

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 to the code you review - please cross-out any non-relevant part.

1. Informative naming of the script? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____

Script Meta-Information

2. Information is provided at top of the script? ☐ 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 script is explained? ☐ yes ☐ 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? ☐ yes ☐ not really because: _____
10. Required other software is explained? ☐ yes ☐ not really because: _____
11. Informative header is well formatted? ☐ yes ☐ not really because: _____
12. All necessary details provided?
- ☐ Yes, I understand its aim and needed input
 - ☐ No, I need to check the script carefully
 - ☐ just some parts are provided.
- 13a. What do you think until now what the output/results will be? Describe it briefly:

Actual Code for the Analysis

- 13b. Well commented? horrible ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ fantastic
remarks: _____
- 13b. Ratio of Comments vs. Code? horrible ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ fantastic
14. The code can be redone without any fixes? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
- 14b. Data can be retrieved without contact the author? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
- 14b. Data import is generic (no full paths, direct import possible)? yes ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ no
15. Code follows a logical structure? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
16. Code only includes useful information? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
17. Script can be run easily on other data sets (generic code)? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
18. Appropriate use of commands - no unnecessary detours? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____
- 18b. Novel code not covered in the course is used? a lot ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ just known commands
- 18b. The script triggered interest and you learned new things? yes, a lot ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ no, not a bit

19a. Please describe what was special/interesting:

19b. Script is fast (based on performance measures) yes ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ no

20a. Which parts should be improved?

20b. Data handling and transformation is coherent and well commented? yes ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ no

21a. What is missing?

Graphs and Maps

22. Graphs or Maps are providing key messages? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____

23. Plots/Maps are self-explanatory? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____

24. Graphs or Maps include all necessary items? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____

24b. Plots/maps are not overloaded? yes, clean ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ no, totally cluttered

24b. Plots/maps are informative? yes ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ no

24b. Plots/maps layout is consistent? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____

24b. Plots/maps have appropriate colour scheme? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____

24b. Maps have scale bars, legend, coordinates? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____

24b. Maps include landmarks, cities, roads for orientation? ☐ absolutely ☐ not really because: _____

Overall Impression

Please evaluate the following parts

25a. Readability horrible ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ fantastic

25b. Information horrible ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ fantastic

25c. Aim horrible ☐—☐—☐—☐—☐ fantastic

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

☐ yes

☐ no

☐ needs some more work

☐ details: _____

27. Is the script really worth the effort? ☐ Yes, totally. ☐ Probably not. ☐ Don't know.

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

☐ yes, would love to

☐ No clue. I just can't figure it out. So sorry.

☐ yes, definitely parts of it.

29a. Please describe your impression.

30a. When you check your anticipated results/output (Q 13) at the beginning - where you expectations met? and if no, why not:

30b. What do you especially like about this script:

30b. What do you especially dislike about this script:
