## Peer Evaluation by Group 4

# Group 8 [70/84]

Section 1 : Interaction Diagram [ 28/30 ]

* The diagrams in this report is independent from those in the report 1, but the connection with report 1 is strong. The most valuable thing is that the introduction together with the diagram gives a further introduction of the system by its clear figure and neat words.
* The relationship between each UML is clear and easy to understand the beginning and end of certain activity.
* The illustration of the diagrams is strong, 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 mentioned in report 1 is now re-introduced in report 2 by a table which is really good compared to other groups, this table could serve as a review of report 1 and help the users to follow the introduction of the system just incase they forget something mentioned in report 1.
* 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 [ 7/10 ]

* 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 clear to understand and the readability is good.
* They have defined the meaning of each class, operation, and attribute in plain language.
* They haven’t provided detailed description for each class, the name and the attributes. I think this report will be better if they can add some more detailed description for the class diagram.
* However they haven’t display their traceability matrix for the system.

Section 3: System Architecture and System Design [ 13/15 ]

* There is an explanation of what each package is doing and why the classes are grouped in the given way; Also, they provide a introduction of the architecture styles.
* Introducing the elements in detail (DAO layer, POJO, Service layer, View) is helpful for readers to have a better view of this project.
* They use a diagram to display the system architecture, it is very helpful to understand the architecture model.
* They also describe the network protocols, global control and hardware requirement. Which provide a more specific view of their software. There is one shortage that the hardware boundaries are not clearly indicated.

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

* They provide a detailed description of the algorithms in their project, their description is formed step by step, which makes reader easy to follow and understand the idea of the algorithms. However, providing a pseudocode is better.
* Lack of a diagram or flowcharts for the algorithms description.
* For the data structure part, the briefly introduced their data structure, but I think that is enough.

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

* They provide sketches of visual appearance for different screens.
* In this report, they provide a very clear screen for the user interface they talked about, their GUI clear show how their system works and how the user interface will support the execution of the use cases.
* navigation path through the screens is provided.
* Lack of user effort estimation.

Section 6: Design of Tests [11/12]

* They provided detailed description unit/component test in the form of use case, which is clear and easy to read.
* They also provide a detailed introduction of the system test.
* The testing coverage part shows that, they have a clear idea about the shortage of their test and their plan

Section 7: Plan of work [1/2]

* This group provide a description of the plan of work as well as the timeline. The timeline is very clear and shows the plan of the future work.
* There is a lack of breakdown responsibilities in their report. This part is important, it shows the partition of the work among the group members.
* Their plan is not detailed enough.

Section 8: Reference [-1]

* The references are totally inadequate; it is clear from their report that they have drawn on many sources, but they did not mention them all.
* only URL without a title shown