



Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoepp@gmail.com>

How Sage development should proceed: II. Review Standards

1 message

Matthias Koepp <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
To: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Tue, Apr 23, 2024 at 11:30 AM

Hi sage-conduct committee:
In our meeting on Monday we didn't have much time for the question
"How Sage development should proceed".
Here are my thoughts. In this second email, I'll focus on the topic of
review standards.

2. It's necessary to review / refine / affirm our review standards.
(<https://doc.sagemath.org/html/en/developer/review.html>)

a. The burden of proof is on those who propose changes to the status quo.

This is important to affirm because trying to reverse this burden, and
demanding that reviewers do work to justify the status quo, has been
at the core of many of the "disputes". (I can provide many examples.)
I raised this previously in
<https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36726#issuecomment-1847870000>

b. The importance of keeping PRs and their review narrowly focused.

Bundling unrelated changes in one PR, and bundling unrelated topics in
the review of a PR, has been at the core of many of the "disputes". (I
can provide many examples.)
I raised this previously in
<https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36726#issuecomment-1871441132>

c. A clarification of the role of reviewers in relation to authors.

PRs are not the place for power games.

d. The importance of shipping quickly what is good enough.

Often even simple changes, for example to our installation
instructions, don't make it into a release because of over-the-top
demands by reviewers. Refinements are always possible later.

Matthias

--

Dr. Matthias Koepp <http://www.math.ucdavis.edu/~mkoeppe>
Professor of Mathematics