

[Forums](#)[Questionnaires](#)[Resources](#)

Respondent: **Sakari Pöyhä** Submitted on: Thursday, 7 December 2017, 4:12 PM

## Mid-term review of C++ project

Name of the project group evaluated

media-player-1

C1.1: The implementation corresponds to the selected topic and scope. The extent of project is large enough to accommodate work for everyone (2 p)

Yes. Group media-player-1 has implemented two versions of a mediaplayer, one with a graphical user interface (using QT) and other without a gui (using only SFML). These two implementations most certainly create enough work for every group member. (2/2p)

C1.2: The class structure, information hiding and modularization is appropriate, and it is explained and justified in documentation. The file structure corresponds to the class structure (2 p)

The class structure is poorly implemented. It appears that the group has chosen to place all of the needed files under one directory. The main concern is the naming of the corresponding files. These choices makes it difficult for an outsider to fully understand the project structure. (1/2p)

C1.3: Use of at least one external library (in addition to C++ standard library). Comment the appropriateness of libraries and their use. (2 p)

Yes, the group uses at least Qt's library in addition to the standard library. (2/2p)

C2.1: Git is used appropriately (e.g., commits are logical and frequent enough, commit logs are descriptive) (2 p)

Git is used appropriately. (2/2p)

C2.2: Make or Cmake (recommended) is used appropriately. The software should build easily using these tools without additional tricks. Nevertheless, instructions for building the project should be provided (1 p)

Group uses qmake and make for compiling the project. Unfortunately we failed to compile the project due to a broken master (error: missing some resources files). (1/1p)

C2.3: Work is distributed and organised well, everyone has a relevant role that matches his/her skills and contributes project (the distribution of roles needs to be described) (1 p)

Work appears to be distributed and organised well. Everyone seem to have a relevant role in their project. (1/1p)

C2.4: Issue tracker is used appropriately to assign new features and bug fixes (1 p)

Issue tracking is not used appropriately since the group has chosen not to use it at all. (0/1p)

C2.5: Testing and quality assurance is appropriately done and documented. There should be a systematic method to ensure functionality (unit tests, valgrind for memory safety, separate test software and/or something else.) (1 p)

No, there is no testing or quality assurance policies done nor documented. (0/1p)

C3.1: C++ containers are used appropriately (including appropriate use of iterators), and justified (e.g., why certain type of container over another) (2 p)

Group uses c++ containers, or at least vector. We didn't find any justifications or descriptions why only vector container is used. (1/2p)

C3.2: Smart pointers are used in memory management, describe how (1 p)

If we missed the use of smart pointers. However, we didn't go through every single line in each individual cpp or hpp file. (0/1p)

C3.3: C++ exception handling is used appropriately, describe how (1 p)

We didn't find any evidence of using some sort of exception handling. Therefore (0/1p)

C3.4: Rule of three / rule of five is followed, describe how (1 p)

No use of the rule of three/ rule of five. (0/1p)

C3.5: Dynamic binding and virtual classes/functions are used, describe how (1 p)

No use of dynamic binding and virtual classes. (0/1p)

Other comments and feedback to the evaluated project group.

Well done, carry on! Difficult to review this project since we were not able to build the project properly.

If you did this review together with (some of) your group members, list the names of the group members here. Everyone needs to turn in a review, either separately or as a group.

Sakari & Santeri

[Protection of privacy](#) | [Service description](#)  
**mycourses(at)aalto.fi**



Hi! Jussi Hietanen (Log out)  
ELEC-A7150\_1130165667

Schools

[School of Arts, Design, and Architecture \(ARTS\)](#)

[School of Business \(BIZ\)](#)

[School of Chemical Engineering \(CHEM\)](#)

[- Guides for students \(CHEM\)](#)

[- Instructions for report writing \(CHEM\)](#)