**Peer Evaluation for GridWorld**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Your name |  |
| ID of submission |  |

For each of the following, provide a score on a 1-5 point scale. 1 being very poor, 5 being outstanding. For each give constructive feedback .

**Data Decomposition/Organization:**  How well does the code organize the data structures? Do the members of structs for example have clear logical relationships to each other?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| score |  |
| feedback |  |

**Functional Decomposition:**  Is the code decomposed into logically coherent subroutines/functions? Can the expected behavior of functions be easily understood (or inferred) with minimal examination of the body of the function (i.e., abstraction has been done welll)? Are functions of appropriate length?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| score |  |
| feedback |  |

**Naming:**  Were good names chosen for variables, functions and types? Are there cases where the type of word used (e.g., noun, verb, adjective, etc.) seems to not fit the meaning of the item? Is a plural form used when the singular form makes better sense (or vice-versa)? Are some names too long? Is there some kind of consistency in naming conventions?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| score |  |
| feedback |  |

**Formatting:**  Is the code appropriately indented? Is the formatting consistent?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| score |  |
| feedback |  |

**Comments/Documentation:**  Are comments used appropriately and actually add to understanding? Are the comments clear ,unambiguous and concise? There is such a thing as over-commenting; does this submission suffer in this way? For example:

int a = 7;

a++; // add one to a

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| score |  |
| feedback |  |

**Runtime Requirements:**  To what degree does the code appear to meet the runtime requirements? Your answer may be “code too hard to understand to determine if runtime requirements are met” or similar.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| score |  |
| feedback |  |