# Reviewer Comment Template

### What was implemented well?

*Mention details that work well in the following cases:*

- ☐ *When you are providing feedback for significant changes to implement the "hamburger" approach.*
- ☐ *When the employee is new and needs team support to perform well (sometimes, a little acknowledgment goes a long way).*
- ☐ *When you learned something significant during code review (it makes sense to acknowledge the author).*

### What problems have you identified?

*Mention parts that were implemented poorly; this will help identify what needs to be changed.*

### Why do you think this is a problem?

*Describe why this solution is not suitable. Provide references.*

### How can the change be implemented?

*Share your opinion on how to improve the code. Include information on which standards, methods, patterns, or approaches are better. It is especially important to make feedback actionable if code needs improvement.*

### Screenshots (optional for UI changes)

*If necessary, provide visual support for your idea.*

### Any additional information

*Any additional information can be written here.*

## Example

### What was implemented well?

The auth mechanism was implemented using all the principles of the authenticator design pattern and according to the guide to project coding conventions.

### What problems have you identified?

The current implementation uses auth library v1.2.

### Why do you think this is a problem?

Auth library v1.2 is obsolete and has leaked authorization codes and problems with access tokens. In the newer version, these issues are fixed. This can be checked with the security testing framework or by using module vulnerability scanning.

### How can the change be implemented?

Update auth library to v1.3 or higher.

### Screenshots (optional for UI changes)

None

### Any additional information

The newer version requires minor updates in Token_Generator method implementation. Now the method contains one additional parameter—the algorithm type for encoding a token.