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| 1 | D\_02 | \*Validator | Some conditions are redundant (eg: “ tema.getDeadline() < tema.getStartline()” was checked before by another if branch). |
| 2 | D\_01 | StudentXMLRepository |  |
| 3 | D\_01 | AbstractCRUDRepository/38 | Should not print in the repository layer. |
| 4 | D\_01 |  | Exceptions should be handled better than just by printing the stack trace (there are multiple examples in different files). |
| 5 | D\_01 | NotaXMLRepository/55 | The algorithm used in the method is very unclear, inefficient, unmaintainable and should be rewritten. |
| 6 | D\_07 |  | There shouldn’t be commented pieces of code in the program. (eg: NotaXMLRepository/82). |
| 7 | D\_01 | AbstractCRUDRepository | Validators should not be used in the Repository layer. (instead, they should be used in the service layer) |
| 8 | D\_07 | Service | Methods should return boolean or enums, instead of int values for undefined codes (eg: line 47). |
| 9 | D\_07 |  | There is a mix of Romanian and English in many files. |
| 10 | D\_01 | Service/107 | The method logic (related to the week of the year part) is vague and should be rewritten. |
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