



Project FINGERPAINT

Review-0.10

Review Document

Authors:

Tessa Belder (0739377)
Lasse Blaauwbroek (0749928)
Thom Castermans (0739808)
Roel van Happen (0751614)
Benjamin van der Hoeven (0758975)
Femke Jansen (0741948)
Hugo Snel (0657700)

Junior Management:

Simon Burg
Areti Paziourou
Luc de Smet

Senior Management:

Mark van den Brand, MF 7.096
Lou Somers, MF 7.145

Technical Advisor:

Ion Barosan, MF 7.082

Customer:

Patrick Anderson, GEM-Z 4.137

Eindhoven - June 23, 2013

Abstract

This document contains a collection of all review documents for several documents of FIN-GERPAIN that have to be created and delivered for the Software Engineering Project (2IP35). The review document is based on the conventions listed in the Software Configuration Management Plan (SCMP) [1].

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---------------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 8 |
| 1.1 | Purpose | 8 |
| 1.2 | List of references | 8 |
| 1.3 | Overview | 8 |
| 2 | URD Feedback | 10 |
| 2.1 | Title page | 10 |
| 2.1.1 | External reviews | 10 |
| 2.2 | Abstract | 10 |
| 2.2.1 | External reviews | 10 |
| 2.3 | Chapter 1 | 11 |
| 2.3.1 | External reviews | 11 |
| 2.3.2 | Internal reviews | 11 |
| 2.4 | Chapter 2 | 13 |
| 2.4.1 | External reviews | 13 |
| 2.4.2 | Internal reviews | 17 |
| 2.5 | Chapter 3 | 21 |
| 2.5.1 | External reviews | 21 |
| 2.5.2 | Internal reviews | 23 |
| 2.6 | Appendix A | 25 |
| 2.6.1 | External reviews | 25 |
| 2.6.2 | Internal reviews | 26 |
| 2.7 | Appendix B | 26 |
| 2.7.1 | Internal reviews | 26 |
| 3 | SRD Feedback | 29 |
| 3.1 | Title page | 29 |
| 3.2 | Abstract | 29 |
| 3.2.1 | Internal reviews | 29 |
| 3.3 | Document Status Sheet | 29 |
| 3.3.1 | External reviews | 29 |
| 3.3.2 | Internal reviews | 29 |
| 3.4 | Chapter 1 | 30 |
| 3.4.1 | Internal reviews | 30 |
| 3.5 | Chapter 2 | 30 |
| 3.5.1 | External Reviews | 30 |

| | | |
|----------|----------------------------|-----------|
| 3.5.2 | Internal reviews | 31 |
| 3.6 | Chapter 3 | 32 |
| 3.6.1 | External Reviews | 32 |
| 3.6.2 | Internal reviews | 33 |
| 3.6.3 | External Reviews | 40 |
| 3.7 | Chapter 4 | 40 |
| 4 | SCMP Feedback | 41 |
| 4.1 | Abstract | 41 |
| 4.1.1 | Internal reviews | 41 |
| 4.2 | Chapter 1 | 41 |
| 4.2.1 | Internal reviews | 41 |
| 4.3 | Chapter 2 | 42 |
| 4.3.1 | External reviews | 42 |
| 4.3.2 | Internal reviews | 42 |
| 4.4 | Chapter 3 | 43 |
| 4.4.1 | External reviews | 43 |
| 4.4.2 | Internal reviews | 44 |
| 4.5 | Chapter 4 | 44 |
| 4.5.1 | External reviews | 44 |
| 4.5.2 | Internal reviews | 45 |
| 4.6 | Chapter 5 | 47 |
| 4.6.1 | Internal reviews | 47 |
| 4.7 | Chapter 6 | 47 |
| 4.7.1 | Internal reviews | 47 |
| 4.8 | Chapter 7 | 49 |
| 4.8.1 | External reviews | 49 |
| 4.8.2 | Internal reviews | 49 |
| 5 | SVVP Feedback | 50 |
| 5.1 | Chapter 1 | 50 |
| 5.1.1 | External reviews | 50 |
| 5.1.2 | Internal reviews | 50 |
| 5.2 | Chapter 2 | 51 |
| 5.2.1 | Internal reviews | 51 |
| 5.3 | Chapter 4 | 51 |
| 5.3.1 | External reviews | 51 |
| 6 | ADD Feedback | 52 |
| 6.1 | Abstract | 52 |
| 6.2 | Chapter 1 | 52 |
| 6.2.1 | External reviews | 52 |
| 6.2.2 | Internal reviews | 52 |
| 6.3 | Chapter 2 | 54 |
| 6.3.1 | Internal reviews | 54 |
| 6.4 | Chapter 3 | 55 |
| 6.4.1 | External reviews | 55 |

| | | |
|----------|----------------------------|-----------|
| 6.4.2 | Internal reviews | 55 |
| 6.5 | Chapter 4 | 57 |
| 6.5.1 | External reviews | 57 |
| 6.5.2 | Internal reviews | 57 |
| 6.6 | Chapter 5 | 59 |
| 6.6.1 | External reviews | 59 |
| 6.6.2 | Internal reviews | 59 |
| 6.7 | Chapter 6 | 62 |
| 6.8 | Chapter 7 | 63 |
| 7 | ATP Feedback | 64 |
| 7.1 | Abstract | 64 |
| 7.1.1 | Internal reviews | 64 |
| 7.2 | Chapter 1 | 64 |
| 7.2.1 | Internal reviews | 64 |
| 7.3 | Chapter 2 | 66 |
| 7.3.1 | Internal reviews | 66 |
| 7.4 | Chapter 3 | 67 |
| 7.4.1 | Internal reviews | 67 |
| 7.5 | Chapter 4 | 72 |
| 7.5.1 | Internal reviews | 72 |
| 7.6 | Chapter 5 | 72 |
| 7.7 | Chapter 6 | 73 |
| 7.7.1 | Internal reviews | 73 |
| 8 | UTP Feedback | 74 |
| 8.1 | Abstract | 74 |
| 8.1.1 | Internal reviews | 74 |
| 8.2 | Chapter 1 | 74 |
| 8.2.1 | Internal reviews | 74 |
| 8.3 | Chapter 2 | 75 |
| 8.3.1 | Internal reviews | 75 |
| 8.4 | Chapter 3 | 76 |
| 8.4.1 | Internal reviews | 76 |
| 8.5 | Chapter 4 | 76 |
| 8.5.1 | Internal reviews | 76 |
| 8.6 | Chapter 5 | 78 |
| 8.6.1 | Internal reviews | 78 |
| 9 | ITP feedback | 79 |
| 9.1 | Chapter 1 | 79 |
| 9.1.1 | Internal reviews | 79 |
| 9.2 | Chapter 2 | 79 |
| 9.2.1 | Internal reviews | 79 |
| 9.3 | Chapter 3 | 81 |
| 9.3.1 | Internal reviews | 81 |
| 9.4 | Chapter 4 | 81 |

| | | |
|-------|----------------------------|----|
| 9.4.1 | Internal reviews | 81 |
| 9.5 | Chapter 5 | 81 |
| 9.5.1 | Internal reviews | 81 |

Document Status Sheet

General

Document title: Review Document
Identification: Review0.10
Author: Tessa Belder, Roel van Happen, Benjamin van der Hoeven,
Femke Jansen, Hugo Snel
Document status: Internal feedback up and to UTP-0.0.

Document history

| <i>Version</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>Author</i> | <i>Reason of change</i> |
|----------------|-------------|---|---|
| 0.0 | 24-Apr-2013 | Tessa Belder Femke Jansen | Included internal reviews on URD-0.0. |
| 0.1 | 26-Apr-2013 | Benjamin van der Hoeven Roel van Happen Hugo Snel | Included internal reviews on URD-0.1. |
| 0.2 | 2-May-2013 | Roel van Happen Hugo Snel | Included internal reviews on URD-0.2. |
| 0.3 | 2-May-2013 | Femke Jansen | Included external reviews on URD-0.2. |
| 0.4 | 2-May-2013 | Benjamin van der Hoeven Femke Jansen | Included internal reviews on URD-0.3. |
| 0.5 | 6-May-2013 | Tessa Belder Femke Jansen | Included internal review on SCMP-0.1. |
| 0.6 | 6-May-2013 | Femke Jansen | Included internal review on SVVP-0.0. |
| 0.6 | 17-May-2013 | Tessa Belder Hugo Snel | Included internal review on SRD-0.0. |
| 0.6 | 23-May-2013 | Roel van Happen | Included review from the technical advisor. |
| 0.7 | 28-May-2013 | Thom Castermans Femke Jansen | Included internal review on ADD-0.0. |
| 0.8 | 30-May-2013 | Roel van Happen Femke Jansen | Included internal review on SRD-0.1. |
| 0.9 | 13-Jun-2013 | Benjamin van der Hoeven Femke Jansen | Included internal review on ATP-0.0. |
| 0.10 | 18-Jun-2013 | Tessa Belder | Included internal review on UTP-0.0. |

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Purpose

This document contains the collection of all review documents, both internal reviews and external reviews. It is used for documentation and later reference.

1.2 List of references

- [1] Group Fingerprint, “Software configuration management plan,” *SEP*, 2013.
- [2] Group Fingerprint, “User requirements document,” *SEP*, 2013.
- [3] Group Fingerprint, “Software requirements document,” *SEP*, 2013.
- [4] Group Fingerprint, “Software validation and verification plan,” *SEP*, 2013.
- [5] Group Fingerprint, “Architectural design document,” *SEP*, 2013.
- [6] Group Fingerprint, “Acceptance test plan,” *SEP*, 2013.

1.3 Overview

Each chapter corresponds to one document and contains all the feedback on this document. The chapters are organized according to the newest version of each of the documents; we distinguish between internal and external reviews and will also list the name of the person or group of persons that provided the feedback.

The following deliverables are reviewed in this document:

- User Requirements Document [2] (chapter 2)
- Software Requirements Document [3] (chapter 3)
- Software Configuration Management Plan [1] (chapter 4)
- Software Validation and Verification Plan [4] (chapter 5)
- Architectural Design Document [5] (chapter 6)

- Acceptance Test Plan [6] (chapter 7)

Chapter 2

URD Feedback

2.1 Title page

2.1.1 External reviews

| Junior Management | | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| title page | Missing | Maybe include student numbers and room numbers for staff (as in other URD's). | |

| Technical Advisor | | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| title page | Missing | The advisor is not just an advisor: more explicitly, he is a technical advisor. | |

| Client | | | Version 0.4 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| title page | Incorrect | The client's room is GEM-Z 4.137, not GEM-Z 4.147. | |

2.2 Abstract

2.2.1 External reviews

| Junior Mangement | | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| Abstract | Missing | State that this document was based on discussions with your client and that it conveys their wishes. | |

| Technical Advisor | | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| Abstract | structure | Change “how it should function and in what environment it should function” to “how and in what environment it should function”. | |

2.3 Chapter 1

2.3.1 External reviews

| Junior Management | | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1.1 | Structure | You might consider rephrasing the sentence “All of the listed requirements”. We just assure that some requirements will be implemented, but not all requirements. | |
| 1.1 | Other | The sentence “mixing on a mobile device” implies that you are bound to specific hardware. The application should be cross-platform. | |

| Technical Advisor | | | Version 0.4 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1.3.1 | Layout | Colons should be added to the definitions list. | |

2.3.2 Internal reviews

| Tessa Belder | | | Version 0.1 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1.3 | Missing | URD is missing from the list. | |

| | | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1.2 | Typo | ’developed by Group Fingerpaint group’ – 2x ’group’. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 1.2 | Incorrect | 'Users can define the initial concentration' should be 'can define the initial concentration distribution'. |
| 1.3.1 | Missing | 'iPhone' should be added here, since it is used in section 2.2.2. |
| 1.3.2 | Other | 'TBC' and 'TBD' can be removed from this list, as they aren't used in this document. |
| 1.3.2 | Missing | 'PC' should be added here, since it is used in section 2.2.2. |
| 1.5 | Missing | The appendices aren't mentioned here, and they should be. |

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|------------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| abstract | missing | The abstract is very short and could use some more information; see the template for scmp.pdf as an example. You could mention in the abstract that this document is part of the SEP project and what can be found in this document (a very brief description). | |
| 1.1 | Structure | I would change the beginning to this sentence to "This document", because you already mentioned in the abstract that this document is the URD. | |
| 1.2 | Question | I believe that the client mentioned that the original goal was to find the optimal mix as soon as possible. Should we mention that here as well? | |
| 1.5 | Typo | "remainder" should be "remaining" in "The remainder chapter" | |
| 1.5 | Structure/layout | I would change the layout/text in the list to something like: * The relation to other systems (2.1) * The main capabilities (2.2) * etcetera. That would make the list more readable, I believe. | |

| Hugo Snel | | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1.1 | Typo | ”full consent”; ’full’ is kind of weird. You consent or you don’t. | |

