

Code Review

Anurag - SortData Refactor

December 2, 2019

1 Roles

Author: Anurag

Other Attendees: Braunson, Evan, Mesa

2 Objectives

3 Scoring

Provide a rating from 1 - 5.

1 - Work has room for improvement

3 - Work was done to an acceptable standard

5 - The work went above and beyond expectations

Criteria	Score
Completeness: (completed to the full scope of the requirements)	4
Concise: (the purpose is achieved without undue complication)	5
Documentation (Including author):	4
Structure/organization: (does the work flow well, are components grouped logically?)	5
Modularity:	5
Follows code style:	5

4 Notes

What was done well? Documentation was done well, pre and post-conditions for everything new.

All date string formats were tested.

Other notes:

5 List of Defects

Lines 203-212 and 214-223 are basically doing the exact same thing, these should probably be abstracted into a singular function.

The unit tests don't intermix various date formats, so we can't be sure that the system is robust if it finds different date formats in the same column

Some negative testing is missing for the isValid method

Look for date key can get to the end of the function without returning anything. This should probably be changed to throw an error if that happens.

The checks if the data is sorted don't actually check that it's sorted, they just test that the data is different.

Line 198 allows a key to be type 'any' this should be changed to string.

Asserts should be used to make sure the key is never null or undefined.

The result of lookForDateKey should be stored