

Protocol Reviews

Summary

In this document we present a review of all other groups' protocol descriptions. Pros and cons of every design scheme are included. The average score is calculated based on all the group members' evaluations.

1. Bhavyan group:

Pros: well-defined set of messages and formats with extensive description. Steps with message formats. Very clear.

Cons: doesn't describe the mechanisms too deeply, maybe some diagrams could help. Servers should change its alias 'automatically' after name collision.

Average score: 3.2

2. Boada group:

Pros: complete definition of commands and messages, nice description of the protocols, the only group to ever write a message grammar. Especially good in message design. Clear structure. Good preferred server mechanisms.

Cons: may need a couple of diagrams. Lack of implementation details

Average score: 4.7

3. Brian group:

Pros: N/A

Cons: technically did nothing.

Average score: 0.6

4. Dube group:

Pros: nice cover sheet :), good description of protocol details, well-defined set of commands, descriptions are exhaustive with diagrams.

Cons: mixed up implementation details with the design. Implementation details like 'which thread or class handles the sending task' should not be included in a protocol.

Average score: 3.6

5. Dugan group:

Pros: excellent set of commands, great idea for discovery based in an equation.

Cons: No mechanism is described.

Average score: 2.3

6. Hwang group:

Pros: describes both the mechanisms and messages.

Cons: confusing and ambiguous, may need a couple of diagrams, the syntax is not clearly defined. Little message format is introduced.

Average score: 2.0

7. Jindal group:

Pros: describes entities, threads, databases, messages, and mechanisms in a graphical way. Very concrete algorithms

Cons: too much implementation details. The directory server idea is good, but possibly vulnerable.

Average score: 4.3

8. Pearson group:

Pros: very complete definition of message format and meaning.

Cons: doesn't define the mechanisms, may need a couple of diagrams. Only emphasized on message format.

Average score: 2.5

9. Ritu group:

Pros: complete definition of both message formats and mechanisms. Nice Discovery mechanism.

Cons: could be more organized, may need a couple of diagrams.

Average score: 2.7

10. Ritwik group:

Pros: very good definition of message formats and possible messages, plus a pseudocode definition of the mechanisms.

Cons: pseudocode is great if mixed with a complete explanation, which was missing.

Average score: 3.0

11. Rohin group:

Pros: defines both the mechanisms and message format/meaning in a clear way.

Cons: some terms are confusing. The "load balancing" definition and implementation is actually wrong.

Average score: 4.0

12. Tapasvi group:

Pros: gives a graphical explanation of all the mechanisms and defines the message formats.

Cons: may need a word-by-word definition of all the mechanisms, messages and such. The document is unclear and disorganized.

Average score: 2.5

13. Vaishnav group:

Pros: gives a good description of the messages, very complete.

Cons: may need to delve deeper into the mechanisms. Only focused on command format.

Average score: 2.8