2.4 Chapter 2

2.4.1 External reviews

| Junior Mangement | | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.1 | Inconsistent | In this paragraph you talk about mobile devices, while it should be cross-platform. | |
| 2.1 | Other | The sentence “after which output should be shown on the screen” is unclear and ambiguous. | |
| 2.1 | Other | You talk about sending constraints to the server as a black box, but I think there’s too much detail about the black box and how it will work. Just say it is present and you leave the complicated computations to them and you do the visualizing and formatting. | |
| 2.2.1 | Incorrect | The system should not be able to simulate the flow, as you just said that you leave the computations to the server. You will only visualise the results of these computations. | |
| 2.2.1 | Other | The sentences “given some constraints. There are a number of constraints to be specified” are redundant, as you already said that there are some constraints in the first sentence. | |
| 2.2.1 | Other | The sentence “can be specified by tapping on and dragging over the screen” is unclear and ambiguous. What you’re actually doing is making an app that can specify these constraints (it should be noted somewhere before additional capabilities). | |
| 2.2.2 | Missing | From the sentence “When the initial parameters have been set, the computations are offloaded to a server” it is not clear what your capabilities are. Your capability is sending these to the server and retrieving results. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 2.2.2 | Other | “should be exportable topng or .pdf” is very specific. Maybe there’s a better way you didn’t think of yet. Here you should probably say: ”We need to be able to export it to a standardised animated format (solution space rather than problem space). |
| 2.2.2 | Missing | It is in general not clear that we can actually visualise the returned results. |
| 2.3 | Other | You use a lot of pretty words and long sentences, but actually you’re not really saying what you want to say. For instance, just say that you assume that the server computation does not take too long and thus visualisation can be handled quickly. That clarifies things much more and the sentences also get shorter. |
| 2.4 | Missing | This section is more for different stakeholders. Although in this case, I feel there is actually only one. Still, it might be beneficial to describe WHO your user is (in terms of position, not person) on top of what this person can do. |
| 2.4 | Missing | In the sentence “after the application has sent these off to the server, should be able to view the results” it is unclear which results you’re talking about. |
| 2.5 | Question | You say “intermediate results are sent back to the mobile device for displaying”, but is this really the case? Does the server not simply finish a step and then send it back, then calculate the next step? “While solving, return some stuff” is a bit vague. |
| 2.5 | Missing | Maybe you can make one of those domain models, even though it will be small. |
| 2.6 | Question | “Therefore, we assume this server always answers within a few seconds”, but you should also have some basic error handling at least, right? I think it is not a good assumption that the server ALWAYS responds within a few seconds. |
| 2.6 | Missing | What about the assumption that the server in fact gives a correct solution? Or the assumption that the mobile device doesn’t lose connection to the internet? |

| Technical Advisor | | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.1 | Question | In the sentence “we are to use it as a black box to which we can send constraints and a vector”, it is unclear what the vector is. Is this an implementation detail? If this is the case, it should not be mentioned in this document | |
| 2.2.1 | Question | What do you mean with the sentence “It is possible to both specify ...”? Perhaps you can insert a few comma’s in this sentence or you can re-write it to make it more clear. | |
| 2.2.2 | Missing | In the sentence “A history of past simulations ... to compare previous runs with the current”, I would change “current” to “current run”, because now it is unclear what “current” is. | |
| 2.3 | Inconsistent | “The user interface ... without much hassle” contains both present time and past time writing. Try to stick to writing in one particular time. | |
| 2.3 | Structure | In general, I see the word “so” quite often, but try to use some other words for “so” as well. | |
| 2.5 | Question | Where does “parameters described above” refer to? It doesn’t appear to be in the previous paragraph in this section, so try to be more clear in which section you described these parameters. | |
| 2.6 | Typo | In “As a mentioned”, “a” should be “we”, I believe. | |
| 2.6 | Missing | In the sentence “Therefore, we assume this server...” I would add the word “that”, to obtain the sentence “Therefore, we assume that this server...”. | |

| Client | | | Version 0.4 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.2.1 | Incorrect | The sentence ‘It is not possible to use any other method than the free-form drawing described here’ conflicts with the requirements in chapter 3. | |
| 2.3 | Missing | The meaning of ‘reasonably’ in the sentence ‘We assume that the server can compute the displacement of the fluids reasonably fast’ should be specified. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 2.3 | Question | Where do you store the attributes of a saved run? |

2.4.2 Internal reviews

| Tessa Belder | | | Version 0.1 |
|---------------------------|------------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.2 | Missing | The sentence “The third parameter to be specified is ” is unfinished. | |
| 2.2.1 | Structure/Layout | The sentence “It is possible to both specify an entire protocol consisting of multiple wall movements, and to only execute one step at a time.” sounds like you can do two things at the same time. I would change it to: “It is both possible to specify an entire protocol consisting of multiple wall movements, and to only execute one step at a time.” | |
| 2.2.1 | Missing | There is no information included about the parameter ‘#steps’ which defines how many times the defined mixing protocol is executed. | |
| 2.2.1 | Incorrect | “The fourth parameter is the initial concentration of the fluids,” should be: “The fourth parameter is the initial concentration distribution of the fluids,” | |
| 2.2.1 | Missing | “If desired, it is also possible to load an existing initial distribution.” This should be “If desired, it is also possible to load an existing or predefined initial concentration distribution.” | |
| 2.2.2 | Structure/Layout | “When the final result has been computed, this result is of course sent back to the mobile device” Sounds a little weird, I would leave the ‘of course’ out.” | |
| 2.2.2 | Incorrect | “to easily sharable formats, such as .png or .pdf” We changed this to vector graphics. | |
| 2.2.2 | Structure/Layout | “or to start over with the original initial concentration distribution” You can start over with ‘a new’ initial concentration distribution, not with ‘the original’ initial concentration distribution. | |
| | | | Version 0.3 |
| 2.1 | Incorrect | ‘to compute the flow of the fluids’ – The server doesn’t compute the flow, it computes the new concentration distribution. | |
| 2.1 | Incorrect | ‘for the flow of the fluids’ – Again, not the flow of the fluids, just the resulting concentration distribution. | |
| 2.1 | Incorrect | ‘can compute the flow of the fluids’ – The same as above. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 2.2 | Incorrect | 'able to compute the flow of the fluids' – Same as above. |
| 2.2.1 | Incorrect | 'The fourth constraint is the initial concentration of the fluids' – Should be 'initial concentration distribution of the fluids'. |
| 2.2.2 | Incorrect | 'the computation of the flow' – Should be 'the computation of the new concentration distribution'. |
| 2.2.2 | Incorrect | 'via a two-dimensional image of the fluid distribution' should be 'of the fluid concentration distribution'. |
| 2.2.2 | Incorrect | 'It should also be possible to save entire runs as an animations' – this is a 'could' and not a 'should'. |
| 2.2.2 | Incorrect | 'or to start over with the original distribution' – Actually this is not always possible; you can reset it to an entire white distribution, or, if you've saved the original one, you can load it again. |
| 2.3 | Incorrect | 'to quickly try out new ideas for mixers' – You can't try a new mixer, you can try new protocols / new initial concentration distribution. |
| 2.3 | Incorrect | 'the server can compute the flow of fluids' – Same mistake again. |
| 2.3 | Incorrect | 'when the flow has been computed' – Again, flow isn't computed. |
| 2.3 | Incorrect | 'As mentioned before, it should be possible... ..and the resulting performance metric' – You can't export mixing runs, you can only save them within the application. You can only export the image of the final concentration distribution, the performance graph, and the animation of the mixing run. |
| 2.4 | Incorrect | 'to quickly try out ideas for mixers' – Can't try out a new mixer, only new protocols / initial concentration distributions. |
| 2.4 | Incorrect | 'The user can change the shape and characteristics of the mixer' – Well maybe later, but these are options to be included later, not the main idea of the application. |
| 2.5 | Incorrect | Figure 2.1: arrows 3, 4 and 5 talk about flow, should be concentration distribution. |
| 2.5 | Incorrect | Second assumption talks about flow. Again not correct. |

| Roel van Happen | | | Version 0.2 |
|----------------------------------|------------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.2 | Inconsistent | Third parameter is not exactly a parameter for the algorithm. | |
| 2.4 | Typo | “The user can then store these results to reference later” → “The user can then store these results for reference later.” | |
| | | | Version 0.3 |
| Appendix B, Use case B.20 & B.21 | Missing | Navigation to the history interface is missing in both use cases | |
| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.2 (description) | Missing | In this paragraph, the “movement of the walls” is mentioned, but we didn’t mention the “walls” as a mixing protocol in earlier sections. Perhaps changing it to something like this will clarify it a bit more: “.. given some constraints and initial concentration of the fluids. The constraints are described through a mixing protocol and consists of a sequence of transformations that are applied to the selected geometry. In case of a rectangular geometry, for instance, the sequence consists of ‘wall movements’: the fluid can be manipulated by moving an upper and lower wall for a specified amount of steps.” | |
| 2.2 | Structure | I would explain the example as a new sentence, instead of placing it within brackets in the current sentence. In general, using long sentences within brackets can decrease the readability of the text. | |
| 2.3 | Missing | A third parameter is started to be explained, but the sentence is not finished. “The third parameter ...” | |
| 2.4 | Structure/Layout | I would change this to “As mentioned before”. Now, it seems like the focus lies on the “being documented” part, whereas you probably only want to say that you mentioned this earlier in this chapter. | |

| Hugo Snel | | Version 0.1 |
|---------------------------|------------------|--|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
| 2.1 | Other | “Should be provided to” → “allows to”. We’re not provided with any interface |
| 2.1 | Inconsistent | “initial details” → initial concentration distribution. This is consistent with chapter 3. |
| 2.2 | Inconsistent | “is the protocol for moving the mixer” → “is the protocol for moving the geometric component” |
| 2.4 | Typo | “results to reference later” → “results for later reference” |
| 2.5 | Structure/Layout | “Apple iPhones and Android phones or tablets” → “Apple and Android mobile devices” |
| 2.5 | Other | “the hard work of computing the matrices” → “the hard work of computing”. The fact that matrixes are used is an implementation detail that the reader should not be aware of in “Environment description”. |
| 2.5 | Structure/Layout | “will be distributed to” → “send to”. You distribute to >1 servers , you send it to 1 server. |
| | | Version 0.3 |
| 2.1 | Typo | ”the user should be able to specify initial parameters.” Can be interpreted as ’the user can define new initial parameters’ |
| 2.1 | Other | ”intuitive and attractive user interface.” Don’t call it ’attractive’, hard to quantify. |
| 2.1 | Typo | ”where it can be visualised.” → ”Will be” |
| 2.1 | Typo | ”is impossible to comfortably use this solution on a mobile device.” Is it possible at all? If not, don’t emphasize on ’comfortable’, and leave it out. |
| 2.2.1 | Incorrect | ”is fixed for the entire protocol.”. It’s not fixed, the user should be able to change it for each step. |
| 2.2.1 | Inconsistent | If you mean ’change D in the positive direction’ type ”+D”. Just ’D’ looks like you mean the variable D, instead of D in the positive direction. |
| 2.2.1 | Inconsistent | ”The fourth constraint is the initial concentration of the fluids.” → Initial concentration Distribution |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|---------------------|--|
| 2.2.2 | Other | You talk about the "Client's server", "client device". The case of c is the only difference. This is not very clear for a non-computer scientist. |
| 2.2.3 | Other | "easy to share the visualised results". Don't call it 'easy', hard to quantify. |
| 2.2.3 | Incorrect | "flow of fluids reasonably". It does not compute flow, it computes the resulting concentration distribution. Idem for other occurrences of "Flow" |
| 2.2.3 | Other | "We will concentrate on mobile devices." -> "Our main focus is mobile devices" |
| 2.2.3 | Inconsistent | Initial distribution - _i Initial concentration distribution |
| 2.2.3 | Inconsistent | the resulting fluid distribution" -> Concentration distribution. Idem for other occurrences of "fluid distribution" |
| 2.2.5 | Incorrect | "The main device for the user interface is the mobile device." User interface -> FINGERPAINT application |
| Figure 2.1 | Incorrect | Change to-> 3. Computes resulting concentration distribution. 4. Send resulting concentration distribution. 5. Visualise resulting |
| Figure 2.1 2.6 | Missing Question | Missing a label "User" below the stick figure 1st bullet; Is there really already a connection? I think we need to make this ourselves. What we assume is that both sides(=devices) have access to the internet to allow for internet protocol communication. |
| 2.6 | Question | 2nd bullet; Do we assume the server already has an internet protocol to communicate? I think we need to make this ourselves. |

