

Jrk	Matrikkel	T1(2)	T2(2)	T3(1)	T4(1)	T5(1)	T6(1)	Sum Lab4	Bonus(4)	Comment
1	98117	2,00	2,00	1,00	0,75	2,00	0,00	7,75	0,0	T1: It's interesting that your subjective estimates of min number of faults remaining is 0 (=6-6) and the number of max number of faults remaining is 6 (=12-6), i.e., the same as the most probable number of faults remaining; T3: You both found a total of 10 faults in RSpec and you covered only 5 respectively 6 use cases (overlapping); it's not plausible that you estimate the number of remaining faults as 2 (i.e., saying that the total number of faults is 12); your explanation given for the joint estimate is not plausible - why would the estimated total number of faults for the joint estimate (12) be the same as that of the individual estimates, although you must have noticed that you found jointly many more faults than you did individually - and still only covered about 60% of all use cases; how could you assume that the number of faults in the not yet inspected use cases is only 2?; T5: you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet) / T6: missing / BT: not done.
2	A00793	2,00	2,00	1,00	0,75	2,00	0,00	7,75	0,0	T1: It's interesting that your subjective estimates of min number of faults remaining is 0 (=6-6) and the number of max number of faults remaining is 6 (=12-6), i.e., the same as the most probable number of faults remaining; T3: You both found a total of 10 faults in RSpec and you covered only 5 respectively 6 use cases (overlapping); it's not plausible that you estimate the number of remaining faults as 2 (i.e., saying that the total number of faults is 12); your explanation given for the joint estimate is not plausible - why would the estimated total number of faults for the joint estimate (12) be the same as that of the individual estimates, although you must have noticed that you found jointly many more faults than you did individually - and still only covered about 60% of all use cases; how could you assume that the number of faults in the not yet inspected use cases is only 2?; T5: you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet) / T6: missing / BT: not done.
3	A01118									
4	A20413									
5	A21624									
6	A40946	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	2,00	0,25	8,25	0,0	T5: you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet) / T6: You talk much about the problems that estimation models have in general (i.e., that estimates are just estimates) but you don't really propose an alternative estimation approach (and that was your task) / BT: not done.

7	A52925	1,75	2,00	0,00	0,75	0,50	0,00	5,00	0,0	T1: min and max values of subjective estimates missing / T3: missing / T4: discussion of underlying assumptions of Mt model is missing / T5: F1=9 (not 6) and F2=3 (not 15) /T6: missing / BT: not done.
8	A62054									
9	A71821	1,75	2,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	0,00	6,75	0,0	T1: min and max values of subjective estimates missing / T5: capture-recapture calculation wrong, thus no extra mark / T6: no other estimation model described / BT: not done.
10	A72027	2,00	2,00	0,00	0,75	2,00	0,75	7,50	0,0	T3: subjective group estimate missing; T4: discussion of underlying assumptions of Mt model missing; T5: you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet); T6 good discussion but you don't say what should be measured to build alternative estimation models; BT: not done.
11	A72044	2,00	2,00	1,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	5,00	0,0	T4, T5, T6: missing / BT: not done
12	A72080	1,75	2,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	0,00	6,75	0,0	T1: min and max values of subjective estimates missing / T5: capture-recapture calculation wrong, thus no extra mark / T6: no other estimation model described / BT: not done.
13	A73516	1,75	2,00	1,00	0,75	0,50	0,75	6,75	0,0	T1: min and max values of subjective estimates missing / T3: it's not fully clear why the fact that you found 3 duplicates makes you think that the number of remaining faults is 5-7 / T4: discussion of underlying assumptions of Mt model is missing / T5: F1=8=(6-3)+(8-3) not 6 and F2=3 (i.e., the number of faults found by both) / T6: It's not fully clear what the experience with the tester of a software has to do with estimating the number of faults in a requirements spec; do you mean the experience of the reviewer? How would you measure 'experience'? / BT: not done.
