Peer Code Review Summary
DIME Analytics, August 2022

Principal Investigator: ██████████████

Research Assistant: ████████████████████████████

Software used: R

Project diagnostic

WAS REVIEWER ABLE TO RUN THE CODE?

ALL CODE RUNS AS IS

DID OUTPUTS REPRODUCE?

ALL OUTPUTS REPRODUCED

WAS REVIEWER ABLE TO UNDERSTAND THE CODE?

YES, PROJECT MATERIAL WAS ENOUGH

HOW EASY IS IT TO MAINTAIN THE CODE?

CODE IS EASY TO MAINTAIN

HOW MANY DAYS WOULD IT TAKE FOR REVIEWER TO UNDERSTAND THE CODE WELL ENOUGH TO CONTRIBUTE TO IT?

1

Code feedback

Code strengths: for some sections.

Areas for improvement: seem to be much faster and easier options to get a TeX output in most of the cases. The packages allow for enough flexibility with regression analysis that is performed in one of the scripts.

Additional feedback:

Adoption of best practices

	Not applicable	Not used	Can improve a lot	Can improve a little	Perfectly implemented
Master script	○	○	○	○	●
Folder organization	○	○	○	○	●
Code organization	○	○	○	○	●
Use of documentation	○	○	○	○	●
Use of comments	○	○	○	●	○
Use of loops	○	●	○	○	○
Use of white space	○	○	○	●	○
Naming conventions	○	○	○	○	●
Use of functions (abstraction)	○	○	○	○	●

i2i
DIME
TRANSFORM DEVELOPMENT

WORLD BANK GROUP

DIME
analytics