

Respondent: **Elias Seeve** Submitted on: Monday, 31 August 2020, 3:36 PM

Project evaluation form

1 * Name of the group being evaluated

micro-machines-2020-1

2 * Names of the persons authoring this evaluation

Elias, Niklas, Saku, Antti

3 Proposed grade for Design category (15%)

4

4 * Verbal evaluation for Design category, to justify grade.

Use of libraries is good, class structure is well documented, but abstract classes or inheritance are not used. Also, some header files and code files are unstructured and messy.

5 Proposed grade for Working practices category (15%)

5

6 * Verbal evaluation for Working practices category, to justify grade.

Git is used correctly and documentation includes a detailed work log. Unit testing is implemented and documented.

7 Proposed grade for Implementation category (20%)

3

8 * Verbal evaluation for Implementation category, to justify grade

The software includes build scripts for windows and linux, and basic operation seems to work fine. Smart pointers are not used and some class destructors are obsolete, but there are no memory leaks.

9 Proposed grade for Features category (40%)

5

10 * Verbal evaluation for Features category, to justify grade.

All basic features are implemented and many advanced features as well, such as networking multiplayer, simple AI, many editors like map and tile editor and weapons.