14	A73560	1,75	2,00	0,00	0,75	0,50	0,00	5,00	0,0	T1: min and max values of subjective estimates missing / T3: missing / T4: discussion of underlying assumptions of Mt model is missing / T5: F1=9 (not 6) and F2=3 (not 15) /T6: missing / BT: not done.
15	A73883	1,75	2,00	1,00	0,75	0,50	1,00	7,00	0,0	T1: min and max values of subjective estimates missing / T4: discussion of underlying assumptions of Mt model is missing / T5: F1=7=(8-3)+(5-3) not 5 and F2=3 (i.e., the number of faults found by both) / T6: How would you measure 'length'? How would you measure 'experience'? / BT: not done.

16	A81902	1,50	2,00	1,00	0,75	1,00	1,00	7,25	0,0	T1: subjective estimates are missing / T2: How comes you count 15 unique defects? The defects are to be counted in the Rspec; often you mention two fault locations in the Rspec for one (counted) fault; shouldn't that be counted as two faults in the Rspec? / T4: discussion of underlying assumptions of Mt model is missing / T5: of course, in this task you were supposed to apply again the capture-recapture model, this time for three reviewers (i said this during the lab); you tried to do this (although not explicitly stated in the assignment) and would have got an extra mark; however, you use the capture-recapture formula incorrectly; T6: good discussion; in particular, your point about using the 'actual fault detection process'; for example, one could try to exploit the defect detection rate to estimate the remaining faults; to do so, one would have to log the time when a defect is detected (a task you didn't do, although requested in T1); /BT: not done.
17	A81919									
18	A81942									
19	A82956									
20	A92243	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	2,00	1,00	9,00	4,0	T5: you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet)
21	A92310									
22	A92325	1,50	2,00	1,00	0,50	0,00	0,00	5,00	0,0	T1: subjective estimates missing / T2: no duplicates detected - all 11 defects found by the inspectors are unique / T4: unclear where the 3 duplicates suddenly come from / T5: missing / T6: you only hint to other capture-recapture models - the task was to suggest other ways of estimating defects than capture-recapture / BT: not done.
23	A92420	1,50	2,00	1,00	0,75	0,00	1,00	6,25	0,0	T1: individual subjective estimates are missing / T3: It's a bit unclear what exactly you mean by 'The total number of faults are 5', but considering what you write before, I assume you mean 'The total number of remaining faults is 5'. / T4: Your discussion of the underlying assumptions of the Mt model is missing; note that division by 0 can be interpreted as follows: a very large (infinite) number of faults is estimated - note that there exist mathematical systems that allow division by zero; we also discussed this point in the lecture; / T5: F1=6 (not 4 as you say) and F2=2 (not 7 as you say), thus: $n1=6/2=3$, $n2=1/3=0$ and $n3=1/2=1$ (rounded) / BT: not done.
24	A92775	1,50	1,50	1,00	0,75	2,00	1,00	7,75	4,0	T1: individual subjective estimates missing / T2: not visible who found the fault in case of 'one found' / T4: According to T1&T2 you had 7 duplicates (re-captures, 'both found'). In your application of Mt you have only 6. Why? / T5: you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet)

25	A93273	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	2,00	0,50	8,50	4,0	T1: most probable value of subjective estimate of first reviewer is missing. / T5: you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet) / T6: you don't say what metrics should be collected!
26	A93830	1,50	2,00	0,00	1,00	1,00	0,25	5,75	0,0	T1: Individual subjective estimates missing - instead you use capture-recapture - but then Nr is calculated wrongly: should be '2' instead of '26' / T3: joint subjective estimate is missing / T6: All methods you list are of the type 'capture-recapture' - no metrics indicated / BT: not done.
