Peer review of group 16

1. When a timeline is launched in the rendering application, all states are calculated and scroll correctly. Robot movement is smooth, and timer running corresponds to its state.

2. All user interface use cases have been tested, including changing timeline time, execution speed, pausing and resuming, etc.

3. Once a state has been opened, the launch options are always present. If you decide to start a state, it will resume the previously opened timeline and the timer will scroll where it left off. The panel should be deactivated, thus disabling the ability to launch execution when a simple state is opened.

4. If a timeline is opened incorrectly, the sound signal indicating that the file is not conform is absent. If a new timeline is opened in the middle of a previous one, the timer display does not reset.

5. The code is understandable and well structured, with consistent names for variables and functions. Comments are not excessive, but make it easy to find your way around the code.

6. Best practices have been applied, such as the use of generic functions, especially for opening files, or managing collisions between robots/particles or robots/robots.

7. The function calculating the explosion of a particle has been optimized, avoiding code repetition as much as possible. The same applies to the function managing collisions between entities, which uses a dichotomous search.

8. The calculation of the step has been brilliantly executed. It consists in calculating the maximum distance that can be covered, taking into account the maximum speed of a robot and the minimum diameter of an entity present on the terrain. This avoids the scenario where a robot crosses an entity without detecting a collision.

9. The work was divided in a methodical and balanced way, with two groups of three people working on the rendering application and the setup application.

10. The collaborative tool git was used with care, committing regularly and dividing the project into branches to avoid major code conflicts.

Group 16 comments:

The group 16 agrees with all the remarks group 14 wrote. We exchanged some words after the meeting, we spoke about how we implemented some functions and helped each other. We adapted our code with the good observations they made.