## Review Form

**Authors’s Name:\_\_\_Yan\_DAI\_\_\_\_ Author’s Student No.: \_\_\_2020040048\_\_\_\_**

**Reviewer’s Name:\_Wuwei\_YUAN\_\_ Reviewer’s Student No.: \_\_2020040054\_\_ Date：03-09**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Makefile**  **(10%)** | 10 |
| **Comments** | Well done. |
| **Compilation**  **(编译正确) (10%)** | 10 |
| **Comments** | Compile successfully. |
| **Correctness of Results**  **(结果正确) (40%)** | 40 |
| **Comments** | Correct. |
| **Naming Convention**  **(变量命名合理) (5%)** | 5 |
| **Comments** | Concise naming. |
| **Code Formatting**  **(代码格式合理) (5%)** | 5 |
| **Comments** | Well formatted. |
| **Code Comments**  **(代码注释合格) (5%)** | 5 |
| **Comments** | There are plenty of comments for each file, class, and function. I think it will be better to add some comments for classes and put the comments about the function’s description and usage around the declaration of the function according to the Google Coding Style. |
| **Other Coding Style and efficiency** (代码运行效率) **(10%)** | 9 |
| **Comments** | Problem1: The program is too slow. Fair otherwise. |
| **OOP Design Style**  **(15%)** | 14 |
| **Comments** | Problem2: The fixed number of reviewers in the code makes it difficult to reuse when the number of reviewers changes. |
| **Total Score (0-100)** | 98 |
| **Overall Comments** | All the algorithms are well-implemented, with clear naming, comments, and good use of the OOP design style. |
| **Version of Reviewer’s compiler** | GNU Make 4.1  g++ (Ubuntu 9.2.1-17ubuntu1~18.04.1) 9.2.1 20191102 |

**NOTE:**

1. For coding styles including naming, formatting, code comments, etc., please refer to the Google C++ Style Guide. You may stick to your own coding style if you already have one, provided that your coding style is easy to read and understand by others.

(<https://google.github.io/styleguide/cppguide.html>)

2. OOP design: easy for code reuse (代码复用); easy for extension and adaptability to future change for new user requirements (易于扩展，适应未来用户需求的改变). We will learn these OOP design features throughout this semester.

3. The reviewer (评阅人) is responsible for filling in the review form with both credits (分数) and detailed comments/suggestions (评价/建议) for further improvements (改进), and then returns the review form to the author of the code.

4. Finally, each student needs to submit the improved (改进后的) source code according to the comments, as well as a .doc or .pdf file including the returned review forms and statements on the revised code in reply to the reviewers’ comments.

5. Please comply with our “**Rules for Submission**” when submitting your homework.