27	A93847	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	8,00	0,0	BT: not done
28	A94096	2,00	2,00	1,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	5,00	0,0	T4, T5, T6: missing / BT: not done
29	A94168	1,50	1,50	1,00	0,75	2,00	1,00	7,75	4,0	T1: individual subjective estimates missing / T2: not visible who found the fault in case of 'one found' / T4: According to T1&T2 you had 7 duplicates (re-captures, 'both found'). In your application of Mt you have only 6. Why? / T5: you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet)
30	A95496	1,50	2,00	1,00	0,75	1,00	0,00	6,25	0,0	T1: the number of faults found (1 respectively 4) is extremely low / T4: No discussion of prerequisites for applying Mt; the interpretation of 'division by 0' is that the number of total faults is very large ('infinite') / T5: same comment as for T4 / T6: what you write under point 6 doesn't relate to the question asked in T6, i.e., what estimation techniques other than capture-recapture could be used / BT: not done.
31	A95503									
32	A95505	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	8,00	0,0	BT: not done
33	A96171	2,00	2,00	1,00	0,75	1,75	1,00	8,50	4,0	T4: wrong count of Sander's faults (is '11', not '12' - note: false positives don't count) / T5: F1=14 (again, false positives don't count); you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet)
34	B00866	2,00	1,75	1,00	1,00	0,75	0,00	6,50	0,0	T1/T2: You don't show who found what defect, however, you need this info for Mt - so why don't you show the data? / T5: F2 is '5' (not '10' - note: you have 5 duplicates, thus 5 defects were found by exactly two reviewers) / T6: missing / BT: not done
35	B02130	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	0,75	0,50	7,25	0,0	T5: F1=8 (not 7) since you have 8 faults that were found by exactly one reviewer (either rev1 or rev2) and not by both / T6: the paper you reference presents model for defect estimation based on software characteristics; how does this transfer to a requirements spec? / BT: not done

36	B02131	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	2,00	1,00	9,00	4,0	T5: you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet)
37	B03306									
38	B03336	2,00	2,00	1,00	0,75	1,25	0,25	7,25	1,0	T4: mistake in counting R1 (it equals '5' not '6') / T5: wrong calculation of F1 and F2 (F1=16 and F2=5); you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet); however, C2 and R2 are calculated incorrectly; / T6: What measures do you have to take for 'size and complexity of the system' when you only have the requirements spec? / BT: only did Mt for Task 4
39	B04856	1,50	2,00	0,00	1,00	1,00	0,25	5,75	0,0	T1: Individual subjective estimates missing - instead you use capture-recapture - but then Nr is calculated wrongly: should be '2' instead of '26' / T3: joint subjective estimate is missing / T6: All methods you list are of the type 'capture-recapture' - no metrics indicated / BT: not done.
40	B04866	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	0,50	7,50	0,0	T6: it's not very clear what data you would collect in which phase and how you would estimate the number of remaining faults from that; also, you don't explain how neural networks would be used / BT: not done
41	B04867	1,50	2,00	1,00	0,50	0,00	0,00	5,00	0,0	T1: subjective estimates missing / T2: no duplicates detected - all 11 defects found by the inspectors are unique / T4: unclear where the 3 duplicates suddenly come from / T5: missing / T6: you only hint to other capture-recapture models - the task was to suggest other ways of estimating defects than capture-recapture / BT: not done.
42	B04868	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	8,00	0,0	BT: not done
43	B04872	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	8,00	0,0	BT: not done
44	B04876	1,50	2,00	0,25	0,50	0,50	0,00	4,75	0,0	T1: subjective estimates missing / T3: subjective estimates unclear: what is the number of faults remaining? / T4: wrong application of capture-recapture model (the total faults by each inspector are 8 and 11, according to your data, and not 7 and 7, as you say) / T5: wrong calculation of n1 (should be $11/3=4$) / T6: your proposed alternative estimation method doesn't make sense. How would you calculate cyclomatic complexity of a requirements spec? / BT: not done
45	B04879	2,00	1,00	1,00	0,50	0,00	0,50	5,00	0,0	T2: joint log is missing / from the individual logs it looks like you had found disjoint sets of faults - nevertheless you say that 2 faults were duplicates. How is this possible? / T4: The reason you give why Mt is not appropriate is incorrect: you can do capture-recapture with 2 inspectors only / T5: F1 and F2 are not the same as the faults found by inspector 1 and 2, respectively / T6: It's unclear from the description how exactly the defect estimate of your proposed approach will be made. / BT: not done

55	B04964	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	2,00	0,75	8,75	0,0	T5: you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet) / T6: It's not clear what you mean by 'empirical defect prediction'. Do you mean reliability growth models or curve-fitting models? In what way is SPC similar to capture-recapture? SPC is not a prediction model. / BT: not done.
