## Peer Evaluation by Group 4

# Group 7 [ 56/84 ]

Section 1 : Interaction Diagram [ 20/30 ]

* The diagrams in this report is independent from those in report 1, though they looks really simple. The black lines and words looks like they are generated by Microsoft office Word which makes the report less professional , but it is ok since the teacher has no requirement for the diagram for report 2, but comparing with other group, professional softwares are recommended for further diagrams.
* The relationship between each UML is clear and easy to understand the beginning and end of certain activity.
* There is no words for each diagrams which makes impossible for users to read the introduction of the system, but only can take a guess or by their own understanding generated from the diagram. Further detailed introduction is needed absolutely.
* NO specific words in report 1 is mentioned in report 2.
* 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,but seems too simple.

Section 2 : Class Diagram and Interface Specification [ 8 / 10 ]

* Class diagram and method signatures are provided with text description of classes, methods and attributes, which makes it easy to read
* Class diagram is split and shown on several pages to improve readability.
* A full class diagram is used to show the relationship between class diagrams, making it easily for us to understand the relations between each class.
* A brief description of the class diagram was provided, while the description seems too simple and does not cover much information should be provided to us.
* Traceability matrix is not described in their report with words.
* The described all the functions or variables in their class diagram, very easy to read.

Section 3 : System Architecture and System Design [ 10 / 15 ]

* They explained well why they need to use a client-server architecture for their system - because they have the needs to be accessed by many clients at the same time and they will need their server to do most of the jobs while the client just needs to retrieve some simple graph and data from the server, which is appropriate by using client-server architecture.
* The architecture of their subsystem does not seem appropriate because Web Browser should not be at the same level of Network and front-end techniques.
* Hardware/Software and Hardware/Hardware boundaries are not appropriate. Network and Client and Server should be parallel rather than included/including by each other.

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

* They provide a introduction of factor analysis, which makes reader easy to understand the reason why the chose factor analysis in this project.
* A very strong description of the algorithm mathematical model instruction is provided in this report. They introduce the algorithms in a very detailed description as well as the mathematical formula. I think this part is a very good job.
* Lack of some diagrams or flowcharts description of the algorithms. Also, there is not enough description about the data structure.

Section 5: User Interface Design and Implementation [6/11]

* Progress can be find compared to their user interface description in report1.
* They only provide some word description about the user interface, there is a lack of sketches of visual appearance provided for different screens
* the navigation path through the screens is missing.
* There is no user effort estimation in their report.

Section 6: Design of Tests [7/12]

* Only acceptance tests for use cases are provided, but unit tests for classes are missing
* The provide a test coverage analysis, and there is also an introduction of integration testing strategy.

Section 7: Plan of work [1/2]

* A table is provided to show the timeline of their work, but I think they should also provide a diagram which is more clear.
* There is a very detailed description of the breakdown of responsibilities, which shows that their group has very clear idea of the partition of the work.

Section 8: Reference [1]

* They provide a very adequate reference of this project, I think they do it very carefully to ensure not to miss any reference.
* Every URL is associated with a title, which helps reader to get the reference file for what the want know about more.
* The format is not easy to read