Advanced Object Oriented Programming - Specification and Design documents for the mini-project

Group	Surname	Name	Comments on the deliverables
6	ABDYEVA	SABINA	Very nice specification and design documents. However, you should have prepared a REAL document (and not a presentation) and add some text to explain your diagrams. I would have also expected a domain model diagram in the specification document.
4	AHMADZADA	EYVAZ	The specification document is EMPTY ... there are no use case diagram, no domain model diagram, no interaction diagram, no GUI mock-up The design document is REALLY poor ... Where do these diagrams come from ? There is no explanation, no correct use of the syntax. Please, revise the syntax of sequence diagrams to integrate the idea that there can be a success for the operation OR an error message (see the use of the ALT blocks)
1	ALIYEV	RUSTAM	Attention in your use case diagram ! the server is not a user there is no domain model in your specification ... it makes it impossible to understand how you have reached to the HIGHLY complex class diagram in your design Your Server Client Interaction via RMI Diagram is not necessary you need to add text to explain your diagrams
12	AZADOV	EMIN	**deliverables not uploaded**
11	AZIZOV	RASHAD	Very nice specification document, However some text to explain the diagrams would have been very welcome. Please complete. Also include a system sequence diagram to make clear the error management Concerning the design document, the interaction diagram should include the classes that appear in your class diag'ram. This is not the case. Please correct Again, explain with some tex how you have reached to those versions of the diagrams
3	BABAYEVA	MARYAM	Your design document is very nice. You should complete it with some text to explain your diagrams Your specification document is less nice. In the use case diagram, the server is not an actor. there is no REAL user in the server side. In your system sequence diagram you should only show the interactions of the actor and the system (as a black box) to explicitely show the error management. In the domain model diagram, I would have expected to have only the notions of client, server, operation, operand, operator .. and not implementation details, such as interfaces. This domain model is at the base of the class diagram that you present later
8	EMINOV	MUSAKHAN	You have not uploaded a specification document Your design document is EMPTY. Please follow the guidelines !!!
4	GAHRAMANOV	ORKHAN	The specification document is EMPTY ... there are no use case diagram, no domain model diagram, no interaction diagram, no GUI mock-up The design document is REALLY poor ... Where do these diagrams come from ? There is no explanation, no correct use of the syntax. Please, revise the syntax of sequence diagrams to integrate the idea that there can be a success for the operation OR an error message (see the use of the ALT blocks)
8	GAMBAROV	VAGIF	Your specification document is empty. There is only a use case diagram, with errors, as the server is not a REAL actor of your system. You have not uploaded the design document
5	GAMBAROVA	TAMILLA	Use case : first of all, you do not have a REAL actor on the server side, so please delete it. Secondly, you cannot have a "extends" arrow between a case and an actor. What do the "full arrows" mean (for instance, between see results and negative operand error" ? the only accepted arrows between use cases are "includes", "extends" ou eventually a heritage. The system sequence diagram is missing (where you can make explicitely appear all the error management The diagram of the domain model SHOULD NOT INCLUDE implementation details, as yours does. In the domain model i would have expected to have a Client, a Server, an Operation, Operands, Operators ... and nothing more than that. This domain model diagram will be enriched later (you do not have it) as a class diagram where you can even include some classes that could be needed for implementation ... In the final sequence diagram you should have the classes of the class diagram (that you have not presented)
5	GASIMOV	AYDIN	Use case : first of all, you do not have a REAL actor on the server side, so please delete it. Secondly, you cannot have a "extends" arrow between a case and an actor. What do the "full arrows" mean (for instance, between see results and negative operand error" ? the only accepted arrows between use cases are "includes", "extends" ou eventually a heritage. The system sequence diagram is missing (where you can make explicitely appear all the error management The diagram of the domain model SHOULD NOT INCLUDE implementation details, as yours does. In the domain model i would have expected to have a Client, a Server, an Operation, Operands, Operators ... and nothing more than that. This domain model diagram will be enriched later (you do not have it) as a class diagram where you can even include some classes that could be needed for implementation ... In the final sequence diagram you should have the classes of the class diagram (that you have not presented)
7	GASIMOVA	LEYLA	Your design document is very nice. You should complete it with some text to explain your diagrams Your specification document is less nice. In the use case diagram, the server is not an actor. there is no REAL user in the server side. In your system sequence diagram you should only show the interactions of the actor and the system (as a black box) to explicitely show the error management. In the domain model diagram, I would have expected to have only the notions of client, server, operation, operand, operator .. and not implementation details, such as interfaces. This domain model is at the base of the class diagram that you present later