56	B04965	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	1,50	1,00	8,50	0,0	T5: F1 not calculated correctly (it's 10 not 9); M2 not calculated correctly (it's 10 not 13); you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet) / T6: Note that ICR is actually a version of the capture-recapture method. / BT: not done
57	B04966	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	1,50	1,00	8,50	0,0	T5: F1 not calculated correctly (it's 10 not 9); M2 not calculated correctly (it's 10 not 13); you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet) / T6: Note that ICR is actually a version of the capture-recapture method. / BT: not done.
58	B04970									
59	B04971	1,50	2,00	1,00	0,75	1,00	0,00	6,25	0,0	T1: the number of faults found (1 respectively 4) is extremely low / T4: No discussion of prerequisites for applying Mt; the interpretation of 'division by 0' is that the number of total faults is very large ('infinite') / T5: same comment as for T4 / T6: what you write under point 6 doesn't relate to the question asked in T6, i.e., what estimation techniques other than capture-recapture could be used / BT: not done.
60	B04973	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	1,75	1,00	8,75	4,0	T5: You got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet) - however, since C2 is calculated incorrectly (it's $7 = 4 \text{ new} + 3 \text{ duplicates}$) the extra mark is reduced to 0.75 /
61	B04977	2,00	2,00	1,00	0,75	1,25	0,25	7,25	1,0	T4: mistake in counting R1 (it equals '5' not '6') / T5: wrong calculation of F1 and F2 ($F1=16$ and $F2=5$); you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet); however, C2 and R2 are calculated incorrectly; / T6: What measures do you have to take for 'size and complexity of the system' when you only have the requirements spec? / BT: only did Mt for Task 4
62	B04994									
63	B05126	2,00	0,00	0,00	1,00	1,25	0,00	4,25	0,0	T2 & T3: missing / T5: wrong calculation of F1 and F2 ($F1=33$ and $F2=9$); you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet); however, C2 and R2 are calculated incorrectly; / T6: What measures do you have to take for 'size and complexity of the system' when you only have the requirements spec? / T6: missing / BT: not done

64	B06462										
65	B06657	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	2,00	0,50	8,50	4,0	T1: most probable value of subjective estimate of first reviewer is missing. / T5: you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet) / T6: you don't say what metrics should be collected!	
66	B11208	2,00	2,00	1,00	0,75	1,75	1,00	8,50	4,0	T4: wrong count of Sander's faults (is '11', not '12' - note: false positives don't count) / T5: F1=14 (again, false positives don't count); you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet)	
67	B11857	1,50	2,00	1,00	0,75	0,00	1,00	6,25	0,0	T1: individual subjective estimates are missing / T3: It's a bit unclear what exactly you mean by 'The total number of faults are 5', but considering what you write before, I assume you mean 'The total number of remaining faults is 5'. / T4: Your discussion of the underlying assumptions of the Mt model is missing; note that division by 0 can be interpreted as follows: a very large (infinite) number of faults is estimated - note that there exist mathematical systems that allow division by zero; we also discussed this point in the lecture; / T5: F1=6 (not 4 as you say) and F2=2 (not 7 as you say), thus: $n1=6/2=3$, $n2=1/3=0$ and $n3=1/2=1$ (rounded) / BT: not done.	
68	B14246										
69	B15634	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	0,25	7,25	0,0	T5: n2 and n3 not calculated correctly ($n2=2/3=1$ and $n3=2/2=1$; you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet), however, C2 and R2 are calculated incorrectly (should be 9 and 7 respectively, based on your n2 and n3 data); also, your reasoning about the impact of false positives doesn't make sense as the capture-recapture model doesn't use any information on false positives / T6: it's unclear what you mean by "One could only analyze very thoroughly only few test cases/code and make an assumption from there (by multiplying)" / BT: not done.	