2.5 Chapter 3

2.5.1 External reviews

| Junior Management | | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3 | Incorrect | The sentence “any requirements following from further requests will be added here” is not correct: we won’t just add any requirements that are requested. Also, after signing the URD, there should not really be any more changes/additions. | |
| 3.1 | Structure | It might be nice to have more hierarchy for the requirements (as in the review checklist: coherent groups). | |
| 3.1 | Inconsistent | Formats are named in these constraints, while others are named in previous chapters (.SVG here, .GIF there). Try to make this consistent. | |
| CPR03 & CPR04 | Other | Maybe you can split these requirements, so you can always try to achieve one of them. | |
| CPR06 & CPR17 | Other | Why do you use a list? This seems like a solution space instead of a problem space. | |
| CPR09 & CPR18 | Question | What does “reset” mean here? | |
| CPR10 | Other | This requirement is ambiguous: can he save by drawing or can he save a drawing? | |
| CNR02 & CNR03 | Other | Maybe you can split-up the browsers, so you can do them individually. | |
| CNR07 & CNR08 & CNR09 | Other | We cannot ensure that this is ALWAYS the case. Maybe the “mean/average access time” is a better term. | |
| CNR10 | Other | The sentence “should be easily extendable” is ambiguous. Maybe there are more wishes in the Software Engineering sense, such as easily extending mixing patterns, easily extending it for different platforms, easily scaling things (but perhaps with a lower priority). | |

| Technical Advisor | | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| CPR04 | Question | You mention that the “user can define an initial concentration distribution with black and white”, but what are these “black and white” exactly? Do they refer to colors? | |
| CPR21 | Typo | “an image of the end result” should be “end-result”. | |
| CPR24 | Question | What do you mean in the sentence “an animation of applying the mixing protocol”? | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| CPR29 | Typo | “mixng performance” should of course be “mixing performance”, I assume. |
| Version 0.4 | | |
| 3 | Incorrect | Usecases are based upon requirements, not the other way around. |
| Client Version 0.4 | | |
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
| CPR20 | Incorrect | The protocol for a circle geometry is not defined by a sequence of rotations of the circle. |

2.5.2 Internal reviews

| Tessa Belder Version 0.1 | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
| 3.1 & 3.2 | Missing | Explanation is missing about what exactly capability/constraint requirements are. |
| Roel van Happen Version 0.2 | | |
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
| CPR 5 & 7 | Question | Isn't 7 an extension of 5? |
| CPR 8 | Other | Vague |
| CPR10 | Incorrect | Isn't 6 supposed to be 9? |
| CPR13 | Incorrect | Isn't 9 supposed to be 12? |
| CNR 10 | Inconsistent | It has priority 'should have', while the interface is required for this function has priority 'could have'. |
| Femke Jansen Version 0.0 | | |
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
| 3.1 | Typo | “off” should be “of” in “and constraints off the application ...” |
| 3.1 (CPR 10 & 13) | Incorrect | CPR10 should refer to CPR09 and CPR13 should refer to CPR12. |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 3.2 | Incorrect | The order/IDs of the constraint requirements are incorrect, as we have duplicate IDs. All IDs must be incremented by one starting from the CNR13 I mentioned. starting from CNR13 'should have' |

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | Version 0.3 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
| 3 | Missing | We have chosen not to specify interfaces, because we want to have options when designing these. Also, this is more of a developer detail than a customer need, as the customer does not really care how exactly the interfaces look, as long as they are functional and intuitive. However, none of this is documented in the URD. |
| 3.1 | Missing | CPR23 should reference a constraint that specifies that it is possible to execute the mixing protocol. As it is now, this constraint actually specifies two constraints, one of which is only implicitly mentioned. |
| 3.1 | Other | CPR24 and CPR27 contain solutions. We specify that we will use vector formats, but this is not a customer need. Therefore, this part should be removed. |

| Hugo Snel | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|------------------|--|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
| 3.1 | Structure/Layout | The priorities should be listed in list-format instead of the current 'newline-format' |
| 3.1 | Other | "could have" talks about 'budget' whilst there is no financial compensation. This seems a bit odd. |
| 3.1 | Incorrect | "won't have" talks about "this version", whilst the requirements describe only the final deliverable. This seems a bit odd. |
| 3.1 & 3.2 | Structure/Layout | For all requirements with 'save' → 'Save and manage'. If you have access to store it, access to delete is kind of implicit (in b4 memory overflow). This would make all 'is able to delete ...' requirements obsolete. |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|------------------|--|
| 3.1 & 3.2 | Structure/Layout | Sort the table on importance. First all “must have”, then “should”, then “could”. |
| CPR 7 | Typo | should be “..can define a Stepsize” or “..can define a time period.” Not both. |
| CPR 7 | Missing | Say something about a “fixed period” (otherwise the difference with the dynamic stepsize in 08 isn’t clear). |
| CPR 8 | Missing | Mention that stepsize can be adjusted in between steps (it is a dynamic stepsize) |
| CNR 12,13,14 | Structure/Layout | replace with “The application is compatible with devices running ..” |

2.6 Appendix A

2.6.1 External reviews

| Junior Management | | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| Appendix A | Missing | Add alternatives, if necessary. | |
| A.2 | Questions | What are the details in the storage of step 6? Will the exports of the results also be deleted? | |

| Technical Advisor | | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| Appendix | Structure | Perhaps you can omit the preconditions and instead include the necessary use cases as an additional step in the use case. | |
| Appendix | Missing | Now, it is not directly clear how the use cases are related; perhaps you could add a Use Case Diagram with a “precedes” relation to indicate the preconditions. | |
| A.3 | Incorrect | The first step in this use case is that the FINGERPAINT application gives a response, but now it seems that the application triggers the use case. This seems a bit strange, because it is a use case for users. | |
| A.3 & A.5 | Question | Is the confirmation message in step 7 from A.3 and step 7 from A.5 the exact same confirmation message? You’re mixing general descriptions with specific descriptions, try to stick to one of them. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| A.7 | Question | Is the priority of this use case correct? It seems that selecting a geometry and mixer is quite important for the application. |
| A.9 | Question | What does the <i>Load C₀</i> button do? It is not clear what it does from the name of this button. |
| A.10 | Question | Why is the first step numbered as 0? Is it different from the other use cases? |
| A.10 | Structure | I would change “Increments/decrements value in the display...” to “Increments/decrements value and displays the change in the display...” |
| A.11 & A.12 | Inconsistent | The numbering from the use cases mentioned in step 3 appear to be inconsistent with the actual use cases listed. |
| Version 0.4 | | |
| Appendix A | Missing | The actors should be added to the use case diagram. |

2.6.2 Internal reviews

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.3 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| A | Other | Yellow background is probably not suitable for printing, and also looks slightly unprofessional. | |

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| A | Typo | “use-cases” should be “use cases”. | |
| A | Missing | Perhaps also explain what the <i>Preceeds</i> and <i>Uses</i> relationships mean, although we know what this means, the client might not. | |

2.7 Appendix B

2.7.1 Internal reviews

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.3 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| B | Other | Third person sounds a bit odd. | |
| B | Typo | No closing ‘.’. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| B | Other | For alternatives: say <i>why</i> the alternative takes place. |
| B.1 | Other | To define a mixing geometry and mixer, the user should first tap the “Start mixing” button. I’d think that this button means that the mixing starts now, not that I first have to do all kinds of things before the mixing actually starts. |
| B.2 and others | Other | Alternative 6: Which mixing interface? |
| B.4 and others | Other | “B.1 or B.2 or B.3” should be “B.1, B.2 or B.3”. |
| B.4 and others | Other | Use “and” instead of “&”. |
| B.5 and others | Typo | “succesfull” → “successful”. |
| B.5, B.11, B.12, B.14, B.15, B.16 | Other | Why is a message shown when the save was successful? It would only be an annoying pop-up that the user would have to click away. I’d only show a message if the save was unsuccessful. |
| B.7 | Question | Is it possible that there are no saved protocols? I thought that either we would not implement this feature or the client would provide us with predefined protocols. |
| B.8 and others | Typo | Inconsistent spacing. |
| B.8 | Question | Remark is not clear. |
| B.9 | Other | Maybe refer to use cases by name, not just by section number. |
| B.10 | Question | What is the protocol-log? |
| Version 0.5 | | |
| B.9 | Typo | protoco.l → protocol. |
| B.10 | Other | The Alternative of this use case is unclear: the numbering goes from 8 to 5 to 6, making it unclear when a failure to connect actually happens. |
| B.10 | Other | Forward reference to Alternative R.2 . I was unable to find this alternative without using the search function, because I was expecting it to be somewhere in use cases B.1 until B.9. Also, I’m not sure whether this is the correct alternative. |

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| Figure 2.1 | Question | What are those use cases listed above the diagram? Do they have no relations to other use cases? Maybe you can clarify this a bit. | |
| Figure 2.1 | Missing | In the use case B.8, you mention B.4, B.5, B.6 or B.7 as actor actions that have been taken earlier. In the use case diagram, however, there is no direct arrow between B.4 and B.8. | |
| Figure 2.1 | Question | Is it an idea to also include the IDs (B.x) of the use cases in the use case diagram? I think this might clarify things even more. | |
| Figure 2.1 | Inconsistent | Use case B.20 is called “remove concentration distribution”, but the use case listed in figure 2.1 says “remove initial concentration distribution” | |

Chapter 3

SRD Feedback

3.1 Title page

No feedback has been given on this part of the document.

3.2 Abstract

3.2.1 Internal reviews

| Hugo Snel | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| Abstract | Missing | One of which assignments? Now it feels like it is incomplete. Saying its for the SEP course is enough in my opinion. | |

3.3 Document Status Sheet

3.3.1 External reviews

| Junior Management | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| Change Records | Inconsistent | The change record is non-empty, but the version is still 0.0, which is inconsistent. | |

3.3.2 Internal reviews

| Hugo Snel | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| Status Overview | Incorrect | It is version 0.0 even though it has a previous issue. I would say remove the template from the history. | |

3.4 Chapter 1

3.4.1 Internal reviews

| Hugo Snel | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| Purpose | Structure | The last sentence seems out of place for the section "Purpose". | |
| Scope | Incorrect | "can be stored and analysed by the user.." Analysing is not part of the functionality provided by the application, therefore I wouldn't mention it in the scope of our project. | |

3.5 Chapter 2

3.5.1 External Reviews

| Technical Advisor | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|------------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.4 | Inconsistent | Safari has two different priorities. | |
| 2.7 | Structure | Figure reference to 2.7.4 should be figure 2.1. | |
| 3.1.7 | Structure/Layout | Saving/exporting should be italic. | |
| 3.1.7 | Question | Is the alternative language selection priority only could have? | |

| Junior Management | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|------------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.4 | Question | Do you really want to support all those screen sizes? | |
| 2.4 | Question | Will you perhaps do something dynamic? | |
| 2.5 | Structure/Layout | 'That is, the correct (correct as in: how the HTML standard prescribes it) rendering of the web page is (should be) done by the browser.' – Rewrite this to something less complicated please. Or chop it up in pieces. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 2.7 | Question | ‘There are an arbitrary number of Client tiers.’ – Not sure if ”tiers” is the right word here. Is the tier not something like a layer, rather than a possible phone. Are not all these devices in the same tier? |
| 2.7.2 | Question | ‘(and executing those simulations in the first place)’ – Isn’t this actually done by the fortran part, rather than your server part? |

3.5.2 Internal reviews

| Hugo Snel | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.2 | Other | Last 2 sentences. I would say smth like ‘FINGERPAINT is no longer responsible for the application after the final deliverable produced in the SEP course’. It’s more to the point than saying ‘the client takes over these responsibilities and can make further changes’. | |
| 2.3 | Other | I would replace ‘playing’ with Interacting. Playing is more ”speeltje”-like. | |
| 2.3 | Other | ”This leads to a better understanding of the user” You don’t understand the user, you understand the mixing process. | |
| 2.3 | Other | last sentence. I would remove ”recently thought of” from this sentence. | |
| 2.4 | Typo | It should be ‘version’ instead of ‘versions’. You refer to 1 version, and then add ‘and above’. | |
| 2.4 | Missing | This is also consistent with section 3.2.6 ”We will test the application on the following screen resolutions:”. Ok, we will test it, but we will also make it work for these resolutions right? Seems trivial but it’s not mentioned anywhere. | |
| 2.5 | Typo | Remove ‘on itself’. | |
| 2.6 | Incorrect | ”We assume that the server can compute the displacement of fluids reasonably fast, so the visualisation of results can be handled quickly.” Visualisation is a separate process, so its not ”so” because they’re not related. It would be ”so the mixing run can be executed quickly”. But the server speed does not influence the visualisation speed. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 2.7 | Typo | "A graphical representation of these relation between those tiers and channels" – > "A graphical representation of the relation between tiers and channels". |
| 2.7.1 | Missing | "GUI" isn't introduced as an abbreviation anywhere. |
| 2.7.2 | Missing | "system administrator" isn't introduced anywhere. Also we don't ever talk about how the application will be distributed or how it will be maintained in the future. It is not in the contract nor in the scope of our project, thus I would not talk about it. |
| 2.7.4 | Typo | "are ran" -> run. |

