|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Description | Reviewers Comment | Action taken by reviewed group |
| Build | Could you clone from Git and build using the README file? | Project built successfully. | No action taken. |
| Legibility | Was the flow sane and were variable names and methods easy to follow? Does the code adhere to general guidelines and code style? | Code follows general guidlines and is easy to follow. Most abstractions come from frameworks, which is to be expected. | No action taken. |
| Impleme ntaDon | is it shorter/easier/faster/cleaner/ safer to write funcDonally equivalent code? Do you see useful abstracDons? | Given the project's significant focus on frameworks to develop ML models (which is what was expected) there is not much room for improvement in terms of code structure or abstractions. | No action taken. |
| Maintain  ability | Are there unit tests? Should there be? Are the test covering interesDng cases? Are they readable? | Unit tests do not appear present, but would likely not be a good fit for the nature of the project, which would focus more on managing data and optimizing model results. | No action taken. |
| Require ments | Does the code fulfill the requirements? | The code appears to fulfil its requirements, however the nature of the project means that it can not be adequately evaluated by simply examining the code. | We believe that the project currently fulfills the project requirements. However there are optimizations that we are currently developing. |
| Other | Are there other things that stand out that can be improved? | Once again, this isn't realistically able to be evaluated via just the code. The model and convolutions appear to be competently written, however, evaluating that would require a different review process. | No action taken. |