Review report

Review object (topic):   Topic12.ppt
Version: Aug.01,2003
Reviewer: Z. Budimac & M. Ivanovic
Date: Sep. 01, 2003
----

1. General remarks and general impression concerning the
   state of the review object

   - A relationship to UML notation should be better emphasized. LN of the slide
1
     just tell us that both concepts are included, but it would be nice it it
would
     be stated up-front is the notation presented in this topic completely
     in conformance to UML.

2. Contents errors and misspellings in the slides

   - Slide 4: is the place of these two notations correct (see also slide 17).
Shouldn't we
     correct it and at slide 17 say that different authors (for example Balzert)
see the place
     of these two notations differently?
   - Slides 7 and 9: what is denoted as 'seminar' should be 'presentation'
                     (to be an accordnace with other slides where make a difference
                      between seminar/seminar type [static/planned] and (seminar)
presentation
                     [seminar execution]).
   - Slides 8 and 9: Szenario -> Scenario
   - Slide 11: sequencies -> sequences
   - Slide 15: titel -> title
   - Slide 16: linie -> line

3. Physical errors in the slides

  - Slide 8: third item apperas wrongly animated

4. Slides with a bad style and suggestions for improvements

   - too many colors throught the lecture (clouds, rectangles)

5. Additional suggestions for improvements and extentions

   - to add several slides finishing the UML notation (that can be skipped if
students already know UML).
     For example, notation for alternatives... (using examples from case study).

6. Lecture notes for particular slides:

   - Slide 2: we should make an introductional difference between both techniques
(concepts), i.e.,
              why do we need two.
   - Slides 7 and 9: Replace 'Seminar' with '(seminar) presentation' (see 2.,
second item)
   - Slide 11: we now should repeat the difference that we introduced on slide 2
              We should more clearly state here that now begins the real UML
notation, i.e.,
              only parts of it.
   - Slide 12: discuss 'overspecification' more. What shall we do about it. How
can we state it?
              are we obligatory to use it even we do not need it?

7. Suggestions to improve the review report form
   -

8. Deviations from the style guides

   - see point 4.

9. Experience report from a lecture:
   -

10. Experience with the translation into the native language
   -