3.6 Chapter 3

3.6.1 External Reviews

| Technical Advisor | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3.2.1 | Question | Is this correct? (on the entire subsection) | |
| 3.2.6 | Question | Is SRQ123 not already mentioned in SRQ119? | |

| Junior Management | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|------------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3 | Typo | 'A priority higher then' – Should be 'higher than'. | |
| 3 | Question | 'Note that as Fingerprint application is developed using GWT, some of the software requirements listed in this chapter are described in terms of specific GWT widgets or panels.' – Didn't you say somewhere in the intro that this document was about How and not What. This sounds like What to me. | |
| SQR5 | Structure/Layout | 'The Application Service must allow for removing existing mixers to the Application Persistence.' – That sentence doesnt make sense in English. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 3.1.6 | Other | A bit strange way to start this paragraph with "A duration is bla". Maybe introduce what we are actually talking about first "Such a value D can be entered in a spinner". |
| 3.1.6 | Question | Isn't this again a case of What instead of How? It seems you focus on the spinner a LOT since you already implemented it. This part is not more special than the rest :) |
| SRQ17 | Other | 'This value must be an integer number, and must be at least 1.' – 2 requirements in 1 requirement? Leave out this detail or make it a separate one. |
| 3.1.6 | Other | 'The user can select a rectangular mixer geometry.' – Again a strange way to start off. Once again a LOT of detail on the cell browser. This might be too much detail already, but I'm not sure if it's that bad... |
| SRQ23 - SRQ33 | Question | Should you already say which column etc. things are going to be? Perhaps refer to it more as layers/steps, rather than this specific solution? Once again, I'll leave this in your hands, but these are my thoughts. |
| 3.1.8 | Other | 'The user is able to visualise his mixing protocol, as well as able to save and export these results' – Ambiguous, what are the "results" you speak of? |
| SRQ108 | Typo | 'to the Fortran Module, that the Fortran Module can use for simulations.' – "which" instead of "that" I think. Sounds very Dutch. |
| 3.2.3 - 3.2.5 | Question | TODO or will these just be empty? If they will not get content, perhaps remove them. |
| 3.2.7 - 3.2.12 | Question | TODO or will these just be empty? If they will not get content, perhaps remove them. |

3.6.2 Internal reviews

| Tessa Belder | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| SRQ5 & SRQ12 | Question | Is this true? Isn't this unnecessary complicated? Just remove and add a new one would also do the trick, so I would say changing mixers is at most a <i>should have</i> , not a <i>must have</i> . | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|--|------------------------|--|
| 3.1.6 | Question | ‘Such a value D can be entered in a text box near the drawing canvas.’ Why not something else like a spinner? I would say text box is inconvenient here, because of the error message when an invalid value is entered. |
| SRQ23 | Other | ‘With four columns, to select an initial mixer, geometry and initial distribution.’ Sounds kinda weird, since you have four columns for only three options, so it seems. There were two columns for selecting the initial distributions, right? So maybe that should be mentioned. Note: After reading the following requirements, this becomes clear. But maybe some extra text under the heading ‘Select a geometry, mixer and initial concentration distribution’, like under some of the other headings, would be helpfull here. |
| SRQ32 & SRQ33 Change the drawing Tool | Incorrect Incorrect | Actually, predefined is <i>could have</i> (see CPR14). The menu doesn’t have two vertical panels. It has one horizontal panel with two cells. The left cell contains a vertical panel, with multiple cells, and each cell containing a button. The right cell of the horizontal panel contains the slider. |
| SRQ34 | Layout | Faulty reference which screws up the layout of the document. |
| SRQ38 | Layout | The point that should be on the end of this requirement is placed under the horizontal line, instead of after the requirement itself. |
| Define the mixing protocol for specific geometries | Question/Incorrect | The protocol consists of movements of the geometry, right? That’s what you say in the second alinea of this section. Not of movements of the mixer as stated in the first sentence. |
| Define the mixing protocol for specific geometries | Incorrect | The circle geometry indeed doesn’t support movement, but the mixer that is placed inside it does. Therefore you can specify how far you want to move the mixer inside the geometry, and this serves as the protocol. So the protocol isn’t immediately defined after selecting a mixer. |
| Define the mixing protocol for specific geometries | Question | Why is it stated for the Journal Bearing that movements are defined by swiping, and isn’t it for the rectangular/square geometry? |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| SRQ45 | Inconsistent | In the usecases there isn't an execute step button. Instead theres an 'intermediate steps' checkbox. If this checkbox is checked, selected steps are executed directly. Note: after further reading, it seems you have replaced this checkbox with the 'animate mixing' checkbox, which wasn't mentioned in the URD. I do think however that such an 'animate mixing' checkbox is a good idea. |
| SRQ58 | Other | This isn't mentioned in the User requirements or in the use cases. It is nice, but maybe <i>should have</i> is a bit overkill. |
| Saving and exporting results | Incorrect | 'The user can then name the file and browse to a desirable storage location. If during saving the specified name for saving/exporting is already in use, the application returns a name already in use message'. Since exporting is done through the browser, the application doesn't do anything. You also can't say anything about being able to browse to a specific location, since this totally depends on your browsers download settings. |
| SRQ84 | Incorrect | Same comment as above: depends on your browsers download settings. |
| SRQ90 | Layout | Reference doesn't work. |
| SRQ92 | Typo | textttresults has 3 t's here. |
| Loading Results & SRQ93 & SRQ97 | Other | Loading multiple results sounds very awesome, but this wasn't mentioned anywhere in the URD (except for the performance graphs), and it also sounds pretty complicated. Therefore, I would say at least make it a <i>could have</i> instead of a <i>should have</i> . |
| SRQ96 & SRQ99 | Question | Aren't these requirements the same? |
| Language selection | Other | A preferred language was never mentioned before (in the URD), so be careful with saying this 'should be' there. |
| SRQ109 | Missing | Also the geometry and mixer are given as input. |
| SRQ110 & SRQ112 | Question | What do you mean with matrix files? The vector which holds the concentration distribution? |
| SRQ114 | Other | Sounds like all listed mixers are known for each geometry, which is not the case, and probably not what you meant. |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Define a mixing protocol | Other | I read all of this before, in the section ‘Define mixing protocol for specific geometries’. Also, this section only holds for rectangular and square geometries, which isn’t mentioned here. |

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.1 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3.1 | Style | A general remark: I noticed that sometimes, you talk about a “concentration vector” and sometimes about a “concentration distribution”. For consistency, I would say to stick to either one of them, because the subsections always refer to “distribution”. | |
| 3.1.6 | Incorrect | In “Defining an initial concentration distribution”, you say “He can draw ... or drawing the mouse”, but I think you mean “drawing with the mouse” here. | |
| 3.1.6 | Style | In “Defining an initial concentration distribution”, I would change the last sentence to “In addition, the user can reset the current distribution to a completely white distribution.” | |
| 3.1.6 | Missing | In “Define mixing protocol for specific geometries”, you say “A step of the mixing protocol has a certain duration (the step size)”. In the next sentence, you mention a D , but it has not been introduced yet. Perhaps you can change “the step size” to “the step size, D ”. | |
| 3.1.6 | Incorrect | The circular geometry doesn’t support any operations to be executed directly on the circle. For the circle, only the initial concentration distribution can be set. | |
| SRQ42 | Typo | In the sentence, “If a geometry, a mixer, an initial distribution and a protocol is present” the “is” should be “are”. | |
| 3.1.6 | Missing | Under “Execute mixing runs”, a reference is made to an SRQ, but the reference is unknown. | |
| 3.1.7 | Style | I would change the subsection “Mixing runs” to “Save and remove mixing runs”. | |
| SRQ67 | Typo | “If at least one item” should of course be “If at least one item”. | |
| 3.1.7 | Typo | In the “Exporting results” subsection, “a image” should be “an image”. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 3.1.7 | Question | In “exporting results”, references are made to SRQ39, but this requirement is not about executing a mixing simulation. Do you mean SRQ42 here? |
| SRQ75 | Typo | “the result ... are actually loaded” should be “is loaded”. |
| SRQ75 | Question | Is this indeed true? I thought you just needed to tap on a distribution and then it is loaded. It is not specified in the use cases of the URD that a confirmation is shown. |
| SRQ77 | Typo | In “should be persent” it should be “present”. |
| 3.1.7 | Question | In the subsection “Language selection”, you say that the standard language is English. Is it an idea to make a reference to the requirements regarding the English and Dutch version of the application (from section 3.2.2)? |
| 3.1.7 | Typo | In the subsection “Requirements regarding the presentation of results”, in the second sentence “additon” should be “addition”. |
| 3.1.8 | Missing | A few requirements are listed at the beginning of the subsection “Simulator Service Communication”, but they are not explained. |
| SRQ84 | Typo | In “to the Application service throught”, “throught” should be “through”. |
| SRQ86 | Inconsistent | In SRQ85, “Fortran” is written with a capital letter and has a special font, but in this requirement is written with a small letter and it has no special font. |
| SRQ88 | Inconsistent | Again, “Fortran” has no special font, but in SRQ85 it does. The same holds for the introduction in “Information exchange” and the requirements SRQ89, SRQ90 and SRQ91. |

Hugo Snel

Version 0.0

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 3.1.4 | Question | SRQ11 & 12 & 13 - Not all application services can add new mixers. Right now it looks like very user can define/change/remove mixers. I think we only want to give mr. Anderson the access rights to add/change/remove mixers from the list. |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 3.1.6 | Incorrect | "the user is prompted to enter a different value." A prompt would be a bad solution. I think the way the spinner is currently implemented the number is rounded towards the closest valid value. |
| 3.1.6 | Structure | SRQ20 & 22 contain future references (ref. to parts the reader hasn't read yet) |
| 3.1.6 | Typo | "concentration distribution is.." No capital letter at the start of the sentence. |
| 3.1.6 | Structure | "In case of the second and third option" The text never talks about "options", and suddenly they're referenced to as the 2nd and 3rd option. Same for "3rd column". (Just read the SRQ's below; Only after reading them it is clear what the text above it talks about). |
| 3.1.6 | Inconsistent | Reverse movements are called (for example) "-B". But 'normal' movements are not "+B". I would include the "+" to be more explicit. |
| 3.1.6 | Inconsistent | A positive T movement is a movement to the right. But a positive B movement is a movement to the left. I suggest both should be to the right, and the minus version both to the left. |
| 3.1.6 | Missing | "JSON" isn't introduced as an abbreviation anywhere |
| 3.1.6 | Other | "un-JSON's" is a strange verb, especially when JSON is a noun. |
| 3.1.7 | Other | Very strange, and lost, sentence in between SRQ46 and 47. |
| 3.1.7 | Other | SRQ50 & 51 - "spawns". Spawns is kind of a weird word in my opinion. |
| 3.1.7 | Missing | SRQ61 - Opening quote missing. |
| 3.1.7 | Inconsistent | See above. The quotes around "load buttons" is missing for other SRQ's |
| 3.1.7 | Other | "In the results window a save button" What is the result window? This window is never introduced. |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 3.1.7 | Other | "The button changes to load selected" It is implicit, but basically every menu has a Back/Cancel button. If the name of the button changes when you select something, you first have to un-select everything before you can go back. I think this isn't what we want (a cancel button should always be available). I think it's a bad idea to give 1 button 2 functionalities. (even though you can also cancel by clicking outside the menu). |
| 3.1.7 | Other | SRQ83 and 84 have random capitals letter T half-way the sentence. |
| 3.1.7 | Incorrect | SRQ85 - Only if 83&84 have non-empty fields. |
| 3.1.7 | Other | SRQ86 - It's not clear. Should be "Cancel The 'load file menu' ". Atm it looks like cancelling the loading while its loading. Write it similar to 98. |
| 3.1.7 | Other | SRQ89 - Also for 87 i assume. |
| 3.1.7 | Other | SRQ90 - Reference to SRQ 87 is wrong. |
| 3.1.7 | Other | SRQ91 - Analogue to comment about 86. |
| 3.1.7 | Other | SRQ93 - TexTTT, 3 T's is not how you spell text |
| 3.1.7 | Question | Language select - I thought we would use a togglebutton? It's unlikely we implement more languages than english/dutch. |
| 3.1.8 | Other | Again - I advise to not use 1 button for 2 functionalities. |
| 3.1.8 | Inconsistent | SRQ 106 - "visual information" = _i performance graph. |
| 3.1.9 | Missing | "The server executes the mixing using" -> "Mixing run". |
| 3.1.9 | Inconsistent | +T and +B should both be to the right/left, not opposing directions. |
| 3.2.1 | Incorrect | SRQ 117 118 119 - should be "ON AVERAGE ... " |

Roel van Happen

Version 0.1

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 3.1.1 | Question | SRQ1 What is meant with 'static' files? |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 3.1.2 | Structure | SRQ7 Perhaps the sentence 'acts as a relay between the client browser and the simulation service' should be rephrased to something like 'the application service must communicate all files sent by the client browser to the simulation service and vice versa'. |
| 3.1.4 | Structure | SRQ12 'The application psistence must remove existing mixers..' should be rephrased to someting like 'the application persistence must be able to allow the as to remove mixers.' |
| 3.1.6 | Incorrect | In 'Define mixing protocol for specific geometries', it is stated that the circle geometry walls can be moved, but this is not the case for the circle. |
| 3.1.6 | Question | SRQ40 Isn't the step direction created with the mixing step instead of added afterwards. |
| 3.1.6 | Layout | In subsection 'visualising the results', the reference between the references to SRQ83 and SRQ85 is broken. |
| 3.1.7 | Question | SRQ47 Isn't the persistence also capable of storing results? |
| 3.1.7 | Incorrect | SRQ52 Reference to SRQ29 should be to SRQ32. |
| 3.1.7 | Question | Is SRQ75 actually true? |
| 3.1.8 | Layout | The reference between the references to SRQ83 and SRQ85 is broken. |
| 4.1 | Layout | Many references are broken. |

3.6.3 External Reviews

| Technical Advisor | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3.2.1 | Question | Is this correct? (on the entire subsection) | |
| 3.2.6 | Question | Is SRQ123 not already mentioned in SRQ119? | |

3.7 Chapter 4

No feedback has been given on this part of the document.

