

# Efficiency of Review Meetings

Haris Causegic, Aretina Iazzolino, Andreas Korge, Josip Ledic and Thommy Zelenik  
University of Stuttgart  
Institute of Software Technology  
Stuttgart, Germany  
Email: inf82831@stud.uni-stuttgart.de

**Abstract**—The abstract goes here.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Traditional code and document inspection in terms of discovery and comprehension of mistakes and bugs is one of the most important processes in software development. In addition to the intuitive approach of manually discovering mistakes, side effects and bugs in software and documents, there are various techniques to further enhance code and documentation quality, ranging from spell-checking, static and dynamic code analyses, automatic code quality monitoring to project check-in policies. These techniques have one thing in common. They can mostly be applied (semi-)automatically without the need of interacting with other fellow developers.

Another technique for improving code quality, that utilizes the *many eyes see better than two* principle are review meetings. These developer meetings generally take place after each developer independently reviewed the code or document in question. The idea of these meetings is that all independently discovered issues get accumulated, presented and discussed in a public manner. Earlier work on code review meetings has shown that such review meetings are useful for discovering potential bugs, improving code quality and enforcing standards (software reviews: the state of the practice). The question that yet remains to be answered is if code review meetings are an efficient way of improving code quality in general.

## II. RELATED WORK

In this section we discuss the related work with respect to the efficiency of technical review meetings and the relevance of the meeting sessions. Prior work has qualitatively analyzed the technical review process used by large software systems.

### A. Review without meeting session

Without a review meeting the reviewers would just send their list of findings via tools developed for supporting code review to the author of the artifact or choosing one reviewer taking care of all the review work. The following papers show the influence on the quality of the artifact when using this method.

Baker discussed a procedure for reviewing code changes that are made to a software product as it moves through its life cycle. Facing a decline of customer confidence in his product his team came up with the idea of using a revision control

system to identify all changes made to the product and a line by line review of the changes by the project manager. He noted that this methodology came with several advantages one of them being the efficiency with which the quality improvement was made. A single reviewer becomes very efficient in his reviews due to practice at reviewing code and to a thorough understanding of the product. The fact they used the product manager as the single reviewer facilitated him getting an insight into the whole project encompassing each engineer's performance, the complexity of the tasks, progress of the project and also bettering his scheduling skills. The employees liked this methodology because of the manager getting an understanding of the effort in their work, capabilities and identifying areas that needed improvement.

By using this methodology a 40% reduction in the number of bugs at a cost of 1-2% of the project was achieved [?].

Mcintosh et al. studied the relationship between software quality and:

- the proportion of changes that have been code reviewed (code review coverage), and
- the degree of reviewer involvement in the code review process (code review participation)

through a case study of the large Qt, VTK, and ITK open source systems. The Gerrit-driven code review process for git-based software projects has been used which is tightly integrated with test automation and code integration tools. They extracted code review data from the Gerrit review databases of the studied systems and linked the review data to the integrated patches recorded in the corresponding version control systems. They built Multiple Linear Regression (MLR) models to explain the incidence of post-release defects detected in the components of the studied systems having the goal to understand the relationship between the explanatory variables (code review coverage and participation) and the dependent variable (post-release defect counts).

They found out that low code review coverage and participation are estimated to produce components with up to two and five additional post-release defects respectively [?].

Bacchelli et al. empirically explored the motivations, challenges, and outcomes of tool-based code reviews. They observed, interviewed, and surveyed developers and managers and manually classified hundreds of review comments across diverse teams at Microsoft using discussions within the review tool CodeFlow. They found out that the main motivation

for reviews despite finding defects are knowledge transfer, increasing team awareness, and creation of alternative solutions to problems [?].

### B. Review with meeting session

One common way of quality assurance of documents or code in a software development process is to organize a technical review where several reviewers examine an artifact and discuss the findings together in a two to three hour review meeting. Although it has been shown that a technical review can find bugs and issues efficiently it is unclear how relevant the meeting session is where reviewers discuss their findings.

## III. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

### A. Research Questions

First, we wanted to see, whether review meetings help the software development process in terms of quality management.

**RQ1: How effective are review meetings in regards to improving document or code quality?**

Next, we were interested in how efficient these review meetings are in regards to time and monetary requirements.

**RQ2: Are code review meetings an efficient way of increasing document or code quality?**

### B. Hypothesis

Initially, we defined two hypotheses and their according null hypotheses. The first hypothesis refers to RQ1. We wanted to understand if review meetings help improving code or document quality at all and thus only look at the effectiveness.

**H1: Review meetings are effective in improving document or code quality.**

The respective null hypothesis assumes that there is no significant improvement in code quality.

