Group 34 Code Review

Category	Description	Reviewer's Comment	Action taken by Reviewed Group
Build	Could you clone from Git and build using the README file?	README could use some extra polishing. While I was able to get the project to build in the end, I needed help external to the README to get it working. What I'd suggest also having in the README is that the project must be built on OSU ENGR servers. I had trouble figuring out why I was getting permission errors because of this. The README could also use an example test case such that the user has a physical piece of code to reference off of when testing.	
Legibility	Was the flow sane and were variable names and methods easy to follow? Does the code adhere to general guidelines and code style?	Code is readable. Code correctly stays consistent with the style it is adhering to (underscored variables). Majority of the code is properly indented and spaced out such that there are little to none blobs of code making the file difficult to read. However there are some codes not properly indented, noticeably, in the JS files. This isn't too much of a problem but for readability sake should be fixed whenever.	
Implementation	is it shorter/easier/ faster/cleaner/ safer to write functionally equivalent code? Do you see useful abstractions?	Project implementation is implemented in an efficient and simple manner. I did notice the project uses Links for it's routing. The links route without using the "exact to." Maybe consider using "exact to /" for the homepage as routing to "/" only would catch anything that has "/."	
Maintainability	Are there unit tests? Should there be? Are the test	Based on the GitHub link provided, there are a small amount of unit tests available. The user should provide their	

	covering interesting cases? Are they readable?	own test cases to test the application robustly however. Likewise, the project provides detailed documentation for testing so testing the application shouldn't be too much of a problem.	
Requirements	Does the code fulfill the requirements?	Requirements meet what is described in the requirements PDF.	
Other	Are there other things that stand out that can be improved?	I'd also suggest, for usability sakes, using NPM instead of yarn if the project is intended to persist only on OSU ENGR servers since OSU ENGR servers have NPM installed but not yarn. It's a small gripe and can be disregarded if the project doesn't intend to stay only on OSU ENGR servers. It's a small detail but it is important to let the users know. Outside of this, I think the project is in a good state.	