10	GULIYEV	FARID	The specification document is quite poor. In the use case diagram, please erase the Server that is not a REAL user. The system sequence diagrams should allow you to express the error management, and I do not see that clearly. There is a domain model missing and the exhaustive list of functionnalities to develop Your design document is strangely close to the one of groupe 6. Be careful. More explanations are needed on the way you reach your diagrams. As the domain model is missing int the specification, it is not clear how you reach to your complex class diagram
9	GULUZADE	EMIL	The specification document is quite poor. In the use case diagram, please erase the Server that is not a REAL user. The system sequence diagrams should allow you to express the error management, and I do not see that clearly; all the error messages should be clearly explicit. There is a domain model missing and the exhaustive list of functionnalities to develop Your design document is strangely close to the one of groups 6 and 10. Be careful. More explanations are needed on the way you reach your diagrams. As the domain model is missing int the specification, it is not clear how you reach to your complex class diagram Your design includes too many implementation details that are not needed at this step
11	GURBANLI	ELCHIN	Very nice specification document, However some text to explain the diagrams would have been very welcome. Please complete. Also include a system sequence diagram to make clear the error management Concerning the design document, the interaction diagram should include the classes that appear in your class diag'ram. This is not the case. Please correct Again, explain with some tex how you have reached to those versions of the diagrams
12	HASANOV	JAFAR	**deliverables not uploaded**

2	HUSEYNLI	RAVAN	Regarding the specification document : The server is not a real ACTOR (there is no user on the server side to manually do what you say), please remove it. The domain model is missing. At this is the foundation to your class diagram in the design phase, it makes the class diagram impossible to understand Regarding the design document : It is quite poor. The interaction diagram is a navigation diagram, you MUST include a real interaction diagram; where the classes of your class diagram appear in place of the system black box in the system sequence diagram Text is needed to explain all the diagrams
6	ISMAYILOVA	ASMAR	Very nice specification and design documents. However, you should have prepared a REAL document (and not a presentation) and add some text to explain your diagrams. I would have also expected a domain model diagram in the specification document.
2	ISMAYILZADA	KAMRAN	Regarding the specification document : The server is not a real ACTOR (there is no user on the server side to manually do what you say), please remove it. The domain model is missing. At this is the foundation to your class diagram in the design phase, it makes the class diagram impossible to understand Regarding the design document : It is quite poor. The interaction diagram is a navigation diagram, you MUST include a real interaction diagram; where the classes of your class diagram appear in place of the system black box in the system sequence diagram Text is needed to explain all the diagrams
7	JAFARLI	SARKHAN	Your design document is very nice. You should complete it with some text to explain your diagrams Your specification document is less nice. In the use case diagram, the server is not an actor. there is no REAL user in the server side. In your system sequence diagram you should only show the interactions of the actor and the system (as a black box) to explicitely show the error management. In the domain model diagram, I would have expected to have only the notions of client, server, operation, operand, operator .. and not implementation details, such as interfaces. This domain model is at the base of the class diagram that you present later
6	KHALILLI	ASMAR	Very nice specification and design documents. However, you should have prepared a REAL document (and not a presentation) and add some text to explain your diagrams. I would have also expected a domain model diagram in the specification document.
2	KHANLAROV	SABIR	Regarding the specification document : The server is not a real ACTOR (there is no user on the server side to manually do what you say), please remove it. The domain model is missing. At this is the foundation to your class diagram in the design phase, it makes the class diagram impossible to understand Regarding the design document : It is quite poor. The interaction diagram is a navigation diagram, you MUST include a real interaction diagram; where the classes of your class diagram appear in place of the system black box in the system sequence diagram Text is needed to explain all the diagrams
11	KHASIYEVA	UMNISA	**You are supposed to work with Group 11. However, you are not included as an author of the deliverables and you have submitted radically different things. Can you explain to me and to Seymour what the problem is ?**
1	MALIKZADE	MAHIRA	Attention in your use case diagram ! the server is not a user there is no domain model in your specification ... it makes it impossible to understand how you have reached to the HIGHLY complex class diagram in your design Your Server Client Interaction via RMI Diagram is not necessary you need to add text to explain your diagrams
3	MAMMADOV	ASIF	Your design document is very nice. You should complete it with some text to explain your diagrams Your specification document is less nice. In the use case diagram, the server is not an actor. there is no REAL user in the server side. In your system sequence diagram you should only show the interactions of the actor and the system (as a black box) to explicitely show the error management. In the domain model diagram, I would have expected to have only the notions of client, server, operation, operand, operator .. and not implementation details, such as interfaces. This domain model is at the base of the class diagram that you present later
