

Peer review of the requirements table

The requirements table is in general very thorough, all requirements can clearly be derived from the SRS document, and they are also well described, so the important aspects are well reflected in the descriptions. It is also good that there is categorization among the requirements, so Functional and nonfunctional requirements are also clearly separated from each other, and they also have a shorter name that can be easily referred to. As a result of these, the table is easy to see through. The formatting is completely appropriate as well.

However we have a few remarks and proposals for consideration:

- Referencing to figures in REQ-TSM-EI-1 can be considered unnecessary because these illustrations are not part of this document
- Maybe it would be better to separate straight and divergent cases into two sub-requirement in REQ-TSM-F-17
- A more straightforward arrangement of requirement hierarchy would possibly be better
- REQ-TSM-F12 should take only one row of the table, even if it has a longer than usual description

In conclusion the requirements table is complete and well formatted, and we made our suggestions for a few minor improvements.