Instruction for Peer Reviewer

As a peer reviewer, you need to observe your reviewee's demonstration and explanation of their weekly submission during the workshops, and write a review for each student in your group (excluding yourself). Your review needs to address the following:

1. Has your reviewee attempted and demonstrated the required exercises? (Yes or No)
2. Describe your reviewee's attempt and what's working and not working,
3. Describe the quality of your reviewee's submission, including:
    a. What is done well, and what could be better.
    b. The readability of the code.
4. Describe the quality (in your opinion) of your reviewee's demonstration and explanation of his/her work, including:
    a. Whether your reviewee's demonstration and explanation are easy for you to understand and follow.
    b. Whether your reviewee demonstrates good understanding of his/her submission.
5. Any other constructive comment that you think could help your reviewee improve his/her work (including their professionalism, what you've learnt from your reviewee's demonstration, or other praise/encouragements).

The review you write should show you have insight into your reivewee's work. If your review is generic, then you may lose mark (even receive 0) for your review.

Attempting the exercise (Q1)

For question 1, the review needs to state if the reviewee has **attempted** the required exercises. An attempt does not mean the solution is correct or works. The <u>minimum</u> your reviewee should have done is to have <u>similar</u> code as demonstrated in the videos for those tasks, made a start at tasks that are not demonstrated in the video (implement until they got stuck), present their work for peer review, and explain where (or why) they got stuck. If that is the case, then you answer should be a YES. Otherwise, NO.

If you are unsure whether you should write yes or no for question 1, ask your lab instructor.

Examples reviews

Reviewer's Name: [Redacted]

Reviewee 1: Peer A

1. Attempted exercises 1, 2, and 3. Consider adding type declarations to enhance clarity and structure.

2. Encountered an issue with comment display in part 3, which was resolved collaboratively. This troubleshooting process provided valuable insights into the

functionality of the Post class. Code readability is acceptable, but adding comments would improve understanding.

3. Demonstration was effective; the issue stemmed from a variable naming error ($comment vs $comments).

4. Submission met the required criteria and included a clear explanation of the code's functionality.

5. Suggest improving inline comments to aid future review and comprehension.

Reviewer's Name: [Redacted]

Reviewee 2: Peer B

1. Yes. Successfully completed and demonstrated tasks 1 through 4, including type declarations.

2. Tasks were visually similar but structurally distinct. All components functioned as intended. Code readability was good, though comments were missing.

3. High-quality submission with clear understanding and thorough explanations.

4. The explanation was easy to follow, and the peer demonstrated a solid grasp of the differences between tasks and the role of type declarations.

5. Recommend adding comments to clarify functions and classes. The use of visuals was appreciated.

Reviewer's Name: [Redacted]

Reviewee 2: Peer C

1. Yes completed, task 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

2. Key points: Get method posts directly to URL. Cannot maintain data integrity with databases. Talks about sanitisation and better method for handling user input so it doesn't. Shows an example of how putting a script into the input can lead to thins being run that really you don't want. Factorisation code has the appropriate error handling. 3 error types. Explains the code how the error handling works. Talking about how server-side validation is much stronger. Talking about the issues that David talked about in the lectures. Task 7 also completed.

3. Yes, it is done well and mostly clear and easy to follow. Not fully understanding some explanations but that is just due to my own learning. Core explanations are mostly easy to follow.

4. Yes. I was following, had some initial problems understanding the explanation of the input script problems but understood in the end. Able to explain error handling for task 5. Enthusiastic about the tasks and trying to explain extra information.

5.Thanks for your work and extra information. Working well!

Reviewer's Name: [Redacted]

Reviewee 2: Peer D

1. Yes

2. Has a clear understanding of the limits of client-side input through the GET method. Changes the values through the URL. Shows how the GET method is setting variables and displaying as HTML in code file. Showed all the error handling working for task 3. With appropriate explanation for how the checking is handled in the code.

3. Quality is good. Easy to understand explanations. Task 4/5 error input handled well. All the code follows videos from lectures. Has implemented 3 different types of errors. Collapsed the search form into a single field. Understands how it is working and explains it clearly.

4. Good quality work and easy to follow. Followed the instructions as they have been written in the task. I found the general explanations easy to follow and as far as I can tell you have done everything that has been asked.

5. You've done well. Keep going!

Reviewer's Name: [Redacted]

Reviewee 2: Peer E

1. No,
2. Tasks 2, 3, and 4 were executed well following all the requirements excellently. Task 5 was not attempted
3. Understanding of GET method is done well, and all code is concise and well formatted. This task could be done better by ensuring use of if statements prevent error outputs being present on screen, aswell as accomplishing task 5.
4. The demonstrations was easy to follow. The individual understands the inner workings of forms and input validation very well.
5. To improve on the task, copying the task 4+5 file to make task 5 file easier to accomplish, without having to re clone the repo would prove beneficial and could potentially aid in the completion of task 5. Understanding how if statements work in regards to error validation would improve the submission.

Reviewer's Name: [Redacted]

Reviewee 2: Peer F

1. No. She is on her halfway.
2. Her Index function, edit form screen, and create Item screen worked properly, but she hasn't completed Edit function, delete function yet. About Index and edit screen, they worked perfectly.
3. Her code has high readability, and I can easily read her code. But it could be better if you complete all CURD function and do a little bit adjustment for your code.
4. She demonstrated she did her work herself and she understands what the error is, and which code has to be fixed, it means she has good understanding for her code. Also, her explanation was clear.
5. GOOD WORK!