

Project Tech Peer Review

peer review for assessment 1

Reviewer	Christiaan Braun
Reviewee	Bas Vughts
Class	Tech_2
Teacher	Danny de Vries

Checklist

Source code is available on GitHub	J
Project is documented and has a readme.md	J
Cites the sources used; code comments or docs	J
Research is documented in the wiki	J
A live version is deployed and linked in description	N

Project install




Git clone the repository of your fellow student and install it following the installation guidelines from the readme. Can you get it up and running? Does the readme.md miss essential information?

Yes, the project works without technical problems!	X
Kinda, the project runs but gives errors.	




Werkt perfect, geen problemen gehad	
-------------------------------------	--

1. Concept

Job Story & Requirements List

 <p>There is no concept and idea on what to build, it's vague and lacks specificity</p>	→	 <p>You've written a good job story, there is a clear concept and there are additional requirements</p>	→	 <p>You've researched other applications and implemented design patterns and insights in your own project</p>
--	---	--	---	--

Interface (wireframes)

 <p>The wireframe and screens are incomplete (no states, flow is unclear)</p>	→	 <p>The wireframes give a clear idea on how the feature looks; there are different states and the flow is understandable</p>	→	 <p>The wireframes and interface as whole are well thought out</p>
--	---	---	---	---

Comments

Ik kan nergens een duidelijke omschrijving van het concept vinden. De wireframe is goed opgebouwd alleen er zijn geen states.

2. Research

Is there any documentation on the git strategy?	N
Is there any documentation on the local dev environment?	J
Is there any documentation on deploying and production?	N

😞 There is no technical research in the wiki or it's very minimal (no images, not much text)	→	😄 You researched technical terms and concepts related to web tech and documented them clearly in you wiki	→	😄 You describe the technical choices you made and can offer alternatives for chosen technology
---	---	--	---	---

Comments

Je zou wat meer afbeeldingen kunnen gebruiken. Dit helpt bij het visualiseren van de stof die je uitlegt.

3. Application

🙄 The feature partially works but is not complete; incomplete flow	→	😄 The feature completely works and is usable from a user experience point of view	→	😄 The user experience is fantastic and the feature is complex. You took special care of your interface and your user
---	---	--	---	---

Comments

Je kunt iemand liken maar daarna loopt het vast en kan je niet nog meer mensen zoeken/likken.


4. Quality

Does the readme.md cover what the project does? (concept)	J
Are there any linters installed and used in the project?	J
Is version control user properly? Commits early and often.	J

Code quality

🙄 There is a distinction between ES5 versus ES6, there are code comments throughout the code	→	😄 The code is readable and consistent, uses modern JavaScript syntax and uses a linter to adhere to code standards	→	😄 Code quality is good and enforced, the project is structured logically
---	---	---	---	---

Documentation



Comments

Documentatie kan nog wel iets uitgebreider maar het meeste staat er. Code is netjes en leesbaar alleen soms nog uitgecommente code.