What was done well

1. Continuous testing has been implemented and helped us find issues that would have gone unnoticed.
2. A database was added for the purpose of testing so that the production database is not contaminated with testing artefacts.
3. Group members collaborated on fixing and implementing features. This made a noticeable difference in the amount of time taken to bring features to production since there was a division of labour.
4. Trunk based development was followed. All members rebased their branches when a new merge was performed on main. No merge issues occurred.
5. All stories have vertical slices that pass through all the application layers
6. Code reviews made by the person whose code would be affected by the pull request. This meant that the person could provide input to the programmer so that their code would not be impacted by the pull request.
7. $Sprint\ velocity = \frac{Num\ story\ points}{Num\ sprints} = \frac{35+36+38}{3} = 36.33$
8. Considering the previous two weeks, one can see that the sprint velocity has been increasing.
9. The UI elements across the different pages were unified by using a standardised page layout (this was discussed as an improvement in Week 2's retrospective).
10. The quality as well as quantity of the tests increased substantially (this was also discussed as an improvement in Week 2's retrospective).
11. Commenting was improved in the sense that comments describing how the code works was reduce and comments that explain reasoning were increased.
12. Files names and variable names were improved so that the names were short but descriptive.

What needs to be improved

1. Time management should be improved as this sprint is three days past its due date.