## Peer Evaluation by Group 4

# Group 3 [ 40/45 ]

### Section 1 [ 9/9 ]

• Problem statement is clearly and has much details

They divided their problems in a comparatively large scale: when order, when wait for a table and so on so forth. In this way it’s straightforward that when they would meet with what kind of difficulties. But a list can be used to illustrate the problems more clearly.

• Customer statement of requirements are written from customer’s view

• CSR describes the problems to be solved

• Glossary of terms clearly indicates the terms without ambiguity

They defined technical terms and non-technical terms individually in their project. The roles are all defined with certain functions so they would not cause any misunderstanding.

### Section 2 [ 4/6 ]

• User stories illustrated clearly and logically

They have included user stories for different roles. For each role, they contained all possible requirements for that role.

• User stories contain size of each story

An expected time needed for each story was included so they would know how to schedule their work.

• Stories enumerated all functions needed to solve the problems

They tried to enumerated all functions based on the problems they need to solve. But since they use a descriptive way to illustrated their problems, it might be a little bit difficult to match every problems with functions.

• One of the user story does not have Size

• The diagram of user stories is well plotted

• A high priority is assigned to more than half of all requirements

This will make the priority size less useful since there are too many top priority requirements.

### Section 3 [ 27/30 ]

• They haven’t identified human stakeholders, I think it is a little carelessness, but they have defined detailed actors.

• The actors they have defined are very easy understanded and the actors exactly named, such as busboy, manager, host, chef and waiter. The participating actors which they have defined is database.

• For the use case, the UC’s name are exactly verb phrases and very detailed.

• The use case capture the whole dynamic aspects of system requirements and present a holistic view of system. In the meanwhile, they have Identified factors affecting the system, both external and internal.

• To illustrate their use case clearly, they have divided the use case diagrams into two parts. The additional work is worthy, even the system is a little complicated, they still present very straightforward and detailed use case diagrams.

• They have showed traceability matrix in different colors.

• They have listed fully-dressed description for each use case.

• In the table, they describe the related user stories, initiating actor, actors’s goals, participating actors, pre-conditions, post-conditions and flow of events for main success scenario.

• The fully-dressed description will become perfect, if they can list how to work with the exceptions or the failure scenario.