Reviewers: Tyler Holt, Alex Day, Michael Burkett

**Introduction:**

1.

Tyler Holt: Dodging potential sideswipes in the intro, but not in the requirements or later on in the doc?

Alex Day: Maybe change to avoid all dangers of crossing the line. Sideswipes could potentially be inferred to restrict not as many potential crashes.

**1.2**

Tyler Holt:

* Make full names of systems intro abbreviations since they’re mentioned previously
* “The driver will only be responsible for speed control”(in paper).... Check scope for if the car is responsible for driving itself. Maybe reword to clear up that the driver can’t just keep their foot on the pedal and the car will drive where it needs to go.
  + Michael: might be autonomous when staying in lane?
* “In the secondary state”....clarify the secondary and primary state if this is mentioned, or fix wording
* “The product is capable of adjusting the speed”....Not mentioned anywhere else in doc

Michael -

* 35 mph requirement? Where is that from? *RESOLVED*

**2.1**

Tyler:

* Initial state of system being off? Make sure this is explicit somewhere
* Remove “Still working on this” from doc at end of paragraph

**2.2**

Tyler

* “... to maintain the vehicle centered” - fix wording
* Fix incomplete sentence right after

**2.4**

Alex

* First and last sentence, the very high confidence and … confidence-not sure if its ambiguous or not. Why is there high confidence, what is it checking?

Michael

* Follow up from Alex - Include events that are low confidence?
* Dangerous road conditions, how does that affect if the LMS is on?

Tyler

* “Only be active when it has a very high confidence that it could avoid situations” Clear up wording, “high confidence” is subjective
* Whats the behavior of the system in unfavorable situations to alert the driver? (Might not be correct place to describe it but consider including here)

**2.5**

Tyler

* Seems like a lot of the paragraph was about the system behavior rather than assumptions
* Pretty long paragraph, consider breaking it up into smaller sections

**2.6**

Alex

* Move ….. To assumptions

Tyler:

* First few sentences talk in a circle, consider rewording
* Thinks the section is supposed to talk about features out of scope. We talk about the update process, but not what could be added in? Wrong content for this section

**3**

Alex:

* Requirement 6: Add subsection

Michael:

* First requirement: Confusion on location of the button through specification of requirements

Tyler:

* 1.1 - better way to word?
* 2.2
  + Is the predictive path going to take up the whole screen? Be clear on where/how big it is
* 2.3
  + Behavior of light when its off
* 3
  + Mentioning of systems that aren’t part of our system
  + UI system - something else? Utilizing from car? Not really clear in requirements/assumptions
  + Path Prediction system
  + Image processing system
* 3.4
  + How is the LKS attempting to adjust trajectory? Maybe merge 6
* 3.5
  + Maybe move to section 2
* 5
  + Only spot that cameras are mentioned?
* 7
  + What if the blinker stays on longer than 5 seconds
* 8
  + Consider moving up to where the subsystems are addressed
  + Has ECU been mentioned?

**4**

Tyler:

* Figure 1: Inconsistencies between requirements and diagram
  + Missing some of the braking system and others
  + Missing gps system on diagram
  + Make sure requirements and use case diagram match up

Alex:

* Cross-reference for toggle on LKS, extra comment

**4.2**

Tyler:

* Supposed to have all of the nouns? Car, person, how they all interact with each other? More real things as opposed to different things from software

**4.3**

Tyler

* Figure 7: Inactive/Active messed up
* Figure 9: Inactive/Active messed up