

Peer Review 2 of Team 5 by Team 3

Koushik Kannepally s2925877

Oebele Lijzenga s1954385

Tommy Lin s1840932

Jordy van der Poel s2692937

June 2, 2022

Skill S3

Score: +

1. Good: Contains all the minimum requirements, and also a packaging phase to compile a jar file.
2. Good: Explains the process and issues they had.
3. Neutral: Figures in text might be nicer to read (general remark), look into latex such as using [h] in figures.

Skill S4

Score: +/−

1. Good: Good coverage.
2. Good: Mentions what exactly needs to be improved
3. Neutral: Are aware of some missing tests and know why coverage is low at some places.
4. Neutral: Is branch supposed to be 0 in the whole column in figure 4?
5. Improvement: The report does not mention system/user tests.

Skill S8

Score: −

1. Good: Useful refactoring.
2. Bad: Does not state whether each refactoring step was done in a separate commit.
3. Bad: Unclear how many refactoring steps were exactly performed, and if the 5 required steps were reached.

4. Improvement: Change the documentation such that it implements the listed requirements in the project description, as you might have done this well, just not documented it properly, as the refactoring does seem useful in practice.

Skill S9

Score: $+/-$

1. Good: Use of TRAFFIC terminology.
2. Good: Describes the failure, infection, defect and steps taken clearly.
3. Neutral: Quick and dirty debugging was still applied instead of using a 'scientific' method as defined by the project description. However, the overall bug was solved by using proper methods.
4. Improvement: Could refrain from mentioning the "quick and dirty debugging" in the report, as it might cause confusion. Overall, change the wording of that a bit and it should be good.