## Peer Evaluation by Group 4

# Group 6 [ 37/45 ]

### Section 1 [ 7/9 ]

• Customer Statement of Requirements can be more written from customers’ view instead of programmer’s view

• Problems can be illustrated more clearly one point by one point

It is a little bit hard to find problems since they used a descriptive way to illustrate their problem. Personally I think it might be better to list the problems.

• CSR has considered many key points that should be considered

For airfare, it is really important to consider as many things as possible and they considered a lot of them.

• An example was used, which was easier understandable

To illustrate the airfare fluctuation, they use an example to make it easy to understand.

• Glossary of terms can be added

### Section 2 [ 5/6 ]

• Requirements statements can be enumerated in a way that reflects different roles

• System requirements match the problems above

• REQ-8 may be separated into several sub requirements, which might make the implementation easilier

REQ-8 is a big problem, it seems it requires for price inquiring for different classes, time and even an optimization algorithm. It might need to be broken into several sub requirements.

• Both functional and non-functional requirements are listed

• A maximum priority is assigned to too many requirements

### Section 3 [ 25/30 ]

• For the parts of actors and goals, this report has defined four actors, but they are poorly named, since they are all named as user. I think it maybe a little confused, but these four actors have different goals and use case names.

• It will be better if they can introduce the participation actors.

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

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

• They already have very detailed flow of events for main success scenario. However they can add some flow of events to deal with the exceptions, such as system failure or the mistakes which user makes,

• In the traceability matrix. they have marked system requirement with the related use case clearly.

• For the use case, although they have present a detailed diagram, the UC’s name are not verb phrases.

• They display the sequence diagram for the use case after the use case diagram. The sequence diagram clearly describe the sequence of the whole system.

• In the last part, the report displays the user interface. It is beautiful and straightforward.

For the use case, I think they have captured the key points of system requirement and describe the system clearly.