Q.NO:

NAME:ANUSHA PEDDAPELLI

ROLL.NO:2403A51103

BATCH NO:06

ASSIGNMENT 10.3

Task 1: Syntax and Error Detection

Task: Identify and fix syntax, indentation, and variable errors in the given script.

buggy_code_task1.py
def add_numbers(a, b)
result = a + b

Expected Output:

print(add numbers(10 20))

return reslt

- Corrected code with proper syntax (: after function, fixed variable name, corrected function call).
- AI should explain what was fixed.

PROMPT:

You are given a buggy Python script. Identify and fix syntax, indentation, and variable errors. Ensure the function works properly and produces the correct output.

Week5 - Thursday

CODE:

```
# Fixed version of buggy_code_task1.py

def add_numbers(a, b):
    result = a + b
    return result

# Corrected function call with comma between arguments
print(add_numbers(10, 20))
```

OBSERVATION:

- \Box Function definition error \rightarrow Missing colon (:) after def add_numbers(a, b).
- \Box Indentation issue \rightarrow result = a + b and return result must be indented inside the function.

- □ Variable name mismatch → reslt was undefined; corrected to result.
 □ Function call error → Arguments were written as 10 20 without a comma; fixed to 10, 20.
 - Task 2: Logical and Performance Issue Review

Task: Optimize inefficient logic while keeping the result correct.

Expected Output:

- More efficient duplicate detection (e.g., using sets).
- AI should explain the optimization.

PROMPT:

You are given a Python script with inefficient duplicate detection logic. Optimize the code to improve performance while keeping the output correct. Use better data structures (like sets) instead of nested loops.

CODE:

OBSERVATION:

- \square Removed nested loops \rightarrow Original code checked every element against every other, making it $O(n^2)$.
- \Box Used sets for efficiency \rightarrow Set lookup is O(1) on average, reducing

overall complexity to O(n). ☐ Avoided repeated checks → duplicates.add(num) ensures no duplicates are added multiple times. \square Result correctness \rightarrow Output remains the same ([1, 2] or order may vary since sets are unordered Task 3: Code Refactoring for Readability Task: Refactor messy code into clean, PEP 8-compliant, wellstructured code. # buggy code_task3.py def c(n): x=1for i in range(1,n+1): x=x*ireturn x print(c(5))**Expected Output:** Function renamed to calculate factorial. Proper indentation, variable naming, docstrings, and formatting. AI should provide a more readable version. **PROMPT:** You are given a messy Python script that calculates a factorial. Refactor the code to follow PEP 8 standards with proper naming, indentation, docstrings, and readability. **CODE:**

```
def calculate_factorial(n):
         Calculate the factorial of a given number.
        Args:
            n (int): A non-negative integer.
            int: Factorial of n.
        result = 1
         for i in range(1, n + 1):
             result *= i
        return result
     print(calculate_factorial(5))
21
     print(calculate factorial(0)) # Edge case: factorial of 0
OBSERVATION:
☐ Function name improved → Renamed c to calculate factorial
(clearer, self-explanatory).
\square Variable naming \rightarrow Changed x \rightarrow result for readability.
□ Indentation fixed \rightarrow Proper 4-space indentation per PEP 8.
\square Docstring added \rightarrow Clear explanation of function purpose,
parameters, and return type.
☐ Code formatting → Blank lines and spacing make it structured and
readable.
Task 4: Security and Error Handling Enhancement
Task: Add security practices and exception handling to the code.
# buggy code task4.py
import sqlite3
def get user data(user id):
  conn = sqlite3.connect("users.db")
  cursor = conn.cursor()
  query = f"SELECT * FROM users WHERE id = {user id};" #
Potential SQL injection risk
```

```
cursor.execute(query)
result = cursor.fetchall()
conn.close()
return result
user_input = input("Enter user ID: ")
print(get_user_data(user_input))
```

Expected Output:

Safe query using parameterized SQL (? placeholders).

Try-except block for database errors.

Input validation before query execution.

PROMPT:

You are given a Python script that retrieves user data from a database.

The code is vulnerable to **SQL injection** and lacks **error handling**.

Refactor the script to:

- Use parameterized queries (? placeholders).
- Add **try-except blocks** for database error handling.
- Validate

CODE:

```
# 10.3.PY > ...
# Refactored version of buggy_code_task4.py

import sqlite3

def get_user_data(user_id):
    """

Fetch user data securely from the database using parameterized queries.

Args:
    user_id (int): The ID of the user to fetch.

Returns:
    list: List of tuples containing user data.

"""

try:
    # Ensure input is an integer
    user_id = int

# Ensure input is an integer
```

OBSERVATION:'

□ **SQL Injection Fixed** → Replaced f-string with parameterized query (?).

	☐ Input Validation → Converted user_input to int; handled						
	ValueError if input isn't numeric.						
	☐ Error Handling Added → Wrapped DB operations in try-except-						
	finally.						
	☐ Connection Safety → finally ensures database connection closes						
	properly.						
	☐ Docstring Added → Clear explanation of function purpose and						
	parameters.						
	Task 5: Automated Code Review Report Generation						
	Task: Generate a review report for this messy code.						
	# buggy_code_task5.py						
	def calc(x,y,z):						
	if z=="add":						
	return x+y						
	elif z=="sub": return x-y						
	elif z=="mul":						
	return x*y						
	elif z=="div":						
	return x/y						
	else: print("wrong")						
	cisc. print(wrong)						
	print(calc(10,5,"add"))						
	print(calc(10,0,"div")) Expected Output:						
	AI-generated review report should mention:						
	Missing doestrings						
	 Inconsistent formatting (indentation, inline return) 						
	Missing error handling for division by zero						
	 Non-descriptive function/variable names 						
	 Suggestions for readability and PEP 8 compliance 						
	Prompt:						
	You are given a messy Python script that performs basic arithmetic						
	operations. Perform an automated code review and generate a clean,						
	PEP 8—compliant version. The review should address:						

- Adding docstrings.
- Improving function and variable naming.
- Consistent indentation and formatting.
- Adding **error handling** (e.g., division by zero).
- Enhancing readability and maintainability.

CODE:

OBSERVATION:

\square Missing docstrings \rightarrow	Added de	tailed doc	string witl	n Args,	Returns,
and Raises.					

■ Non-descriptive names	→ Renamed ca	$alc \rightarrow calculate$	and $z \rightarrow$
operation for clarity.			

- \square Inconsistent formatting \rightarrow Fixed indentation and avoided inline returns.
- \square Error handling added \rightarrow Handled division by zero using ZeroDivisionError.
- \square Readability improved \rightarrow Code now follows PEP 8 with spacing and blank lines.
- \square Maintainability \rightarrow Structured errors using raise ValueError for invalid operations.