## Peer Evaluation by Group 4

# Group 2 [ 44/45 ]

### Section 1 [ 9/9 ]

• Customer Statement of Requirements are easy to follow

For example, they enumerated all the major issues they may meet with as a list. What they have in the rest indeed followed the CSR they brought up.

• The major issues they brought up are very clear and detailed illustrated

They listed all the issues based on the roles, which made it very straightforward who would have what problems/requirements.

• CSR are written from customer’s of view

• They problems they try to solve are exactly happening everyday everywhere

This was saying that the project they were going to build indeed based on the real situation and could be used widely, which makes their project valuable.

• Glossary of terms is very clear and adequate

For example, they defined every role appeared in their projects, with this definition, there will be no vague misunderstanding of their roles.

### Section 2 [ 6/6 ]

• System requirements enumerated ideally

They enumerated all the requirements and as user stories.

• Requirements are divided as different roles, which is very clearly

• Requirements match with CSR

They brought up their requirements based on the customers statement of requirements, no more no less.

• Their requirements clealy illustrated different non-functional requirements for different roles

• Their requiments have concrete needs to be taken care of

### Section 3 [ 29/30 ]

• They have identified two human stakeholders, named as Restaurant team and Software engineering team, which are actually the people but non-human.

• The actors they have defined are also clear and the actors eaxctly named, such as customer, manager, chef and awiter.

For each acrtor, they have defined the role and goal of the actor. It could help users to understand which role match his works.

• For the usecase, they already make a very perfect and clearly graph which shows how the system works and the realtionships between actors.

• The use case is exactly drive from the system requirment.

• To illustrrate their usecase, they also have a matrix mapping of use case with user stories.

• In the part four of functional requiremnet, they have listed fully-dressed description for each actor.

• In the fully-dressed descreption table, they descript the related user stories, initiating actor, participating actors, pre-conditions, post-conditions and flow of events for main success scenario.

This detailed description could help users to thoroughly understand how this system woks and what happend in the system.

• No alternative scenario described in their functional requirements.

# 

# 

# Section 4 [15/15]

* Various visual appearances of screens are presented clearly in the report, and they are very helpful for understanding the system due the conciseness and well-mannered logic.
* The description part of each diagram is sufficient to get a deep understanding of how the system is operated.
* The navigation path of the system is straight forward, clear enough to distinguish the responsibility and relation between each inner part of the system.
* It could be perfect if the worst cases analysis is presented, since it could help the users to get a better preview of the system.

.Section 5 [23/25]

* As they did in the user case, the visual appearance of screen is adequate.
* The domain analysis is really impressive, not only the Use Case figure is clear, but also the situations considered is sufficient, including the idea of changing food menu which is very creative.
* The definition of every term is fairly enough to introduce the concepts, and they are used in a proper way.
* The traceability matrix is clear.
* The domain model describe the system in a good manner and clear enough for the users to understand.
* In the part of system operation contract, the contracts for each system operation has been eactly defined and described in detail.

# Section 6 [5/5]

The plan of work is too impressive that personally i want to give 6 out of 5 but i cant. The table in of the plan has a progress part that could be easy to know how much work they have done and how much work are left to be done. However, one thing to be mentioned, the duration week is presented like 13.29 week, i think the 0.29 part is not necessary since if you really want to be accurate, you could use the unit of Day instead of Week.

# Section 7 [4/5]

The reference listed at the end just covers the Marsic’s book which is absolutely not convincing to have such good report, some extra internet links or books should be included. Except, the ‘Tools’ part is comparatively good since it mentioned all the things that helps for the project.