Lab 6: Code peer review

Dhyey Mavani

September 16, 2021

1. Pair up!

Say Hello! If you know each other, catch up for a few minutes. If you don't know each other, introduce yourselves. What is your favorite season and why?

Use Campuswire to DM each other your `Lab03-wrangle-tidy.Rmd` file

> Note: *While GitHub makes it easy to share files, I want you to keep your repositories private/unshared with other students. So, please send each other an email with your `lab03_wrangle-tidy.Rmd` file attached.*

2. Review your partners lab with an eye on functionality, readability, and documentation.

Follow the coding assessment criteria for the calendar assignment to review your partner's code in terms of *functionality* (does it execute without error? is it reproducible on your machine? does it produce the expected output?), *readability* (is the code easy to read/follow? is the formatting consistent?), and *documentation* (are there any comments? are they useful/add value/help explain what particular code is doing?).

Provide comments in *this* `lab06` rmd file.

It is helpful if you refer to specific line numbers when referring to particular lines of code. It is beneficial to each of you to be critical in your review – better for your peer to point out errors, disorganization or confusions in your code now, then for the instructor to identify them in the calendar assignment!

Did your partner go about wrangling the data in the same way you had, or did they use a different "order of operations"? Did they use any functions you were unfamiliar with?

Remember to use appropriate formatting for inline code and code chunks.

3. Share your comments!

Knit this document with your comments, and respond to your partner's DM with this pdf. If you have extra time, discuss your respective strategies for tackling the wrangling with each other.

FEEDBACK

Please take these comments with a grain of salt. I agree to the fact that I am not that experienced person to give feedback, but I did my best to reflect on this piece of work. Sorry, and please forgive me if I am being too critical!

Functionality

The code runs well till 2.3

Later the Problem 3 shows errors.

Although the code is showing sense of understanding and logic there are some complications and signs of lengthiness to the code.

Maybe I would recommend you to think on making code more concise by using the minimal functionality possible in order to reduce the run time and space also.

Readability

The code is well documented and organised in the sense of braces and spacing from clarity and general organization.

Code is very easy to follow as there are explicit steps even in each part.

But, in my opinion, you should define less intermediate tables as possible because not only it stores memory but it makes code bulky and hard to follow through the data sets like from where we selected and from where we filtered and all.

Documentation

This is included in questions themselves as said by professor