

Assignment#3 - Group 16

Henrik Åkesson, Robin Eggestig, Anton Sederlin, Robert Skoglund, Tsz Ho Wat

February 2024

1 Statement of Contribution

- [issue/#5](#)
 - Robin Eggestig: Refactored *compareConsideringTypeParameters* and reduced the complexity by 60%.
- [issue/#8-CCN-cleanLines](#)
 - Anton Sederlin: Manual CCN calculation of *cleanLines* through code comments.
- [issue/#10-ImproveBCcleanLines](#)
 - Anton Sederlin: Added 5 tests that improve the branch coverage of *cleanLines*
 - Henrik Åkesson: Added 2 tests that improve the branch coverage of *cleanLines*
 - Robert Skoglund: Added 2 tests that improve the branch coverage of *cleanLines*
- [issue/#11-refracCleanLines](#)
 - Anton Sederlin: Refactored *cleanLines* and reduced the cyclomatic complexity by 65%.
- [issue/#14](#)
 - Tsz Ho Wat: *isAssignableMatchTypeParametersMatchingQName* refactor with cyclomatic complexity reduction.
- [issue/#15](#)
 - Robin Eggestig: Added 4 tests to improve the branch coverage of *compareConsideringTypeParameters*.
- [issue/#16](#)

- Tsz Ho Wat: Added tests for function *isAssignableMatchTypeParametersMatchingQName* to improved the breach coverage (the function was not covered at all by the original test suite).
- [issue/#18](#)
 - Robert Skoglund: Implemented our own branch coverage instrumentation tool for the large CC functions with > 0% coverage by the original test suite. Extra manual cover for one more function, as requested, is written here as well as the fix to cover else branches too.
- [issue/#19](#)
 - Robert Skoglund: *isApplicable* function refactor. No test coverage in first place, hence only a refactor.
- [issue/#21-RefractorCalculatedSynta xModelForNode](#)
 - Henrik Åkesson: Refactored *RefractorCalculatedSyntaxModelForNode* and reduced the cyclomatic complexity by 50%.
- [issue/#23-two-tests](#)
 - Henrik Åkesson: Added two new tests (*nameAsStringForSimpleName* & *nameAsStringThrowsErrorForNonName*) on the *nameAsString* method of the *NameLogic* class. While this was not the initially selected function, the function selected (*RefractorCalculatedSyntaxModelForNode*) ended up being too complex, as well as private, and thus to try and still contribute with tests, an additional function was selected to compensate. This was also due to limited time, trying to make the best of the situation. I also added two tests for the *cleanLines* function to increase coverage, as can be seen on the above mentioned branch [issue/#10-ImproveBCcleanLines](#).

2 Onboarding

We chose the the following project for this assignment: [javaparser](#). This java parser project is fully written in java, in accordance with the Apache Java Project, and contains $\sim 200k$ NLOC.

2.1 Documentation

As the project uses the Apache Maven Project to manage to code base its quite straight forward how to build, test and run the project. This process is well documented in the README. After cloning the project locally you can simple run: `./mvnw clean install`. mvnw is a bash script wrapping the maven project, which essentially mean that the correct version of maven will be installed and

used for you if it don't already exist on your system. `./mvnw clean install` will compile, build and run tests automatically for you. It will also install all the dependencies and tools needed as specified and documented in the pom.xml files.

2.2 Experience

Even though the onboarding process is very simple, the project build result is extremely unreliable. The project is built successfully, almost every time the first time you run `./mvnw clean install`. However, every time you want to rebuild the project, problems and errors occur, even though nothing in the code base is changed. There is no pattern for when the project builds successfully or not across all five group members systems, the unsuccessfully builds appear to be arbitrary. Fixes that work sometimes include, deleting and re-cloning the repository, restarting VScode, or running multiple `./mvnw clean` followed by `./mvnw test`. The extreme extent of the unreliable builds made it very hard to compile and test our own contributions to the project.

3 Complexity Measurement

3.1 Metrics

Complexity measurement metrics was acquired automatically by running a complexity measurement tool named lizard on the code base. After successfully installing lizard [lizard](#) the flowing command was run in the root folder of the code base:

```
1 $ lizard -C 12
```

The above command returns a list with complexity metrics on all functions with $CCN > 12$.

