Linnæus University
Course: Object Oriented Analysis and Design (1DV607, Autumn 2016)

Peer-Review of Workshop 1 (grade 2)

Reviewed work by: **Patrik Nilsson**
Reviewer: **Mitja Tim Rijavec Bruneus**

Overall evaluation

The presented Domain Model is simple and very easy to read and understand, probably even by a person not familiar with UML diagrams and without special knowledge of the modelled domain. However, this simplicity comes at a cost of not providing enough information to the implementer for certain planned use cases (e.g. boat management, berth assignment). The association naming is somewhat inconsistent. Overall, the model is a reasonably good although simple representation of the domain but can be improved with some alterations to make it more useful.

Observations and recommendations

Coverage of the requirements and use cases:

The model covers (some) requirements/use cases in a very clear and simple way. The model does however not represent probably the most important requirement for the new system: the automatic berth assignment system (same goes for payment tracking, but that is not covered in the use cases and could therefore potentially be omitted). Furthermore, boat management (use cases 4-6) and authentication (use case 1) are not represented at all. In order for the model to be more useful to the implementer, more cases should be covered (possibly at the cost of simplicity and clarity).

Choice of classes and associations:

The classes are chosen well, the associations between them are reasonable and the terms used to describe them come from the domain. The *BoatDescription* class might not really be necessary at this level of detail and could probably be represented as an attribute (depending on whether we assume different boats will have the same description). To cover more use cases, new classes and associations would have to be introduced (some kind of automatic berth assignment system, authentication system etc.; see Larman 2005, 9.5. Guideline: How to Find Conceptual Classes?). The berth assignment is not completely clear: *Berth Assign to Boat* – who does what?

Naming conventions:

The association names are somewhat inconsistent: some association names are in the 3rd person (e.g. *Views*) while some are not, try being consistent preferably using the 3rd person forms according to the readability guideline: "*Name an association based on a ClassName-VerbPhrase-ClassName format where the verb phrase creates a sequence that is readable and meaningful.*" (Larman 2005, 9.14. Associations). Larman also states that the two common formats for association names are Association-name and AssociationName. The association names *Assign To* and *owns* do not comply with this format (spaces, lower case initial).

Reference

Larman, C. (2005). Applying UML and patterns. 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall PTR