TU/e

Project FINGERPAINT

Review-0.9

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 FINGERPAINT 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

Document Status Sheet

General

Document title:	Review Document
Identification:	Review0.9
Author:	Tessa Belder, Roel van Happen, Benjamin van der Hoeven, Femke Jansen, Hugo Snel
Document status:	Internal feedback up and to ATP-0.0.

Document history

Version	Date	Author	Reason of change
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.

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 Fingerpaint, "Software configuration management plan," *SEP*, 2013.

[2] Group Fingerpaint, "User requirements document," *SEP*, 2013.

[3] Group Fingerpaint, "Software requirements document," *SEP*, 2013.

[4] Group Fingerpaint, "Software validation and verification plan," *SEP*, 2013.

[5] Group Fingerpaint, "Architectural design document," *SEP*, 2013.

[6] Group Fingerpaint, "Advanced 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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
title page	Missing	Maybe include student numbers and room numbers for staff (as in other URD's).

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

Client		Version 0.4
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
Abstract	Missing	State that this document was based on discussions with your client and that it conveys their wishes.

Technical Advisor		Version 0.3
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
1.3.1	Layout	Colons should be added to the definitions list.

2.3.2   Internal reviews

Tessa Belder		Version 0.1
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
1.3	Missing	URD is missing from the list.
		Version 0.3
1.2	Typo	'developed by Group Fingerpaint group' – 2x 'group'.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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' shoudl 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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
2.2.2	Other	"should be exportable to ... .png 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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
2.3	Question	Where do you store the attributes of a saved run?

2.4.2   Internal reviews

Tessa Belder		Version 0.1
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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 predifined 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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 characterisitics 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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 –¿ 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	Missing	Missing a label "User" below the stick figure
2.6	Question	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 |
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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 |
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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"?

Location/reference	Category	Remark
CPR29	Typo	"mixng performance" should of course by "mixing performance", I assume.

		Version 0.4
3	Incorrect	Usecases are based upon requirements, not the other way around.

Client		Version 0.4
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
3.1 & 3.2	Missing	Explanation is missing about what exactly capability/constraint requirements are.

Roel van Happen		Version 0.2
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 *Load C_0* 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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
A	Other	Yellow background is probably not suitable for printing, and also looks slightly unprofessional.

Femke Jansen		Version 0.3
Location/reference	Category	Remark
A	Typo	"use-cases" should be "use cases".
A	Missing	Perhaps also explain what the *Preceeds* and *Uses* 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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
B	Other	Third person sounds a bit odd.
B	Typo	No closing '.'.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
B	Other	For alternatives: say *why* 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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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'. This is also consistent with section 3.2.6
2.4	Missing	"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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
3	Typo	'A priority higher then' – Should be 'higher than'.
3	Question	'Note that as Fingerpaint 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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 seperate 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' – Ambigious, what are the "results" you speak of?
SRQ108	Typo	'to the Fortran Module, that the Fotran 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 |
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 *should have, not a must have.*

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 *could have* (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 protocl 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?

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 *should have* 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	tex**ttt**results 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 *could have* instead of a *should have*.
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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 subsubsections 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 subsubsection "Mixing runs" to "Save and remove mixing runs".
SRQ67	Typo	"If at leas one item" should of course be "If at least one item".
3.1.7	Typo	In the "Exporting results" subsubsection, "a image" should be "an image".

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 subsubsection "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 sectioon 3.2.2)?
3.1.7	Typo	In the subsubsection "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 subsubsection "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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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" =¿ 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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
3.1.1	Question	SRQ1 What is meant with 'static' files?

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 psersistence 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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 |
Location/reference	Category	Remark	
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 |
Location/reference	Category	Remark	
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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 fingerpaint.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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
2.1	Missing	Here, you refer to the SPMP, but there is no reference to this external document.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
2	Other	First sentence of *Management* 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 *So, a standard "main" .tex-file should like as is shown in figure 2.1.*

4.4 Chapter 3

4.4.1 External reviews

Junior Management		Version 0.0
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
3.1	Other	Future tense in first sentence of first and second paragraph.
3.2	Typo	*Baseslines* in second sentence.
3.2	Other	Future tense in third sentence.
3.2	Typo	Last sentence of first paragraph: *rebuild* should be *rebuilt*.

