Peer review for Virtual-Deck

Category	Full Marks (3 Points)	Partial Credit (2 Points)	Partial Credit (1 Points)	No Marks (0 Points)	Score
Quality of Work	Work (e.g., code) looks correct and organized. The project's readme file is clear, intelligible, and give a good idea of what the project is about.	Work (e.g., code) looks mostly correct and organized. The code could be better structured. OR the project readme file is somewhat unclear.	Work (e.g., code) is mostly disorganized. OR the project readme file is very unclear.	No code is given.	
Comments (e.g. Give an example of what could be improved. How can the code or readme file be improved?, etc.)		Through the readme file, I was able to grasp the progress of the work. It looks like not all code has been updated.			2
Project Progress	Main features of the project are working and demonstrated.	Some complex features of the project are working and demonstrated.	A few features of the project are working but have issues.	No progress has been made.	
Comments (e.g. Give an example of what could be improved. If the project is too complex, what parts of the project could feasibly done? If the project is too simple, what features could be added?)			It looks like the project isn't all updated. The image is broken.		1
Video	The video gives a helpful, clear depiction of the project.	The video gives a helpful, clear depiction of the project, but is confusing or vague in parts.	The video does not give a helpful, clear depiction of the project.	The video is missing or is inappropriate.	
Comments (e.g. Give constructive feed back to help improve the presentation style.)	Through the video, I was able to grasp what has been worked up to the present time. However, I feel a bit lacking in the description of the code and future goals..				3