**H10: Review meetings are not effective in improving document or code quality.**

Next we were interested in whether or not review meetings are also efficient in improving code quality, since a group of usually five or six software developers is required and thus entails high monetary costs.

**H2: Review meetings are an efficient way of increasing document or code quality.**

The null hypothesis for H2 presumes that review meetings are not efficient in improving code quality.

**H20: Review meetings are not an efficient way of increasing document or code quality.**

### C. Design

Quantitative and qualitative analysis.? One factor 2 treatment.

For our quantitative analysis we used a one factor two treatment design. The first treatment is the control treatment of doing no review meetings, while the second treatment is the execution of a review meeting. Since doing no review does not influence the subjects, each group was assigned to both treatments.

Subjects	No Review Meeting	Review Meeting
"SoPra" Group 1	x	x
"SoPra" Group 2	x	x
...	x	x

TABLE I

THE ONE FACTOR TWO TREATMENT DESIGN USED FOR OUR EXPERIMENT.

### D. Objects

The idea of our experiment was that we analyse the review report that result out of the review meetings and compare them to the merged lists of findings from each individual reviewer.

1) *Review Meetings*: The review meetings are conducted by students of the University of Stuttgart within the scope of the "Software Praktikum". Each review group consists of five people, being three reviewers, one moderator and one scribe, who is also representing the authors. Before the review meeting itself, all reviewers have to inspect the document and create a list of findings using a review tool [?] tool. The reviews are expected to have a duration of TODO:90 minutes. During the reviews, the scribe also uses a review meeting tool to gather the findings and in the end creates a final review report.

2) *Review Tools*: We looked into the following review tools: *RevAger*: *Collaborator* TODO Thommy: Find more review tools, explain them, decide for *RevAger* (and find a reason).

### E. Experiment Procedure

TODO: Josip

### F. Data collection Procedure

The data for the control treatment is gathered by taking the findings lists of each reviewer in a review group and merging these lists together, eliminating duplicates. On the other hand, the data for the review treatment equals the findings list that results out of the review. Additionally, the *RevAger* tool automatically measures the elapsed time. The tool also saves the participants and their respective roles.

The structure of a finding consists of a description, an aspect (what reviewers should have a special focus on, e.g. completeness), a reference (where to find it in the document) and an importance rating.

TODO Haris: qualitative data collection

### G. Analysis Procedure

For the analysis of the findings, we decided to evaluate them manually, due to the fact that there is no objective way of rating the quality of a finding. The evaluation will be executed by three of the study conductors independently and the final result is determined by establishing the median of these.

In order to rate the individual findings, we constructed the following classification scale, which can also be seen in table III: The weighing of the findings are worth 1 for good, 2 for besides error, 3 for main error and 5 for crucial error. If a rating is incorrect, we will instead assign the value for the correct weighting and decrease it by 1. If a finding itself is

incorrect (e.g. claims to have found a mistake, where there is none), the finding will receive a rating of -1.

Next, we tried to find formula that determines the overall quality of a finding list. It is important to consider both the amount of findings, but also the overall quality of these findings. Although more findings generally are a positive result, we decided that the overall quality is even more important (e.g. to reduce stacking of rather unimportant "good" findings). Therefore our focus is set more on the overall finding quality, meaning that we rate critical and main errors higher. We defined the amount of findings  $a_L$  by:

$$a_L = \sum_L$$

Where  $L$  is the merged list of all findings, without duplicates.

For the overall quality  $q_L$  we determined the arithmetic mean of the accumulated weightings of the findings.

$$q_L = \frac{1}{a_L} \sum_{f \in L} w_f$$

Where  $w_f$  is the weighting (see table III) of finding  $f$ .

In order to evaluate the difference between two finding lists, we defined the following function:

$$f(L_1, L_2) = \frac{a_{L_2} - a_{L_1}}{a_{L_2} + a_{L_1}} + (q_{L_2} - q_{L_1})$$

While in theory  $f \in [-7, 7]$  holds with  $\frac{a_{L_2} - a_{L_1}}{a_{L_2} + a_{L_1}} \in [-1, 1]$  and  $q_{L_2} - q_{L_1} \in [-6, 6]$ , in reality the values we will receive will be very small. Suppose the reviewers assemble 100 unique findings beforehand and the review meeting results in 5 new findings (which would be a unusually high amount), our first term would have a value of 0.0244. As for the second term, suppose the average rating for the findings was 3.0 and 10 classification errors occurred, we would receive a final quality rating  $q_{L_1}$  of 2.951. Assuming that the review meeting corrects all these classification errors, the second term would add up to 0.049. So overall our improvement is 0.0734. Assuming these values are realistic, our previously mentioned focus on the quality would be given with approximately 2:1. Considering these values, we now can define our hypotheses. We define effectiveness as having any improvement from the document without the meeting. We define our H1 Hypothesis on effectiveness as following:

