Interview Assessment Report

Generated: February 06, 2026 at 09:07 UTC

Candidate:	John Smith	**Position:**	Backend Engineer
Interview Date:	February 06, 2026	**Duration:**	0 minutes

Executive Summary

John Smith demonstrated average performance in technical and behavioral areas, with acceptable scores in screening questions. His communication skills were below the expected level.

Overall Score

47/100

Below Average

Recommendation

Strong No Hire

Confidence: 75%

Score Breakdown

Technical	47/100	Below Average
Behavioral	62/100	Acceptable
Communication	45/100	Below Average

Key Strengths

- **Technical Skills**: Successfully completed basic coding challenges during technical rounds.
- **Behavioral/Soft Skills**: Demonstrated a positive attitude and willingness to learn, as evidenced by his engagement in behavioral questions.

Areas for Improvement

- **Technical Skills** (medium): Failed to answer technical questions with sufficient depth or accuracy, particularly on the third question during the technical round.
- **Communication** (medium): Had difficulty articulating his thought process in some scenarios, as noted during behavioral questions.

Question-by-Question Breakdown

Screening

Q1. ■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■ 62/100

Score: 62/100 (good). Strengths: described experience with TechCorp. Improvement: addressed FastAPI specifically.

Question: Can you describe your experience with FastAPI and how it has helped you build scalable APIs?

Answer:

> I'm a senior Python developer with 5 years of experience building backend systems. At TechCorp, I've built REST APIs that handle over a million requests daily. I'm passionate about clean code, testing, and mentoring junior developers.

Strengths: described experience with TechCorp, mentioned clean code and testing

Improvements: addressed FastAPI specifically, demonstrated understanding of scalability aspects

Q2. ■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■ 50/100

Score: 50/100 (needs improvement). Strengths: mention of Python advantages. Improvement: addressing specific Python advantages and how they relate to backend development.

Question: Why do you prefer Python over other languages for backend development, and how have your AWS experiences influenced this preference?

Answer:

> I'm excited about this role because HackGeniX is working on innovative AI technology. The tech stack aligns perfectly with my expertise in Python and FastAPI. I'm also drawn to the remote-first culture and growth opportunities.

Strengths: mention of Python advantages, reference to AWS experience

Improvements: addressing specific Python advantages and how they relate to backend development, explaining in more detail how their AWS experiences influenced their preference for Python, demonstrating a deeper understanding of the tech stack and its alignment with their skills

Technical

Q1. ■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■ 55/100

Score: 55/100 (needs improvement). Strengths: mention of async/await in FastAPI context. Improvement: explaining the difference between synchronous and asynchronous API calls.

Question: Explain the difference between a synchronous and an asynchronous API call in the context of FastAPI. Provide examples where one might be preferred over the other and why.

Answer:

> For handling high traffic, I use several strategies: horizontal scaling with load balancers, Redis caching for frequently accessed data, database connection pooling, async I/O with FastAPI, and proper database indexing. I also implement circuit breakers for graceful degradation when dependencies fail.

Strengths: mention of async/await in FastAPI context, horizontal scaling strategy

Improvements: explaining the difference between synchronous and asynchronous API calls, addressing performance impact and scalability considerations, including examples of when one might be preferred over the other

Q2. ■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■ 35/100

Score: 35/100 (needs improvement). Strengths: describes debugging approach. Improvement: did not address websockets, message queue technology or streaming data architecture.

Question: You're working on an application that requires real-time updates across multiple clients. Describe how you would set up this functionality using FastAPI and explain the key components you'd use (e.g., websockets, message queues). Provide code snippets if possible.

Answer:

> My debugging approach is systematic. First, I reproduce the issue consistently. Then I check logs and metrics to understand the timeline. For distributed systems, I use tracing tools like Jaeger. I isolate components and test individually. Once found, I write a failing test, fix the issue, and document the root cause.

Strengths: describes debugging approach

Improvements: did not address websockets, message queue technology or streaming data architecture, did not provide code snippets

Q3. ■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■ 50/100

Score: 50/100 (needs improvement).

Question: You need to design a database schema in PostgreSQL that supports the following requirements: users can create multiple posts, each post can have many comments, and both users and comments should be able to be searched by name. How would you structure your tables? Provide SQL queries for creating these tables.

Answer:

> I follow TDD principles where practical. I write unit tests for business logic, integration tests for API endpoints, and end-to-end tests for critical flows. I aim for 80% coverage on core code. I use pytest with fixtures and mock external services. Tests run in CI/CD pipeline before any merge.

Behavioral

Q1. 50/100

Score: 50/100 (needs improvement).

Question: When working on a large-scale project that required integrating with multiple AWS services, how did you effectively manage dependencies between different services and ensure smooth communication flow among them?

Answer:

> I had a teammate who was resistant to code reviews. I scheduled a private conversation to understand their perspective. They felt their experience wasn't valued. I started highlighting positives in reviews first and framed suggestions as questions. We established team guidelines together, which improved everyone's experience.

Q2. 73/100

Score: 73/100 (good). Strengths: The candidate demonstrated daily progress communication which is relevant to managing a project timeline.. Improvement: The candidate's answer does not directly address the challenges related to API versioning, backward compatibility, and seamless data flow between new and old systems as described in the question..

Question: You were part of a team tasked with developing a feature that required integrating FastAPI with an existing legacy system. The project faced multiple challenges related to API versioning, backward compatibility, and ensuring seamless data flow between the new and old systems. How did you approach these challenges and what strategies did you implement to ensure successful integration?

Answer:

> We had a critical feature needed in 2 weeks instead of 6. I met with stakeholders to understand core requirements and negotiated scope reduction. I broke down tasks, communicated progress daily, and identified blockers early. We delivered core functionality on time and added remaining features in the next sprint.

Strengths: The candidate demonstrated daily progress communication which is relevant to managing a project timeline.

Improvements: The candidate's answer does not directly address the challenges related to API versioning, backward compatibility, and seamless data flow between new and old systems as described in the question.

Wrap Up

Q1. 55/100

Score: 55/100 (needs improvement). Strengths: Asks about team structure and development process. Improvement: Does not ask about growth opportunities or technical debt in a more detailed manner.

Question: Is there anything else you'd like to share about your experience or ask about the role?

Answer:

> I'd like to know more about the team structure and development process. How does the team handle technical debt? What are the growth opportunities? I'm very excited about contributing to this AI interview product.

Strengths: Asks about team structure and development process, Shows excitement about the role

Improvements: Does not ask about growth opportunities or technical debt in a more detailed manner, Lacks depth on their understanding of AI interview products

Hiring Recommendation

Strong No Hire

Confidence: 75%

Reasoning: John Smith showed promise with basic technical skills and a positive attitude. However, he struggled to demonstrate depth of knowledge on technical challenges and had communication issues that could hinder collaboration within the team. Given these concerns, especially in technical areas where they are critical for backend engineering roles, I recommend not hiring John Smith.

Recommended Next Steps:

- Schedule additional interviews with more challenging technical questions
- Recommend a lower-level role or entry point if applicable