70	B15635	1,50	2,00	1,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	4,50	0,0	T1: individual subjective estimates are missing / T4-T6: missing / BT: not done	
71	B15636	1,50	2,00	1,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	4,50	0,0	T1: individual subjective estimates are missing / T4-T6: missing / BT: not done	
72	B15637	2,00	2,00	1,00	0,75	0,00	0,00	5,75	0,0	T4: wrong calculation of remaining faults (is '5', not '10') / T5 & T6: missing / BT: not done	

73	B15638	2,00	2,00	1,00	0,50	0,00	0,00	5,50	0,0	T4: According to your fault table, A found 4 faults and M found 5 faults of which 2 are duplicates (thus total number of unique faults is $7=4+5-2$), based on these numbers the estimated faults are $5*4/2=10$; how did you get a result of 15? Since you don't show your calculation, you can't get marks for this part of T4; note that false positives are no faults and thus are not included in the calculations / T5: $F1=5$ (faults foundy either A or M) and $F2=2$ (duplicates = faults found by both); it's unclear how you got your F1 and F2 values / T6: There are many other ways how faults can be estimated, e.g., based on the fault time series (curve fitting models) or based on structural properties of the requirements doc - the related literature is easy to find; it's unclear how the information in the first link you provide would be applied to fault estimation in requirements docs; the second link you provide refers to another model of the capture-recapture type / BT: not done.
74	B15639	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	1,75	1,00	8,75	4,0	T5: You got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet) - however, since C2 is calculated incorrectly (it's $7 = 4 \text{ new} + 3 \text{ duplicates}$) the extra mark is reduced to 0.75 /
75	B15640	2,00	1,75	1,00	1,00	0,75	0,00	6,50	0,0	T1/T2: You don't show who found what defect, however, you need this info for Mt - so why don't you show the data? / T5: F2 is '5' (not '10' - note: you have 5 duplicates, thus 5 defects were found by exactly two reviewers) / T6: missing / BT: not done
76	B15642	2,00	2,00	1,00	0,75	0,00	0,00	5,75	0,0	T4: wrong calculation of remaining faults (is '5', not '10') / T5 & T6: missing / BT: not done
77	B15643	2,00	2,00	1,00	0,50	0,00	0,00	5,50	0,0	T4: According to your fault table, A found 4 faults and M found 5 faults of which 2 are duplicates (thus total number of unique faults is $7=4+5-2$), based on these numbers the estimated faults are $5*4/2=10$; how did you get a result of 15? Since you don't show your calculation, you can't get marks for this part of T4; note that false positives are no faults and thus are not included in the calculations / T5: $F1=5$ (faults foundy either A or M) and $F2=2$ (duplicates = faults found by both); it's unclear how you got your F1 and F2 values / T6: There are many other ways how faults can be estimated, e.g., based on the fault time series (curve fitting models) or based on structural properties of the requirements doc - the related literature is easy to find; it's unclear how the information in the first link you provide would be applied to fault estimation in requirements docs; the second link you provide refers to another model of the capture-recapture type / BT: not done.

78	B15644	2,00	2,00	1,00	0,75	0,75	1,00	7,50	0,0	T1: Remark: you don't show the locations of the faults in the Rspec (instead you only say which UC helped you find the fault in the Rspec) / T4: You don't discuss the prerequisites for applying Mt - are they fulfilled? / T5: F1 equals '11', not '12' (F1=17-6=11) / BT: not done
79	B15646	1,75	2,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	0,00	6,75	0,0	T1: min and max values of subjective estimates missing / T5: capture-recapture calculation wrong, thus no extra mark / T6: no other estimation model described / BT: not done.
80	B15648	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	0,75	1,00	7,75		T5: How did you get to 23 different faults? You had 17+1 different faults with 2 reviewers; with the 6 new faults found by the 3rd reviewer, you get 17+1+6=24 different faults (Note: the 1 joint fault is different from the 17 individual faults) / BT: not done.
