Reviewer #1

- User more comments throughout the code when explaining what each major block of code does
- Write more extensive test cases.
  - Example: Test cases for 6x6, 5x5, 4x4, 3x3 etc grids
- Write more abstract test cases
  - Example: Test case if the whole grid makes up one word
  - Example: Test Cases where dictionary only has words that are less than 3 letters

Reviewer #2

- Remove line 41
  - Duplicate for loop to remove any words from solution set that is less than 3 letters
- Consider using better variable names
  - example: line 91 | variable name lst is ambiguous
- Consider removing .toLowerCase() function in line 74
  - the enitre grid is already lowercased in line 24 so any pushed words should be lowercased too
- Use consistent line spacing throughout code
- Consider combining potential_neighbors and valid_neighbors functions
  - The code can be combined and may be confusing.

- Remove commented log statements throughout the code
- Give javadoc descriptions for all functions
- Consistently use semi colons

The majority of the critiques that I received on my boggle_solver file were primarily focused on improving my code clarity. Specifically, both reviewers made comments on the absence of my javadoc functions. As well as the inconsistent line spacing, and semicolon use throughout my code. They expressed how the weird spacing threw off their code tracing when they were reviewing my code. Another detail that was pointed out to me was my commented out log statements. Understandably to them the log statements were confusing because they were used as a tool to help with my debugging process. I received one critique on my variable name choices. The critique was that one of the variables in my helper function was not descriptive enough and caused the reviewer a little trouble. But the other reviewer didn't take issue with my variable choice name because it wasn't critical to the functionality of the program. Logic wise I received a couple of suggestions/critiques. One reviewer suggested that I combined my potential_neighbors function and valid_neighbors function. Their reason being that both functions can be combined into one and the same effect can be had. I acknowledged the validity of their statement but decided to keep the two functions separate to prevent creating a super large and complex function.