Chapter 4

SCMP Feedback

4.1 Abstract

4.1.1 Internal reviews

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| General Remark | Other | There was already a LaTeX template available for SCMP; perhaps you can check whether you conformed to the template. Another possibility is to merge the pieces you have with the text that is provided in the template. | |
| Abstract | Missing | The reference to the ESA document doesn't work/is missing. As a consequence, all references mentioned in the document are broken/missing. | |

4.2 Chapter 1

4.2.1 Internal reviews

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1.3 | Incorrect | 2IP35 is the Software Engineering Project, not a Course. | |
| 1.3 | Other | You don't have to translate BCF: its English equivalent meaning is namely "Bureau for Computer Facilities". | |
| 1.4 | Missing | The list of references is empty. | |

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1 | Other | The introduction is in future tense, while it should be present tense. | |
| 1 | Other | The introduction is strangely constructed, and the second sentence should be a subsentence of the first. | |
| 1.1 | Other | Second sentence contains future tense again. | |
| 1.4 | Missing | References are empty, and in turn all references show as “[?]”. | |

4.3 Chapter 2

4.3.1 External reviews

| Junior Management | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|------------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.1 | Question | ‘Other group members should always assist’ – Unclear. What is meant by ‘should always assist’? | |
| 2.4 | Missing | For SCMP and SPMP the references are missing. | |
| 2.5 | Missing | ‘should use the fingerprint.cls document’ – A reference to this document should be added as well. | |
| 2.5 | Structure/Layout | ‘This to ensure a consistent...’ – Grammar mistake. Maybe something like ”This [rule is meant] to ensure [...]”? | |

4.3.2 Internal reviews

| Tessa Belder | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.5 | Typo | ”So, a standard ”main” .tex-file should like as is shown” – probably should be something like ”should look like as is shown”. | |

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.1 | Missing | Here, you refer to the SPMP, but there is no reference to this external document. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 2.3 | Missing | Again, you mention the SPMP, but there is no reference. |
| 2.5 | Question | Is it an idea to make a small figure that summarizes what you say in this paragraph, so people can immediately say what the required structure of the documents is? |
| 2.5 | Missing | The template describes that all documents must also adhere to the requirements in SQAP and SVVP. |

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2 | Other | First sentence of <i>Management</i> is passive, but it could easily be changed to active form. | |
| 2.2 | Missing | Master and archive libraries are introduced, but they are never explained. Only in Section 3.1 is it mentioned that these will be described in Chapter 4. | |
| 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2 | Typo | “chapter”, “section” etc. should be capitalised. | |
| 2.5 | Typo | It seems a word is missing in <i>So, a standard “main” .tex-file should like as is shown in figure 2.1.</i> | |

4.4 Chapter 3

4.4.1 External reviews

| Junior Management | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3.1 | Other | ‘This identifier is title abbreviation-version’ – This was confusing when I read it the first time, especially with the space (it looks like “title” is one term and “abbreviation-version” is another term). i would write “[title abbreviation]-[version]” or something similar maybe. Although that is more a personal opinion. This was also done this way in 6.2.2. by the way. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|------------------|--|
| 3.1 | Other | ‘Basically, the version number will not change after that, but it is theoretically possible that after that, some more changes are required and versions 1.x are created.’ – This is a little unclear. First it states that “[...] the version number will not change [...]” followed by “[...] but it is possible that [...] changes are required[...] and versions 1.x are created”. So the version might change apparently. Also, try to avoid using “after that” too many times in a row, it can get confusing what “that” is. |
| 3.1 - Second Paragraph | Structure/Layout | This does not really belong in the naming conventions anymore. |
| 3.2 | Missing | ‘The ESA standard prescribes’ – A reference should be added here. |

4.4.2 Internal reviews

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3.1 | Style | The writing style of this section is a bit informal, in my opinion, especially the sentence “note how exception this situation sounds”. It is a formal document, so a formal writing style is appropriate here. | |
| 3.1 | Typo | “Et cetera” should be “etcetera”, I think. | |

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3.1 | Other | Future tense in first sentence of first and second paragraph. | |
| 3.2 | Typo | <i>Baseslines</i> in second sentence. | |
| 3.2 | Other | Future tense in third sentence. | |
| 3.2 | Typo | Last sentence of first paragraph: <i>rebuild</i> should be <i>rebuilt</i> . | |

4.5 Chapter 4

4.5.1 External reviews

| Junior Management | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|------------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 4.1.1 | Other | ‘and not to the SEP that led’ – Unclear. Is a CI not automatically related to the Software Engineering Project (SEP) if it is related to the application you are creating? Maybe saying “[...] and not exclusively to the SEP documentation [...]” is less confusing? | |
| 4.1.3 | Structure/Layout | The last line of the folder structure under the bullet ‘Documentation’ is displayed on the next page. This is ugly formatting. | |
| 4.3.2 | Question | ‘Note that in this procedure, the version number of the CI is bumped with 1.0.’ – I am not sure, but shouldn’t it say ”bumped to”? | |

4.5.2 Internal reviews

| Tessa Belder | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 4.1.2 | Missing | ”on the website of the Fingerpaint application.” – A reference to this site would be nice. | |
| 4.2 | Typo | ”and how the libraries can accessed through it” – should be ”can be accessed through it”. | |
| 4.3 | Typo | ”who can change what in the various libraries” – should be ”what is in the various libraries”. | |
| 4.3.2. | Question | It says files in the master library can only be changed by the CM, but you have to contact the QM if you want to change something. Why QM and not CM? Or is this just a typo? If QM is correct, it has to be defined somewhere (it’s not in the definitions list). I suppose it means quality manager, but i’m not sure. | |

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 4 | Style | “Since we are at it” sounds a bit informal to me. Perhaps you can change it to, ”Moreover, we will describe ...” | |
| 4.1 | Style | In the sentence “We call a place where CIs are stored a library”, I would place library between quotes, as you introduce it as a new term here. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 4.1.1 | Style | In project-docs, in the sentence “That is, all CIs that ... are stored here” I would place an additional comma somewhere, to make it more readable. It is now unclear to me what the “leading to the creation of that application”-part refers to. |
| 4.1.1 | Style | In sep-docs, I would start the second sentence with “This” instead of “That”: often “that” is used in the same sentence, whereas “this” is more appropriate in a new sentence, I think. |
| 4.1.3 | Question | The purpose of the sentence “Of course, the difference is clearly stated on the website” is not clear to me. Do we have to mention explicitly that the difference is explained on the website? Now, it appears that the focus lies on the fact that the difference is stored on the website, whereas you actually just want to say that there is a difference, I think. |
| 4.1.3 | Missing | The template mentions again SQAP and SVVP, but there are not mentioned in this section. |
| 4.3.2 | Missing | You mention the SVVP document, but there is no reference to it. |
| 4.3.3 | Missing | The template mentions SVVP, but there is no reference to that document in this subsection. |
| 4.3.3 | Style | The sentence “Note that files ... been approved externally” is a bit long, perhaps you can split it in multiple sentences? |

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
| 4, 4.1.1 | Other | Future tense. |
| 4.1.1 | Other | It says that documents that are stored are stored in <i>The development library will store all versions of a CI that are stored in it</i> . I get what is meant, but it does sound strange. |
| 4.1.1 | Other | <i>made undone</i> should be <i>undone</i> . |
| 4.1.1 | Other | <i>(Git is discussed in more detail in chapter 6)</i> can be a main sentence instead of a sub-sentence. |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 4.1.1 | Other | <i>all CIs are stored here that are related to the Fingerpaint application and not to the SEP that led to the creation of that application should be all CIs that are related to the Fingerpaint application and not to the SEP that led to the creation of that application are stored here.</i> |

4.6 Chapter 5

4.6.1 Internal reviews

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 5 | Question | In the template, it is mentioned that changes in the development library will not be recorded. However, in your table an entry for “current” is created? | |

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 5 | Other | Future tense in first sentence. | |

4.7 Chapter 6

4.7.1 Internal reviews

| Tessa Belder | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 6.1.1. | Other | ”to work efficiently in parallel on the same file, even to some extent on the same file” – Don’t understand what is meant here exactly, but probably not two times ”on the same file”. | |
| 6.1.2 | Typo | ”GitHub is a (commercial) servers” – should be ”server” (or maybe ”set of servers”?). | |
| 6.1.3 | Inconsistent | In this section ”the GWT” is mentioned a few times, and also ”GWT”. I don’t think this is very consistent, since ”the GWT” can also be used at all places where ”GWT” is used. (except for GWT-enabled). | |

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 6.1.3 | Question | Is it really the case that GWT provides only two things? Or does it provide many things and are we only going to use those specific two things? | |
| 6.1.3 | Typo | In the sentence “Finally, the GWT includes a plugin..”, “plugin” should be “plug-in”. | |
| 6.1.4 | Other | You have two sentences that start with “Of course”. This reads a bit odd and I think you actually mean to say “However” in the second sentence. | |
| 6.1.4 | Other | It seems a bit strange to start a sentence with “Still then”, perhaps you can suffice with “Still”. | |
| 6.1.6 | Style | The style of the sentence “if the server .., which we have done” is again a bit informal. Perhaps you can simply remove the “which we have done” part, or you can re-phrase it in a different way. | |
| 6.1.7 | Question | I understand that we use LaTeX because of the good-looking documents, but is that really a key motivation to use LaTeX? | |
| 6.2.1 | Style | Again, beware of the informal style: it is a formal document, after all. | |

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 6.1 | Incorrect | Saying that <i>we will be able to do anything the client wants</i> is a very strong statement. | |
| 6.1 | Other | Second paragraph: lots of future tense. | |
| 6.1.1 | Typo | Superfluous comma in <i>Git is a distributed, lightweight, version control system</i> . | |
| 6.1.1 | Typo | In <i>GitHub is a (commercial) servers</i> , servers should probably be service. | |
| 6.1.3 | Other | In my opinion, writing JavaScript instead of JS looks better. | |
| 6.1.3 | Missing | The five most widely used browsers are mentioned, but not named. | |
| 6.1.4 | Other | Like it is written now, <i>It is simply impossible to test both browsers on ...</i> implies that there are only two browsers. | |
| 6.1.4 | Other | <i>It is multilingual, including Java, which is our choice</i> is a strange fragmented sentence. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 6.2.1 | Other | The colon in ... <i>so the conventions are simple: a developer does not want to do something complex a lot</i> implies that “the conventions are simple, namely a developer ...”. |

4.8 Chapter 7

4.8.1 External reviews

| Junior Management | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 7 | Other | ‘In general, when we consider using software from a supplier we trust, we just use the software.’ – I would be careful about stating that this way. You should never blindly trust and use software products. i had occasions where i used well known libraries in JAVA for example, had an error in my code and tried to track it down in my code only, just to find out after days and days that the error was in the library itself. | |

4.8.2 Internal reviews

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 7 | Style | The introduction text is slightly informal, try to stick to a more formal writing style. | |

Chapter 5

SVVP Feedback

5.1 Chapter 1

5.1.1 External reviews

| Junior Mangement | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1.2 | Typo | ”is to provide a intuitive and modern” → ”is to provide an intuitive and modern”. | |

5.1.2 Internal reviews

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1.2 | Question | You mention that our application provides an interface for an already defined mixing program, but do you suggest here that we are the ones that made that mixing program? Now, it looks like we developed this program, whereas actually our application only visualizes the results of this “already defined mixing program”. Only at the end of this paragraph, you mention that the calculation is done elsewhere. Perhaps you can mention this earlier in this section. | |
| 1.2 | Missing | The part of the sentence “The second goal is” suggests that there is some enumeration. However, there is no “first goal”. | |
| 1.3 | Incorrect | 2IP35 is not a course, but a project. | |

5.2 Chapter 2

5.2.1 Internal reviews

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.7 | Other | Selenium is the name of a product/framework, so it should be written with a capital letter in “In this project ...”. | |

5.3 Chapter 4

5.3.1 External reviews

| Junior Mangement | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 4.3 | Structure | reference to the STP in the tracing matrix should be removed because no STP will be written. | |

Chapter 6

ADD Feedback

6.1 Abstract

No feedback has been given on this part of the document.