81	B15651	2,00	2,00	0,00	1,00	1,00	0,00	6,00	0,0	T3: subjective group estimate missing; also, it is unclear why you say that you had no 'false positives' - what does it then mean when you say that a fault found by one reviewer is not accepted by the other? / T6: missing / BT: not done.
82	B15655	1,25	1,50	0,50	0,75	0,00	0,00	4,00	0,0	T1&T2: It's unclear which reviewer found which faults; first you say that rev1 found 11 and rev2 found 9 faults; since the total number of faults is 14, the number of joint faults must be 6 - ok, but then you talk about 'later faults (12 and 10 respectively, with 6 joint faults), what do you mean by 'later faults'? So, these numbers imply that the total number of faults is now 16; furthermore you say that rev1 faults + rev2 faults - 2*common faults = 14 - How do you get this result? Due to these unclarities I subtract 1 mark; in addition, the upper and lower bounds for the individual subjective estimates are missing; / T3: there is no explanation given how the subjective group estimate was made / T4: no discussion of the assumptions of Mt model / T5: F1 and F2 are incorrect / T6: missing / BT: not done.
83	B15656	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	0,25	7,25	0,0	T5: n2 and n3 not calculated correctly (n2=2/3=1 and n3=2/2=1; you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet), however, C2 and R2 are calculated incorrectly (should be 9 and 7 respectively, based on your n2 and n3 data); also, your reasoning about the impact of false positives doesn't make sense as the capture-recapture model doesn't use any information on false positives / T6: it's unclear what you mean by "One could only analyze very thoroughly only few test cases/code and make an assumption from there (by multiplying)" / BT: not done.
84	B15657	2,00	2,00	1,00	0,25	0,00	1,00	6,25	0,0	T4: Mt formula not applied correctly: you don't have joint faults, thus your estimate of remaining faults will be infinity (due to division by 0) / T5: F1 and F2 incorrect (correct values are: F1=8, F2=0) / BT: not done.

85	B15663	1,50	2,00	0,25	0,50	0,50	0,00	4,75	0,0	T1: subjective estimates missing / T3: subjective estimates unclear: what is the number of faults remaining? / T4: wrong application of capture-recapture model (the total faults by each inspector are 8 and 11, according to your data, and not 7 and 7, as you say) / T5: wrong calculation of n1 (should be $11/3=4$) / T6: your proposed alternative estimation method doesn't make sense. How would you calculate cyclomatic complexity of a requirements spec? / BT: not done
86	B15691	2,00	2,00	0,00	1,00	1,00	0,00	6,00	0,0	T3: subjective group estimate missing; also, it is unclear why you say that you had no 'false positives' - what does it then mean when you say that a fault found by one reviewer is not accepted by the other? / T6: missing / BT: not done.
87	B16032	2,00	2,00	1,00	0,25	0,00	1,00	6,25	0,0	T4: Mt formula not applied correctly: you don't have joint faults, thus your estimate of remaining faults will be infinity (due to division by 0) / T5: F1 and F2 incorrect (correct values are: $F1=8$, $F2=0$) / BT: not done.
88	B16067	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	0,75	1,00	7,75	0,0	T5: How did you get to 23 different faults? You had 17+1 different faults with 2 reviewers; with the 6 new faults found by the 3rd reviewer, you get $17+1+6=24$ different faults (Note: the 1 joint fault is different from the 17 individual faults) / BT: not done.
89	B16145	1,25	1,50	0,50	0,75	0,00	0,00	4,00	0,0	T1&T2: It's unclear which reviewer found which faults; first you say that rev1 found 11 and rev2 found 9 faults; since the total number of faults is 14, the number of joint faults must be 6 - ok, but then you talk about 'later faults' (12 and 10 respectively, with 6 joint faults), what do you mean by 'later faults'? So, these numbers imply that the total number of faults is now 16; furthermore you say that $rev1\ faults + rev2\ faults - 2*common\ faults = 14$ - How do you get this result? Due to these unclarities I subtract 1 mark; in addition, the upper and lower bounds for the individual subjective estimates are missing; / T3: there is no explanation given how the subjective group estimate was made / T4: no discussion of the assumptions of Mt model / T5: F1 and F2 are incorrect / T6: missing / BT: not done.
