Team 19 Inspection Document

Laboratory #8: Inspection

Morgan, Laura Miaw, Jireh Hauser, Steven Dworak, Catherine Bertoglio, David

Work Product

Documentation of inspection of Group 20's source code, following three-phase inspection.

Document Revision Information

April 12, 2013 - Document created

April 15, 2013 - Phase 1 Inspection documented

April 19, 2013 - Phase 1 Rework documented

April 21, 2013 - Phase 2 Inspection and Rework documented

April 26, 2013 - Phase 3 Inspection and Rework documented

Approval Sheet

All group members whose names are listed below approve of the document and contributed fairly.

Member Names

Morgan, Laura Miaw, Jireh Hauser, Steven Dworak, Catherine Bertoglio, David

Pledge

On my honor, as a student, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this assignment.

Names

Morgan, Laura Miaw, Jireh Hauser, Steven Dworak, Catherine Bertoglio, David

Contents

Inspection Schedule	5
Group Member Responsibilities	5
Checklists Used	5
Phase 1	
Phase 2	6
Phase 3	7
Inspection and Rework	
Questions about Implementation by Group 19	7
Answers about Implementation for Group 2020	7
Results of Inspection	8
Phase 1	8
Phase 2	9
Phase 3	10

Inspection Schedule

Phase 1 – Internal documentation & source-code layout Monday, April 15 – 3:30 p.m. during in-lab.

Phase 2 – Coding practices Sunday, April 21 – 1:30 p.m. Rice Hall.

Phase 3 – Functional correctness Friday, April 26 – 1:00 p.m. Rice Hall.

Group Member Responsibilities

Inspections

Phase 1 Inspector – Catherine

Phase 2 Inspector – Laura

Phase 3 Inspector – David, Jireh, Steven, Catherine Laura

Rework

Rework of source code after Phase 1 – Steven Rework of source code after Phase 2 – Jireh Rework of source code after Phase 3 - David

Checklists Used

Phase 1

Internal documentation & source-code layout (single inspector).

Structure

- proper use of indentation for "levels" in code
- proper use of tabbing when declaring variables
- existence of columns of related items
- existence of white space (spaces after commas, variables, between methods etc.)
- use of new line when line is too long
- consistency followed with use of braces {} throughout

Documentation

- sparing use of comments; only used to document unavoidable complexity
- identifiers
 - meaningful
 - o underscores used as separators
 - o capitalization of types, Classes
 - o names indicate purpose
- constants
 - mixed case capitalization
 - o no magic numbers (no embedded literals or constants)
 - o only symbolic constants used

- symbolic constants in all capital letters, separated by underscores
- avoid abbreviations in names

methods

- mixed case for name
- abbreviations avoided
- o names indicate function
- "get/set" used where attribute is accessed directly
- o "is" used for Boolean methods
- "find" used for methods that look something up

variables

- o name should reveal purpose and/or type
- plural if representing group of objects
- iterator variables consistent (for example: i and j)
- abbreviations avoided

Phase 2

- Switch statements
 - Switch statements used rather than if-else-if blocks
 - o Every switch statement has a break in each case statement

Variables

- All variables initialized prior to use
- All variables declared at top of function
- All loop variables initialized just before loop
- No variables initialized that are not used

Classes

All classes have complete set of get() and set() methods

Bounds

- o All arithmetic checked for ranges within bounds
- All loop bounds are correct

Methods

- All method arguments are used in method
- All functions named after what they return
- All procedures named after what they do

Conditionals

- Complexity of conditionals should be avoided
- All relational operators correct (> vs >=)
- Executable statements not included in conditionals

Miscellaneous

- No public data
- Every file is included in given file uses

- o All file open commands checked for failure
- Type conversion done explicitly

Phase 3

- Methods
 - All methods return what they supposed to return
 - All methods execute what they are supposed to execute
- Variables
 - o All variables exist for the purpose for which they are named
- All specified functionality is implemented

Inspection and Rework

4/15/13 Phase 1 Inspection completed 4/19/13 Rework of Phase 1 completed

4/21/13 Phase 2 Inspection completed 4/21/13 Rework of Phase 2 completed

4/26/13 Phase 3 Inspection completed 4/26/13 Rework of Phase 3 complete

Questions about Implementation by Group 19

- 1. Why does decode message and encode message and implement command use a string ArrayList?
- 2. Why do we include getPadding() function in Message Handler
- 3. What are the arguments passed in the differential pilot for?
- 4. Why is the differential pilot passed Motor.B and Motor.C but not Motor.A?
- 5. Why is the setRotateSpeed of the Pilot originally set to 90?
- 6. What is COMMAND TYPE INDEX and why is it initialized to 0?
- 7. What is DEFAULT RADIUS and why is it initialized to 90?

Answers about Implementation for Group 20

- Why do we utilize a readFlag instead of a while(True) statement in line 48 of Basestation.java
 - The readFlag allows an engineer to control whether or not the GUI will read input from the robot more easily than having to find the while(true) statement.
- 2. Why do we choose to hardcode values in methods as opposed to creating a communications class and finding the correct message from there as the communication's document evolves?

Hardcoding allows for less complexity within the design of the code while still allowing messages to be changed relatively easily if the communications document evolves.

- 3. How do we verify that we receive the sensor data after requesting it?

 The returned message is checked through the checksum to verify that it is a valid message. The first three characters of the message are then used to determine what sensor the data is for.
- 4. What is the inherent speed limit to our setSpeed method in line 271? The inherent speed limit for set Speed is 999.
- 5. What happens when the speed limit is set above this number? A message that is longer than 11 bytes will be sent.
- What does exit robot do?An End Connection message will be sent to the robot.

Results of Inspection

Phase 1

Date and time: Monday April 15, 2013 4:00 p.m.

Inspector: Catherine

Defects found

- proper use of indentation for "levels" in code line 201, else should be on next line
- existence of white space (spaces after commas, variables, between methods etc.)

line 58, extra space between (0, 3) in GUI, spaces between "import" lines white space in beginning public class GUI

- use of new line when line is too long
 - line 82 does not need to be on new line (" + e.toString());")
- consistency followed with use of braces {} throughout
 should check consistency. Starting line 199 you being to put { on the same
 line as the method declaration and the if statement, rather than the next
 line. These braces should be moved to the next line. Check methods:
 qetTouchValue(), verifyChecksum(), qetChecksum()
- sparing use of comments; only used to document unavoidable complexity
 comment on line 34 runs off screen
 comment on line 53 doesn't clarify code
 unneeded code should be removed lines 95-100
 comments in moveForward(), moveBackward(), turnLeft(), turnRight(),
 turn180(), stop() most likely unneecessary

in GUI, comment line 20 in GUI, line 163, 362, 460, 495, 596, 632, 637, 650

constants

in GUI class, all private variables should be before public

- no magic numbers (no embedded literals or constants)
 in setSpeed() what are numbers 10 and 100?
- methods

methods between line 163 and 181 – unimplemented or unnecessary?

o abbreviations avoided

getUltraValue() - consider changing to getUltrasonicValue()
getMicroValue() - consider not abbreviating

- variables
 - name should reveal purpose and/or type
 in method setSpeed, int s does not reveal purpose
 - o abbreviations avoided

variable "ret" – abbreviated for return? name does not indicate purpose, in methods: establishConnection(), getCheckSum()

Result of rework:

Rework performed by: Steven

Effort used in corrections: Small amount of effort as not many fields of inspection checklist were violated, rework time, 30 minutes Approximate number of statements that had to be added: 3 Approximate number of statements that were changed: 10

Phase 2

Date and time: Sunday April 22, 2013 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Inspector: Laura

Defects found:

- Switch statements
 - Switch statements used rather than if-else-if blocks
 - BaseStation lines 72-92: If-else-if block should be switch-case block
 - GUI lines 468-700: if-else-if blocks should be switch-case blocks
- Variables
 - All variables initialized prior to use
 - GUI lines 246 & 247: txtConnectionButtonOn and txtConnectionButtonOff background set before textFields initialized (lines 257 and 265)
 - GUI lines 525, 543, 560, 577: wIsPressed, aIsPressed, sIsPressed, dIsPressed used in conditionals before initialized – consider initializing them all to false in initialize()

- GUI line 652: Boolean isSent never initialized
- GUI line 470: int speed used before initialized on line 475
- All variables declared at top of function
 - BaseStation line 71: String message declared in middle of function
 - BaseStation line 216: byte[] checksum should be declared at top of function
 - GUI line 643: Boolean valueHolder declared twice (also declared on line 25)
- All loop variables initialized just before loop
 - BaseStation line 30: Initialize readFlag on line 62 (just before loop) rather than at declaration
- No variables initialized that are not used
 - GUI line 28: private static GUI window never used

Result of rework:

Rework performed by: Jireh

Effort used in corrections: rework time, 20 minutes

Approximate number of statements that had to be added: 5 Approximate number of statements that were changed: 10

Phase 3

Date and time: Performed at different times between Wednesday April 24 and Friday

April 26

Inspector: David, Catherine, Steven, Jireh, Laura

Defects found:

- Methods
 - All methods return what they supposed to return]
 - Good though all methods return void (might want to add a Boolean value to ensure correct return)
 - All methods execute what they are supposed to execute
 - The base station should send back an "ack" message when it receives sensor data from the robot. Otherwise the methods execute properly.
 - See methods that are missing implementation
 - Unable to connect to a NXT that is not the given one.
 - Terminate Connection button does not work for me, for some reason the connection was shutdown prior to clicking that event.
 - Button does not correctly send message to the robot.
 - Stop is not functioning correctly, when I tell it to move forward then release the "W" key, the robot stops then continues forward until the Ultrasonic sensor causes the robot to stop.

- If I tell the robot to move in a certain direction, then release the key it doesn't always trigger the stop event.
- Touch sensor is not always refreshing to display correct value (may also need to look into other sensors but those are harder to examine without actually knowing what the values should be).
- os and is are abbreviations, as well as iHandle and oHandle
- I understand the use of the "10" and "100" in some functions, but I would suggest at least adding a comment to explain them if you are going to leave them in instead of symbolic constants, otherwise they just seem like magic numbers

Variables

- All variables exist for the purpose for which they are named
 - Looked like it to me, however I didn't extensively look at this, was more focused on actual functionality.
- All specified functionality is implemented
 - Is only able to connect to a specific NXT, should be more generic and able to connect to any NXT nearby with the specific PIN.
 - If connection fails, the GUI has no way of instantiating a new connection without restarting program.
 - Missing Implementation
 - Sending back an "ack" message upon receiving sensor data
 - moveForwardLeft(), moveForwardRight(), moveBackwardLeft(), moveForwardRight().
 - Add ability to move swinging arm (not specified but should be added as a "cool" feature)
 - Need to implement the timeout for if an ACK is not receive
 - Getting a bunch of exceptions that shouldn't be occurring, usually of the IOException: Stream Closed type.

Result of rework:

Rework performed by: David

Effort used in corrections: rework time, 2 hours

Approximate number of statements that had to be added: 100

Approximate number of statements that were changed: 3