$$\mathbf{H1:} f(L_{pre}, L_{post}) > 0$$

Where  $L_{pre}$  is the finding list before the review meeting, while  $L_{post}$  describes the finding list that results after the meeting. The corresponding null hypothesis, assuming that there is no improvement resulting out of a review meeting, looks as follows:

$$\mathbf{H10:} f(L_{pre}, L_{post}) \leq 0$$

As for efficiency, we first have to consider the time and monetary costs that result out of a review meeting. Assuming that a review consists of three reviewers, one moderator, one scribe and an author with an average earnings of 100/h per developer, an hour would cost approximately 600, not

Classification	Rating
'Good'	1
'Besides Error'	2
'Main Error'	3
'Critical Error'	5
'Finding Error'	-1
'Classification Error Penalty'	-1

TABLE II

RATING TABLE FOR THE EVALUATION OF FINDINGS.

considering potential costs of the meeting room. Since this research only focuses on the review meetings themselves, we do not consider any costs that arise within a review process outside the meeting itself (e.g. the cost for the reviewers to analyse the specimen). Estimating the cost of an error poses a difficult task. According to [?] the cost of an error in the requirements phase increases by 30 to 70 times, when found in the acceptance testing, where a specification error is most likely found in. We assume that correcting an average error in the specification takes about 3 minutes to correct and thus has an initial cost of about 5, which will cost about 250 when found in the acceptance testing. We assume that this is the average cost for a critical error in order to not overestimate the efficiency. Further we assume that a besides error is worth 100 and a main error is worth 150. We define our hypothesis H2, that describes the efficiency of review meetings, as follows:

$$\mathbf{H2:} 100 * n < 50 * \sum_{f \in L_{new}} w_f$$

Where  $n$  is the amount of developers taking part in the review meeting.  $L_{new}$  is the list of newly discovered findings, defined as  $L_{new} = L_{post} \setminus L_{pre}$ .

#### H. Validity Procedure

The review teams were assigned semi-randomly out of all "SoPra" participants with only one condition, being that no "SoPra" team members are within the same review group.

In order to reduce subjectivity of the manual evaluation that will take place when weighting the findings, we decided that three study conductors independently rate these weightings. The median of these three ratings will be taken as the final value.

Each group received the specification document three days before their respective review meetings. By doing this we strived for having their memories on the specimen as fresh as possible.

### IV. ANALYSIS

#### V. THREATS TO VALIDITY

##### A. Conclusion Validity

The threat level to conclusion validity of our experiment is rather high. This is due to the fact that some of our measurements could not be automatically calculated but instead had to be determined manually by the conductors. In order to reduce this threat, we decided to let three conductors determine the values independently and finally took the median as our final result. Our calculations on the efficiency hypothesis H2 are mainly based on money estimates, and the costs of developers

Group No.	Good Error		Besides Error		Main Error		Critical Error		Finding Error		Classification Error		Time
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	
Group 1	x	y											
Group 2													
Group 3													
Group 4													
Group 5													
Group 6													
Group 7													
Group 8													
Group 9													
Group 10													
Group 11													
Group 12													
Group 13													
Group 14													
Group 15													

TABLE III  
RATING TABLE FOR THE EVALUATION OF FINDINGS.

varies between countries, companies and individual position within a company.

#### B. Internal Validity

Due to the fact that the participants had to be informed about the experiment to give us their consent, they knew that some part of their work will be evaluated and thus might have been influenced in their behavior by the experiment, e.g. resulting in them making more efforts than they would have done otherwise.

Since we cannot prevent students from communicating with each other, it is unavoidable that information about the specification or experiment in general could be exchanged.

#### C. Construct Validity

The construct validity between the treatment and the cause construct is a given, since they are identical, being the review meeting.

As for the validity between the outcome and the construct of the effect, ?

#### D. External Validity

Our study also contains external threats to validity. Since every group of students in the "SoPra" has to solve the exact same task, all produces code or specifications should ideally be semantically equal and thus our results might not necessarily be generalizable to all kind of software systems.

Another external factor that threatens validity are the participants of the study. These are limited to students of the university Stuttgart and thus represent only a minor part of software engineers.

Lastly, the size of the "SoPra" is very small, since it is only a six month project for three developers and thus is far off from realistic industrial projects.

## VI. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

TODO

## VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

TODO

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank...

## REFERENCES

- [1] H. Kopka and P. W. Daly, *A Guide to L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X*, 3rd ed. Harlow, England: Addison-Wesley, 1999.