## Peer Evaluation by Group 4

# Group 2 [75/84]

Section 1 : Interaction Diagram [ 27/30]

* The diagrams in the report are not completely independent from the previous report #1, the update items status diagrams,place orders diagrams,change food menu diagrams are exactly the same as report 1, but the remaining 3 diagrams are independent , especially the serve table diagram, a improvement of adding waiter interface is added which is good.
* The relationship between each UML is clear and easy to understand the beginning and end of certain activity.
* The illustration of the diagrams is brief, 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.
* Certain words in report 1 are not mentioned in report 2, but 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 [9/10]

* They have provided a very detailed class diagram which described all classes and their associations of the whole system.
* For each class, the diagram provided specific data types of all attributes and operation signatures.
* The connection between classes in the class diagram is very clear to understand and the readability is good.
* They have defined the meaning of each class, operation, and attribute in plain language.
* In the table of data types and operation signatures, they have provided detailed description for each class, the name and the attributes. I think it is useful to understand the whole system.
* In the part C of class diagram, they have displayed a clearly and defined traceability matrix.

Section 3: System Architecture and System Design [14/15]

* They use a diagram to display the system architecture, it is very helpful to understand the 3-tier architecture model.
* They have explained the reason for using 3-tier architecture and why the classes are grouped in the given way.
* They also use a elegant diagram to describe their planned system design.
* They have introduced the subsystems of the system in detail and described UML package diagram of subsystems in their system.
* In the part of mapping subsystems to hardware, they have used a diagram to briefly introduce how the application running on all kinds of systems interact with the database through the internet.
* If they can add a little introduction of the hardware boundaries, this part will be better for readability and technical.
* They have introduced the database scheme for each actors.

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

* Their algorithm is welly introduced and easy to understand, the pseudocode alone with the word introduction makes the algorithm easy to understand.
* For data structure, their instruction is sufficient, but not centralized, which is to say, it is more like a specific word explanation, like ‘ what is JSON, what is Array, we used balabal in our system ‘. A general instruction would be better if it gives the full-view of the system, and present in a sequence that could tell the users the data structure step by step.

Section 5: User Interface Design and Implementation [8/11]

* The interface design is good, there is visible picture of what the system page looks like, and this could help the users to understand a lot. However, besides such ‘screenshots’, at least a brief introduction should be presented ( though i can understand every figure) since the users could get confused of the meaning of each figure.
* Since there is no such introduction, it is difficult to see how the interface would support the execution of the use cases and neither could tell how each component of the user interface addresses the specific requirements.

Section 6: Design of Tests [11/12]

* Tests of case scenarios are presented in a sequential order which is really good for the users to follow, but except the use case acceptance tests, unit tests for classes are missing.
* Test coverage is presented and analysis is adequate.

Section 7: Plan of work [2 / 2 ]

* This group has a strong project management, their plan of work is very clear through words, tables and diagrams. Besides, the breakdown is also very clear.

Section 8: Reference [0]

* According to the reference, it is not difficult to imagine how much work this group has refer to through the books and internet. It is quite adequate.