| **REVIEW DOCUMENT** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Start Date:** 2023-04-25 | |  | |
| **Project Name:** IMTSquare - AnyChange Software | | **Number of Pages:** | |
| **Product Name:** AnyChange Software | | **Product Definition:** AnyChange is a web scraping and analysis tool | |
| **Roles:** | **Review Leader:** | Code Busters | |
| **Reviewers:** | 1. Ezgi Özkan | 2. Kadir Kılıçoğlu |
| 3. Tuğçe Sözer | 4. - |
| **Review Materials:** | * Vision (V) * Glossary (G) * Use Case Model (U) * System-Wide Requirements (S) * Risk List (R) * Project Plan (P) * Work Items List (W) * Next Iteration’s Plan (N) * Iteration Plan (I) * Architecture Notebook (A) * Design Document (D) * Test Cases (TC) * Test Scripts (TS) | | |
| **Total Number of Errors:** | | | |
| **Assessment Status:** | ACCEPTED   * As It Is * With Rework | REJECTED   * Review Again | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ERROR TYPES** | | |
| **Error Type Number** | **Error Type Definition** | **Number of Errors Found** |
| 1 | Spelling (grammar, punctuation, etc.) | - |
| 2 | Inconsistency with standards | 2 |
| 3 | Uncertain | 2 |
| 4 | Incorrect | 6 |
| 5 | Inapplicable | - |
| 6 | Internal Inconsistency | 5 |
| 7 | External Inconsistency | - |
| 8 | Incomplete/Insufficient/Missing | 7 |
| 9 | Other | 2 |
| **TOTAL** | | **24** |
| **Importance Types** | **Importance Type** | **Number of Errors Found** |
| 1 | Little | 4 |
| 2 | Medium | 12 |
| 3 | Important | 8 |
| **TOTAL** | | **24** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Reviewed**  **Material**  **ID** | **Section** | **Page** | **Line/**  **No** | **Error**  **Type** | **Importance** | **Explanation** | **Correction Status** | **Correction**  **Explanation** |
| 1 | A | 2. Architectural goals and philosophy | 1 | 9 | 8 | Medium | No solid goals were defined nor a set of philosophies were formulated to address these goals. | Under Review |  |
| 2 | A | 3. Assumptions and dependencies | 1 | 14 | 8 | Little | Assumptions and dependencies are not properly listed. | Under Review |  |
| 3 | A | 4. Architecturally significant requirements | 1 | 20 | 4 | Medium | Links or references from the Vision, Use Cases or SWRS are not provided. | Under Review |  |
| 4 | A | 5. Decisions, constraints, and justifications | 1 | 24 | 4 | Important | Justifications and possible alternatives are not provided. | Under Review |  |
| 5 | A | 6. Architectural Mechanisms | 1 | 36 | 4 | Important | Architectural mechanisms are not properly provided. | Under Review |  |
| 6 | A | 7. Key abstractions | 1 | 41 | 4 | Important | Key abstractions are not properly provided neither by list or model. | Under Review |  |
| 7 | A | 8. Layers or architectural framework | 2 | 46 | 4 | Medium | Neither layers or architectural framework are properly described. | Under Review |  |
| 8 | A | 9. Architectural views | 2 | 52 | 8 | Medium | The provided diagram is vague and does not explain much. | Under Review |  |
| 9 | A | 9. Architectural views | 2 | 52 | 6 | Important | The provided diagram does not comply with the MVC model as it is missing the Model and View parts. | Under Review |  |
| 10 | D | N/A | 1 | 1 | 9 | Medium | The document does not have a version history, headers and footers, ToC, cover page, etc. | Under Review |  |
| 11 | D | Subsystems | 2 | 14 | 8 | Medium | Couldn't get the point why an extra entity as PriceSource is required. | Under Review |  |
| 12 | D | Requirement Realization | 2 | 25 | 6 | Important | Use cases assigned in the Work Item List (UC-2, UC-6 and UC-8) are missing | Under Review |  |
| 13 | D | Requirement Realization | 2 | 25 | 2 | Important | The sequence diagrams does not comply with the OAuth2.0 protocol which is defined as the security measure for user authentication in the SWRS document. | Under Review |  |
| 14 | D | Requirement Realization | 3 | 32 | 8 | Medium | Couldn't get which UC the Confirmation Process refers to. | Under Review |  |
| 15 | TC | N/A | 1 | 1 | 6 | Medium | Use cases assigned in the Work Item List (UC-6 and UC-8) are missing | Under Review |  |
| 16 | TS | N/A | 1 | 1 | 6 | Medium | Use cases assigned in the Work Item List (UC-6 and UC-8) are missing | Under Review |  |
| 17 | I | N/A | N/A | N/A | 2 | Little | Pushing each document with a version number makes it difficult to track documents. Instead, using version history in the documents is enough. | Under Review |  |
| 18 | I | 1.Key Milestones | 3 | 17 | 6 | Medium | Although UC-5, UC-3, UC-4, UC-9, UC-7 are provided in this table, their status are still "In Backlog" in Work Items List document | Under Review |  |
| 19 | I | 3. Work Item Assignments | 3 | 26 | 4 | Little | Although it is the plan or iteration 3, the statement is provided for iteration 2. | Under Review |  |
| 20 | TS | Test steps | N/A | N/A | 9 | Little | It would be more accurate to write test steps in the form of orders. | Under Review |  |
| 21 | TS | Test steps | N/A | N/A | 3 | Important | Test steps should be more clear. For example the data used while testing must be stated. Tests should be able to be run without interruption. | Under Review |  |
| 22 | W | N/A | 1 | N/A | 8 | Important | There is no work item assigned for iteration 3. Hence, it is not understood that which of these are planned to be included for iteration 3. | Under Review |  |
| 23 | U | UC-4 (Manage Payment Information) | 5 | 1 | 3 | Medium | Standart user is stated as one of the primary actors. It is not clear that why this user manages payment since this type of user is assumed to be free. | Under Review |  |
| 24 | TC | N/A | N/A | N/A | 8 | Medium | It is stated in work items list, and iteration plan 2 that UC-1, UC-2, UC-6, UC-8 are implemented, however test cases for UC-8 and UC-9 are neither exist nor planned. | Under Review |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |