Peer Review 3

Usability of code

* Appropriate parameterisation including defaults
* Encapsulation (private fields where appropriate)
* Useful methods including draw

The developer has set default values within the draw function which are appropriate and useful for each of the classes he has created. All values are set within the classes themselves.

They have an extra setter to set the colour for the center\_point class which is affected by an event listener. Outside of the setter, there are no extra useful methods added. All classes have no other functions apart from the draw method.

All values are passed into each classes constructor within the draw function. Each class has their own variables that they use instead of using global variables.

**Development of original**

* Original code to be submitted as well as final version
* Work done in refactoring code to class
* Work done in useful parameterisation
* Work done in extending scope

The developer has submitted the original code with the final version. It has been successfully converted to JavaScript.

They have developed multiple classes which do the same thing when refactoring the code. For example first\_electron and second\_electron have the same constructor variables and draw function. The repeat in classes defeats the original purpose of creating a class which you can create multiple objects of.

There are many default empty variables labelled with alphabet letters used for setting up each class object. This is not the most appropriate way of creating multiple objects and labelling as it is hard to understand what they could be.

They have extended the scope by allowing to change the centre point to be a different class. Within the code, there is no optional p5 renderer included.

**Quality of example**

* HTML page is valid
* Appropriate on-page instructions
* Appropriate on-page controls (form)

The HTML page is not valid as it gives errors including: No character encoding declared, no doctype within the HTML, and the head element is missing a required title child element.

There is an on-page control and instructions to explain what the input form does. The input form could have been a drop-down list of possible colours as inputting anything incorrect does nothing.

**Quality of documentation**

* All methods and parameters explained (including constructor)
* Explanation of example
* Source of initial code acknowledged (including licence)

The documentation explains each of the parameters individually. There are multiple repetitions for each class, so the developer has opted to describe them for all classes and the constructors. All methods have been explained as to why they are included. There is an explanation for how the electrons in the drawing move around their orbit.

The documentation includes a reference to the original code but does not name the license even though it is included in the file list.

**Code quality: ESLint**

Apply rules from [eslint.org/docs/rules/](https://eslint.org/docs/rules/):

* Possible Errors
* Best Practices
* Variables
* Stylistic Issues
* ECMAScript 6

The code has missing semicolons e.g. line 194. The developer has used tabs instead of 4 spaces when indenting and has used double quotes instead of single quotes. Also, there is a parsing error on line 142 where the developer has not parsed in a 4 argument. There is nothing else wrong with the code quality.