9	MAMMADOV	VUGAR	The specification document is quite poor. In the use case diagram, please erase the Server that is not a REAL user. The system sequence diagrams should allow you to express the error management, and I do not see that clearly; all the error messages should be clearly explicit. There is a domain model missing and the exhaustive list of functionnalities to develop Your design document is strangely close to the one of groups 6 and 10. Be careful. More explanations are needed on the way you reach your diagrams. As the domain model is missing int the specification, it is not clear how you reach to your complex class diagram Your design includes too many implementation details that are not needed at this step
7	MAMMADOVA	LAMAN	Your design document is very nice. You should complete it with some text to explain your diagrams Your specification document is less nice. In the use case diagram, the server is not an actor. there is no REAL user in the server side. In your system sequence diagram you should only show the interactions of the actor and the system (as a black box) to explicitely show the error management. In the domain model diagram, I would have expected to have only the notions of client, server, operation, operand, operator .. and not implementation details, such as interfaces. This domain model is at the base of the class diagram that you present later
	NAGHIYEV	HUSEYN	**deliverables not uploaded**
	RAHMANOV	MAJID	**deliverables not uploaded**
8	RAMAZANOV	ILKIN	See my comments to the deliverables of the other two members of the group. There is HUGE work for you to do correctly the specfication and design documents to include in the final report
4	RZAYEV	MAHAMMADALI	The specification document is EMPTY ... there are no use case diagram, no domain model diagram, no interaction diagram, no GUI mock-up The design document is REALLY poor ... Where do these diagrams come from ? There is no explanation, no correct use of the syntax. Please, revise the syntax of sequence diagrams to integrate the idea that there can be a success for the operation OR an error message (see the use of the ALT blocks)
10	SADIGOV	EMIL	Specifiaction document not uploaded. Your design document is strangely close to the one of groupe 6. Be careful. More explanations are needed on the way you reach your diagrams. As there is no specificaiton, it is not clear how you reach to your complex class diagram
1	SALIMLI	KAMIL	Attention in your use case diagram ! the server is not a user there is no domain model in your specification ... it makes it impossible to understand how you have reached to the HIGHLY complex class diagram in your design Your Server Client Interaction via RMI Diagram is not necessary you need to add text to explain your diagrams
10	SHIKHALIYEV	ANAR	The specification document is quite poor. In the use case diagram, please erase the Server that is not a REAL user. The system sequence diagrams should allow you to express the error management, and I do not see that clearly. There is a domain model missing and the exhaustive list of functionnalities to develop Your design document is strangely close to the one of groupe 6. Be careful. More explanations are needed on the way you reach your diagrams. As the domain model is missing int the specification, it is not clear how you reach to your complex class diagram

3	SHIKHLI	NADIR	Your design document is very nice. You should complete it with some text to explain your diagrams Your specification document is less nice. In the use case diagram, the server is not an actor. there is no REAL user in the server side. In your system sequence diagram you should only show the interactions of the actor and the system (as a black box) to explicitely show the error management. In the domain model diagram, I would have expected to have only the notions of client, server, operation, operand, operator .. and not implementation details, such as interfaces. This domain model is at the base of the class diagram that you present later
	SHIRINZADA	VASIF	**deliverables not uploaded**
9	SHUKUROV	SHAMIL	The specification document is quite poor. In the use case diagram, please erase the Server that is not a REAL user. The system sequence diagrams should allow you to express the error management, and I do not see that clearly; all the error messages should be clearly explicit. There is a domain model missing and the exhaustive list of functionnalities to develop Your design document is strangely close to the one of groups 6 and 10. Be careful. More explanations are needed on the way you reach your diagrams. As the domain model is missing int the specification, it is not clear how you reach to your complex class diagram Your design includes too many implementation details that are not needed at this step
12	TAGHIYEV	HASAN	**deliverables not uploaded**
5	VERDIYEVA	AISHA	Use case : first of all, you do not have a REAL actor on the server side, so please delete it. Secondly, you cannot have a "extends" arrow between a case and an actor. What do the "full arrows" mean (for instance, between see results and negative operand error" ? the only accepted arrows between use cases are "includes", "extends" ou eventually a heritage. The system sequence diagram is missing (where you can make explicitely appear all the error management The diagram of the domain model SHOULD NOT INCLUDE implementation details, as yours does. In the domain model i would have expected to have a Client, a Server, an Operation, Operands, Operators ... and nothing more than that. This domain model diagram will be enriched later (you do not have it) as a class diagram where you can even include some classes that could be needed for implementation ... In the final sequence diagram you should have the classes of the class diagram (that you have not presented)