4.5 Chapter 4

4.5.1 External reviews

Junior Management		Version 0.0
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
4, 4.1.1	Other	Future tense.
4.1.1	Other	It says that documents that are stored are stored in *The development library will store all versions of a CI that are stored in it.* I get what is meant, but it does sound strange.
4.1.1	Other	*made undone* should be *undone.*
4.1.1	Other	*(Git is discussed in more detail in chapter 6)* can be a main sentence instead of a subsentence.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
4.1.1	Other	*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.*

4.6 Chapter 5

4.6.1 Internal reviews

Femke Jansen		Version 0.0
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
5	Other	Future tense in first sentence.

4.7 Chapter 6

4.7.1 Internal reviews

Tessa Belder		Version 0.0
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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 |
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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 |
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
6.1	Incorrect	Saying that *we will be able to do anything the client wants* is a very strong statement.
6.1	Other	Second paragraph: lots of future tense.
6.1.1	Typo	Superfluous comma in *Git is a distributed, lightweight, version control system.*
6.1.1	Typo	In *GitHub is a (commercial) servers*, 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, *It is simply impossible to test both browsers on . . .* implies that there are only two browsers.
6.1.4	Other	*It is multilingual, including Java, which is our choice* is a strange fragmented sentence.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
6.2.1	Other	The colon in *...so the conventions are simple: a developer does not want to do something complex a lot* implies that "the conventions are simple, namely a developer ...".

4.8 Chapter 7

4.8.1 External reviews

Junior Management		Version 0.0
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
1.2	Typo	"is to provide **a** intuitive and modern" $\rightarrow$ "is to provide **an** intuitive and modern".

5.1.2 Internal reviews

Femke Jansen		Version 0.0
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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 |
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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 |
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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 perticular for students" should be "particular".

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

Location/reference	Category	Remark
1.5	Typo	Chapter 6 gives an overview of all resources need**ed** to build, operate and maintain the application.

Hugo Snel		Version 0.0
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
2	Other	*...and the environment it will operate in.* 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	*any one other information systems* should be either singular or plural.

6.4   Chapter 3

6.4.1   External reviews

| Junior Management | | Version 0.0 |
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 |
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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".
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
3.1	Other	*Communication with this module are done* should be either singular or plural.
3.1	Other	All of the `len_*` 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	Len_*: *. . . of above string* misses an article.
3.1	Other	Geometry: *For example, Rectangle 400x240.* 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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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 "Fingerpaint" 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.
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 |
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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 |
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
4.2.1	Typo	*The following components are identified:* (fixed)
4.2.2	Typo	fulfill (fixed).
4.2.2	Typo	eachother is/are two words (fixed).

| **Hugo Snel** | | Version 0.0 |
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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 |
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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."

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 \fpstartparagraph.

Femke Jansen		Version 0.0
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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?

