# **Iteration 2 Review for Team 7**

By Team 1

Harsh Chaludia & Deep Patel

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issues** | **Finder** | **Severity** | **Status** | **Defect Type** | **Defect Description** |
| UML diagram missing | Deep | major | missing | Implementation Defect | The demo was good, but a UML diagram was missing as per the implementation mentioned as per the rubric. |
| The point “how the product is different from the competitors” could have been more elaborative. | Harsh | minor | missing | Documentation Defect | The document does not present the selection of challengers from the Code Search Net Challenge and neither compares their approach to get more details about the differences and the improvements they have made. |
| Unable to find the exact team’s contribution in some combined contributed files in the Git repository. | Harsh | minor | wrong | Code Defect | Regarding the code organization, there was a link to one of the files  <https://github.com/rifatarefin/semantic-code-search/blob/ mav2/src/models/model.py> in which there are two contributors. It would have been better if the team member’s and 3rd person’s contributions were distinguishable. |
| Missing test cases documentation. | Deep | Open issue | missing | Test Defect | The demo link presented in the written deliverables was not working, and there was no documentation or records of test cases. |
| Critical Deliverables for the said project have not been documented properly. | Harsh | minor | missing | Documentation Defect | The was no information included about the deliverables for further stages. |

The above-mentioned defects were found that were relevant to the presentation of the what the team was pitching.