For our code review we decided to do a walkthrough. The portion of the code we decided to walk through is basically all of our Executive.cpp file, but we exclude reviewing the display functions and sections of code that handle the display. The reason for that is because we know that the display function would be pretty easy to solve even if there are major or minor faults. It would not really affect gameplay other than display some distracting artifacts. Also, we want to focus on the core functions that run the Blackjack game. This is to ensure that we can catch faults that may break the game. Knowing the portion of the code we want to review we began to make preparations.

The first step of the walkthrough process is to prepare and review. On our first meeting we created a UML design to see the gameplay flow and a google docs to keep track of all of the requirements a Blackjack game needs. These are the two files we had to review before we began the team analysis. As we reviewed the documents as a team we came up with more requirements we missed the first time and tweaked a couple of the existing requirements to better fit our goals. After reviewing we were ready to do the analysis.

To begin our analysis we made Sam our walkthrough leader to be responsible for coming up with questions and facilitating discussions. As for everyone else, we just bring up some possible faults that may occur. Soon after designating a role and creating the defect tracker we started reviewing the code line by line. While reading if the code is a function we also look at that part of the code even if it is outside of the Executive.cpp file. For parts of the code some of the team members do not understand the person responsible for that part of code will explain it. He would explain the purpose of the code and what it does. As we look for faults we are looking for if it does not match the requirements, it does not follow the gameplay flow, or is a straight up a fault. When we do detect faults in the code we write it down in the defect tracker. We make

sure to write the date, who reported, and the description of what is happening. Then we keep going till we finish the portion of the code we chose to review. Then, everyone who can load up the Blackjack game runs the game and verifies that the faults do exist. If they exist they would add a more detailed description of the fault like where it occurs. If we did not catch the fault while reading the code we add it.

Lastly, we all work on the faults. The person responsible for coming up with the portion of the code the fault lies in is responsible for it. That is how we approached it. Once one of us is done with their faults they go help other members who are still working on their faults. After each fault is solved we write down when it was fixed, who fixed it, and a description on how it was fixed in the defect tracker. This concludes our code review.