|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Description | Reviewers Comment | Action taken by reviewed group |
| Build | Could you clone from Git and build using the README file? | I was able to clone and build using the README file. | No need to make any large changes but updated the README file to flow better and handle extraneous cases. |
| Legibility | Was the flow sane and were variable names and methods easy to follow? Does the code adhere to general guidelines and code style? | Yes, flow was sane and variable names were easy to follow. In addition, the code did adhere to general guidelines and coding style. Functions were easy to follow, and appropriate comments were added. | Not need for large changes here but modified the code by adding in more comments to increase readability and adjusted sections that could be moved into functions. |
| Implementation | Is it shorter/easier/faster/cleaner/safer to write functionally equivalent code? Do you see useful abstractions? | Due to the small and inconsistent data given to them by their client they have developed multiple algorithms and have improved upon them. | No large change here. Thankfully, have gone over the data and implemented a model with more meaningful data. Accuracy has improved as a result. |
| Maintainability | Are there unit tests? Should there be? Are the test covering interesting cases? Are they readable? | There was not a list of unit tests, but they did show tests within their code. The tests test input and input types to make sure they are receiving the correct ones. The tests are readable but not really covering anything interesting. | Added in more unit tests into our code to test for more cases rather than simple ones. Added unit tests outside the scope of just the variables in the dataset by also checking for repeats in the dataset extensively. |
| Requirements | Does the code fulfill the requirements? | The code does fulfill the requirements given to them by their client. | Our code did not have a hard accuracy rating but we have definitely exceeded expectations of what our model can achieve and thus the requirements of our project have been fulfilled. |
| Others | Are there other things that stand out that can be improved? | Nothing stands out that could be improved. | Nothing to improve upon here. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Description | Reviewers Comment | Action taken by reviewed group |
| Build | Could you clone from Git and build using the README file? | I could clone the code fine, but the README file was a little incorrect for the setup. It was also recommended that we used a Windows 10 OS, however, there was only instructions for Linux machines. | Updated the README file to make more logical sense. Adjusted to be clear what type of OS should be running. Changed order of steps to flow easier and add readability. |
| Legibility | Was the flow sane and were variable names and methods easy to follow? Does the code adhere to general guidelines and code style? | The flow of the code and variable names makes sense. The code style seems to be standard, for the most part. | Nothing to improve upon here. Did adjust code though to flow easier and added in more comments. |
| Implementation | Is it shorter/easier/faster/cleaner/safer to write functionally equivalent code? Do you see useful abstractions? | The way they implemented the machine learning code was good. The API code could have been broken up to pieces more, rather than clumping most of the code within one function. The server code was short overall, so no changes are needed. | Adjusted the code so that sections that could be put into a function were. Removed functions that were not needed to obtain less clutter and more readability. |
| Maintainability | Are there unit tests? Should there be? Are the test covering interesting cases? Are they readable? | There are tests included with the machine learning code and I believe the API code. For the machine learning code, there were tests for the models. | Nothing to improve upon here. We did add more tests though. |
| Requirements | Does the code fulfill the requirements? | The code does fulfill their requirements. They were able to create an API, server, and machine learning model as set out in their design. | Nothing to improve upon here. |
| Others | Are there other things that stand out that can be improved? | This could go into Legibility, but more of the code could be documented and/or explained. | As mentioned earlier added in more comments for explanation and updated sections of code to flow better. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Description | Reviewers Comment | Action taken by reviewed group |
| Build | Could you clone from Git and build using the README file? | I could clone from Git and build using the README file | Nothing to improve upon here. |
| Legibility | Was the flow sane and were variable names and methods easy to follow? Does the code adhere to general guidelines and code style? | Yes, the variable names and methods are easy to follow. The coding style is good. Small suggestion, a short description before each function will help the reviewer a ton. | Added in short descriptions above function explaining the general use of the function and some description of the parameters passed to allow better readability. |
