

Mondrian: Code Review on the Web

Nov 30, 2006 Open Source Speakers Series

Guido van Rossum

guido@google.com

What is Code Review?

- When one developer writes code, another developer is asked to review that code
- A careful line-by-line critique
- Happens in a non-threatening context
- Goal is cooperation, not fault-finding
- Often an integral part of coding process
- Involuntary code review happens when debugging someone else's broken code
 - Not so good; emotions may flare



Benefits of Code Review

- Two pairs of eyes catch more bugs (duh)
 - Catch 'em early to save hours of debugging
- Enforce coding standards, style guides
 - Keep overall readability & code quality high
- Mentoring of new developers
 - Learn from mistakes without breaking stuff
- Establish trust relationships
 - Prepare for more delegation
- A good alternative to pair programming



Code Review in Open Source

- Author & reviewer on separate computers
- Author invokes "diff -u" to create patch file
- Author mails patch file to reviewer
 - or uploads to e.g. SourceForge patch manager
- Reviewer uses "patch" to recreate the files
- They email back-and-forth a few times
- Finally, reviewer submits into svn/cvs/etc
 - patch author often has no privileges (yet)
 - process helps "vetting" new developers



Google's Development Process

- (In theory :-)
- Single company-wide Perforce (p4) depot
 - No developer branches
- Company-wide NFS
 - Developers workspaces accessibly by others
- All code reviewed before submission
 - All code-review email logged for auditors
- Wrapper "g4" implements superset of "p4"
 - Originally a shell script; now a Python program



Google's Code Review Process

- All command-line and email based:
 - 1. Author edits changes in workspace, tests etc.
 - 2. Author send email to reviewer (a tool helps)
 - 3. Reviewer views the diff (another tool helps)
 - 4. Reviewer sends mail back (regular mail reply)
 - 5. Rinse and repeat (using regular mail replies)
 - 6. When reviewer replies "lgtm", author submits
 - Igtm = looks good to me



Original, Minimal Tools

- "g4 change" invoked by author defines set of files involved, adding comments
- "g4 mail" sends form email to reviewer
 - (also integrated with g4 change call)
- "g4 diff" invoked by reviewer diffs files straight out of author's workspace
 - "tkdiff" X11-based side-by-side differ
- "g4 reply" synthesizes reply mail
 - optional; not used very much



Problems With Old Process

- VPN usage (reviewers working from home)
 - can't use tkdiff, or it is too slow
- Line numbers change as code evolves
 - line-oriented comments get out of sync
- Can't diff between pre-submit revisions
 - reviewer must keep manual track of evolution
- Email can get lost in inbox; no work flow
 - reviewer: what do I still need to review?
 - author: is my code reviewed?



Enter Mondrian

- Web-server based
 - Addresses VPN issues
 - Snapshots all previously reviewed versions
- Shows side-by-side diff (like tkdiff)
- Lets you add in-line comments
 - Collect comments into a single message
- Also receives and organizes email
 - Not all parties need to use Mondrian



Live Demo

- Show dashboard
 - explain categories; hover over CL, flags, users, description
- Show someone else's dashboard
- Show a group's TO DO list (build-grouplet)
- Show a CL view
 - browse some comments (expand/collapse)
 - follow links to Sourcerer, p4web
 - show Request code review form; Upload snapshot form; Approve form
- Show a file view
 - use n/p to navigate diff chunks
 - navigate between files
 - show intra-region diffs
 - add, edit, discard, reply to in-line comments
- Show Review and publish form



10

How It Started

- As a Noogler, I needed a starter project
- Someone proposed a code review web app
- Decided to freshen up my web knowledge
- Learned some Django on the way
- Adopted WSGI (PEP 333) while I was at it
- Learned about Google's Bigtable and p4lib
- Early prototype was immediately hot!





How It Works (Overview)

- Bigtable (a Googly db) used to store:
 - Change metadata (description, list of files, ...)
 - Comments (entered on web or received email)
 - File snapshots taken from user workspaces
 - Per-user data (active changes, last view dates)
- Web server talks to user, Bigtable, p4
 - Also to NFS, SSH when fetching snapshots
- Mail server processes incoming email
 - Storing them as comments



Snapshots

- Copies of files taken from user's directory
 - Updated whenever change view visited
 - Solve two problems with the old process/tools
- What if the files aren't on NFS?
 - Linux: use SSH/SCP to user's workstation
 - Others: author uploads plain old patch
- Snapshots and comments are kept forever
 - To satisfy auditors
 - To track extended history of changes



Web User Interface

- Mostly pretty traditional HTML with CSS
 - Django templates, wsgiref server (all Python)
- Some JavaScript for UI niceties
 - Expand, collapse comments
 - Show unified diffs in-line in CL view (AJAX)
- Full file view uses more AJAX:
 - Keyboard navigation
 - Inline draft comment editing
 - Avoids full-page refresh



Editing Inline Draft Comments

- Each line in the diff is two table rows:
 - 123 textA127 textB
 -
 - First row displays left & right diff text
 - Next row (hidden) used for inline comments
 - Each has a unique id {old,new}+lineno
- Double click on first row calls JavaScript
 - Inserts form into next row
 - "Submit" sends form data to server
 - Server sends back HTML to replace form





Mail Server

- Receives every email sent to review logs
- Ignores messages sent by Mondrian itself
- Parses subject looking for revision #
- Inserts message as comment into Bigtable
- Also updates reviewers' TO DO queues
- Implemented using standard smtpd.py



Performance

- Mostly fast enough, on just one server
- Most of the work is done elsewhere:
 - Bigtable+GFS server infrastructure
 - Perforce server
 - In the browser (rendering reams of HTML)
- What's slow:
 - Contention for Perforce
 - Generating HTML for loaded dashboard
 - Diffing huge files (uses Python's difflib)



