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

	Informative naming of the script? □ absolutely □ not really because:
cri	pt Meta-Information
2.	Some information is provided at top of the script? \Box Yes \Box No
3.	Authors name:
4.	Contact details are provided (email, url, git)? \Box Yes \Box No
5 .	Date of development is listed? \Box Yes \Box No
6.	Main purpose of the script is explained? \Box yes \Box not really because:
7.	Needed input is defined? yes not really because:
8.	Output is defined? — yes — not really because:
9.	R version and R packages needed are listed? \Box yes \Box not really because:
10.	Required other software is explained?
11.	Informative header is well formatted? □ yes □ not really because:
12.	All necessary details provided?
	\square Yes, I understand its aim and needed input
	\square No, I need to check the script carefully
	□ just some parts are provided.
	checking the actual script:
	checking the actual script:
	ual Code for the Analysis Well commented? horrible ————————————————————————————————————
14.	ual Code for the Analysis Well commented? horrible ————————————————————————————————————
14. 15.	ual Code for the Analysis Well commented? horrible ————————————————————————————————————
14.15.16.	ual Code for the Analysis Well commented? horrible fantastic remarks: Ratio of Comments vs. Code? horrible fantastic The code can be redone without any fixes? absolutely not really because:
14. 15. 16. 17.	wal Code for the Analysis Well commented? horrible ————————————————————————————————————
14. 15. 16. 17.	ual Code for the Analysis Well commented? horrible fantastic remarks: Ratio of Comments vs. Code? horrible fantastic The code can be redone without any fixes? absolutely not really because:
14.15.16.17.18.19.	well commented? horrible ————————————————————————————————————
14.15.16.17.18.19.20.	well commented? horrible _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _
14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21.	well commented? horrible _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

	The script triggered interest and you learned new things? yes, a lot ————— no, not a bit Please describe what was special/interesting: Script is fast (based on peformance measures) yes ———— no Which parts should be improved?				
26a. Data handling and transformation is coherent and well commented? yes ——26b. What is missing?			commented? yes □—□—□—□ no		
Gra	phs and Ma	nps			
27.	Graphs or Maj	ps are providing key messages? \Box absolu	ttely 🗆 not really because:		
	• –		not really because:		
29. Graphs or Maps include all necessary items? □ absolutely □ not really 30. Plots/maps are not overloaded? yes, clean □—□—□—□ no, totally contains an end of the state of t			· ·		
			□—□ no, totally cluttered		
	Plots/maps are informative? yes □—□—□—□ no Plots/maps layout is consistent? □ absolutely □ not really because: Plots/maps have appropriate colour scheme? □ absolutely □ not really because:				
	, -	Aps have scale bars, legend, coordinates? □ absolutely □ not really because:			
35.	Maps include	landmarks, cities, roads for orientation?	□ absolutely □ not really because:		
					
Ove					
	e evaluate the fo				
		horrible —————— fantastic			
	Information	horrible ————————— fantastic			
	Aim	horrible \square — \square — \square fantastic			
39.	Do you think	it qualifies for being scientifically reprod	lucible?		
	□ yes				
	□ no	mana mank			
	□ needs some more work □ details:				
	uctais.				
40.	Is the script re	eally worth the effort? Yes, totally.	□ Probably not. □ Don't know.		
		interested to use this script for your an	V		
	-		□ yes, would love to		
			$\hfill\Box$ No clue. I just can't figure it		
			out. So sorry.		
			\Box yes, definitely parts of it.		

42.	Please describe your impression.				
43.	When you check your anticipated results/output (Q 13) at the beginning - where you expectations met? and if no, why not:				
44.	What do you especially like about this script:				
45.	What do you especially <u>dislike</u> about this script:				