Summary of Code Review Feedback

1. **Build**
    a. Most reviews stated that the project was easy to get up and running but could have included more troubleshooting information in the readme. There were some issues with OAuth login functionality.
    b. We included more information on how to troubleshoot issues with installation and permission issues on the OSU servers. Updates were pushed to fix the permission errors in new projects for OAuth functionality along with instructions on how to contact us to get your server approved for OAuth redirects.
2. **Legibility**
    a. Overall most reviewers found our code easy to read and well organized. We got compliments on our file structure and folder names as well as our functions and variable names. We did receive a couple notes about styling in the javascript, which needs work with indentation and adding more comments
    b. We increased the amount of comments in the code making it easier to read, as well as running an automatic linter which fixes style issues in the code. While adding more features made our files longer and harder to understand, we kept our functions small, legible and well commented to make sure the code is still readable.
3. **Implementation**
    a. A few reviews remarked that our functions were a bit bloated in some places (especially our 3D code in js) but otherwise the reviews were positive. Our clean file structure and function abstraction resulted in a concise implementation.
    b. In response to the review about bloated functions in our javascript we made sure to split up the functions we could, and add more comments where functions couldn't be abstracted further. Most of the problems with messy code were in the js, as php helped keep the implementation clean and easy to read.
4. **Maintainability**
    a. All reviews were positive, but some mentioned the fact that there aren't unit tests and that they might not be needed.
    b. Since this is a web based project, unit tests aren't really the most applicable way to keep maintainability. The only problems we are worried about with maintainability are issues related to the database, which is hosted on the OSU ONID MySQL server. This allows us to access a visual

admin page where we can easily see the database and update the data as needed.

5. **Requirements**
    a. The main features lacking from our project at the time of the code review are mostly related to the editor UI such as hole placement as well as saving and loading projects. Most reviewers mentioned that some work was left to be done on the UI but the project looked close to finished.
    b. Before the code freeze we were able to complete hole placement and fix a lot of the bugs that were present at the code review. We were also able to finish implementing saving, loading, and deleting projects and making the projects viewable from the library screen.
6. **Other**
    a. Some reviews mentioned adding a tutorial page on the website, as well as an about page with information about the project and the team. Another reviewer talked about including instructions to run the project on a local device instead of the OSU servers.
    b. To incorporate these ideas we added more information on the homepage explaining some information about the team and the project as well as instructions on how to use it. We also added some information in the Github readme with ideas on how to run on a local machine and on what the OSU servers use for php.