Category	Description	Reviewers' Comments	Actions taken by Group
Build	Could you clone from Git and build using the README file?	"Yes and the README does a good job of describing how to build this project and what packages must be installed beforehand" "I was unable to build the project. I had difficulty installing Gym, and Mujoco requires a license." "I was able to successfully cloned the project from Git, however, I was unable to build the entire project. I think the README file is well written and listed all of the necessary steps for first-time setup. The main reason I got stuck was that the MoJoCo stimulator requires a license." "Build appears to work from group demonstration." "Following instructions via the README file, I was able to get most dependencies setup, but not the full blown project. This project is very complex and pulls from many different sources, repos, and libraries, however. Specifically, I got stuck when trying to install MuJoCo 2.0. A license is required for this library. Further, the instructions were helpful and detailed, but limited to one specific development environment, Ubuntu. I have a Windows machine so this caused some confusion and extra Googling unfortunately. Due to this particular project (high complexity), I wouldn't expect someone to easily clone this git repo and build the project. To reiterate, the instructions were great, but I ended up getting stuck because of a license issue and a few dependencies (I would expect this because of the complexity)." "Yes, I clone and run it success."	**Since my project requires a paid license, it is to be expected that none of my peers were able to build the project. I gave a demonstration which proves the code runs, and walked through some of the functionality. In the README, I also outline steps for obtaining a free license, though nobody seemed to have tried that.**

Legibility	Was the flow sane and were variable names and methods easy to follow? Does the code adhere to general guidelines and code style?	“Yes, code seems logically laid out. However, a few more comments might be beneficial.” “Due to the complexity of the project, it was difficult to follow. I would suggest adding more comments.” “The code style looks clean and easy to follow. The variable names and methods seem relevant to the topic of the project. One thing I would suggest is to add some comments to the important sections of the code for people to review the code easier.” “Code follows general guidlines and is easy to follow. Most abstractions come from frameworks, which is to be expected.” “After inspecting the “qbn.py” file, I found it fairly easy to follow along based on consistent code style and general guidelines. Although I have extremely limited experience with pytorch, the structure of the code is excellent which makes it easier to follow. Additionally, Python conventions for importing libraries, defining functions, and instantiating variables are on point. On the other hand, I would have liked to see a few more comments (at least a brief overview of the functions and some in-line comments). Overall, the code is very legible and clean because the flow is sane, the variable names and methods are easy to follow, and the code adheres to the general guidelines and code style.” “Almost method name is easy to know. But some variable name is the small pieces of code like in the for-loop and if is not easy to read. Using the short name like c,h,x is very common in machine learning project. But I hold view that it should add some comment about it. In conclusion, they do a good job although have some not prefect.”	**The biggest piece of feedback I saw across the board was that my code was missing comments. I have since added a variety of high-level comments to all the relevant files, and think that this should make my code much easier to follow.**

Implementation	Is it shorter/easier/faster/ cleaner/ safer to write functionally equivalent code? Do you see useful abstractions?	“It seems that everything is already abstracted about as much as it can be without going overboard with it.” “Code as clean. I wasn’t able to find any useful abstractions.” “I was not sure if any cleanups were needed since I didn’t fully understand the code of the entire project. Like I mentioned above, any comments would make it more readable.” “Given the project's significant focus on frameworks to develop ML models (which is what was expected) there is not much room for improvement in terms of code structure or abstractions.” “I wasn’t able to find any useful abstractions for this code. This code appears to be very clean, efficient, short, fast, and safe. Perhaps if I had more experience with pytorch, I would be able to offer potential alternatives to make the code run more efficiently, but I do not unfortunately.” “I think they can put the output/input in a big class. But not combined it in the algorithm.”	**None of my peers found any glaringly obvious abstractions, so I think I did an ok job at this. I did not take any action on this point.**

Requirements	Are there unit tests? Should there be? Is the test covering interesting cases? Are they readable?	“I don't believe any unit tests were included but it doesn't really make sense to use them in the context of this project” “There don’t appear to be unit tests. Based on the walkthrough they don’t seem necessary.” “I was unable to find any unit tests on the Git repo. I think having unit tests would be a good way to prevent any unexpected changes.” “Unit tests do not appear present, but would likely not be a good fit for the nature of the project, which would focus more on managing data and optimizing model results.” “After sifting through the entire repo, I was unable to find any unit tests. I think that there technically could be unit tests for “qbn.py”, but it would be too cumbersome to make the tests worth the effort based on the walk-through of the project.” “It seems have a test class, but it seems not a standard unit test.”	**Most of my peers agree with me that a research project does not really need unit tests. I did not take any actions on this point.**

Requirements	Does the code fulfill the requirements?	“Yes. This project meet all the criteria described in the Requirements document in a clean and useful manner.” “No, the project seems to be well done. Code demonstrates great effort.” “The code mostly fulfilled the requirements except for tests which were stated in the initial requirement document.” “The code appears to fulfil its requirements, however the nature of the project means that it can not be adequately evaluated by simply examining the code.” “Yes, the code fulfills the requirements written in the requirements document.” “Almost fulfill the requirement document.”	**My peers agree with me that the code fulfills the requirements.**