Code Review Responses / Actions Taken

- Documentation for code

    - We plan to refactor and add missing documentation after the code freeze.

- Clunky "browser alerts" (modals) that have misleading button labels

    - The usage of modals is an intentional design choice for the user interface. We do not see issues with that design choice. Our client has not brought any issues with it to our attention in the last 5 months.

    - We have changed the labels of the buttons in the modals to better fit the context that they appear in, so that their meaning is more clear.

- There appears to be many unorganized PHP files in the root directory.

    - We wanted to move the PHP files that are not web pages into their own directory. However we experienced issues with our AJAX calls not being able to access the PHP files when they are in their own directory. This is still an ongoing issue and we hope to resolve this soon. To alleviate this, we have an informal naming scheme for the PHP files that separate them between web pages accessed by HTTP GET and code for supporting actions that use HTTP POST.

- The application has security problems.

    - During the code review session, someone found that it is possible to create events for someone else. It was possible because some of the PHP code determines the user's identity via a simple string sent from the client side. It should no longer be possible to do that or anything like that. Any PHP code that needs the user's identity now uses data from the server side PHP sessions, which should be reasonably safe from tampering.

- There are no unit tests.

  - Because our project is meant to be hosted by the ENGR servers, it is true that we have no other options for testing our code using conventional testing methods. Even if we decided to host our application locally for testing, it would be useless since the permissions/environment is completely different on the ENGR servers. We tried our best to manually test everything that we could, including concurrency tests. We feel that our manual testing has covered a good amount of cases, but it would still be nice to be able to run normal unit tests. This is something that future groups could potentially implement.

- The instructions in the README file are specific to the engineering servers

  - The application is intended to be used with an OSU hosted database on OSU servers. For development, the application is hosted on the engineering servers. It is not supposed to be usable elsewhere. That is why the instructions are specific to the engineering servers.

- The content of the README file is ambiguous in some places.

  - To address this issue, we have added the shell commands required for installation so the user can simply copy and paste the commands into their terminal and run them.

- The code could be written faster with another language.

  - That is probably true, but it is far too late for us to redo the entire application. That would be better off as a task for those who will be working on the project in the future.

- The manage page is not great for mobile.

  - We have made changes that should improve the user experience on mobile for that page as well as other pages.

- It would be nice if the README file tells the reader to run the script for install Composer before running the script for installing packages.

  - The provided README file does tell the reader to install Composer first and then install the packages. In any case, we have added the actual shell commands to the README file in the correct order for the user's convenience.and for extra clarity.