6.2 Chapter 1

6.2.1 External reviews

| Junior Management | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1.3.1 | Question | In the definition of mixing step: this is true specifically for a subset of possible mixers only. Maybe a more general description would be better? | |

6.2.2 Internal reviews

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1 | Missing | Every chapter with (sub)sections should contain a small introduction before the first (sub)section. | |
| 1.1 | Typo | In the sentence “it describes the dependencies on other components”, it should be “with” or “to” instead of “on”. | |
| 1.2 | Typo | In “The application serves as an education tool”, it should be “an educational tool”. | |
| 1.3 | Typo | “and in particular for students” should be “particular”. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 1.3 | Typo | The name of the section contains a typo, because it says “abbrviations” and it should be “abbreviations”. |
| 1.3.1 | Missing | Now, there is one definition in the list and a todo to add more if necessary. Perhaps you can include definitions for the following items as well: Fortran, mixing step, meta-parameter, GWT and subordinates. |
| 1.3.2 | Missing | The following abbreviations are mentioned in the document, but are not included in the list of abbreviations: “ADD”, GWT, JNI and GUI. |
| 1.3.2 | Incorrect | 2IP35 is a Software Engineering Project, not a Course. |
| 1.5 | Style | Sometimes you are very brief in this section, such as “Chapter 2 gives a system overview”, whereas sometimes you explicitly say in which sections (“In section 4.2”) something is covered. Perhaps you can include some more information on chapters 2, 3 and 4. |

Thom Castermans

Version 0.0

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 1.3.2 | Structure | The abbreviations should be sorted alphabetically, I think. |
| 1.3.2 | Missing | The abbreviation “ADD” is missing. |
| 1.5 | Typo | In the sentence “...of the system, and an overview...” there should not be a comma. |

Benjamin van der Hoeven

Version 0.0

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 1.1 | Other | <i>... the FINGERPAINT application that will be developed ...</i> The application is currently in development, so I would change this to present tense <i>is being developed</i> . |
| 1.1 | Other | I would change <i>Thereafter</i> to <i>Then</i> . |
| 1.3 | Typo | Fortran: A general pupose (fixed). |
| 1.3 | Other | <i>The combination of a wall the move</i> should be changed to something like <i>The combination of which wall moves</i> . |
| 1.5 | Typo | Chapter 4 covers the system design (fixed). |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 1.5 | Typo | Chapter 6 gives an overview of all resources needed to build, operate and maintain the application. |

| Hugo Snel | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1.3.1 | Typo | Typo. Also I think you should also explain what a 'step' is. | |
| 1.3.2 | Incorrect | 'CM' does not appear anywhere else in the document | |
| 1.3.2 | Incorrect | 'SR' does not appear anywhere else in the document | |
| 1.5 | Inconsistent | Section 4.2 is described, but you should only describe chapters. | |

6.3 Chapter 2

6.3.1 Internal reviews

| Thom Castermans | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2 | Structure | The abbreviations URD and SRD can be used here without writing it all out, especially since these abbreviations are named in the list of abbreviations. When you do want to keep the full titles, please emphasise them. | |

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2 | Other | <i>...and the environment it will operate in.</i> Should be changed to present tense, as it already operates in that environment and this documentation is mainly used for future maintenance, in which case it definitely runs in that environment. | |
| 2 | Typo | <i>any one other information systems</i> should be either singular or plural. | |

| Roel van Happen | | | Version 0.1 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2 | Missing | A description of the design decision to compress with zip is needed. In addition, the alternative (lwz compression) should be described. | |

6.4 Chapter 3

6.4.1 External reviews

| Junior Management | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|------------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3 | Structure/layout | The sentence “parameters are parameters” is bad structure. One “parameters” would be enough: “Some of these parameters are describing the length of other parameters ... ”. | |
| 3 | Question | Are there no standard sets for how the geometry and matrix should be named? I think this would make sense as it would avoid inconsistencies. | |

6.4.2 Internal reviews

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3.1 | Question | Is it really necessary to make a separate section? You’re actually only discussing one item in this chapter. | |
| 3 | Missing | Every chapter with (sub)sections should contain a small introduction before the first (sub)section. That is, if you decide to keep the section for this single item. | |
| 3.1 | Layout | You provide some sort of list/enumeration here, so perhaps you can use a bullet list. | |
| 3.1 | Typo | In “to be done by Fingerpaint applicationare” a space is missing after “application”. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 3.1 | Typo | “fortran” should be written with a capital letter. The same holds for the “fortran” in the title of this section (if you decide to keep the section). |
| 3.1 | Typo | “Communications” sounds a bit odd, I think you mean “Communication” here. |
| 3.1 | Incorrect | The geometry-parameter is not a number, but a String in our current program. |
| 3.1 | Incorrect | The matrix/mixer is also a String-parameter. |

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3.1 | Other | <i>Communication with this module are done</i> should be either singular or plural. | |
| 3.1 | Other | All of the <code>len_*</code> meta-parameters have similar descriptions. Most of these messages could be combined above the table, so that, in the table, these items only have to talk about what exactly they represent, and not why they are there. | |
| 3.1 | Other | <code>Len_*</code> : <i>... of above string</i> misses an article. | |
| 3.1 | Other | Geometry: <i>For example, Rectangle 400x240.</i> This is only a fragment of a sentence and should either be reworded or combined with the previous sentence. | |
| 3.1 | Structure | The paragraph at the end of the section should be moved to the beginning of the section and combined with the remark about the meta-parameters above. | |
| 3.1 | Typo | prevent segmentation faults from occurring (fixed). | |

| Hugo Snel | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3.0 | Style | ”with this, we mean” -> ”This means...” | |
| 3.1 | Typo | ”with this module are done” -> ”is done” | |
| 3.1 | Typo | ”In the above, all meta-parameters are not needed to make” -> ”Not all meta-parameters of the above table are needed...” | |
| 3.1 | Missing | Include ’segmentation faults’ in the definitions table. | |

6.5 Chapter 4

6.5.1 External reviews

| Junior Management | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|------------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 4.2.1 | Structure/layout | The “\newpage” command here (in between the items from the enumeration) looks weird. | |

6.5.2 Internal reviews

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 4.2 | Question | Maybe you can refer specifically to figure 2.1 of the SRD here, so it is more clear that you’re talking about the same components here. | |
| 4.2.1 | Question | What does “Layout” and “Application State” mean here? They are not mentioned in figure 2.1 of the SRD, so maybe you can explain what they’re about. | |
| 4.2.1 | Question | In the Client-component, you say that the Client Browser is responsible for updating the Application Persistence. Do you mean Client Persistence here? And what is exactly updated in this case? | |
| 4.2.2 | Typo | A space is missing behind “Fingerprint” in the first sentence. This causes the dot (.) to appear above the first letter of the next sentence. | |
| 4.2.2 | Question | What does the ‘depends on’-relation mean? Does it mean that, for instance the Simulator Service communicates with the Fortran Module or vice versa? Perhaps you can explain some more about this relation, so the “direction” of the relation is also clear. Explaining the bidirectional arrows might also help for understanding the figure better. | |
| Figure 4.1 | Incorrect | Figure 2.1 in the SRD has bidirectional arrows for all communication lines, for example the communication line between the Simulator Service and the Fortran Module. I think there should be bidirectional arrows in figure 4.1 as well for all these cases. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Figure 4.1 | Incorrect | In figure 4.1 you say that the Application Service depends on the Simulator Service, but that seems quite strange, as the Client Browser is the one who communicates to the Simulator Service (see figure 2.1 SRD). |
| Figure 4.1 | Question | Why does the “Update Application Persistence” depend on the HTTP server? If the Application Persistence is actually the Client Persistence, is there any need to communicate to the HTTP server at all? If this is not the case, could you please explain the purpose of the Application Persistence better? |

| Thom Castermans | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
| 4.1 | Missing | When mentioning the use of GWT, maybe refer to the SCMP (chapter 6)? Maybe not, though, because the SCMP is a project document, whereas the ADD is a product document. |
| 4.2.2 | Typo | In the first sentence, I think there should be a {} behind the \LaTeX command for the project name, because there is something weird happening now. |

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
| 4.2.1 | Typo | <i>The following components are identified:</i> (fixed) |
| 4.2.2 | Typo | fulfill (fixed). |
| 4.2.2 | Typo | eachother is/are two words (fixed). |

| Hugo Snel | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
| 4.2.2 | Incorrect | Needs to be updated to match the latest version of the SRD. |

6.6 Chapter 5

6.6.1 External reviews

| Junior Management | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|------------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 5.1.1 | Question | Is the Fortran Module really a single procedure? It seems you just call one procedure of the module, but I guess the module itself is not just a procedure. | |
| 5.1.1 | Structure/layout | In “performs the calculations to calculate”, I would use “calculates” only once, i.e. “The Fortran Module calculates how the mixing distribution changes as a mixing step is applied.” | |
| 5.1.1 | Typo | In the “Interfaces” section, “ands the segregation factor” should be “and the segregation factor”. | |
| 5.1.3 | Incorrect | You are stating that databases cannot process data, which is not true in general. | |
| 5.1.3 | Typo | In the “Subordinates” section, “was not build” should be “was not built”. | |
| 5.1.5 | Structure/layout | The sentence “This is not entirely true however: some data is compressed before sending it to the client, for example” is bad structure. “This is not entirely true however, as some data is compressed before sending it to the client” would be nicer. The ‘colon’-part and the “for example” don’t really fit here very well. | |
| 5.1.5 | Missing | According to Lou, it would be nice to include how you solved the compression thing, as it is a design decision. | |
| 5.2.2 | Incorrect | For the “Processing section”, the same remark applies as in section 5.1.3 for the databases. | |

6.6.2 Internal reviews

| Thom Castermans | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 5.2.4 | Layout | Under “Purpose”, I think the layout of the block with SRQs is not correct. It starts with an indentation now, but that should not be the case. Use <code>\fpstartparagraph</code> . | |

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 5 | Question | I noticed that you refer to figure 4.1 quite often in the “Dependencies” section. Is it an idea to make a remark at the beginning and remove each of the remarks in the “Dependencies” section? | |
| 5.1.1 | Question | In the section “Interfaces”, you list the arguments that the procedure call receive from the Simulation Service. It seems that you only explain the case where the arguments are immediately send to the server (the checkbox for define protocol is unchecked). Shouldn’t we also explain the case for defining a protocol? In that case, there is a list of mixing steps and also a number of steps parameter. | |
| 5.1.4 | Incorrect | In the “purpose” section, there is one comma extra at the end of the sentence, but no new software requirement is listed. | |
| 5.1.5 | Incorrect | There is a whitespace right in the sentence “The Application Service has an interface with the HTTP Server component.” | |
| 5.2.3 | Typo | In the “Dependencies” section, “dependes” should be “depends”. | |
| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 5 | Other | <i>For every component, we will give an identifier ...</i> should be present tense. | |
| 5.1.* | Other | In every single Dependencies sub-item, figure 4.1 is referenced. This is not necessary as the user has probably already seen this figure at this point. | |
| 5.1.* | Other | References: In <i>... mentioned in the section purpose ...</i> , <i>purpose</i> should be capitalised to indicate that <i>section purpose</i> is not a combined noun, but that <i>Purpose</i> is the name of the section. Also it really isn’t a section anyway. | |
| 5.1.1 | Typo | <i>dependencies with relation to: with</i> should be changed to <i>in</i> . | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 5.1.1 | Question | I'm not sure why the Fortran module does not depend on the Simulator service. Without the latter, I think the Fortran module wouldn't be able to do anything useful. This should either be changed or a better description of <i>Dependency</i> should be provided. |
| 5.1.1 | Other | ...and a performance measure, namely the segregation factor. It is unnecessary to state that the segregation factor is a performance measure, ...and the segregation factor would suffice here. |
| 5.1.2 | Other | Function: <i>The Simulator Service is meant to simulate ...</i> Here, <i>is meant to</i> implies that we really want it to simulate things, but it only does this when it feels like it. |
| 5.1.2 | Other | Interfaces: ...is done through C, that calls the Fortran function. This is a somewhat strange sentence, an alternative would be something like <i>is set up via C, through which the Fortran function is called.</i> |
| 5.1.3, 5.1.4, 5.1.6, 5.2.2 | Other | Dependencies: <i>doesn't</i> should be <i>does not</i> in formal documents. |
| 5.1.3, 5.2.2 | Other | Processing: <i>it's</i> should be <i>it is</i> in formal documents. |
| 5.1.3 | Other | Processing: <i>is being done</i> should be <i>is done</i> . |
| 5.1.3 | Other | Data: Here the emphasis is placed on the Application Persistence rather than its data. I would change <i>is a database containing</i> to <i>contains</i> . |
| 5.1.5 | Other | Function: <i>centralized data or other communication</i> implies that data is a form of communication. |
| 5.1.5 | Other | Dependencies: ...when the either the ...: superfluous <i>the</i> . |
| 5.1.5 | Typo | Interfaces: <i>component.This</i> misses a space. |
| 5.1.5 | Typo | Interfaces: <i>belonging to a mixing run:</i> superfluous <i>a</i> . |
| 5.1.5 | Other | Interfaces: <i>It receives data of the result of ...</i> could be <i>It receives the result of ...</i> . This is the case in the last paragraph as well. |
| 5.1.5 | Other | Interfaces: <i>Lastly</i> without any <i>firstly</i> . |
| 5.1.5 | Other | <i>Basically, the only thing the Application Service does is passing data ...</i> is slightly informal. I propose <i>The Application Service only passes data ...</i> |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 5.1.5 | Typo | <i>Applicdation State.</i> |
| 5.2.1 | Typo | Interfaces: <i>through</i> . |
| 5.2.1 | Typo | Processing: <i>inputted</i> should be <i>input</i> as <i>to input</i> is an irregular verb (fixed). |
| 5.2.1 | Typo | Processing: <i>send</i> should be <i>sent</i> as <i>to send</i> is an irregular verb. |
| 5.2.1 | Other | Processing: <i>The Layout components uses ...</i> should be either singular or plural. |
| 5.2.1 | Other | Data: <i>doesn't</i> should be <i>does not</i> in formal documents. |
| 5.2.3 | Typo | Dependencies: <i>inputted</i> should be <i>input</i> as <i>to input</i> is an irregular verb (fixed). |
| 5.2.3 | Typo | retrieve should be <i>retrieve</i> (fixed). |
| 5.2.4 | Other | Function: As far as I can see there is not difference between keeping track of and storing changes regarding the Application State. |
| 5.2.4 | Typo | <i>needs to be displayed.</i> |
| 5.2.4 | Other | Processing: One (preferably the first) of the <i>its</i> should be changed to <i>Application State</i> . |

| Hugo Snel | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 5.x | Incorrect | Needs to be updated to match the latest version of the SRD. | |

| Roel van Happen | | | Version 0.1 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 5.1.2 | Question | In Data , it is stated that internal data results may have to be duplicated for intermediate results, but intermediate results are not implemented. | |

6.7 Chapter 6

| Hugo Snel | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 6 (client device) | Question | So if you want to run FINGERPAINT on your smartphone, your smartphone needs > 1 GB RAM? This seems a lot. | |

Roel van Happen

Version 0.1

Location/reference *Category**Remark*

6

Question

The operating system requirement for the application is ... or some up-to-date Linux distribution I find some up-to-date distribution a rather vague description for a linux version.

