

Code Inspection Report

*Anti-Spam Configuration Software
Development Project*

BSc/MSc in [LEI | LIGE | METI]
Academic Year 2017/2018 - 1º Semester
Software Engineering I

Grupo: 105
62109 - André Vieira
62112 - Diogo Pires

ISCTE-IUL, Instituto Universitário de Lisboa
1649-026 Lisbon
Portugal

December 22th 2017

Table of Contents

Introduction 3

Code inspection – Name of the component being inspected 3

Code inspection checklist 3

Found defects..... 4

Corrective measures..... 6

Conclusions of the inspection process 7

Introduction

O software corrente tem como principal funcionalidade a geração de pesos ótimos, para uma dada gama de regras de SPAM, para que possa ser calculado para um grupo de emails o numero de falsos positivos e falsos negativos de maneira a encontrar os pesos para que o numero de falsos positivos e falsos negativos seja mais baixo.

Code inspection – Name of the component being inspected

Description of the software component being inspected

<i>Meeting date:</i>	22/11/2017
<i>Meeting duration:</i>	22 minutes
<i>Moderator:</i>	André Vieira
<i>Producer:</i>	André Vieira
<i>Inspector:</i>	André Vieira
<i>Recorder:</i>	André Vieira
<i>Component name (Package/Class/Method):</i>	src/antiSpamFilter.api
<i>Component was compiled:</i>	Yes
<i>Component was executed:</i>	Yes
<i>Component was tested without errors:</i>	Yes
<i>Testing coverage achieved:</i>	No (40%)

<i>Meeting date:</i>	22/11/2017
<i>Meeting duration:</i>	22 minutes
<i>Moderator:</i>	Diogo Pires
<i>Producer:</i>	Diogo Pires
<i>Inspector:</i>	Diogo Pires
<i>Recorder:</i>	Diogo Pires
<i>Component name (Package/Class/Method):</i>	src/antiSpamFilter.gui
<i>Component was compiled:</i>	Yes
<i>Component was executed:</i>	Yes
<i>Component was tested without errors:</i>	Yes
<i>Testing coverage achieved:</i>	No (40%)

Code inspection checklist

1. Variable, Attribute, and Constant Declaration Defects (VC)

- ☒ Are descriptive variable and constant names used in accord with naming conventions?
- ☐ Are there variables or attributes with confusingly similar names?
- ☒ Is every variable and attribute correctly typed?
- ☒ Is every variable and attribute properly initialized?
- ☐ Could any non-local variables be made local?
- ☒ Are all for-loop control variables declared in the loop header?
- ☐ Are there literal constants that should be named constants?
- ☐ Are there variables or attributes that should be constants?
- ☐ Are there attributes that should be local variables?
- ☒ Do all attributes have appropriate access modifiers (private, protected, public)?
- ☐ Are there static attributes that should be non-static or vice-versa?

2. Method Definition Defects (FD)

- ☒ Are descriptive method names used in accord with naming conventions?
- ☐ Is every method parameter value checked before being used?
- ☒ For every method: Does it return the correct value at every method return point?
- ☒ Do all methods have appropriate access modifiers (private, protected, public)?
- ☐ Are there static methods that should be non-static or vice-versa?

3. Class Definition Defects (CD)

- ☒ Does each class have appropriate constructors and destructors?
- ☐ Do any subclasses have common members that should be in the superclass?
- ☐ Can the class inheritance hierarchy be simplified?

4. Data Reference Defects (DR)

- ☐ For every array reference: Is each subscript value within the defined bounds?
- ☒ For every object or array reference: Is the value certain to be non-null?

5. Computation/Numeric Defects (CN)

- ☒ Are there any computations with mixed data types?
- ☐ Is overflow or underflow possible during a computation?
- ☐ For each expressions with more than one operator: Are the assumptions about order of evaluation and precedence correct?
- ☒ Are parentheses used to avoid ambiguity?

6. Comparison/Relational Defects (CR)

- ☒ For every boolean test: Is the correct condition checked?
- ☐ Are the comparison operators correct?
- ☐ Has each boolean expression been simplified by driving negations inward?
- ☒ Is each boolean expression correct?
- ☐ Are there improper and unnoticed side-effects of a comparison?
- ☐ Has an "&" inadvertently been interchanged with a "&&" or a "|" for a "||"?

