

Code Evaluation questionnaire

this document aims to provide a guideline how to evaluate (R) code in my course

Please note: not all item might be applicable - please cross-out any non-relevant part.

1. Informative naming of the file(s)/package/commands?

☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____

Meta-Information

2. Meta-information does exist? ☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Authors name: _____

4. Contact details are provided (email, URL, git)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Date of development is listed? ☐ Yes ☐ No

6. Main purpose of the analysis is explained? ☐ yes ☐ not really because: _____

7. Needed input is defined? (format incl. which information are requirede.g. shp with column of type x and content of y) ☐ yes ☐ not really because: _____

8. Output is defined? (incl. explanations, format etc.) ☐ yes ☐ not really because: _____

9. R version used and R packages needed are listed? ☐ yes ☐ not really because: _____

10. Operating system used is listed or on which one it has been tested? ☐ yes ☐ no

11. Required other software is explained? ☐ yes ☐ not really because: _____

12. Informative header is well formatted? ☐ yes ☐ not really because: _____

13. All necessary details are provided?

- ☐ Yes, I understand its aim and needed input
☐ No, I need to check the script carefully
☐ just some parts are provided.

14. What do you think until now what the output/results will be? Describe it briefly before checking the actual script:

Actual Code for the Analysis

15. Data import is generic? (no full paths, direct import possible) yes ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ no

16. Well commented? horrible ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ fantastic

remarks: _____

17. Ratio of Comments vs. Code is adequate? horrible ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ fantastic

18. Easy to read? (appropriate indentation and spacing) horrible ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ fantastic

19. The script is written for generic data analysis? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____

20. Does the code require a rigid data structure? (e.g. specific column names in data.frame)

☐ absolutely ☐ no, quite flexible

21. Is the code flexible? (i.e allows inputs of different data types)

☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____

22. Data can be retrieved without contacting the author?

☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____

23. Code follows a logical structure? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
24. Analysis only includes relevant codes? (no code output which is not used afterwards) ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
25. Are the derived variables self-explanatory? (e.g. through clear variable names and/or comments) ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
26. A standard documentation structure/naming convention is applied? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
27. The analysis can be run easily on other data sets? (generic code) ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
28. Appropriate use of commands - no unnecessary complex code snippets? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
29. (If a function) is provided: are example code/data provided/explained? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
30. Does the code minimize the storage of data? (e.g. removal of unused variables) ☐ yes ☐ no
31. Does the code minimize the use of RAM?(e.g. appropriate subsetting, no re-reading data) ☐ yes ☐ no
32. Data handling and transformation is coherent and well commented? yes ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ no
33. Novel code not covered in the course is used? a lot ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ just known commands
34. Script is actually a package? ☐ yes ☐ no
35. Proper documentation (manual pages) is provided for this package? ☐ yes ☐ no

Code Impression

36. The script triggered interest and you learned new things? yes, a lot ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ no, not a bit
37. Please describe what was special/interesting:
- _____
- _____
- _____
38. Script is fast (based on performance measures) yes ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ no
39. The code can be executed without any fixes? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
40. Which parts should be improved?
- _____
- _____
- _____
41. What is missing?
- _____
- _____
- _____

Graphs and Maps

42. Graphs or Maps are providing key messages? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
43. Plots/Maps are self-explanatory? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
44. Plots/maps are informative? yes ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ no
45. Graphs include all necessary items? (legend, axis title etc.) ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____

46. Plots/maps are not overloaded? yes, clean ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ no, totally cluttered
47. Plots/maps layout is consistent through-out the script?
☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
48. Plots/maps have appropriate colour scheme? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
49. Maps have scale bars, legend, coordinates? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
50. Maps include landmarks, cities, roads for orientation?
☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
-

Overall Impression

Please evaluate the following parts

51. Readability horrible ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ fantastic
52. Information horrible ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ fantastic
53. Structure horrible ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ fantastic
54. Innovation horrible ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ fantastic

55. Do you think it qualifies for being scientifically reproducible?

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no
- ☐ needs some more work: _____

56. Is the code really worth the effort for you to check it out?

- ☐ Yes, totally. ☐ Probably not. ☐ Don't know.

57. Would you be interested to use this script for your analysis?

- ☐ yes, would love to
- ☐ no, not really anything I couldn't do myself
- ☐ yes, definitely parts of it.
- ☐ No clue what is does. I just can't figure it out.

58. Please describe your impression:

59. When you check your anticipated results/output (Q 14) at the beginning - are your expectations met? and if no, why not:

60. What do you especially like about this script:

61. What do you especially dislike about this script:
