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## VistA M Code Secondary Review Guidance

These are guidelines for review of M code, VistA files, and other components as directed by your manager or team leader.

The purpose of a secondary review is to provide technical expertise and feedback, where warranted, on all or specific aspects of an enhancement or sustainment project.

The focus of this review is different from an SQA review which validates the accuracy of product build components.

This review is intended to be flexible. The components of the build to review and the aspects of that review are determined at the discretion of the Project Manager based on project complexity. This document provides a guide to accomplish the needs of the project.

Upon completion of this review, any issues identified will be discussed with the primary developer, Project Manager, and other team members identified. It is the primary developer’s responsibility to correct valid issues identified. The reviewer shall document, capture and save all evidence in support of findings for review, if necessary, by other team members including the project manager and primary developer.

Follow-up Secondary Developer Reviews are not mandatory. The determination of whether follow-up reviews are needed at any point will be based on the Project Manager’s discretion.

Upon completion of this guide, the document should be stored in the Project’s repository along with other technical artifacts.

**Project Name**: eScreening

**Patch Number**: MHE 1\*0\*1

**Test Version**:

**Review Completed by**:

**Date**:

Not all enhancements are complex in nature. If the scope of the enhancement does not warrant a full secondary code review, the Project Manager may determine a secondary review is not necessary or only a partial review is warranted prior to submission to SQA.

If a full secondary code review is not done, the Project Manager and Lead Developer are accountable for ensuring the code meets current M Standards and Conventions and validation of the other items identified in this document.

Is a secondary code review necessary for this enhancement? YES/NO

If answered “NO”, provide an explanation.

## Instructions:

Check and review each Secondary Developer Review Item in the table below. Indicate Yes/No in the “Reviewed (Yes/No)” column after the item has been reviewed. Entry of “No” requires Comments.

Any errors and findings should be entered in the Developers Review Issues Resolution Log. If the project is using a tracking tool, such as ClearQuest, the Project Manager may determine that issues be posted there and creation of the Issues Resolution Log is not needed.

Upon completion of Checklist, submit to the Project Manager, Primary Developer, and/or team members for review.

Secondary Reviews can include validation of VA M Programming Standards and conventions.

* For a current copy of the VA M Programming Standard, please refer to the VA’s Technical Reference Model.  
  <https://www.oit.va.gov/services/trm/>
* For a listing of warnings and errors checked by XINDEX, refer to the Kernel documents in the VistA Documentation Library:  
  <https://www.va.gov/vdl/>

## Secondary Developer Review Items

| Routine Review | Reviewed  (Yes/No) | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Review code to ensure it meets the current M Standards and Conventions (SAC) and provide feedback to the primary developer if there are questions regarding the technical approach used  (Review for standards compliance on routines is required. Other code checks outside of standards compliance can be done, but are optional. XINDEX is a tool that can be helpful in identifying coding standard or design issues that may need discussion or correction. Note: Not all standards compliance can be determined by checking ^XINDEX errors and warnings.) |  |  |

| Data Dictionary Review | Reviewed  (Yes/No) | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Perform Technical Review of Data Dictionary changes.  (Include a review of any code in the Data Dictionary, ensuring its accuracy and meets the current Standards and Conventions (SAC) standards. This review might also include review of newly created cross references and field and file attributes | No | Not applicable |

| **Review of Other Components** | **Reviewed**  **(Yes/No)** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Other components may include, but are not limited to, Remote Procedure Calls (RPCs), Input Templates, Print Templates, Security Keys, Menus, Options, and Mail Groups.  *(The product build may include other components. If it is not necessary to review all, the Primary Developer and Project Manager should indicate which other components need to be reviewed.)* |  |  |

| **Product Build** | **Reviewed**  **(Yes/No)** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Are there any features of the Product Build that need to be reviewed?    When determining whether a secondary review of the Product Build is needed consider things like Required Build decisions, Packman versus Host File, environment checks, etc.  *(If the Project Manager and Primary Developer have determined that the complexity of this project warrants a secondary review of the Product Build, list the components needed to be reviewed here.)* |  |  |

| **Ad Hoc Testing** | **Reviewed**  **(Yes/No)** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Are any new features of a complexity that ad hoc testing by the reviewer is needed?  *(If the Project Manager has determined that the complexity of this project warrants that ad hoc testing on all or some new features is needed by the reviewer, they will be listed here.)* | No |  |