90	B31742	1,75	2,00	1,00	0,75	0,50	1,00	7,00	0,0	T1: min and max values of subjective estimates missing / T4: discussion of underlying assumptions of Mt model is missing / T5: $F1=7=(8-3)+(5-3)$ not 5 and $F2=3$ (i.e., the number of faults found by both) / T6: How would you measure 'length'? How would you measure 'experience'? / BT: not done.
91	B31743	1,75	2,00	1,00	0,75	0,50	0,75	6,75	0,0	T1: min and max values of subjective estimates missing / T3: it's not fully clear why the fact that you found 3 duplicates makes you think that the number of remaining faults is 5-7 / T4: discussion of underlying assumptions of Mt model is missing / T5: $F1=8=(6-3)+(8-3)$ not 6 and $F2=3$ (i.e., the number of faults found by both) / T6: It's not fully clear what the experience with the tester of a software has to do with estimating the number of faults in a requirements spec; do you mean the experience of the reviewer? How would you measure 'experience'? / BT: not done.

92	B31744	1,75	2,00	1,00	0,75	0,50	0,00	6,00	0,0	T1: min and max values of subjective estimates missing / T3: It's not fully clear why the fact that you found 3 duplicates makes you think that the number of remaining faults is 5-8 / T4: discussion of underlying assumptions of Mt model is missing / T5: $F1=9=(7-3)+(8-3)$ not 7 and $F2=3$ (i.e., the number of faults found by both) / T6: You are not proposing an alternative estimation method; so your proposal of doing additional QA is off-topic / BT: not done.
93	B31745	1,75	2,00	1,00	0,75	0,50	0,00	6,00	0,0	T1: min and max values of subjective estimates missing / T3: It's not fully clear why the fact that you found 3 duplicates makes you think that the number of remaining faults is 5-8 / T4: discussion of underlying assumptions of Mt model is missing / T5: $F1=9=(7-3)+(8-3)$ not 7 and $F2=3$ (i.e., the number of faults found by both) / T6: You are not proposing an alternative estimation method; so your proposal of doing additional QA is off-topic / BT: not done.
94	B31746	2,00	2,00	0,00	0,75	2,00	0,75	7,50	0,0	T3: subjective group estimate missing; T4: discussion of underlying assumptions of Mt model missing; T5: you got an extra 1 mark for doing the capture-recapture with 3 persons (this was intended but not explicitly written down in the assignment sheet); T6 good discussion but you don't say what should be measured to build alternative estimation models; BT: not done.
95	B31747	1,50	2,00	1,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	4,50	0,0	The file was not submitted in the proper format; T1: first reviewer did not provide min/max estimate and second reviewer didn't provide an estimate at all; T3: what do you mean by 'Our estimate ... Is based on a prediction'? What do changing requirements and have to do with estimating the remaining faults in the current document? What does 'availability of money' have to do with estimating the quality of an existing document?/T4: missing / T5: missing / T6: missing/ BT: not done.
96	B31748	1,50	2,00	1,00	0,75	1,00	1,00	7,25	0,0	T1: subjective estimates are missing / T2: How comes you count 15 unique defects? The defects are to be counted in the Rspec; often you mention two fault locations in the Rspec for one (counted) fault; shouldn't that be counted as two faults in the Rspec? / T4: discussion of underlying assumptions of Mt model is missing / T5: of course, in this task you were supposed to apply again the capture-recapture model, this time for three reviewers (i said this during the lab); you tried to do this (although not explicitly stated in the assignment) and would have got an extra mark; however, you use the capture-recapture formula incorrectly; T6: good discussion; in particular, your point about using the 'actual fault detection process'; for example, one could try to exploit the defect detection rate to estimate the remaining faults; to do so, one would have to log the time when a defect is detected (a task you didn't do, although requested in T1); /BT: not done.

