# Code Review: Materialkauf (02.02.2022)

## 1. About the code:

Associated user stories:

- 035\_Material-Einkauf\_Auftrag\_bestätigen
- 034\_Material-Einkauf
- 049 Hinzufuegen von Materialbildern
- 036\_Material-Einkauf\_Kostenapproximation

Iteration reviewed: 4

Code authors: Frederick Wichert

Reviewed by: Frederick Wichert, Jonas Milkovits

Date: 02.02.2022

Language: Python, HTML, Javascript

Files: client/views.py, client/templates/produktauswahl/materialkauf/produktauswahl\_materialkauf.html, client/templates/include/materialkauf/material\_card.html, client/static/include/materialkauf/app.js,

## 2. Automated inspections:

- Code has no static type checking errors
- ▼ The code starts without errors
- ▼ The code starts without warnings
- The code is kept under source control

# Testing: Tests cover edge cases Test have been peer reviewed All inputs are sanitised and validated There are unit tests They are sufficient The code passes them

☐ The code passes them

3. Design	
The code is complete (according to its associated user stor	<del>ries)</del>
There is a good choice of algorithms	
✓ Code performance is acceptable	
☐ Any missing functionality is marked clearly in the code	
Maintainability:	
The code is easy to read	
The code method/class is not too long	
☐ The code is well structured	
☐ There is design documentation	
☐ The code matches the documentation	
Best practices:	
✓ There is a reasonable amount of comments (only relevant	comments)
☐ No magic values (at least no undocumented ones)	,
4.0	
4. General code comments:	
Style:	
Style:  The code layout is clear	
☐ The code layout is clear	
☐ The code layout is clear  ✓ It follows project style guidelines	
<ul> <li>☐ The code layout is clear</li> <li>✓ It follows project style guidelines</li> <li>✓ There is a good choice of names</li> </ul>	
☐ The code layout is clear  ✓ It follows project style guidelines  ✓ There is a good choice of names  Defensive programming:	
☐ The code layout is clear  ✓ It follows project style guidelines  ✓ There is a good choice of names  Defensive programming:  ✓ There is a correct choice of types/datastructures	
<ul> <li>☐ The code layout is clear</li> <li>✓ It follows project style guidelines</li> <li>✓ There is a good choice of names</li> <li>Defensive programming:</li> <li>✓ There is a correct choice of types/datastructures</li> <li>☐ All input is validated</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>☐ The code layout is clear</li> <li>☑ It follows project style guidelines</li> <li>☑ There is a good choice of names</li> <li>☑ There is a correct choice of types/datastructures</li> <li>☐ All input is validated</li> <li>Error handling:</li> <li>☐ Error conditions are routinely handled</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>☐ The code layout is clear</li> <li>✓ It follows project style guidelines</li> <li>✓ There is a good choice of names</li> <li>Defensive programming:</li> <li>✓ There is a correct choice of types/datastructures</li> <li>☐ All input is validated</li> </ul> Error handling:	

# 5. Statement-level review

File	Line	Issue	Rating
client/views.py	38	remove test object data	
/material_card.html	16	replace hard coded thicknesses with database thicknesses	

# 6. Follow-up

Conclusion:

☐ Code OK

Rework and verify

☐ Rework and re-review

- remove console.log's
- replace magic numbers in slicing with variables
- improve error handling

## Record the outcome of the review here:

Complete work by: Frederick Wichert