## Peer-Based GenAI Code Review Assessment

A task sheet for students to work through several times and hopefully then internalise.

Evaluation criteria	Notes
Does the code properly handle user data, ensuring privacy and	Ethical Review
confidentiality?	
Are any third-party libraries or assets used in the project properly	Ethical Review
credited or licensed?	
Has the developer avoided using hardcoded sensitive information	Ethical Review
such as passwords or API keys?	
Are there any parts of the code that could unintentionally enable	Ethical Review
unethical behaviour (e.g. scraping data without consent,	
discrimination in algorithms)?	
Is there transparency in the code's decision-making processes	Ethical Review
(e.g. clear logic, no black-box behaviour)?	<b>F(1: 1D :</b>
Has the author acknowledged any limitations or potential biases	Ethical Review
In the code?	Tastina Oralita
Are there automated tests implemented (unit tests, integration	Testing Quanty
Do the tests cover edge ages and error conditions adequately?	Testing Quality
Are the tests cover edge cases and error conditions adequately?	Testing Quality
Are the test cases repeatable and consistent in their results?	Testing Quality
Are the test results clearly decumented and easy to interpret?	Testing Quality
Are any dependencies mocked or isolated appropriately for	Testing Quality
Are any dependencies mocked or isolated appropriately for testing?	Testing Quanty
Is the code organized into logical modules and functions with a	Code Maintainability
clear structure?	Code Maintainaointy
Are variables functions and classes named descriptively and	Code Maintainability
consistently?	Code Maintainability
Are comments used effectively to explain non-obvious parts of	Code Maintainability
the code?	
Is the code free from redundant or duplicate logic?	Code Maintainability
Are there any parts of the code that would be difficult for others	Code Maintainability
to understand or extend?	5
Has the developer used version control appropriately (e.g.,	Code Maintainability
meaningful commit messages, branching)?	
Was the code shared in a way that is accessible and easy to	Collaboration Process
review (e.g., GitHub repo)?	
Has the developer provided documentation or a README to	Collaboration Process
explain setup and usage?	
Did the developer clearly indicate which parts they want	Collaboration Process
feedback on?	
Did the peer reviewer provide constructive and respectful	Collaboration Process
feedback?	
Was there evidence of collaboration or discussion between group	Collaboration Process
members during the audit?	
Have any issues identified in the peer review been addressed or	Collaboration Process
acknowledged?	