

Workshop 2 – Design. Peer review for Grade 2.

Reviewer: Paulius Zukas (pz222as)

Workshop authors: Fredrik Jönsson (fj222hn),

Christofer Nguyen (cn222hn),

Jonathan Walkden (jw222qi)

Q: Try to compile/use the source code using the instructions provided. Can you get it up and running? Is anything problematic? Are there steps missing or assumptions made?

A: I was able to get it up and running. Instructions were clear and easy to understand.

Q: Does the implementation and diagrams conform (do they show the same thing)? Are there any missing relations? Relations in the wrong direction? Wrong relations? Correct UML notation?

A: Implementation and code displays the same information and can be linked to each other. However, there are some small flaws that could be fixed. For example, class diagram does not seem to include dependencies.

Q: Is the Architecture ok?

A: Overall architecture of the system is quite good. There is a clear Model View separation, domain rules are fulfilled.

Q: Is the requirement of a unique member id correctly done?

A: Unique ID numbers are provided for each member thus are correctly done. During run-time I have not seen any problems with this functionality.

Q: What is the quality of the implementation/source code?

A: Good naming and comments (in some cases the comments even seem too easy to understand, could be removed). User input could be handled in a separate class for better separation and organization of overall code. Good naming of classes, methods, etc. No dead code.

Q: What is the quality of the design? Is it Object Oriented?

A: Overall, the quality of design is good. Design is object oriented, follows all the principles of good UML design. In my eyes, GRASP seems to be used correctly.

Q: As a developer would the diagrams help you and why/why not?

A: Your diagrams could be better, but overall I believe that they would help me as a developer, to better understand what is happening in the system. They are clear to follow, names are easy to understand.

Q: What are the strong points of the design/implementation, what do you think is really good and why?

A: Really well (sometimes as mentioned before makes me feel that too well) written comments. Design is easy to follow. Implementation could be improved, but overall is well written and quite ok to understand and follow.

Q: What are the weaknesses of the design/implementation, what do you think should be changed and why?

A: Some user input is not handled properly. As example: members name can be accepted as an empty string; Personal number can be anything (letters, any digit combination, etc.). Classes could be organized better.

Q: Do you think the model has passed the grade 2 (passing grade) criteria?

A: In my opinion your design (workshop 2) has passed the grade 2 (passing grade) criteria.

References

1. Tutorial Point, UML tutorial,
http://www.tutorialspoint.com/uml/uml_basic_notations.htm
2. Larman C. Applying UML and Patterns 3rd edition, ISBN: 0-13-148906-2