Definitions of metrics in Table 1:

- **Functions:**
- **NLOC:** Non-commented Lines Of Code
- **manCCN:** The cyclomatic complexity count acquired from Lizard
- **manCC:** The cyclomatic complexity count acquired from a manual count $CCN = PredicateNodes + 1$, where *PredicateNodes* equals the total number of conditions (Decisions)
- **TOKENS:** Total number of written characters
- **PARAMS:** Total Number of input parameters
- **LENGTH:** Total number of lines of code

Table 1: Metrics Table

Function	METRICS					
	NLOC	CCN	manCC	TOKENS	PARAMS	LENGTH
cleanLines	30	14	14	342	1	33
calculatedSyntaxModelForNode	131	44	44	1296	4	141
isApplicable	86	27	a	729	4	125
compareConsideringTypeParameters	44	21	21	408	1	47
isAssignableMatchTypeParametersMatchingQName	51	19	19	451	3	65

3.2 Function 1: calculatedSyntaxModelForNode - Henrik Åkesson

3.2.1 Purpose

The purpose of the function, given that it's part of the **LexicalDifferenceCalculator** class, seems to be to create a syntax model in a way that it can be used for comparison, identifying any lexical differences between different versions of the parsed code.

3.2.2 Parameters

- **CsmElement csm** (Concrete Syntax Model): Defines the expected syntax of the code.
- **Node node**: Node in the AST (Abstract Syntax Tree), representing the structure of the code where a node is some part of the syntax.
- **List<CsmElement> elements list**: List where the calculated syntax models are added.
- **Change object**: Keeps track of any changes to the node.

3.2.3 Documentation

The function has no documentation, except for a few comments. The comments are simple and don't give an explanation to the actual functionality. An example is the comment *// nothing to do*, where if the csm element is a comment node, the function does nothing. While this does in some way explain one of the possible outcomes induced by a branch, it's still one of the few outcomes with an explanation. Another comment is *// Same edge-case as in DefaultPrettyPrinterVisitor.visit(LambdaExpr, Void)*, which is not clear what it means in relation to the outcome unless the reader is already familiar with the mentioned edge-case. The function also contains a comment about a fix that was made; *// fix #2382: // This method calculates the syntax model..*, explaining an issue which was fixed in a later version.

3.2.4 CC & LOC

- The function NLOC is 131, a rather large number of non-comment lines of code for one function, correlating with a large CC.
- The high CC seems to be related to the purpose of the function in the way that it handles the many different syntax elements, leading to the numerous conditions and the high CCN.
- The function uses exceptions, which seems to be taken into account by the lizard tool when counting CC, as this matches the manual count where the exceptions were also counted to the total CCN. Therefore, taking into account exceptions did not affect the CC.

3.2.5 Manual CC count

```
1 Condition 1: if (csm instanceof CsmSequence)
2 Condition 2: else if (csm instanceof CsmComment)
3 Condition 3: else if (csm instanceof CsmSingleReference)
4 Condition 4 & 5: if (change instanceof PropertyChange && ((
    PropertyChange) change).getProperty() == csmSingleReference.
    getProperty())
5 Condition 6 & 7: if (node instanceof LambdaExpr && child instanceof
    ExpressionStmt)
6 Condition 8: (child != null)
7 Condition 9: else if (csm instanceof CsmNone)
8 Condition 10: else if (csm instanceof CsmToken)
9 Condition 11: else if (csm instanceof CsmOrphanCommentsEnding)
10 Condition 12: else if (csm instanceof CsmList)
11 Condition 13: if (csmList.getProperty().isAboutNodes())
12 Condition 14: if (rawValue instanceof Optional)
13 Condition 15: if (optional.isPresent())
14 Condition 16: if (!(optional.get() instanceof NodeList))
15 Condition 17: throw new IllegalStateException("Expected NodeList,
    found " + optional.get().getClass().getCanonicalName())
16 Condition 18: if (!(rawValue instanceof NodeList))
17 Condition 19: if (!nodeList.isEmpty())
18 Condition 20: if (i != 0)
19 Condition 21: if (i != (nodeList.size() - 1))
20 Condition 22: if (!collection.isEmpty())
21 Condition 23: if (!first)
22 Condition 24: if (value instanceof Modifier)
23 Condition 25: if (it.hasNext())
24 Condition 26: else if (csm instanceof CsmConditional)
25 Condition 27: if (satisfied)
26 Condition 28: else if (csm instanceof CsmIndent)
27 Condition 29: else if (csm instanceof CsmUnindent)
28 Condition 30: else if (csm instanceof CsmAttribute)
29 Condition 31: if (value instanceof Stringable)
30 Condition 32 & 33: else if ((csm instanceof CsmString) && (node
    instanceof StringLiteralExpr))
31 Condition 34: if (change instanceof PropertyChange)
32 Condition 35 & 36: else if ((csm instanceof CsmString) && (node
    instanceof TextBlockLiteralExpr))
33 Condition 37: if (change instanceof PropertyChange)
```

```

34 Condition 38 & 39: else if ((csm instanceof CsmChar) && (node
    instanceof CharLiteralExpr))
35 Condition 40: if (change instanceof PropertyChange)
36 Condition 41: else if (csm instanceof CsmMix)
37 Condition 42: else if (csm instanceof CsmChild)
38 Condition 43: throw new UnsupportedOperationException("Not
    supported element type: " + csm.getClass().getSimpleName() + "
    " + csm)
39
40 CCN = #Conditions (Decisions/predicate nodes) + 1 = 44

