# **Q** CODE REVIEW & QA PROCESS - Agent Zero v1

# Code Review & Quality Assurance System

**Mission**: Zapewnić wysoką jakość kodu poprzez systematyczny proces review, testing i quality gates

**Team Standards**: 100% PRs reviewed, 90%+ test coverage, zero critical security issues

# **CODE REVIEW WORKFLOW**

# 1. Pre-Review Checklist (Developer)

Przed utworzeniem Pull Request, developer musi:

V	Code Quality
	Kod formatowany z black shared/
	Linting passed z ruff shared/ (zero errors)
	Type checking passed z mypy shared/
	Wszystkie tests pass locally
	No console.log/print statements (except logging)
	Code follows naming conventions
<b>V</b>	Testing
	Unit tests napisane dla nowych funkcji
	Integration tests dla API endpoints
П	Manual testing wykonane

	Performance nie pogorszona
	Cross-browser testing (dla frontend)
V	Documentation
	Docstrings dla nowych funkcji
	README updated jeśli potrzeba
	API documentation generated
	Comments dla complex logic
V	Security
	No hardcoded secrets lub credentials
	Input validation dla external data
	SQL injection prevention
	VCC protection (frontand)
	XSS protection (frontend)
	2. Review Process
·	
PR	2. Review Process
# E	2. Review Process Creation Requirements: ## © What
## E	2. Review Process  Creation Requirements:  ##   What  Description czego zostało zmienione  ##   Why

```
## Screenshots
(Jeśli frontend changes)

## S Related Issues
Links do Notion tasks lub GitHub issues
```

#### **Reviewer Responsibilities:**

#### **Developer A Reviews Developer B PRs:**

• Focus: Frontend quality, UX/UI, React best practices

• Timeline: Within 24 hours

• Feedback: Constructive, specific, actionable

#### **Developer B Reviews Developer A PRs:**

• Focus: Backend architecture, API design, database interactions

• Timeline: Within 24 hours

• Feedback: Technical depth, scalability concerns

### **Review Checklist (Reviewer):**

Code Quality:
☐ Code is readable i maintainable
□ No code duplication
☐ Appropriate abstractions used
☐ Error handling implemented
☐ Performance considerations addressed
Q Architecture:
☐ Follows established patterns
□ No architecture violations
□ Dependencies are appropriate
☐ Separation of concerns maintained

Security:     ■ The security is a security in the sec		
☐ No obvious securit	y vulnerabilities	
☐ Input validation pro	esent	
☐ Authentication/aut	horization correct	
<b>ℚ</b> Testing:		
☐ Adequate test cov	erage	
☐ Tests are meaning	ful	
☐ Edge cases consid	ered	
☐ Integration points	ested	
<b>™</b> DEFINITION	OF DONE (DoD)	
Feature Comp	ete Criteria:	
Development:		
_	all acceptance criteria	
_		
<ul><li>☐ Code implements</li><li>☐ Code follows team</li></ul>		
<ul><li>☐ Code implements</li><li>☐ Code follows team</li></ul>	conventions ts w production code	
<ul><li>☐ Code implements</li><li>☐ Code follows team</li><li>☐ No TODO commer</li></ul>	conventions ts w production code emented	
<ul><li>☐ Code implements</li><li>☐ Code follows team</li><li>☐ No TODO commer</li><li>☐ Error handling imp</li></ul>	conventions ts w production code emented	
<ul> <li>☐ Code implements</li> <li>☐ Code follows team</li> <li>☐ No TODO comment</li> <li>☐ Error handling imp</li> <li>☐ Logging added dla</li> </ul>	conventions ts w production code emented debugging	
<ul> <li>☐ Code implements</li> <li>☐ Code follows team</li> <li>☐ No TODO comment</li> <li>☐ Error handling imp</li> <li>☐ Logging added dla</li> </ul> <b>Testing:</b>	conventions  ts w production code  emented  debugging  90%+ coverage)	
<ul> <li>☐ Code implements</li> <li>☐ Code follows team</li> <li>☐ No TODO comment</li> <li>☐ Error handling imp</li> <li>☐ Logging added dla</li> </ul> <b>Testing:</b> <ul> <li>☐ Unit tests written (</li> </ul>	conventions ts w production code emented debugging  90%+ coverage) a APIs	
<ul> <li>☐ Code implements</li> <li>☐ Code follows team</li> <li>☐ No TODO comment</li> <li>☐ Error handling implements</li> <li>☐ Logging added diagent</li> <li>Testing:</li> <li>☐ Unit tests written (</li> <li>☐ Integration tests diagent</li> <li>☐ Manual testing content</li> </ul>	conventions ts w production code emented debugging  90%+ coverage) a APIs	

Code Review:
☐ PR created z proper description
☐ Code reviewed by team member
☐ All review comments addressed
☐ PR approved by reviewer
Documentation:
☐ API documentation updated
☐ Technical documentation updated
☐ User-facing docs updated (if needed)
☐ Release notes prepared
Deployment:
☐ CI/CD pipeline passes
☐ Deployment tested in staging
☐ Rollback plan prepared

# TESTING STRATEGY

# **6** Testing Pyramid

```
/\ E2E Tests (10%)
/\ - Full user journeys
/\ - Critical path testing
/\ - Cross-browser testing
/____\
/\ \ Integration Tests (30%)
/\ \ - API endpoint testing
/\ \ - Database interactions
/____\ - Service communication
```

Unit Tests (60%)

- Individual functions
- Component testing
- Mock external dependencies

# Testing Tools & Frameworks

#### **Backend Testing:**

```
# pytest dla unit i integration tests
pytest shared/communication/ -v --cov=shared

# httpx dla API testing
import httpx
async def test_api_endpoint():
    async with httpx.AsyncClient() as client:
    response = await client.get("/api/agents")
    assert response.status_code == 200

# pytest-asyncio dla async code
import pytest
@pytest.mark.asyncio
async def test_async_function():
    result = await async_function()
    assert result is not None
```

