PROJECT 1

PLP1. The Scrum method (2 students)

430203819
430203730

Weaknesses

- Must be in article format
- No mention of backlog refinement and document refinement
- No mention of manager role
- Poor typography in some paragraphs like in the conclusion

14/20

430203308
430203298

Weaknesses

- No mention of backlog refinement and document refinement
- Poor typography

18/20

429106963
429107628

Weaknesses

- Must be in article format
- No conclusion
- Poor typography
- Poor content: what's T-Shirt size?
- No mention of backlog refinement and document refinement
- No mention of manager role
- No mention of retrospective

13/20

PLP2. RUP for small projects (3 students)

430204043
430203299
430203656

Weaknesses

- Must be in article format
- Lacking iteration planning activity
- Don't say "you need to do this and that". Tell who does what.
- Bad transition from one section to another like in the end of p. 4.
- Lacking important artifact: project plan or WBS.

15/20

PLP3. Requirements engineering for outsourcing (1 student)

430203659
Weaknesses

- Must be in article format.

18/20

430203701
Weaknesses

- Must be in article format.
- Original addition compared to other students:
- Poor typography and poor content; example: section 6.

15/20

PLP4. Comparing Agile processes (1 student)

430203301

Weaknesses

- Must be in article format
- Poor language: introduction, "produce backlog", conclusion, …
- Poor content: what are JAD, high smith?

14/20

429108105

Weaknesses
- Too long paper
- Poor content and typography
- What is JAD?

16l20

PLP5. Evolution of an Agile developed software (1 student)

430203729

Weaknesses

- Must be in article format
- Poor typography, no capitals in titles
- Poor content: agile methods are not deployment methods, ambiguity in section 4, …

14/20

PLP6.1 Integrating Agile process (2 students)

430203304
430203303

Weaknesses
- Never write Dr. Flen in a scientific article; suffice it to refer to him/her as Flen only.
- Cooper instead of Copper.
- Bad references.

19/20

430203811
430202976

Weaknesses

- Poor and ambiguous language: summary, title of section 2, …
- Bad conclusion
- Bad reference typography

16/20

PLP6.2 Integrating Scrum process (1 student)

430203813

Weaknesses

- Must be in article format
- Conclusion instead of conclusions
- Enumerations should be 1), 2), etc.
- Section 4.1 needs more details

18/20

PLP7. Comparing XP and RUP (1 student)

430203622

Weaknesses

- Avoid writing: the author said, the author did, etc.
- Avoid tutoring content like how to do comparison
- Never put a table in a conclusion
- References must be numerated

19/20

42924874

Weaknesses

- Must be in article format
- Poor content

17/20

RLP1. Architecting without requirements (3 students)

430203309
430203297
430203302

Weaknesses

- Poor content: what are RA and SA?
- Ambiguous content: "So, an exploratory study […]", "The paper exam […]",…
- Bad referencing in section 2, …
- Poor typography: section 3.2, …
- "We" in section 2 vs. "the researcher" in section 4.

16/20

RLP2. Empirical studies applied to software process models (2 students)

430203857
430203880

Weaknesses

- Poor typography, no section numbers
- Poor and ambiguous content: section "Inductive language", "General issues and guidelines […]", …
- "We" vs. "the authors"
- Empirical issues related to process simulation needs more development
- I couldn't understand many paragraphs in your article

15/20

429107923
429108114

Weaknesses

- Section 2 needs to be more detailed
- Poor typography in section 4

18/20

RLP4. Model-driven development, state of the art (3 students)

430203296
430203881

Weaknesses

- Poor content, what is "gab"?
- Section 3 lacks many details you should have brought from the original section 3.2
- Ambiguous content: what are PSM, FST?

15/20

RLP5. Empirical SWE, state of the art (3 students)

430202983
430203306
430203305

Weaknesses

- "We" vs. "the authors".
- Poor and ambiguous content: what are controlled experiment, construct validity?
- Poor content: section 4.2, section 4.4, section 4.51, …
- I couldn't understand many paragraphs in your article

15/20

PROJECT 2

AP1. Business analysis (folder Business, 4 students)

430203302
430203622
430203297
430203309

Weaknesses
- Author column is empty
- Not enough discussed: quality goals, performance and reliability, usability and technologies

16/20

430203813
430203305
430202983
430203306

Weaknesses
- Not enough discussed: quality goals, performance and reliability, usability and technologies, detailed product and technical objectives

17/20

AP2. Requirements (folder Requirements, 4 students)

430203656
430203299
430203701
430203301

Weaknesses
- Document 1:
  - Bad reference section: references must include significant materials only.

- o Poor language
- o Poor presentation
- o Requirements must be coded and enumerated
- o Poor basic knowledge and common sense like in section 3.3, 3.6.2: this is not a user guide, 3.8.2.
- o Poor content like section 3.8.4.
- o Ambiguous content like in section 3.6.3
- Document 2
  - o Poor content: section 1.1
  - o Avoid defining basic concepts like use cases
- Nothing about licensing and legal aspects.

12/20

430203308
430203659
430203298
430204095
Weaknesses
- Nothing about licensing and legal aspects

19/20

AP3. Development (folder Development, 2 students)

430203730
430203819

Weaknesses
- Bad reference section: references must include significant materials only
- Lacking important titles: architectural constraints, deployment view, implementation view, size and performance, quality.

17/20

429106963
429107628

Weaknesses

- Too long document
- Most content is explanation like if it were a tutorial.
- Poor content.
- What is ClientLib?

12/20

430203857
430203880

Weaknesses
- No need to give definitions like in section 2
- Be brief and direct. Don't give examples, tell what you want only
- Lacking important titles: size and performance, quality

18/20

AP4. PM (folder Project Management, 4 students)

430203811
430204043
430202976
430203300

Weaknesses
- You presented risks in a normative way: definitions and abstract rules, like if you were writing a tutorial. You should give real risks.
- No mention of any metric usage.

17/20

AP5. QA (folder Testing&Quality, 2 students)

430203304
430203303

Weaknesses

- Bad document title
- You don't need to list risks here; they are supposed to be detailed in other documents. Here, you simply reference those documents. Further, the risks should be real situations.

- Lacking important titles like: documentation, metrics, review and audit plan, test completion criteria, defect management guidelines, change management criteria.

16/20

430203296
430203881

Weaknesses

- Lacking defect management guidelines, change management criteria.
- You don't need to list risks here; they are supposed to be detailed in other documents. Here, you simply reference those documents. Further, the risks should be real situations.

18/20

429107923
429108114

Weaknesses

- Lacking real metrics (what to measure and how)
- No mention of important test techniques like performance
- You didn't reference other project documents like requirements document, specs, project plan, etc.

19/20

AP6. Deployment (folder Deployment, 2 students)

430203729
42924874

Weaknesses

- Lacking important titles like configuration and change control, milestones, release notes.

17/20

429108105
429106636
Weaknesses
- Too long document

- Most content belongs to quality and project plan documents
- No need of definitions
- Lacking important titles: configuration management, change management, release notes

15/20