

Code Review

Before the deployment of a software product, the activity of a code review by the team is highly encouraged, as it can reveal several faults in the system that were not previously detected and that should be fixed prior to the initial release. This code review is part of the verification of the software, which consist of static testing where it is checked whether the software conforms and meets all the requirements and specifications. In verification the code is a crucial step as it can reveal faults in the software that are not necessarily bug related, but that are factors that can degrade the performance of the code or that can even cause that the product doesn't meet the initial requirements. That is why a walkthrough was performed on the html file of the project. This file included the code that corresponded to the web interface of the software. The walkthrough process consisted on two steps, preparation and team analysis. For preparation all the members were notified of the piece of code that we would be reviewing, which was the html file of the web interface. This way, each one of the members was expected to review this piece of the software before we got together and conducted the review, as this way some possible faults in the artifact could have been already identified. The second step of the walkthrough was the team's analysis of the artifact, which in this case was the html code artifact that corresponded to the interface. This walkthrough performed was participant driven. This means that each one of the members would present a list of items to be reviewed and analyzed. This way, on the team's analysis of the artifact, the team members presented some aspects of the code artifact mentioned that could be accounted as faults in the system, as they didn't fulfill the requirements. Due to that fact that this project was based upon an already developed prototype, a considerable part of the functionalities in this artifact did meet the requirements, and there was not a big number of faults in the system. In this code review two main faults were detected. The first fault detected was regarding the search refresh. It was noticed that after performing a recipe search, if the list of ingredients was modified and a new search was attempted, the web interface would not refresh, and the old results would still be the ones showing up, therefore it was necessary to refresh the interface. The fix of this fault was assigned to Elen Bhattarai. This team member fixed this fault by creating a function that would clear the screen each time that the "search" button was clicked. The second fault that was identified was the recipe display. It was noticed that after performing a search, different recipes would be displayed in different card sizes, displaying an uneven web interface that was not visually appealing. This fault was assigned to Max Dick. This team member managed to fix the fault by creating a display function that would create a number of same sized cards, depending on the number of results, and then the contents of each result would be put inside these boxes/cards. This way, the verification walkthrough ensured that our software met the requirements.