| Implementation | Is it shorter/easier/faster/cleaner/safer to write functionally equivalent code? Do you see useful abstractions? | All the functions are pretty concise. I do not see any unnecessary long/large function. The implement station is clear: fusion 360, AWS, and machine learning model. | Nothing to improve upon here. |
| Maintainability | Are there unit tests? Should there be? Are the test covering interesting cases? Are they readable? | Unit test can be found in API call and machine learning section. They are all readable. | Nothing to improve upon here. |
| Requirements | Does the code fulfill the requirements? | The code fulfills their client’s requirement with ~65% accuracy. The accuracy can be high but is skewed by the given data from the client. | While reviewer gives us credit actually improved accuracy to ~75% so further fulfilled client's requirements |
| Others | Are there other things that stand out that can be improved? | Great presentation and coding style. Good luck showcasing in virtual expo or project showcase | Nothing to improve upon here. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Description | Reviewers Comment | Action taken by reviewed group |
| Build | Could you clone from Git and build using the README file? | Yes, I was able to clone and build the project, I was also able to understand the README file that was provided. | Nothing to improve upon here. |
| Legibility | Was the flow sane and were variable names and methods easy to follow? Does the code adhere to general guidelines and code style? | Yes, as someone who has not seen the project before the code was clean and easy to read. There is nothing I would say needs improvement when it comes to the code style and general guidelines. | Nothing to improve upon here. |
| Implementation | Is it shorter/easier/faster/cleaner/safer to write functionally equivalent code? Do you see useful abstractions? | When looking at the implementation, the functions and components that the person wrote where not verbose. The code also had comments to follow easily and it was useful for me to understand the functionality. | Nothing to improve upon here. |
| Maintainability | Are there unit tests? Should there be? Are the test covering interesting cases? Are they readable? | Yes, the group presented unit tests that they had implemented. The unit tests were needed to see if data was being handled well on a small scale. The user tests were readable. | Nothing to improve upon here. |
| Requirements | Does the code fulfill the requirements? | After the group presented, we asked them what their requirements were from their client and it seemed like the client kept things open ended. They were able to choose how they wanted to approach their machine learning component and they chose to use linear regression. | Nothing to improve upon except that the reviewer mis-heard what model we are using, it’s actually a multi-label model but it still fulfills our client’s requirements. |
| Others | Are there other things that stand out that can be improved? | No, it seemed like the group just needed more data to test their code to have more results to look at. | Still wasn’t able to obtain more data but this was a known setback. Was able to generate “fake” data to increase our dataset though so this was mostly solved through other means. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Description | Reviewers Comment | Action taken by reviewed group |
| Build | Could you clone from Git and build using the README file? | The README had all the instructions required for setting up the code. | Nothing to improve upon here. |
| Legibility | Was the flow sane and were variable names and methods easy to follow? Does the code adhere to general guidelines and code style? | The code was sane and easy to follow. Variable and function names were good, there was no documentation on what functions did. It would be nice to have this. | Added in comments above functions that describe what the function does. |
| Implementation | Is it shorter/easier/faster/cleaner/safer to write functionally equivalent code? Do you see useful abstractions? | The code was clean and variable names made sense. I see some  useful abstractions from the way code optimizations were made (and non-optimized code was commented out) | Nothing to improve upon here. |
| Maintainability | Are there unit tests? Should there be? Are the test covering interesting cases? Are they readable? | I could not find unit tests. I don’t there is a need for unit tests as this project involves creating a model for predicting build times and don’t think a unit test would validate anything. | Despite how I agree with the reviewer here still did add in some unit tests to check the validity of the dataset. |
| Requirements | Does the code fulfill the requirements? | Yes, the code does seem to fulfill the requirements of the capstone. Asking the client for more data may help in making their classifier more robust | Did ask the client for more data but they ran into issues so there was a known setback. But, again, we generated fake data to make up for this fallback. |
| Others | Are there other things that stand out that can be improved? | Can try other ML methods as they have less data and neural networks do not perform very well on small volumes of data | Changed around with different models and found one that got better performance. |