

# Peer Review Report (PRR)

## Data Mining of Digital Library Usage Data

### Team 07

#### Clients

Jewel Ward
------------

#### Team Members

Project Manager: Maxim Krivokon

Developer: Bo Lee

Developer: Genesan Kim

Developer: Vu Nguyen

IV&Ver: Shing-Cheung Chan

IV&Ver: Marie Chi

IV&Ver: Kristine Guevara

<4/25/2005>

# Version History

---

Date	Author	Version	Changes made
4/3/05	Bo Lee	1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Initial version</li></ul>
4/24/05	Bo Lee	1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Updated 2.2 Peer Review Items</li></ul>

---

# Table of Contents

**PEER REVIEW REPORT ..... I**

**(PRR) ..... I**

**VERSION HISTORY ..... III**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS.....IV**

**TABLE OF TABLES .....VI**

**TABLE OF FIGURES .....VII**

1 Purpose .....8

    1.1 Overview .....8

    1.2 References .....8

    1.1 Change Summary.....8

2. Individual Inspection-like Peer Reviews .....9

    2.1 Participants and Roles .....9

    2.2 Peer Review Items .....9

    2.3 Pre-Peer Review Meeting Defect Data .....11

    2.4 Peer Review Meeting Defect Data .....11

    2.5 Post-Peer Review Meeting Defect Data .....11

    2.6 Peer Review Statistics .....11

    2.7 Defect Correction and Rework .....12

3 Other types of Peer Reviews.....13

4 Peer Review Summary Information .....14

    4.1 Peer Reviews' Performed.....14

    4.2 Peer Review Results .....14

5 Appendix .....15

# Table of Tables

*Table 1: Peer Review Items and Exit Criteria* .....9

*Table 2: Peer Review Meeting Defect Data* .....11

*Table 3: Post-Peer Review meeting defect data* .....11

*Table 4: Peer Review Statistics* .....11

# Table of Figures

*Error! No table of figures entries found.*

# 1 Purpose

## 1.1 Overview

The Peer Review Report provides information on the peer reviews performed by team 7 members and IV&V for Data Mining of Digital Library Usage Data. The peer reviews reported in this document were planned in Peer Review Plan.

## 1.2 References

MBASE Guidelines v 2.4.2:

[http://sunset.usc.edu/classes/cs577b\\_2005/guidelines/MBASE\\_Guidelines\\_v2.4.2.pdf](http://sunset.usc.edu/classes/cs577b_2005/guidelines/MBASE_Guidelines_v2.4.2.pdf)

Project Website:

<http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/>

Peer Review Plan V.2.0

[http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/IOC/PRP\\_RLCA\\_S05b\\_T07\\_v2.0.doc](http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/IOC/PRP_RLCA_S05b_T07_v2.0.doc)

## 1.1 Change Summary

N/A – this is the initial version

## 2. Individual Inspection-like Peer Reviews

### 2.1 Participants and Roles

See PRP v.3.0 Section 2

### 2.2 Peer Review Items

The Peer Review for RLCA & IOC documents and artifact was scheduled in LCP 4.4. The Peer Review items and the exit criteria are described in the following table.

**Table 1: Peer Review Items and Exit Criteria**

Items	Exit Criteria	Reviewed
OCD	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status. As described in additional exit criteria provided by the author.	Yes
SSRD	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status. As described in additional exit criteria provided by the author.	Yes
SSAD	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	Yes
Rose Model	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	Yes
LCP	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	Yes
FRD	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	Yes
Iteration Plan	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	No

**Peer Review Report (PRR) template**

Quality Management Plan	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	No
Peer Review Plan	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	No
Test Plan and cases	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	No
Transition Plan	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	No
System Software Support Plan	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	No
Iteration Assessment Report	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	No
Test Procedure and Results	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	No
Peer Review Report	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	No
User Manual	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	No
Training Materials	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	No
Regression Test Package	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	No
Packaged Tools and Procedures	As stated in MBASE Guideline 2.4.2 for RLCA As described in "AgileArtifactReview_Form_v6.xls" for completion status.	No

Exit Criteria depicted in PRP v.3.0 Section 2 is also valid to the documents and artifact specified here.

## 2.3 Pre-Peer Review Meeting Defect Data

There was no Pre-Peer Review meeting due to tight schedule. Instead, team members and IV&Vers used emails and phone calls to communicate about the preparation of the peer review.

## 2.4 Peer Review Meeting Defect Data

Table 2: Peer Review Meeting Defect Data

Items	Size (Page)	Major count	Minor Count	Time
OCD	61	7	23	3.35 hr
SSRD	34	5	12	2.45 hr
SSAD	126	5	25	5.20 hr
Rose Model	1.75 MB (almost 63 pages's size)	3	5	3 hr
LCP	73	3	15	2 hr
FRD	37	0	8	2.5 hr

## 2.5 Post-Peer Review Meeting Defect Data

Table 3: Post-Peer Review meeting defect data

Open defects	1
Issues & defect count	2
Defect between RLCA & IOC	3

## 2.6 Peer Review Statistics

Table 4: Peer Review Statistics

Time meeting Effort	$18.5 * 3 = 55.5$
Total Defects found	$23+88 = 111$
Defects asserted per minute of meeting	$111 / 55.5 = 2$
Peer Review Effort	$27.5 + 55.5 + 20 = 103$

## Peer Review Report (PRR) template

Defect Removal Effectiveness	$111/103 = 1.07$
Defect Density	$111/394 = 0.28$
Peer Review Rate	$394 / 55.5 = 7.10$

## 2.7 Defect Correction and Rework

The information about the status of defect correction can be seen on the weekly progress report <http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/PR>

### **3 Other types of Peer Reviews**

At this time, no other type of peer review that has written formal documents has been done. Buddy checking for some documents and source code will be done and this document will be updated accordingly.

## 4 Peer Review Summary Information

### 4.1 Peer Reviews' Performed

For artifacts prior to Construction, information can be found in LCP Section 4:  
[http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/IOC/LCP\\_RLCA\\_S05b\\_T07\\_V06.0.doc](http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/IOC/LCP_RLCA_S05b_T07_V06.0.doc)

For artifacts during construction, the current and planned peer reviews information can be found in PRP Section 2:  
[http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/IOC/PRP\\_RLCA\\_S05b\\_T07\\_v2.0.doc](http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/IOC/PRP_RLCA_S05b_T07_v2.0.doc)

### 4.2 Peer Review Results

For a summary of the project progress, please refer to the weekly status reports.  
<http://seacliff.usc.edu/~team7b/PR>

## 5 Appendix

N/A