## Peer Evaluation by Group 4

# Group 1 [55/84]

Section 1 : Interaction Diagram [28/30]

* The diagrams in this report is independent from the report 1 which is very good. Besides, the information covered in the diagrams is more detailed than those covered in report 1 and give a further introduction of the system, making the users easier to understand.
* The relationship between each UML is clear and easy to understand the beginning and end of certain activity.
* But the general ideas are presented clearly. The explanation of each diagram could tell exactly what is happening in each step which is very helpful for users to get know with the system.
* Specific terms are recalled for users to follow the report 1 and the illustration is clear and explanation is enough to understand the diagram
* The diagram clearly shows when does the client-side end and when does the server-side start from the diagram.
* The connection between UML and the elements is strong and support each other

Section 2: Class Diagram and Interface Specification [10/10]

* Their system looks complicated by the first diagram, but the good thing is , they break down the whole system into several small parts and give a very detailed introduction of each part, how does the subsystem work and very helpful for users to understand.
* The classes in the diagram are firmly connected with each other, it is easy to see that from the clear arrows between each class in the diagram. Due to this clear construction, the reliability is ensured at the same time.
* As mentioned before, the break-down introduction of each class is very helpful and detailed for users to understand easily.
* The traceability matrix is shown after a detailed introduction which makes the matrix very easy to understand.
* Their introduction of this section is really impressive due to the detailed word-introduction, every single part in the system is introduced, even the parts which could be understand just by looking their names.

Section 3: System Architecture and System Design [12/15]

* Their system architecture has two parts:the Client-Server Software Architecture and Event-Driven Architecture, which is best suitable for their system according to the complexity. The following introduction gives a detailed explanation of the reason behind their implementation.
* Everything looks good except the lack of API introduction. Although the system looks like 100 percent on their own design, but personally i believe certain API is needed for implementation unless they code everything themselves. .
* The way of their utilization of client/server is also introduced which gives a further look of their system operation, and could help the users to form their own understanding of the system.
* The subsystem is welly illustrated according to their introduction. The breakdown introduction really helps a lot.
* They provided mapping subsystems to hardware introduction.
* Since they have not mentioned any information about API, the protocols of API is surely missing but it depends on whether they are using any API or not.
* Their hardware requirement is missing. By adding such introduction, users could get a better understanding of the system. For example, by such introduction, users could get the idea of what the system needs in real life and thus a more detailed evaluation of the system is formed. The most common understanding could be the price of the system according to such introduction.

Section 4: Algorithms and Data Structures [3/4]

* The two algorithms in the report are welly introduced, which are for the Alarm system and the House heating and cooling. The introduction of the theory is sufficient, but it is just word-introduction of how the algorithm works, some pseudocode would be more tenicheque.
* For the data structure, they referred other section as the introduction of the structure, the overall introduction is one sentence, which might not be the best way for users to understand.

Section 5: User Interface Design and Implementation [5/11]

* Though they mentioned in the report that they were still working on this part, points still need to be taken out due to the lack of visual appearance of different screens.
* They do provide some word introduction of what would the page look like, but it is somehow too abstractive since again, no visual pictures help to understand.

Section 6: Design of Tests [11/12]

* The test part is good, not only the acceptance tests , but also the unit tests for classes are designed. But it could be better is shorter for the tests design part, it seems that there is always a test for every single part in the system. Some parts which are not that crucial could be ignored since the test itself is very simple and easy to imagine the result.

Section 7: Plan of work [1 / 2 ]

* They did mention the work in future, and especially for each demo date, what would be presented. But no specific time diagram is presented.
* The breakdown contribution is clear.

Section 8: Reference [ -5]

* Clearly, this part is hidden, intentionally...