#### **Frontend Testing:**

```
// Jest + React Testing Library
import { render, screen } from '@testing-library/react'
import Dashboard from './Dashboard'

test('renders agent status', () ⇒ {
  render(<Dashboard />)
  expect(screen.getByText('Agent Status')).toBeInTheDocument()
```

```
// Cypress dla E2E
cypress.run({
    spec: 'cypress/integration/dashboard.spec.js'
})
```

# Coverage Requirements

#### **Minimum Coverage Targets:**

• Unit Tests: 90% line coverage

• Integration Tests: 80% API endpoints

• E2E Tests: 100% critical user paths

#### **Coverage Monitoring:**

```
# Generate coverage report
pytest --cov=shared --cov-report=html

# Fail build if coverage < 90%
pytest --cov=shared --cov-fail-under=90
```

# QUALITY GATES

# Gate 1: Pre-Commit (Local)

#### **Automated Checks:**

```
# Pre-commit hook
#!/bin/bash
set -e

# Format code
black shared/
```

```
# Linting
ruff shared/

# Type checking
mypy shared/

# Fast tests only
pytest shared/communication/test_unit/ -x

echo " Pre-commit checks passed"
```

Criteria: All checks must pass przed commit

# Gate 2: Pull Request (CI)

#### **Automated Pipeline:**

```
# .github/workflows/pr-check.yml
name: PR Quality Check
on: pull_request
jobs:
 quality:
  runs-on: ubuntu-latest
  steps:
   - name: Code Quality
    run: l
      black --check shared/
      ruff shared/
      mypy shared/
   - name: Security Scan
    run:
      bandit -r shared/
      safety check
```

```
    name: Tests
    run: |
    pytest shared/ --cov=shared --cov-fail-under=90
    name: Performance
    run: |
    python scripts/performance_test.py
```

Criteria: Pipeline musi być zielony dla merge

# Gate 3: Pre-Production (Staging)

# Manual Testing: ☐ Full regression testing ☐ Performance testing ☐ Security penetration testing ☐ User acceptance testing ☐ Load testing Automated Checks: ☐ All E2E tests pass ☐ Performance benchmarks met ☐ Security scans clean ☐ Database migrations successful

# BUG TRIAGE PROCESS

### > Bug Priority Levels

- P0 Critical (Fix within 4h)
  - System down lub major functionality broken
  - Data loss lub security breach

Blocks all development work

#### P1 - High (Fix within 24h)

- Major feature not working
- Performance degradation > 50%
- Blocks significant user workflows

#### P2 - Medium (Fix within 1 week)

- · Minor feature issues
- UI/UX problems
- Non-critical performance issues

#### P3 - Low (Fix in next sprint)

- Cosmetic issues
- Nice-to-have improvements
- Documentation problems

# **Bug Lifecycle**

1. Discovery  $\rightarrow$  Triage  $\rightarrow$  Assignment  $\rightarrow$  Fix  $\rightarrow$  Verification  $\rightarrow$  Closed

#### Triage Process (Daily @ 9:30 AM):

- Review new bugs
- Assign priority levels
- Assign to developer
- Estimate effort
- Update stakeholders

# PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKS

# **©** Performance Targets

#### **API Response Times:**

- **GET /agents**: < 200ms (95th percentile)
- POST /agents/task: < 500ms (95th percentile)</li>
- WebSocket connection: < 100ms initial</li>
- **LLM inference**: < 5s per request

#### **Frontend Performance:**

- First Contentful Paint: < 1s
- Time to Interactive: < 2s
- Bundle size: < 1MB gzipped

#### **System Resources:**

- Memory usage: < 2GB per service
- CPU usage: < 70% sustained
- Database queries: < 50ms average

# Performance Testing Tools

```
# Load testing z locust
from locust import HttpUser, task, between

class AgentUser(HttpUser):
    wait_time = between(1, 3)

    @task
    def get_agents(self):
        self.client.get("/api/agents")

@task(3)
    def create_task(self):
        self.client.post("/api/agents/task", json={
            "description": "Test task",
            "priority": 1
        })
```

# REVIEW METRICS & KPIs

# Code Review Metrics

#### **Quality Metrics:**

• Review Coverage: 100% PRs reviewed

• **Review Time**: < 24h average

• Rework Rate: < 20% PRs require major changes

• **Defect Escape Rate**: < 5% bugs found post-merge

#### **Process Metrics:**

• PR Size: Average < 400 lines changed

• **Review Comments**: 2-5 comments per PR average

• Approval Time: < 2 days from creation

# **Weekly Review Report Template**

#### ## Week XX Quality Report

#### ### Metrics

- PRs Reviewed: X/X (100%)

- Average Review Time: Xh

- Critical Bugs Found: X

- Test Coverage: X%

#### ### Highlights

- What went well

- 🚨 Issues identified

- @ Improvements for next week

#### ### Action Items

- [] Item 1 (Owner: X)

- [] Item 2 (Owner: Y)



# **TOOLS INTEGRATION**

# **GitHub Integration:**

- Branch protection rules
- · Required status checks
- Automated PR templates
- Code owners file (CODEOWNERS)

### **IDE Integration:**

- · Pre-commit hooks
- Linting extensions
- Test runner integration
- Code coverage display

#### **CI/CD Integration:**

- · Automated quality gates
- Performance regression detection
- Security scanning
- Deployment gates

Code Review Process Last Updated: 7 października 2025, 13:02 CEST

Next Review: Weekly during retrospective

Process Owner: Development Team