### Peer-Review Activity

#### Overview

You are required to submit your graphical test application for review by your peers. You are also required to participate in the review of a graphical test application of one or more of your peers. This exercise forms part of your assessment.

You may participate in the peer review while you are still programming your graphical test application, or when upon completion of your application. It is recommended you participate in both peer-review sessions, regardless of what state of completion your application is in.

#### Procedure

The peer-review session will only review the graphical test application.

Take the project for your graphical test application and remove all of your custom Vector and Matrix classes.

You will then give this project (with Vector and Matrix classes removed) to one of your peers, who will test your application using their own maths classes. If you, and they, have written their Vector and Matrix classes to conform to the requirements outlined in the *Assessment Description* section, then the peer-review can proceed.

You should conduct this review together so that any errors that are encountered when integrating different math classes with your application can be solved collaboratively.

If your application cannot be linked with another student’s math classes, this result should be recorded. You should then identify and solve the relevant errors and attempt the review again (either on the same day, or during the next review session).

Once your project is set up and linked correctly, record feedback on the following questions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Author of project being reviewed: | Dylan Smith |
| Reviewer: | Kari Dunn |
| Date: | 7/04/2021 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Does the code conform to a consistent coding standard?  Note the relevant coding standard and list places where the code can be improved. | There is an obvious coding standard but it is not used consistently throughout the program. Most of the class names are consistent except for a few, member variables are slightly consistent but the class methods are consistently pascal case. |
| Is the code well commented, easy to read and understand?  List at least one area for improvement or practice you can apply to your own programming. |  |
| Does the program function as intended?  Comment on the mechanics of the application. Note any variation from the brief.  Does the program perform identically on different machines? |  |
| Is the code well structured?  List at least one area for improvement or practice you can apply to your own programming. |  |
| Is vector and matrix math used correctly to draw and manipulation the position and orientation of the game objects?  Note any differences in how calculations are performed between this program and your own. |  |
| Is there anything else noteworthy? |  |
| How would you rate the quality of this project? |  |
| What steps could be taken to resolve any quality issues? |  |

Record the name of the reviewer, along with their responses.

Compile a document (in MSWord or PDF format) that contains all results from all peer review sessions. Also record the names of the people for whom you reviewed code.

Ensure you include a brief outline of any steps you took to resolve any quality issues found in your project.

#### Submission

You will need to submit the following:

* A document in MSWord or PDF format containing the results of the peer review sessions.

#### Submission Checklist

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| You have participated in at least one peer review session |  |
| The results of all peer review sessions have been recorded (you may use the table above for guidance) |  |
| The name of the review(s) has been recorded, along with their feedback |  |
| You have listed the names of all people for whom you have reviewed code |  |
| The document is neatly typed, with appropriate headings and sub-headings, date, and your name |  |
| Any steps taken to address any quality issues found have been listed |  |