

## peer review 3: Cohortney on DVT

Taras Khakhulin, Mikhail Pautov

April 23, 2021

Introductory note: indices of questions to consider refer to the ones from the corresponding assignment.

### Review

1. general description of the project is clear. The general project is easier than others project (imo). And not all steps clear: the 4th and 5th are similar. Same is true for the 8th and 9th steps it could be merged due to dependency.
2. Generally it is not fair, that the first author of the project has the project about refactoring public code for his project. The official code for the paper itself has the objective of the reproducibility. In addition, it is worth noting that the goal of the project clearly does not coincide with what is happening in reality. In the repository of the author who is proposed to refactor, there is only 1 branch, not 15 and there are no 22k lines of code. Although, in the readme it is written that it is the code itself that does not work and is an illustration, that is why we understand the task.
3. Yes it is obvious.
4. The team contains only 1 person, that contradicts the stated rules.
5. All problems are stated above. General structure is clear. Author could add the table from official github, because it greatly simplifies the understanding of the problem.
6. For first stage - yes.