Code Inspection Report

Anti-Spam Configuration Software Development Project

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

Group Id 112

Student number: 70088, Student name: Ana Patrícia

Silva, Turma: METI-PL

Student number: 68777, Student name: André Baptista,

Turma: METI-PL

Student number: 69311, Student name: Tiago Correia,

Turma: METI-PL

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

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Code inspection – Name of the component being inspected	
Code inspection checklist	4
Found defects	4
Corrective measures	5
Conclusions of the inspection process	5

Introduction

The developed software is meant to solve, or at least mitigate, the problem that is the increasing amount of spam email that affects users of this service. It supports both a manual and an automatic configuration and accounts for false positives and false negatives. By using the manual configuration mode, a user can set up the system with his or her own rules, to better suit his or her needs.

Code inspection – Name of the component being inspected

In these package (antiSpamFilterControl) we implemented the manual and automatic configuration and accounts the false positives and false negatives.

Meeting date:	21/12/2017
Meeting duration:	60 minutes
Moderator:	Ana Patrícia Silva
Producer:	Tiago Correia
Inspector:	
Recorder:	Ana Patrícia Silva
Component name (Package/Class/Method):	Package antiSpamFilterControl
Component was compiled:	True
Component was executed:	True
Component was tested without errors:	True
Testing coverage achieved:	<i>True</i> (78,3%)

Code inspection checklist

The checklist for Java code inspection used in this project is available at http://www.cs.toronto.edu/~sme/CSC444F/handouts/java_checklist.pdf and in blackboard ES1 page.

Found defects

Identify and describe found defects, opinions and suggestions.

Found defect Id	Package, Class, Method, Line	Defect category	Description
1	Package antiSpamFilterControl	VC	Non-constant variables start with capital letter
2	Package antiSpamFilterControl	VC	Some static attributes that should be non-static or viceversa
3	Package antiSpamFilterControl	FD	Not every method parameter value is checked before being used
4	Package antiSpamFilterControl	FD	Some static methods that should be non-static or viceversa
5	Package antiSpamFilterControl	CN	With automatic configuration the process takes some time to run
6	Package antiSpamFilterControl	СМ	Some methods/classes/attributes/variables are missing comments
7	Package antiSpamFilterControl	LP	Some methods have more than 60 lines

Corrective measures

- Defect 1 Locating and correcting every variable that doesn't have constant name. This will be corrected in Sprint 3 by a developer.
- Defect 2 Locating and correcting every static variable the should be non-static. This will be corrected in Sprint 3 by a developer.
- Defect 3 Locating every method parameter value that is not checked before use. This will be corrected in Sprint 3 by a developer.
- Defect 4 –Locating and correcting every static method that should be non-static. This will be corrected in Sprint 3 by a developer.
- Defect 5 It doesn't exist a correction for this case. It depends on the class antiSpamFilterAutomaticConfiguration.
- Defect 6 Locating methods/classes/attributes/variables that are not commented and making a proper comment. This will be corrected in Sprint 3 by a developer.
- Defect 7 Methods that are too long should be divided in shorter methods. This will be corrected in Sprint 3 by a developer.

Conclusions of the inspection process

It was verified that the source code should be improved to correct some cases where the code does not adhere to conventions and to optimize some methods. Besides that, it was verified that the user interface should be changed too. With this in mind, there should have been more scheduled meetings and code inspection events to prevent these kinds of issues so late in the development process.