Location/reference	Category	Remark
5.1.1	Question	In the section "Interfaces", you list the arguments that the procedure call recieve 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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
5	Other	*For every component, we will give an identifier ... 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 ... *mentioned in the section purpose ...*, *purpose* should be capitalised to indicate that *section purpose* is not a combined noun, but that *Purpose* is the name of the section. Also it really isn't a section anyway.
5.1.1	Typo	*dependencies with relation to*: *with* should be changed to *in*.
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 *Dependency* should be provided.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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: *The Simulator Service is meant to simulate ...* Here, *is meant to* 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 *is set up via C, through which the Fortran function is called.*
5.1.3, 5.1.4, 5.1.6, 5.2.2	Other	Dependencies: *doesn't* should be *does not* in formal documents.
5.1.3, 5.2.2	Other	Processing: *it's* should be *it is* in formal documents.
5.1.3	Other	Processing: *is being done* should be *is done.*
5.1.3	Other	Data: Here the emphasis is placed on the Application Persistence rather than its data. I would change *is a database containing* to *contains.*
5.1.5	Other	Function: *centralized data or other communication* implies that data is a form of communication.
5.1.5	Other	Dependencies: *...when the either the ...*: superfluous *the.*
5.1.5	Typo	Interfaces: *component.This* misses a space.
5.1.5	Typo	Interfaces: *belonging to a a mixing run*: superfluous *a.*
5.1.5	Other	Interfaces: *It receives data of the result of ...* could be *It receives the result of ....* This is the case in the last paragraph as well.
5.1.5	Other	Interfaces: *Lastly* without any *firstly.*
5.1.5	Other	*Basically, the only thing the Application Service does is passing data ...* is slightly informal. I propose *The Application Service only passes data ...*
5.1.5	Typo	*Applic**d**ation State.*
5.2.1	Typo	Interfaces: *throught.*
5.2.1	Typo	Processing: *inputted* should be *input* as *to input* is an irregular verb (fixed).
5.2.1	Typo	Processing: *send* should be *sent* as *to send* is an irregular verb.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
5.2.1	Other	Processing: *The Layout components uses ...* should be either singular or plural.
5.2.1	Other	Data: *doesn't* should be *does not* in formal documents.
5.2.3	Typo	Dependencies: *inputted* should be *input* as *to input* is an irregular verb (fixed).
5.2.3	Typo	retreive should be retrieve (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	*needs to **be** displayed.*
5.2.4	Other	Processing: One (preferably the first) of the *it*s should be changed to *Application State*.

Hugo Snel		Version 0.0
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
5.x	Incorrect	Needs to be updated to match the latest version of the SRD.

6.7   Chapter 6

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

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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
General	Typo	Please enable spell checking for your LaTeX editor.
Abstract	Question	*. . . a report on the results needs to be written.* 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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 *Appendix A* 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 *At* which should probably be *AT*.

Femke Jansen   Version 0.0

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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. $URD\backslash ref\{urd\}$ instead of $URD\backslash cite\{urd\}$.
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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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, Fingerpaint application" to "Specifically, the Fingerpaint 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 Fingerpaint application as "the Fingerpaint 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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
3	Other	*Acception* should be something like *exception*, but the sentence should be reworded to fix this. Also, try to avoid *ones*.
3.*	Other	Personally I would use *the user* instead of *a user*.
3.*	Typo	Various lines do not end with ".".

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 **Test items:** 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: *Click/Tap on somewhere in the drawing area* has a superfluous *on*.
3.1	Incorrect	Step 12, 14: There is no *black* or *white* 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 *Rest Dist* button is referenced, this should be *Reset Distribution*.
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	*...there is shown ...* 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 #steps label, this was changed to *Number of steps* or similar. I think it would suffice to say *the spinner for the number of steps*.
3.5	Typo	In *Test items*, it should say *...define and execute **a** mixing protocol*.
3.*	Incorrect	There is no top button any more for number spinners.
3.*	Incorrect	There is no *Define Protocol* check box.
3.11	Question	What is the added value of loading a second initial distribution?

| **Femke Jansen** | | Version 0.0 |
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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 then 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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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).

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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.

Location/reference	Category	Remark
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, AT16, AT17	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, AT16, AT17	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
Location/reference	Category	Remark
4	Typo	*For the tests to succeed, It is important . . .: It* should not be capitalised.
4	Other	*. . . unless the test states otherwise. Otherwise some steps . . .* The second sentence is only a fragment, and the word *otherwise* occurs twice in succession.

Femke Jansen		Version 0.0
Location/reference	Category	Remark
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
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
-	Other	The right and left sides of the header of the page overlap.

Femke Jansen		Version 0.0
Location/reference	*Category*	*Remark*
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.