

Specification review report

Unique Queue Application – Group 6

Short Opinion

The application presented in the report tries to tackle an important issue in everyday life, however, in their report their ideas are not conveyed clearly and there are a lot of mistakes that need correcting. We gave an overview on most of the problems in the next section, as well as some of our personal recommendations.

Comments, bugs and recommendations

1. Presentation of the problem: Very interesting topic. The problem is something we all face, however the definition is a little unclear, could be explained a bit better.

2. Brief presentation of the solution: Clear presentation of the solution.

3.

a) Use Case diagram: The diagram is **backwards**. You cannot start with getting a notification of completing the task that the diagram is supposed to explain how to do.

The “Get notification that appointment has booked” Use Case is not a Use Case in the first place and also it should not be connected with the user.

The three different ways to take an appointment just describe how the “Take an appointment” Use Case can be done, so therefore they should be a generalization from it.

The diagram shows sequence of actions that shouldn’t be in a Use Case diagram.

“Take an appointment” should be an association to the user, since in our understanding that is the main reason we would use that system. From there, the other Use Cases that follow should have the include connections reversed, meaning they should be done before the “Take an appointment” Use Case (inclusion).

b) Use Case descriptions:

Name: Take Appointment with Smartphone/Website - 1

The basic flow is correct but it is not depicted by the Use Case diagram.

The alternative flows 4b and 4c should not be considered in this case.

Name: Take Appointment with Smartphone/Website – 2

The Trigger should be an event (ex. click of a button).

The alternative flow is wrong. Again, there shouldn't be unavailable hours in the list of available hours.

Both colleagues have explained the same use case.

b.2) Functional and non-functional requirements

Functional requirements: should represent what the user can do with the system. After reading all of them, only the first one makes sense. Some of them represent Non-functional requirements, while the others are just restrictions.

Non-functional requirements: the third and sixth option represent the same thing and are the only ones that classify a non-functional requirement.

c) Name: Take Appointment with Smartphone/Website - 1

The decision node after "User selects available hours" should not be there, because if you are selecting from available hours, all hours should be available.

The second decision node should not represent a default method as a choice, while also depicting the three other alternatives.

Name: Take Appointment with Smartphone/Website - 2

There are alternative flows that are not represented in the Sequence diagram.

There are no if-else functions.

4. GUI:

Overall the GUI looks good.

5. Connections to other systems – API

We do not have experience with Google Firebase to comment on this section.

6. Miscellaneous:

The first point is valid but the diagrams and user descriptions have options on the possibility of a selected date being not available.

Summary

The report is in need of corrections, also it is missing a section for the feasibility study and user story. The report also would benefit of better formatting. While the idea is good the execution needs work.