CS 192 Software Engineering II General Programming Standards and Guidelines Code Review Checklist

Reviewer's Name:		Miguel Luis Posadas			Pee	r Review	Date:	Mar 6, 2017
Project Name:	Wi Finder			Project ID:				
					(if a	pplicable)		
Developer's	2 Sab	oaw Guys		Sprint		3		
Group Name:				Number				
Review Files &	home	e.html						
Source code	result	es.html						
	views	s.py						
	wifi.h	ntml						
Code Approved								

This checklist is to be used to assess source code during a peer review. Items which represent the code being reviewed should be checked off.

Refer to the *Android and Java General Programming Standards and Guidelines* (https://source.android.com/source/code-style.html) document for more complete descriptions and examples of the items listed below.

Place a check mark if the code complies with the criteria. If not, place comments at the remarks column.

1. License

Criteria	Comply		Remarks
	Yes	No	
License exists at the top of the code		•	No license needed yet
License contains the name of the author	•		No license needed yet
License contains the following: "This is a course requirement for CS 192 Software Engineering II under the supervision of Asst. Prof. Ma. Rowena C. Solamo of the Department of Computer Science, College of Engineering, University of the Philippines, Diliman for the AY 2015-2016".		•	

2. Code History

Criteria	Comply		Remarks	
	Yes	No		
Code History appears after the license of the source code.	•		Github	
Code History has been updated accordingly based on name of programmer, change date and change description.	•		Github	

3. Internal Documentation

Criteria	Comply		Remarks		
	Yes	No			
A comment block exists after the Code History containing the following information: file creation date, development group, client group and a brief statement of the purpose of the software in the file.		•	Add: each variable would have a corresponding descriptions variable_name; #description		
Each method in the file is preceded by a comment block which provides the following information: method name, routine's creation date, purpose of the routine, a list of the calling arguments (their types and what they do), a list of required files and/or database tables, and return value.		•	Lack of documentation		
Indentions are 5 spaces.	•				
Inline comments are found at the top of the statement using '/*' and '*/'.		•	Lack of documentation		
Bracketing of block statements follows the following format: if () { statements; }	•		code uses python syntax instead of C synta indentation utilized was for python for the sake of the code		
Exceptions are being handled appropriately.	•				

Reviewer's Comments:

No additional comments.