

# Repository Analysis Report

## for [dft\\_organizer](#)



- Repository Name: [dft\\_organizer](#)
- Owner: [alinzh](#)
- Created at: 26.06.2025 15:53

Statistics	Values
Stars Count	1
Forks Count	2
Issues Count	1

Metric	Values
README Presence	✓
License Presence	✓
Documentation Presence	X
Examples Presence	✓
Requirements Presence	✓
Tests Presence	✓
Description Presence	✓

### Repository Structure:

- Compliance: The repository structure is well-organized with clear separation of concerns. The use of subdirectories for parsers (`crystal_parser`, `fleur_parser`) and the distinction between archiver and `re_archiver` are good practices.
- Organization: Good. The project has a logical directory structure, separating source code, examples, tests, and configuration files.

### README Analysis:

- Quality: The README is concise and provides essential information about the project.
- Project description: Yes
- Installation: Yes
- Usage examples: Yes
- Contribution guidelines: No
- License specified: Yes
- Badges present: No

### Documentation:

- Tests present: Yes
- Documentation quality: Limited. While a wiki is present, the README serves as the primary documentation.
- Outdated content: No

### Key Shortcomings:

- Lack of comprehensive documentation beyond the README.
- Absence of contribution guidelines to encourage community involvement.
- No badges for build status, code coverage, or license.

### Recommendations:

- Expand documentation with detailed API references and tutorials.
- Add a `CONTRIBUTING.md` file outlining how others can contribute to the project.
- Integrate continuous integration (CI) and add badges for build status and test coverage.