```

Listing 1: Manual CC count

3.3 cleanLines - Anton Sederlin

3.3.1 Purpose

The `cleanLines()` function is a part of the `JavadocParser` class which is responsible for parsing the content of Javadoc comments and producing Javadoc documents as specified in [The Javadoc specification](#). The purpose of the function itself is to identify, normalise, and remove leading and trailing whitespaces from code comments. It is also responsible for removing empty lines, ensuring that only well formatted comment strings are returned.

3.3.2 Documentation

The function is documented to some extent, the top-level (class) javadoc comment describes its purpose briefly. Furthermore, there is some documentation regarding the outcome of different branches:

- //lines containing only white-space are normalised to empty lines
- //if the first starts with a space, remove it
- //drop empty lines at the beginning and at the end.

3.3.3 CC & LOC

- The NLOC of the function is 44, this is not a huge number but to make it even more readable and less complex, it should be refactored in such way that none of the sub functions NLOCs exceed $NLOC = 20$ and $CC < 12$. This rather high value of NLOC corresponds to the rather high $CCN = 14$
- The purpose of the function is related to the high CC, as there are many different edge cases that need to be checked and handled differently, hence a lot of decisions need to be made.
- This function does not throw any exceptions, so it can't be said of whether it handles try/catch blocks in this specific case.

3.3.4 Manual CC count

```
1 JavadocParser::cleanLines@91-123@./javaparser-core/src/main/java/  
  com/github/javaparser/JavadocParser.java  
2  
3 Condition 1: if (lines.length == 0)  
4 Condition 2: if (asteriskIndex == -1)  
5 Condition 3: if (l.length() > (asteriskIndex + 1))  
6 Condition 4 & 5: if (c == ' ' || c == '\t')  
7 Condition 6: l.trim().isEmpty() ? "" : l  
8 Condition 7 & 8 & 9: !cleanedLines.get(0).isEmpty() && (  
  cleanedLines.get(0).charAt(0) == ' ' || cleanedLines.get(0).  
  charAt(0) == '\t')  
9 Condition 10 & 11: while (cleanedLines.size() > 0 && cleanedLines.  
  get(0).trim().isEmpty())  
10 Condition 12 & 13: while (cleanedLines.size() > 0 && cleanedLines.  
  get(cleanedLines.size() - 1).trim().isEmpty())  
11  
12 CCN = #Conditions (Decisions/predicate nodes) + 1 = 14
```

Listing 2: Manual CC count

3.4 isApplicable - Robert Skoglund

3.4.1 Purpose

The purpose of the `isApplicable` function is to determine whether a given method usage is applicable based on certain conditions involving method names, parameter counts, and parameter types. The function performs a series of checks and comparisons between the provided `MethodUsage` and the expected criteria, and it returns a boolean value indicating whether the method is applicable.

3.4.2 Documentation

The function is documented briefly, the comments tell us that it returns true: if the given `MethodUsage` matches the given name/types (normally obtained from a `ResolvedMethodDeclaration`). It also provides some information on the outcome of a taken branch.

- //If the counts do not match and the method is not variadic, this is not a match.
- // If the counts do not match and we have provided too few arguments, this is not a match. Note that variadic parameters allow you to omit the vararg, which would allow a difference of one, but a difference in count of 2 or more is not a match.
- // If the given argument still isn't applicable even after considering type arguments/generics, this is not a match.

3.4.3 CC & LOC

The function NLOC is 86. The CCN count using lizard is 27. The CCN of 27 in this function is mainly due to intricate nested conditions and loops, involving complex type comparisons type checking. The numerous decision points, especially within the nested loops and conditional statements, contribute to a high CCN, indicating potential code complexity and increased difficulty in understanding and maintaining the code.