7. Control Flow Defects (CF)

- ☒ For each loop: Is the best choice of looping constructs used?
- ☒ Will all loops terminate?
- ☐ When there are multiple exits from a loop, is each exit necessary and handled properly?
- ☒ Does each switch statement have a default case?
- ☒ Are missing switch case break statements correct and marked with a comment?
- ☐ Do named break statements send control to the right place?
- ☐ Is the nesting of loops and branches too deep, and is it correct?
- ☐ Can any nested if statements be converted into a switch statement?
- ☒ Are null bodied control structures correct and marked with braces or comments?
- ☒ Are all exceptions handled appropriately?
- ☒ Does every method terminate?

8. Input-Output Defects (IO)

- ☒ Have all files been opened before use?
- ☒ Are the attributes of the input object consistent with the use of the file?
- ☒ Have all files been closed after use?
- ☐ Are there spelling or grammatical errors in any text printed or displayed?
- ☒ Are all I/O exceptions handled in a reasonable way?

9. Module Interface Defects (MI)

- ☒ Are the number, order, types, and values of parameters in every method call in agreement with the called method's declaration?
- ☒ Do the values in units agree (e.g., inches versus yards)?
- ☒ If an object or array is passed, does it get changed, and changed correctly by the called method?

10. Comment Defects (CM)

- ☒ Does every method, class, and file have an appropriate header comment?
- ☒ Does every attribute, variable, and constant declaration have a comment?
- ☐ Is the underlying behavior of each method and class expressed in plain language?
- ☐ Is the header comment for each method and class consistent with the behavior of the method or class?
- ☒ Do the comments and code agree?
- ☒ Do the comments help in understanding the code?
- ☒ Are there enough comments in the code?
- ☒ Are there too many comments in the code?

11. Layout and Packaging Defects (LP)

- ☒ Is a standard indentation and layout format used consistently?
- ☐ For each method: Is it no more than about 60 lines long?
- ☒ For each compile module: Is no more than about 600 lines long?

12. Modularity Defects (MO)

- ☒ Is there a low level of coupling between modules (methods and classes)?
- ☒ Is there a high level of cohesion within each module (methods or class)?
- ☐ Is there repetitive code that could be replaced by a call to a method that provides the behavior of the repetitive code?
- ☒ Are the Java class libraries used where and when appropriate?

13. Storage Usage Defects (SU)

- ☒ Are arrays large enough?
- ☒ Are object and array references set to null once the object or array is no longer needed?

14. Performance Defects (PE)

- ☒ Can better data structures or more efficient algorithms be used?
- ☒ Are logical tests arranged such that the often successful and inexpensive tests precede the more expensive and less frequently successful tests?
- ☒ Can the cost of recomputing a value be reduced by computing it once and storing the results?
- ☒ Is every result that is computed and stored actually used?
- ☐ Can a computation be moved outside a loop?
- ☐ Are there tests within a loop that do not need to be done?
- ☐ Can a short loop be unrolled?
- ☐ Are there two loops operating on the same data that can be combined into one?
- ☒ Are frequently used variables declared register?
- ☐ Are short and commonly called methods declared inline?

Found defects

Identify and describe found defects, opinions and suggestions.

Found defect Id	Package, Class, Method, Line	Defect category	Description
1	antiSpamFilter.api, HVFile.java, compile()	Create HV file	Ao criar o ficheiro HV.Boxplot.eps é preciso editar primeiro o ficheiro HV.Boxplot.R de maneira a colocar o path completo da pasta data. Caso contrário é gerado um erro dizendo que não é possível encontrar o ficheiro.

Corrective measures

Found defect Id, how/when/who will correct the identified defect.

Found defect 1 – irá ser corrigido a quando da versão 2, de maneira a funcionar sem ser preciso editar o ficheiro.

Conclusions of the inspection process

Quality assessment of the component inspected for the purpose of integration/delivery the software (does it need no changes, minor/major changes/corrections, build from scratch).

Back-end – todo o backend está a funcionar corretamente e sem problemas. No entanto, poderia ser melhorado para que o carregamento de ficheiros fosse de maneira automática em vez de o developer estar sempre a inserir ficheiros. Desta forma seria mais rápido fazer os testes de qualidade e de primeira impressão.

Front-end – todo o frontend está a funcionar sem problemas. No entanto seria bom, por uma questão de otimização, dividir mais o código mais de maneira a ser mais fácil escrever os testes e descobrir problemas.