6.8 Chapter 7

No feedback has been given on this part of the document.

Chapter 7

ATP Feedback

7.1 Abstract

7.1.1 Internal reviews

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| General | Typo | Please enable spell checking for your L ^A T _E X editor. | |
| Abstract | Question | <i>... a report on the results needs to be written.</i> Does this mean that a report should be written after the client has run the tests? Is this report part of this document? I can get the answers from reading the rest of the document, but on its own, the wording is a bit unclear. | |
| Abstract | Structure | The last sentence with the ESA standards is unexpected and directly follows unrelated text. I'd move this sentence to the start of the abstract and start a new paragraph for the remaining text. | |

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| Abstract | Missing | The URD is mentioned here, but there is no reference. | |

7.2 Chapter 1

7.2.1 Internal reviews

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1.2 | Other | The last sentence implies that the user manual is written because the server setup needs to run the tests on its own. | |
| 1.2 | Other | In the last sentence <i>Appendix A</i> is not a clickable reference. | |
| 1.3.1 | Other | For Safari, you might want to make it clear that this is the version used for desktop systems, to indicate that iOS Safari is not the same as Safari. | |
| 1.3.2 | Typo | The list contains <i>At</i> which should probably be <i>AT</i> . | |

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1.3.1 | Other | “Firefox” is mentioned in the list of definitions, but it is not used in the document. | |
| 1.3.1 | Other | “Google Chrome” is mentioned in the list of definitions, but it is not used in the document. | |
| 1.3.1 | Other | “Internet Explorer” is mentioned in the list of definitions, but it is not used in the document. | |
| 1.3.1 | Other | “Firefox” is mentioned in the list of definitions, but it is not used in the document. | |
| 1.3.1 | Other | “iOS” is mentioned in the list of definitions, but it is not used in the document. | |
| 1.3.1 | Other | “iOS Safari” is mentioned in the list of definitions, but it is not used in the document. | |
| 1.3.1 | Other | “iPhone” is mentioned in the list of definitions, but it is not used in the document. | |
| 1.3.1 | Other | “iPad” is mentioned in the list of definitions, but it is not used in the document. | |
| 1.3.1 | Other | “Opera” is mentioned in the list of definitions, but it is not used in the document. | |
| 1.3.1 | Other | “Safari” is mentioned in the list of definitions, but it is not used in the document. | |
| 1.3.1 | Other | “System Administrator” is mentioned in the list of definitions, but it is not used in the document. | |
| 1.3.2 | Typo | “At” should be in complete capital letters (AT). | |
| 1.3.2 | Other | “ADD” is mentioned in the list of abbreviations, but is not used in the document. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 1.3.2 | Typo | An “ATP” is an “Acceptance Test Plan”, not a “Plane”. |
| 1.3.2 | Other | ‘CM’ is mentioned in the list of abbreviations, but is not used in the document. |
| 1.3.2 | Other | ‘GUI’ is mentioned in the list of abbreviations, but is not used in the document. |
| 1.3.2 | Other | ‘SR’ is mentioned in the list of abbreviations, but is not used in the document. |
| 1.3.2 | Other | ‘SRD’ is mentioned in the list of abbreviations, but is not used in the document. |
| 1.3.2 | Other | ‘TU/e’ is mentioned in the list of abbreviations, but is not used in the document. |
| 1.3.2 | Missing | ‘CPR’ is used in this document, but it is not included in the list of abbreviations. |

7.3 Chapter 2

7.3.1 Internal reviews

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2 | Other | The wording of this introduction is strange and contains too much passive forms. | |
| 2.* | Other | This chapter contains a lot of incorrect citations, e.g. <code>URD\ref{urd}</code> instead of <code>URD\cite{urd}</code> . | |
| 2.1 | Other | Why do the first two sentences need to be two sentences? These tests are only to test whether the application fulfils the URD requirements. The first sentence need not be there if the second is reworded slightly. | |
| 2.6 | Other | Broken reference in the last sentence. | |

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2 | Other | I noticed that the references to external documents (URD, ATP) in this chapter are not working. This is because the command ‘ref’ is used, whereas you actually need ‘cite’ for references from the ref.bib file. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 2 | Style | The style of the first sentence of this chapter is a bit weird. I would rephrase it somewhat, for instance: “This chapter describes which items are tested and how they are to be tested, using the acceptance tests.” |
| 2.1 | Typo | I would change “Specifically, Fingerprint application” to “Specifically, the Fingerprint application”. |
| 2.2 | Question | If I understand it correctly, you want to give a list of implemented requirements here. However, I think the list of unimplemented requirements is much shorter. So, is it an idea to list the unimplemented requirements instead? Note: after reading chapter 3, I saw that you wanted to list the unimplemented and not testable requirements there. Is it still necessary to list all (un)implemented requirements here? |
| 2.3 | Style | I would rewrite the last sentence of this section to “After the tests are concluded, the test reports should be written. Problem reports should be written, when necessary.” |
| 2.5 | Typo | I would refer to the Fingerprint application as “the Fingerprint application”. |
| 2.6 | Style | “all the acceptance tests in it pass” sounds a bit odd to me. Perhaps you can say “if all the individual acceptance tests pass”. |
| 2.6 | Other | A reference is made to a chapter, but the reference is not working. Perhaps you are missing a label or the label is misspelled. |

7.4 Chapter 3

7.4.1 Internal reviews

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3 | Other | <i>Acception</i> should be something like <i>exception</i> , but the sentence should be reworded to fix this. Also, try to avoid <i>ones</i> . | |
| 3.* | Other | Personally I would use <i>the user</i> instead of <i>a user</i> . | |
| 3.* | Typo | Various lines do not end with “.”. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 3.* | Other | Throughout the chapter, both computer and mobile input actions are specified, which reads awkwardly. I would discard the computer actions, as we have always said that the application is only really supported on mobile devices. If both types of actions should be kept, I would just put a notice at the start of the chapter. |
| 3.* | Structure | It might be an idea to create a table with on the left the input and on the right the output. Currently it is slightly annoying to scroll up and down every time to validate whether the correct output follows from input. |
| 3.1 | Other | Add a <i>Test items:</i> for consistency to the table. |
| 3.1 | Missing | After step 2, not only does the canvas appear, but the menu (which is crucial to the application) does too. |
| 3.1 | Other | Step 7: <i>Click/Tap on somewhere in the drawing area</i> has a superfluous <i>on</i> . |
| 3.1 | Incorrect | Step 12, 14: There is no <i>black</i> or <i>white</i> in the menu bar, only a picture with a black and white rounded square. The text makes it appear that there are buttons with these texts. |
| 3.* | Other | Occasionally, the <i>Rest Dist</i> button is referenced, this should be <i>Reset Distribution</i> . |
| 3.2 | Missing | This test does more than it says in the test items: it also tests whether all drawing tools work etcetera. |
| 3.* | Other | <i>... there is shown ...</i> sounds really strange. |
| 3.3 | Missing | This test also does more than its test items suggest, such as loading and overwriting. |
| 3.4 | Missing | At this point, a smiley is drawn on the canvas, but the test assumes the canvas is empty. Somewhere the distribution should be reset. |
| 3.* | Incorrect | There is no <i>#steps</i> label, this was changed to <i>Number of steps</i> or similar. I think it would suffice to say <i>the spinner for the number of steps</i> . |
| 3.5 | Typo | In <i>Test items</i> , it should say <i>... define and execute a mixing protocol</i> . |
| 3.* | Incorrect | There is no top button any more for number spinners. |
| 3.* | Incorrect | There is no <i>Define Protocol</i> check box. |
| 3.11 | Question | What is the added value of loading a second initial distribution? |

| Femke Jansen | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
| 3 | Question | Some requirements contain the text “Test items” (AT2, for instance), while others do not (AT1). Why is this the case? |
| 3 | Question | Perhaps you can mention that the input/output specifications listed for each of the ATs are based on the use cases? |
| 3 | Question | Why do you use the term “website” instead of “application” in the test case specifications? We always referred to our product as an application. |
| 3 | Missing | It is not entirely clear whether the ATs are stand-alone or have to be executed one after the other. Perhaps you can mention this in the introduction. Note: after reading chapter 4, this becomes clear. Maybe a reference to chapter 4 in the introduction of this chapter is in place here. |
| 3 | Missing | For the saving and loading of items, you implicitly assume that the user has not yet saved any items yet. If this is not the case, then some ATs will fail. Perhaps you can include an assumption that the user begins the ATs with a completely clean local storage. |
| 3 | Incorrect | Throughout this chapter, some buttons are named differently than those in the application. An example is “Rest Dist”, which should be “Reset Distribution”. The same holds for the “rectangle” button, which is actually the “Rectangle 400x240” button. |
| 3 | Incorrect | In some test cases, the construction “there is shown a ...” is used, but the order of the sentence is not correct. It should be “a ... is shown”. |
| 3 | Inconsistent | The description of the test case vary in level of detail. For instance, in AT2 you mention “a popup panel with two buttons and a number spinner”, whereas in AT3 you mention “a popup panel” and ” a new popup panel”. I would stick to the more detailed description, to make the test cases less ambiguous. |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 3 | Incorrect | Some acceptance tests are described in terms of the old GUI elements. For instance, the numberspinners don't have top and bottom buttons, but + and - buttons instead. This is the case in AT4 and AT5, for instance. The same holds for the checkbox, which is now a toggle button (and hence, the text alters between "Define Protocol" and "Hide Define Protocol") and the toggle colour button, which is also a toggle button (instead of text white/black). The text of the label "#steps" has been changed to "Number of steps". Moreover, after the GUI has been refactored w.r.t. new menus, a lot of acceptance tests probably need some additional steps. |
| 3 | Inconsistent | In some ATs, you specify what is displayed on the canvas when a drawing action is executed (AT2). In others (AT3), this is not mentioned explicitly, which is inconsistent. |
| 3 | Other | The unimplemented requirements are CPR3, CPR4, CPR5, CPR14, CPR15, CPR16, CPR25, CPR26, CPR27, CPR28, CPR38, CPR39 and CPR41. |
| 3 | Other | The not testable requirement(s) is/are: CPR40. |
| AT1 | Typo | "both the selection rows" is not entirely correct. It should be "both selection rows". |
| AT2 | Question | What's the purpose of the "Click/Tap somewhere in the drawing area"? I think you mean to deselect the current menu that the user is in, so maybe you can say that. Why is the first action necessary? Note: after reading the output, it becomes clear that you actually draw on the canvas with these steps. Perhaps you can clarify this a bit more. |
| AT2 | Question | In step 11, is it allowed to click on the canvas as well? Or should the user press outside the menu, but not on the canvas? |
| AT3 | Missing | The following requirements are part of this scenario, but are not mentioned in the list of requirements for this AT: CPR6 (user draws distribution) and CPR8 (user resets distribution). |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| AT3 | Incorrect | In step 10, the user must press “Cancel”, but there is no such button in the overwrite panel. This panel has a “Close” button. The same holds for the “OK” button, which should be the “Save” button. |
| AT4 | Missing | The following requirements are part of this scenario, but are not mentioned in the list of requirements for this AT: CPR6, CPR8 (if reset distribution should be the first step). I believe that CPR8 might be necessary here, because of the last step of the previous AT. |
| AT4 | Incorrect | CPR17 (define protocol) and CPR20 (define step for each movement in protocol) are not part of this AT, because this AT is not about defining a protocol. |
| AT4 | Typo | In the output specification after step 3, it should be “and now has a different shape”. |
| AT5 | Missing | The following requirements are part of this scenario, but are not mentioned in the list of requirements for this AT: CPR6 and CPR8 (if reset distribution should be the first step). |
| AT5 | Other | In the output specification, the description “some new menu items have appeared” is quite vague. This doesn’t ensure that the correct menu items are shown when this step has been executed. |
| AT5 | Incorrect | CPR18 (execute mixing step directly) is not part of this AT, because a protocol is defined here (CPR17). |
| AT5 | Incorrect | In the output specification of step 4, the text area also appears (it is not visible initially). |
| AT5 | Incorrect | In the output specifications, the numbering of the steps is incorrect. The output after step 6 is actually the output after step 7 and so forth. Just add one to the current step numbers (starting from step 6) and then it is correct. Moreover, the text area is not visible when you’ve pressed “Reset Protocol”. |
| AT11 | Missing | From the output specification of steps 2 and 4, it is not clear that the smileys involve the smileys that have been saved previously. |
| AT12 | Incorrect | The first step from the input involves clicking “Define Protocol”. However, it has never been pressed in between AT5 and this AT. The step is therefore not needed. |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| AT13 | Missing | The following requirements are part of this scenario, but are not mentioned in the list of requirements for this AT: CPR29 (execute mixing run) and CPR30 (save results) and CPR32 (view end result of mixing run). |
| AT14 | Incorrect | The “Export Graph” should be the “Export graphs” button. |
| AT14 | Incorrect | The “Close” button should be the “Cancel” button. |
| AT15, AT17 | AT16, Question | Is it really enough to click “Remove Saved ...” button once? Does that truly show that the chosen item has been removed? Perhaps an additional click on the button can convince the user that the item has indeed been removed. |
| AT15, AT17 | AT16, Missing | After step 2 (pressing the X-button), a “Delete Successful” message appears (just like the “Save Successful”). |

