Code Review: Laserschnitt (21.02.2022)

1. About the code:
Associated user stories:
032_Laserschnitt_Auftrag_Bestätigen
063_Laserschnitt_Bugfixes
Iteration reviewed: 5
Code authors: Simon
Reviewed by: Simon, Jannik
Date: 21.02.2022
Language: Python, Javascript, HTML
Files: api/views.py, client/views.py, client/static/produktauswahl/laserschnitt/app.js, client/templates/produktauswahl/produktauswahl_laserschnitt.html, client/templates/include/laserschnitt/card.html
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
There are manual tests
☐ The code passes them

3. Design

☐ The code is complete (according to its associated user stories)
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. General code comments:
Style:
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
☐ All input is validated
Error handling:
☐ Error conditions are routinely handled
Structure:
✓ There is no redundant code
▼ There is no copy paste programming
5. Statement-level review
OI OWNIGHT HOUSE HOUSE

File	Line	Issue
api/views.py	158	missing validation of some input values
api/views.py	172	uses fixed size values (`size_width`, `size_height`)
client/templates/produktauswahl/produktauswahl_laserschnitt.html	70	placeholder text

6. Follow-up

Conclusion:

☐ Code OK

Rework and verify

Rework and re-review

- · Fix problems mentioned in Statement-level review
- Improve server-side input validation
- Fix static type checking issues after models are refactored
- Refactor backend functionality to improve readability and maintainability

Record the outcome of the review here:

- Fixed Statement-level review problems
- Reworked code, improving the passing of data between frontend and backend, and enhancing the structure of the code itself
- Adapted code to new models, cleaning up now obsolete parts of the code
- Fixed server-side input validation and slightly improved client-side validation as well

Complete work by: Simon Jungherz