

Software and Core Review Process

Document Authors: arho.virkki@tyks.fi, juha-matti.varjonen@tyks.fi

Best practices of software and code review in KTP

Put the following texts into the beginning of code file comment section and update accordingly.

Software / application review template

```
Review Date: <yyyy-mm-dd>
Software / application (file)name: <name>
Software / application version number: <version>
Responsible developer / designer: <name>
Responsible reviewer: <name>

[Yes/No/Under work]: is the documentation of the software or application saved in the KTP network
share (\\atdbw61\KTP\Ohjeet).
- Rejection criterion: no documentation and / or good reason why there is
only a subset of documentation or no official documentation at all.
- Comments: TBA

[Yes/No/Under work]: is the software or application information documented in the ktp wiki
(http://ktpdoc.vsshp.net/Home)?
- Rejection criterion: no documentation on the ktp-wiki and / or good reason why the software or
application does not have a
documentation on the ktp-wiki.
- Comments: TBA

[Yes/No/Under work]: is the software or application stored in the KTP version control system (Git)?
- Rejection criterion: The software or application can not be found in the version control.
- Comments: TBA

[Yes/No/Under work]: does the documentation have information on the software or application's
production, testing, and
development environments?
- Rejection criterion: no basic information about the application's environments.
- Comments: TBA

[Yes/No/Under work]: do reviewer know which tools have the software or application been developed
and with which tools can the
application be further developed?
- Rejection criterion: maintenance and / or upgrading of the software or application required tools
not mentioned
in the documentation.
- Comments: TBA

[Yes/No/Under work]: are there any examples of the use of modules / classes?
- Rejection criterion: no reason for rejection?
- Comments: TBA

[Yes/No/Under work]: is there any architecture or class diagrams etc. available?
- Rejection criterion: no reason for rejection?
- Comments: TBA
```

Code review template

```
Review Date: <yyyy-mm-dd>
Code (file)name: <name>
Code version number: <version>
Responsible developer / designer: <name>
Responsible reviewer: <name>

[Yes/No/Under work]: is the reviewer able to test the software or application while performing the
code review?
- Rejection criterion: the software / or application can not be tried and / or tested in practice.
- Comments: TBA
```

[Yes/No/Under work]: see how easy is to get "big picture" from the version control of the code and folder structure etc.?

- Rejection criterion: the whole code is very difficult and / or impossible to get an overview without the author's

verbal instruction.

- Comments: TBA

[Yes/No/Under work]: try to find out is there any mistakes and misunderstandings in the code and that the

code is properly commented?

- Rejection criterion: there are large logical errors in the code and not commented.

- Comments: TBA

[Yes/No/Under work]: the variables, functions, methods, classes and modules should be named descriptively.

- Rejection criterion: in order to understand the code, reviewer must consult the developer in critical manner because

of poor naming

- Comments: TBA

[Yes/No/Under work]: the method / function should be less than 100 lines long

- Rejection criterion: Multiple and / or non-reasoned over 100 lines long methods or functions if not clearly stated

otherwise why.

- Comments: TBA