blimpy Test Coverage

Lukas Finkbeiner

May 1, 2020

1 Introduction and Background

Test coverage is good. We want more.

At various points the tone of this report will shift toward advice, in case some future intern wishes to contribute.

2 Methods

I isolate the script that I want to work on.

I recommend fast.sh, fail.sh. They are here in the repository and represent pared-down bash scripts, which makes it easier to rapidly re-run the tests and fix errors.

3 Observations

The current areas of transformation are like this. This table represents a similar view to what one will receive from running codecov in the shell. I have shortened the script names unless the directory is necessary for disambiguation.

Script	Statements	Misses	Coverage (%)
__init__	25	8	68
bl_scrunch	45	25	44
dice	103	48	53
ephemeris/__init__	3	0	100
compute_lsrk	28	0	100
compute_lst	15	4	73
ephemeris/config	9	2	78
observatory	41	12	71
fil2h5	42	21	50
guppi	271	137	49
h52fil	42	21	59
io/__init__	2	0	100
fil_writer	41	8	80
file_wrapper	397	101	75
hdf_writer	87	20	77
sigproc	157	28	82
match_fils	74	61	18
plotting/__init__	7	0	100
plotting/config	11	2	82
plot_all	69	5	93
plot_kurtosis	16	2	88
plot_spectrum	39	6	85
plot_spectrum_min_max	44	5	89
plot_time_series	26	3	88
plot_utils	28	4	86
plot_waterfall	28	4	86
utils	65	0	100
waterfall	228	57	75
TOTAL	1925	581	70

4 Current Efforts and Obstacles

Guppi sucks!! I HATE it!

5 Concluding Recommendations

In conclusion, we need some deprecation notices. We also need to exclude some methods from our tests.

We need more documentation all-around.

Error checking? Not likely, but it is something to think about...

6 Acknowledgments

Danny Price? Should I even have this section?