




 Secrets


 ABAP


 Apex


 C


 C++


 CloudFormation


 COBOL


 C#


 CSS


 Flex


 Go


 HTML


 Java


 JavaScript


 Kotlin


 Objective C


 PHP


 PL/I


 PL/SQL


 Python


 RPG


 Ruby


 **Scala**


 Swift


 Terraform


 Text


 TypeScript

 T-SQL

 VB.NET

 VB6

 XML



## Scala static code analysis

Unique rules to find Bugs, Security Hotspots, and Code Smells in your SCALA code

All rules 41

Bug 6

Security Hotspot 2

Code Smell 33

Tags ▾

Search by name... 🔍

Track uses of "FIXME" tags

Code Smell

Nested blocks of code should not be left empty

Code Smell

Functions should not have too many parameters

Code Smell

Collapsible "if" statements should be merged

Code Smell

Using hardcoded IP addresses is security-sensitive

Security Hotspot

Multi-line comments should not be empty

Code Smell

Boolean checks should not be inverted

Code Smell

Unused local variables should be removed

Code Smell

Local variable and function parameter names should comply with a naming convention

Code Smell

Boolean literals should not be redundant

Code Smell

Class names should comply with a naming convention

Code Smell

### Two branches in a conditional structure should not have exactly the same implementation

Analyze your code

Code Smell Major ? design suspicious

Having two cases in a match statement or two branches in an if chain with the same implementation is at best duplicate code, and at worst a coding error. If the same logic is truly needed for both instances, then in an if chain they should be combined, or for a match, one should fall through to the other.

#### Noncompliant Code Example

```
value match {
  case 1 =>
    doFirstThing
    doSomething
  case 2 =>
    doSomethingDifferent
  case 3 => // Noncompliant; duplicates case 1's implementation
    doFirstThing
    doSomething
  case _ =>
    doTheRest
}

if (a >= 0 && a < 10) {
  doFirstThing
  doTheThing
}
else if (a >= 10 && a < 20) {
  doTheOtherThing
}
else if (a >= 20 && a < 50) {
  doFirstThing
  doTheThing // Noncompliant; duplicates first condition
}
else {
  doTheRest
}
```





#### Exceptions

Blocks in an if chain that contain a single line of code are ignored, as are blocks in a match statement that contain a single line of code.

```
if(a == 1) {
  doSomething //no issue, usually this is done on purpose
} else if (a == 2) {
  doSomethingElse
} else {
```

https://rules.sonarsource.com/scala/RSPEC-1871

1/2

<div>Method names should comply with a naming convention</div> <div> Code Smell</div>
<div>Track uses of "TODO" tags</div> <div> Code Smell</div>
<div>Track lack of copyright and license headers</div> <div> Code Smell</div>
<div>"match" statements should not be nested</div> <div> Code Smell</div>
<div>Control flow statements "if", "for", "while", "match" and "try" should not be nested too deeply</div>

```
doSomething
}
```

But this exception does not apply to `if` chains without `else`-s, or to `match`-es without default clauses when all branches have the same single line of code. In case of `if` chains with `else`-s, or of `match`-es with default clauses, rule {rule:scala:S3923} raises a bug.

```
if(a == 1) {
  doSomething //Noncompliant, this might have been done
} else if (a == 2) {
  doSomething
}
```

Available In:

 |  | 