**Expected Output/Results:** The system's failure rate remains below LOW\_FAILURE\_RATE during updates.

**Actual Output/Results:** system failure rate remains below LOW\_FAILURE\_RATE during deployment of versions

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** PR-ST-LR1

**Test Case Identifier:** PR-ST-LR2

**Input/Condition:** The system is run on multiple operating systems (Windows, macOS).

**Expected Output/Results:** The system functions correctly on all

tested platforms without issues.

**Actual Output/Results:** The system functions correctly on multiple operating systems

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Functional Requirement(s):** PR-ST-LR2

#### 4.4 Operational and Environmental

The test cases below

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-A1

**Input:** Selection of Parent account role for login

**Expected Output:** The expected result is the Parent account role is selected and User is brought to the Parent login screen

**Actual Output:**

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Nonfunctional Requirement(s):** FR-A1

#### 4.5 Maintainability and Support

The test cases below

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-A1

**Input:** Selection of Parent account role for login

**Expected Output:** The expected result is the Parent account role is selected and User is brought to the Parent login screen

**Actual Output:**

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Nonfunctional Requirement(s):** FR-A1

#### 4.6 Cultural

The test cases below



**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-A1

**Input:** Selection of Parent account role for login

**Expected Output:** The expected result is the Parent account role is selected and User is brought to the Parent login screen

**Actual Output:**

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Nonfunctional Requirement(s):** FR-A1

## 4.7 Security

The test cases below

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-A1

**Input:** Selection of Parent account role for login

**Expected Output:** The expected result is the Parent account role is selected and User is brought to the Parent login screen

**Actual Output:**

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

**Relevant Nonfunctional Requirement(s):** FR-A1

## 4.8 Compliance

The test cases below

**Test Case Identifier:** FR-ST-A1

**Input:** Selection of Parent account role for login

**Expected Output:** The expected result is the Parent account role is selected and User is brought to the Parent login screen

**Actual Output:**

**Expected and Actual Output Match:** True

## 5 Comparison to Existing Implementation

As this project does not have existing implementations, this section is not appropriate for the TeleHealth Insights project.

## 6 Unit Testing

## 7 Changes Due to Testing

[This section should highlight how feedback from the users and from the supervisor (when one exists) shaped the final product. In particular the feedback from the Rev 0 demo to the supervisor (or to potential users) should be highlighted. —SS]

## 8 Automated Testing

### 8.1 Linters

To maintain a good coding standard, we integrated linters into our development workflow. For JavaScript files, we rely on Prettier to automatically format code, ensuring consistent indentation and spacing. By running Prettier as part of our pre-commit checks, any formatting concerns are addressed before merging into our main repository, which helps minimize merge conflicts and maintain a clean codebase.

### 8.2 Unit Testing

We use Jest as our primary JavaScript testing framework to automatically verify critical parts of our code before changes are merged into the main branch. This approach helps us catch issues early, maintain code quality, and keep the overall system stable.

### **8.3 Continuous Integration**

We used continuous integration (CI) pipeline to automate test execution and provide immediate feedback whenever new code is committed. We configure GitHub Actions trigger to run our Jest unit tests, linters and document tests on each pull request or direct push to main, ensuring that only code meeting quality standards is always met.

## **9 Trace to Requirements**

## **10 Trace to Modules**

## **11 Code Coverage Metrics**

## **References**

## Appendix — Reflection

The information in this section will be used to evaluate the team members on the graduate attribute of Reflection.

The purpose of reflection questions is to give you a chance to assess your own learning and that of your group as a whole, and to find ways to improve in the future. Reflection is an important part of the learning process. Reflection is also an essential component of a successful software development process.

Reflections are most interesting and useful when they're honest, even if the stories they tell are imperfect. You will be marked based on your depth of thought and analysis, and not based on the content of the reflections themselves. Thus, for full marks we encourage you to answer openly and honestly and to avoid simply writing "what you think the evaluator wants to hear."

Please answer the following questions. Some questions can be answered on the team level, but where appropriate, each team member should write their own response:

1. What went well while writing this deliverable?
2. What pain points did you experience during this deliverable, and how did you resolve them?
3. Which parts of this document stemmed from speaking to your client(s) or a proxy (e.g. your peers)? Which ones were not, and why?
4. In what ways was the Verification and Validation (VnV) Plan different from the activities that were actually conducted for VnV? If there were differences, what changes required the modification in the plan? Why did these changes occur? Would you be able to anticipate these changes in future projects? If there weren't any differences, how was your team able to clearly predict a feasible amount of effort and the right tasks needed to build the evidence that demonstrates the required quality? (It is expected that most teams will have had to deviate from their original VnV Plan.)