3.4.4 Manual CC count

```
1 Condition 1: if (!methodUsage.getName().equals(needleName))
2 Condition 2 & 3: if (!methodIsDeclaredWithVariadicParameter && !(
    needleParameterCount == countOfMethodUsageArgumentsPassed))
3 Condition 4 & 5: if (!(needleParameterCount ==
    countOfMethodUsageArgumentsPassed) && needleParameterCount <
    lastMethodUsageArgumentIndex)
4 Condition 6: for (int i = 0; i < needleParameterCount; i++)
5 Condition 7: boolean reachedVariadicParam =
    methodIsDeclaredWithVariadicParameter && i >=
    lastMethodUsageArgumentIndex;
6 Condition 8: if (!reachedVariadicParam)
7 Condition 9 & 10: boolean argumentIsArray = (needleParameterCount
    == countOfMethodUsageArgumentsPassed) && expectedArgumentType.
    isAssignableFrom(actualArgumentType)
8 Condition 11: if (!argumentIsArray)
9 Condition 12: for (int j = 0; j < countOfMethodUsageArgumentsPassed
    ; j++)
10 Condition 13: if (parameter.isVariadic())
11 Condition 14: if (needleParameterCount == j)
12 Condition 15: if (tp.getBounds().isEmpty())
13 Condition 16: else if (tp.getBounds().size() == 1)
14 Condition 17: if (bound.isExtends())
15 Condition 18: if (tp.getBounds().isEmpty())
16 Condition 19: else if (tp.getBounds().size() == 1)
17 Condition 20: if (bound.isExtends())
18 Condition 21 & 22 & 23 & 24: if (!expectedArgumentType.
    isAssignableFrom(actualArgumentType)
19 && !expectedTypeWithSubstitutions.isAssignableFrom(actualArgumentType
    )
20 && !expectedTypeWithInference.isAssignableFrom(actualArgumentType)
21 && !expectedTypeWithoutSubstitutions.isAssignableFrom(
    actualArgumentType))
22
23
24 CCN = #Conditions (Decisions/predicate nodes) + 1 = 24
```

Listing 3: Manual CC count

3.5 compareConsideringTypeParameters: Robin Eggstig

3.5.1 Purpose

This function is part of the `ResolvedReferenceType`. The `compareConsideringTypeParameters` function compares two instances of a `ResolvedReferenceType` class, accounting for type parameters, raw types, and wildcard types. It ensures nuanced equivalence checks, crucial for understanding the compatibility and similarity between instances with respect to their generic type information.

3.5.2 Documentation

The `compareConsideringTypeParameters` function is a protected method designed for comparing instances of a `ResolvedReferenceType` class, considering various scenarios involving type parameters. The method begins by checking object equality and qualified names before delving into more nuanced comparisons. It handles raw types, wildcard types, and type variables, ensuring that type parameters are appropriately matched. The method exhibits a comprehensive understanding of Java generics, providing a detailed and context-aware equivalence check for reference types. While the provided code lacks explicit Javadoc comments, a well-documented version would likely emphasize its role in type parameter comparison, guide users on proper usage, and highlight potential exceptions. Users should consult external documentation or codebase comments for a more detailed understanding of the function's behavior and intended usage.

3.5.3 CC & LOC

The function NLOC is 44. The CCN count using lizard is 21. The CCN of 21 in this function is mainly due to intricate nested conditions and loops, involving complex type comparisons and wildcard handling. The numerous decision points, especially within the nested loops and conditional statements, contribute to a high CCN, indicating potential code complexity and increased difficulty in understanding and maintaining the code.

3.5.4 Manual CC count

```
1 Condition 1: if (other.equals(this))
2 Condition 2: if (this.getQualifiedName().equals(other.
    getQualifiedName()))
3 Condition 3 & 4: if (this.isRawType() || other.isRawType())
4 Condition 5: if (typeParametersValues.size() != other.
    typeParametersValues().size())
5 Condition 6: Loop condition - for (int i = 0; i <
    typeParametersValues.size(); i++)
6 Condition 7: if (!thisParam.equals(otherParam))
7 Condition 8: if (thisParam instanceof ResolvedWildcard)
8 Condition 9 & 10: if (thisParamAsWildcard.isSuper() && otherParam.
    isAssignableBy(thisParamAsWildcard.getBoundedType()))
```

```

9 Condition 11 & 12: else if (thisParamAsWildcard.isExtends() &&
    thisParamAsWildcard.getBoundedType().isAssignableBy(otherParam)
    )
10 Condition 13: else if (!thisParamAsWildcard.isBounded())
11 Condition 14 & 15: if (thisParam instanceof ResolvedTypeVariable &&
    otherParam instanceof ResolvedTypeVariable)
12 Condition 16: return thisBounds.size() == otherBounds.size() &&
    otherBounds.containsAll(thisBounds);
13 Condition 17 & 18: if (!(thisParam instanceof ResolvedTypeVariable)
    && otherParam instanceof ResolvedTypeVariable)
14 Condition 19 & 20: if (thisParam instanceof ResolvedTypeVariable &&
    !(otherParam instanceof ResolvedTypeVariable))
15
16 CCN = #Conditions (Decisions/predicate nodes) + 1 = 21

