## Peer Evaluation by Group 4

# Group 6 [ 40/84 ]

Section 1 : Interaction Diagram [ 10/30 ]

* The report 2 part 1 is exactly the same as the report 1 part 1+2+3 which might be a misplacement or they might have a misunderstanding of what the requirement of report 2 part 1 is.

Section 2 : Class Diagram and Interface Specification [ 9/10 ]

* They have defined each class method and attribute with text description.
* They used some classes to control other classes and wrote that down in their report clearly.
* No text description was provided to explain their diagram - only description for classes, methods and attributes.
* Traceability Matrix was given along with text descriptions.

Section 3 : System Architecture and System Design [ 8/15 ]

* Client-Server was used by their system. They explained what is a client-server model well. But they did not explain why it was appropriate for their system.
* They have technical details about what platform they would use as server. If they can provide more details about their application layer implementation for server or client, it would be even better.
* Subsystems were given without any explanation. It could be a little bit hard for customers to read the graph without assistant.
* Software / Hardware boundaries are not defined. They did not explain how the software and hardware interface worked for their system. If they can provide some details of how their subsystem would run on different hardware rather than just saying Azure will take care of the requests and give back the result, it will be even better.

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

* Their algorithms for mathematical models from report 1 are provided in the report.
* They provide a very detailed description of their algorithms, not only in words, but also in a very clear diagram. In their report, Figure 9 really helps readers to understand how the algorithm works.
* They also provide own implementation of the two-class logistic regression in their project, and the diagram is also very clear.
* I think it would be better to provide some pseudocode for their algorithms, which can really help readers to understand the main idea of their algorithms.

Section 5: User Interface Design and Implementation [2/11]

* none visible progress made compared to the user interface description from their Report #1.
* No sketches of visual appearance provided for different screens.
* No screens explanation or description.
* There is no navigation path through the screens.
* They did not describe how each component of the user interface addresses the specific requirements (referred by their label);
* difficult to see how the user interface will support the execution of your use cases
* There is no user effort estimation

Section 6: Design of Tests [8/12]

* They provide a very detailed test case scenario in a very standard format.
* There is no coverage analysis.

Section 7: Plan of work [1/2]

* In the report, they describe how they merge contributions of every group member and the project coordination.
* There is a word description about their plan of work, but inadequate.
* Lack of timeline and timeline analysis.
* A very clear table is provided to show the breakdown of responsibilities.

Section 8: Reference [-1]

* only URL without a title shown