7.5 Chapter 4

7.5.1 Internal reviews

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 4 | Typo | <i>For the tests to succeed, It is important ...: It should not be capitalised.</i> | |
| 4 | Other | <i>... unless the test states otherwise. Otherwise some steps ...</i> The second sentence is only a fragment, and the word <i>otherwise</i> occurs twice in succession. | |

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 4 | Other | The last sentence of this chapter is a little vague. Perhaps you can say “The set up required to execute the ATs from chapter 3 is described in appendix A.” | |

7.6 Chapter 5

No feedback has been given on this part of the document.

7.7 Chapter 6

7.7.1 Internal reviews

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| - | Other | The right and left sides of the header of the page overlap. | |

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 6.1 | Incorrect | There are duplicate entries in the table, for CPR29 and CPR30. | |
| 6.1 | Incorrect | For AT4 and AT5 and AT13, some incorrect requirements are listed in this AT. | |
| 6.1+6.2 | Missing | The following requirements are implemented and listed in the ATs, but are not described in this table: CPR12, CPR23, CPR33, CPR35, CPR37. | |
| 6.1+6.2 | Missing | Some requirements are covered in more ATs. See the “Missing” remarks for the individual ATs for the missing requirements. | |
| 6.1+6.2 | Missing | Some ATs are not mentioned in this table. The missing ATs are AT6, AT9, AT13 (the reference doesn’t work), AT14, AT15 and AT16. | |

Chapter 8

UTP Feedback

8.1 Abstract

8.1.1 Internal reviews

| Tessa Belder | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| abstract | typo | Dot missing after last sentence. | |

| Hugo Snel | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| abstract | typo | "needs to be written" -> "will be written" | |
| Document Status Sheet | Question | Why don't the dates match? It is the same version (probably because of the stub that was made, but it is weird when you read the DSS). | |

8.2 Chapter 1

8.2.1 Internal reviews

| Tessa Belder | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|------------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1.1 | Structure/Layout | 'The UTP document' sounds weird. I would say 'The UTP' or 'This document'. | |
| 1.2 | Typo | 'Chapter 3 species' should be 'Chapter 3 specifies'. | |
| 1.2 | Incorrect | Chapter 3 doesn't specify how tests are defined. It lists all the Unit Tests. | |
| 1.2 | Typo | 'Chapter 5 species' should be 'Chapter 5 specifies'. | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 1.2 | Incorrect | Chapter 5 doesn't specify how test results are reported. It reports the test results. |
| 1.3.1 | Other | Client is mentioned a lot of times in this document, but it always refers to the client-side of the application. Never to dr. Anderson. |
| 1.3.1 | Missing | I think Javadoc should be added here. |
| 1.3.1 | Missing | I think local storage should be added here. |
| 1.3.2 | Missing | DD is missing from this list. |

| Hugo Snel | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1.1 | Typo | "dened" -> "defined". | |
| 1.1 | Typo | "..tests make sure that kroket complies.." This is not Kroket ;) | |
| 1.2 | Typo | "all items be tested" -> "all items that will be tested" | |
| 1.2 | Typo | "species" -> "Specifies" | |
| 1.2 | Typo | "dened" -> "defined". | |
| 1.3 | Incorrect | Firefox, Chrome, IE, iOS, iOS Safari, Safari, Opera, System Administrator don't appear in the document. | |
| 1.3 | Missing | "GWT" does not appear in the definitions list. | |

8.3 Chapter 2

8.3.1 Internal reviews

| Tessa Belder | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.1 | Typo | 'using the Google Web Toolkit,the unit test..'. A space is missing after the comma in this sentence. | |
| 2.5 | Question | Is Ant still needed on the client device? I thought this was only necessary for running the tests from the command lines, which we aren't doing. | |
| 2.6 | Question | 'Every test should describe the criteria that should be met to pass a specific test'. We aren't doing this in chapter 3. Is it really necessary? | |

| Hugo Snel | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.1 | Other | ”described elsewhere in this section” should probably replaced with a more concrete reference. | |
| 2.3 | Other | The style of this section is a bit weird. While reading it, it looks like you’re reading an unfinished document. I suggest to rewrite references to the future (i.e. ”must be delivered” in reference to a chapter in the same document). | |
| 2.6 | other | There is no ”fail criteria”. When you don’t meet the pass criterea you automatically fail. | |

8.4 Chapter 3

8.4.1 Internal reviews

| Tessa Belder | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3.1.1 | Other | I think GUI shouldn’t be spelled with capital letters, since it doesn’t conform to the folder structure like that. | |
| 3.1.2 | Incorrect | GeometryNamesTest doesn’t exist. | |
| 3.1.2 | Incorrect | SimulationServiceTest doesn’t exist. SimulatorServiceTest does, but shouldn’t be included here since it’s a integration test. | |
| 3.1.3 | Incorrect | Both classes mentioned here are classes to use with Selenium, and not unit tests. Therefore this whole section should be removed. | |
| 3.2 | Typo | ‘Every suit described..’. This should be ‘suite’ instead of ‘suit’. | |
| 3.2.2. | Missing | This suite also contains ColourTest.class | |
| 3.2 | Inconsistent | At 3.2.2 comma’s are added at the end of each test class, where this isn’t the case in 3.2.1. I think the comma’s should be left out at 3.2.2. | |

8.5 Chapter 4

8.5.1 Internal reviews

| Tessa Belder | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 4 | Other | 'to both client and the server side testing.' This sounds weird. It should be 'to both client and server side testing'. | |
| 4 | Typo | 'server side testing is discussed'. Should be 'are discussed'. | |
| 4 | Missing | It states here that only tests with the local storage should be executed in manual mode, but this is not entirely true anymore. All tests that make use of zipping in some way, all tests that use the canvas and some server side tests need to be executed in manual mode as well. | |
| 4 | Typo | 'these tests in given in section sec:localStorageProc'. This reference is broken. It looks like the <i>ref</i> tag is missing. | |
| 4.2 | Incorrect | 'All GWT JUnit test can ben executed from a single test suite'. Actually, we have two: ClientUnit.java and SharedUnit.java. | |
| 4.2 | Missing | It should be mentioned these test suites will only pass when running them in manual mode (section 4.4). | |
| 4.3 | Incorrect | We don't have any server side tests, since Fortran didn't cooperate here. The test suite mentioned in this section therefore doesn't exist anymore. | |
| 4.4 | Incorrect | This doesn't apply only to the local storage tests anymore. I would just make this a general procedure to run the tests, since over half of the tests only work in manual mode now. | |
| 4.4 | Other | I would make this a general guide for both test cases and test suites, and not specifically for the suite 'ClientUnit.java'. | |
| 4.4 | Other | The last step of this guide states that a dialogue is shown, but in my experience this isn't always the case. So I would change this to 'a dialogue might be shown', or something like that. | |
| Hugo Snel | | | Version 0.0 |
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 4.0 | Typo | "to both client and the server side testing is discussed" Plural, -> "are discussed" | |
| 4.0 | Typo | "to be adhered for client" -> "adhered to". | |

| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 4.0 | Missing | "sec:localStorageProc" Misses the <i>ref</i> command in latex. |
| 4.4 | Other | We wanted test cases to be independant of Eclipse (discussion 11-06-13). Therefore this section should probably be re-written. |

8.6 Chapter 5

8.6.1 Internal reviews

| Tessa Belder | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|------------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 5 | Incorrect | 'after executing the integration tests'. This should be 'unit tests'. | |
| 5 | Structure/Layout | In general, I would list the test methods for each test class in alfabetical order. | |
| 5.1 | Structure/Layout | I would list the testcases here in the same order as in chapter 3, and preferably also with the same structure. So make subsubsections for 'client.gui', 'client.model' etc. | |
| 5.1 | Typo | FingerpaintJsoniserTest should be spelled with a 'z' (Jsonizer), not an 's'. | |
| 5.2 | Incorrect | The second SimulationResultTest, with test-GetShort and testGetLong doesn't exist and should be removed. | |
| 5.2 | Typo | 'ColoursTest' should be 'ColourTest'. | |
| 5.2 | Missing | The ServerDataResultTest is missing from this list. | |
| 5.2 | Missing | At MixingProtocolTest, testToSring is missing. | |
| 5.2 | Incorrect | At MixingProtocolTest, testEditStepException, testEditStepSize, testEditStepWall and testEditStepDirection should be removed, since they don't exist. | |

Chapter 9

ITP feedback

9.1 Chapter 1

9.1.1 Internal reviews

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 1.2 | Other | You mention here that chapter 3 gives a detailed description of the test cases, but in my opinion, the given description is very brief. Either remove “detailed” here or make chapter 3 more detailed. | |

9.2 Chapter 2

9.2.1 Internal reviews

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2 | Other | <i>3-5</i> would look better as <i>3 to 5</i> . | |
| 2.2 | Question | This subsection is unclear. What does it matter and why does this mean all features are tested with ITs? | |
| 2.3 | Other | Change <i>documents/code</i> to <i>items</i> , characters like the slash look messy. | |
| 2.3 | Other | Inconsistent ‘.’ing in the list. | |
| 2.5 | Other | Change <i>hardware/software</i> to <i>hardware and software</i> . | |

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2 | Incorrect | This introductory text is not suited for the ITP, as it is about “acceptance tests”. I would also slightly rephrase this sentence, for instance: “This chapter describes what items are tested with integration tests and how these items must be tested.” | |
| 2.1 | Other | Perhaps you can also mention here that the components are from chapter 5 of the ADD. I think that would clarify about which components you’re talking here. | |
| 2.1 | Other | See previous remark: if you include the reference to chapter 5, perhaps you can also list the components in the same order here as in chapter 5 of the ADD. | |
| 2.3 | Style | I would rephrase the last sentence of this section to “After the tests are concluded, test reports should be written. Problem reports should be written when necessary.” This makes it also consistent with the text in the ATP. | |
| 2.4 | Question | What do you mean with “Integration test input data needs to be created”? What is this “input data”? | |
| 2.5 | Incorrect | This section is about running the application, but it should discuss “properties required of the test environment”. | |
| 2.6 | Incorrect | The test criteria are not described in chapter 3. In chapter 3, you describe the test cases. | |

| Hugo Snel | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 2.2 | Remark | I don’t think this sentence gives the information you expect in the section “features to be tested” | |
| 2.3 | Other | ”..the test reports (chapter 5).” I would replace it with ”chapters 1-4” to prevent confusion about incl or excl chapter 5. | |
| 2.6 | Other | ”Similarly” implies ‘all things have to pass as well’. It’s not the right word in this context. | |

9.3 Chapter 3

9.3.1 Internal reviews

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3 | Missing | The link to a figure in the ADD is broken (it says figure ??). | |

9.4 Chapter 4

9.4.1 Internal reviews

| Benjamin van der Hoeven | | | Version 0.0 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 3 | Missing | The link to a chapter in the ADD is broken (it says chapter ??). | |

9.5 Chapter 5

9.5.1 Internal reviews

| Femke Jansen | | | Version 0.0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Location/reference</i> | <i>Category</i> | <i>Remark</i> | |
| 5 | Missing | Perhaps you can say what the listed items are the individual tests from the mentioned test classes. Providing information in a tabular format might also clarify things even more. | |
| 5 | Missing | According to the general info document, you should also include “when was the test performed, by who and who witnessed it. | |