



## Code Design Review Summary Form

Project Lab T4 Author Tyler Gilmore

Function Name(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Date 9/25/2016

| Number of errors |       | Error Type   |
|------------------|-------|--|
| Major            | Minor |  |
|                  | 1     | Code does not follow coding conventions  |
|                  |       | Function size and complexity are unreasonable                                      |
|                  |       | ISR size, complexity, execution time are unreasonable                              |
|                  |       | Unclear expression of ideas in code  |
|                  |       | Poor encapsulation   |
|                  |       | Function prototype not correctly used  |
|                  |       | Data types do not match  |
|                  |       | Uninitialized variable at function start   |
|                  |       | Uninitialized variable going into loop   |
| 1                |       | Poor logic - will not function as needed   |
|                  |       | Poor or missing comments   |
|                  |       | Error condition not caught or ignored  |
|                  |       | Switch statement without a default case (when using subset of possible conditions) |
|                  | 1     | Incorrect syntax   |
|                  |       | Non-reentrant code in dangerous places   |
|                  |       | Slow code in speed-critical area   |
|                  |       | Interrupts are not masked during possible critical code                            |
|                  | 2     | Other  |
|                  |       | Other  |

Major bugs are ones that will result in a problem that the customer will see. Minor bugs are those that include spelling errors, non-compliance with coding conventions, and poor workmanship that does not lead to a major error.

Time Code Design Review Started: 8:00 Ended: 8:15

Recorder Austin Heath



## Code Design Review Summary Form

Project Lab T4 Author Emily Gorman

Function Name(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Date 9/25/2016

| Number of errors |       | Error Type   |
|------------------|-------|--|
| Major            | Minor |  |
|                  | 6     | Code does not follow coding conventions  |
|                  |       | Function size and complexity are unreasonable                                      |
|                  |       | ISR size, complexity, execution time are unreasonable                              |
|                  |       | Unclear expression of ideas in code  |
|                  |       | Poor encapsulation   |
|                  |       | Function prototype not correctly used  |
| 1                |       | Data types do not match  |
|                  |       | Uninitialized variable at function start   |
|                  |       | Uninitialized variable going into loop   |
| 1                |       | Poor logic - will not function as needed   |
|                  | 1     | Poor or missing comments   |
|                  |       | Error condition not caught or ignored  |
|                  |       | Switch statement without a default case (when using subset of possible conditions) |
|                  |       | Incorrect syntax   |
|                  |       | Non-reentrant code in dangerous places   |
|                  |       | Slow code in speed-critical area   |
|                  |       | Interrupts are not masked during possible critical code                            |
|                  |       | Other  |
|                  |       | Other  |

Major bugs are ones that will result in a problem that the customer will see. Minor bugs are those that include spelling errors, non-compliance with coding conventions, and poor workmanship that does not lead to a major error.

Time Code Design Review Started: 8:15 Ended: 8:30

Recorder Austin Heath



## Code Design Review Summary Form

Project Lab T4 Author Chayne Thrash

Function Name(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Date 9/25/2016

| Number of errors |       | Error Type   |
|------------------|-------|--|
| Major            | Minor |  |
|                  | 1     | Code does not follow coding conventions  |
|                  |       | Function size and complexity are unreasonable                                      |
|                  |       | ISR size, complexity, execution time are unreasonable                              |
|                  |       | Unclear expression of ideas in code  |
|                  |       | Poor encapsulation   |
|                  |       | Function prototype not correctly used  |
|                  |       | Data types do not match  |
|                  |       | Uninitialized variable at function start   |
|                  |       | Uninitialized variable going into loop   |
| 2                |       | Poor logic - will not function as needed   |
|                  |       | Poor or missing comments   |
|                  |       | Error condition not caught or ignored  |
|                  |       | Switch statement without a default case (when using subset of possible conditions) |
|                  |       | Incorrect syntax   |
|                  |       | Non-reentrant code in dangerous places   |
|                  |       | Slow code in speed-critical area   |
|                  |       | Interrupts are not masked during possible critical code                            |
|                  | 2     | Other  |
|                  |       | Other  |

Major bugs are ones that will result in a problem that the customer will see. Minor bugs are those that include spelling errors, non-compliance with coding conventions, and poor workmanship that does not lead to a major error.

Time Code Design Review Started: 8:30 Ended: 8:50

Recorder Austin Heath



## Code Design Review Summary Form

**Project** Lab T4 **Author** Austin Heath

**Function Name(s)** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** 9/26/2016

| Number of errors |       | Error Type   |
|------------------|-------|--|
| Major            | Minor |  |
|                  | 2     | Code does not follow coding conventions  |
|                  |       | Function size and complexity are unreasonable                                      |
|                  |       | ISR size, complexity, execution time are unreasonable                              |
|                  |       | Unclear expression of ideas in code  |
|                  |       | Poor encapsulation   |
|                  |       | Function prototype not correctly used  |
|                  |       | Data types do not match  |
|                  |       | Uninitialized variable at function start   |
|                  |       | Uninitialized variable going into loop   |
| 4                |       | Poor logic - will not function as needed   |
|                  |       | Poor or missing comments   |
|                  |       | Error condition not caught or ignored  |
|                  |       | Switch statement without a default case (when using subset of possible conditions) |
|                  | 1     | Incorrect syntax   |
|                  |       | Non-reentrant code in dangerous places   |
|                  |       | Slow code in speed-critical area   |
|                  |       | Interrupts are not masked during possible critical code                            |
|                  | 2     | Other  |
|                  |       | Other  |

Major bugs are ones that will result in a problem that the customer will see. Minor bugs are those that include spelling errors, non-compliance with coding conventions, and poor workmanship that does not lead to a major error.

**Time Code Design Review Started:** 8:50 **Ended:** 9:20

**Recorder** Austin Heath