```

Listing 4: Manual CC count

3.6 isAssignableMatchTypeParametersMatchingQName: Tsz Ho Wat

3.6.1 Purpose

- The provided function, `isAssignableMatchTypeParametersMatchingQName`, compares two `ResolvedReferenceType` instances for assignability while considering type parameters and nested parameterizations. It checks if the qualified names of the expected and actual types are equal and then iterates over their type parameters. It handles cases such as nested parameterizations, array types, type variables, reference types, and wildcards.
- In the case of nested parameterizations, it peels off one layer and recursively verifies assignability. For array types, it recursively checks the component types. It handles type variables by matching their names or invoking another function (`matchTypeVariable`). The function also addresses wildcard types, specifically handling unbounded wildcards and extends-bounded wildcards.
- The method returns true if the types are assignable, considering all the specified conditions. If an unsupported scenario is encountered, an `UnsupportedOperationException` is thrown.

3.6.2 Documentation

- The function is a private function, it have few comment represent the meaning of code.
- The function iterates through each type parameter, addressing nested parameterizations, arrays, type variables, reference types, and wildcards.
- The comments provide insights into the detailed comparisons made, such as peeling off layers for nested types or verifying component types for arrays.

- The function intelligently handles various scenarios, including type variable matching and wildcard comparisons.
- The documentation effectively outlines the function’s purpose and the considerations for determining type assignability, making it a valuable reference for developers.

3.6.3 CC & LOC

- The NLOC is 51.
- The CCN is 19 counted by Lizard.
- The high CCN in the provided function arises due to its intricate logic for comparing and validating assignability of complex type structures, including nested parameterizations, arrays, type variables, and wildcards. Multiple conditional branches and recursive calls contribute to the elevated CCN, reflecting the code’s intricate control flow.

3.6.4 Manual CC count

```

1 Condition 1: if (!expected.getQualifiedName().equals(actual.
    getQualifiedName()))
2 Condition 2: if (expected.typeParametersValues().size() != actual.
    typeParametersValues().size())
3 Condition 3: for (int i = 0; i < expected.typeParametersValues().
    size(); i++)
4 Condition 4,5: if (expectedParam.isReferenceType() && actualParam.
    isReferenceType())
5 Condition 6,7: if (expectedParam.isArray() && actualParam.isArray()
    )
6 Condition 8: if (expectedParam.isTypeVariable())
7 Condition 9,10: if (!actualParam.isTypeVariable() || !actualParam.
    asTypeParameter().getName().equals(expectedParamName))
8 Condition 11: if (expectedParam.isReferenceType())
9 Condition 12: if (actualParam.isTypeVariable())
10 Condition 13: if (!expectedParam.equals(actualParam))
11 Condition 14: if (expectedParam.isWildcard())
12 Condition 15: if (expectedParam.asWildcard().isExtends())
13 Condition 16,17: if (actualParam.isWildcard() && !actualParam.
    asWildcard().isBounded())
14 Condition 18: if (actualParam.isTypeVariable())
15
16 CCN = #Conditions (Decisions/predicate nodes) + 1 = 19
17 Same as the counted in lizard

```

Listing 5: Manual CC count

4 Coverage measurement & improvement















































Our code coverage tool is very simple, it can determine if elementary branches such as if statements and loops are taken. More complex branches such as

different exit points, errors and ternary operators are not supported. This instrumentation does not take into account conditions containing multiple and/or. The tool will only count these as 1 branch, however if you refractory the code to only have atomic conditions, it will be counted as multiple branches.

4.1 calculatedSyntaxModelForNode

LexicalDifferenceCalculator

Source file "com/github/javaparser/printer/lexicalpreservation/LexicalDifferenceCalculator.java" was not found during generation of report.





























Element	Missed Instructions	Cov.	Missed Branches	Cov.	Missed	Cxty	Missed	Lines	Missed	Methods
calculatedSyntaxModelForNode(CsmElement, Node, List, Change)		74%		80%	12	44	33	146	0	1
loadFromFile()		0%		0%	3	3	14	14	1	1
toToken(Modifier)		36%		38%	8	13	8	14	0	1
calculateSyntaxModelAfterListAddition(Node, ObservableProperty, int, Node)		61%		50%	1	2	1	6	0	1
calculateSyntaxModelAfterListRemoval(Node, ObservableProperty, int)		60%		50%	1	2	1	6	0	1
calculatePropertyChange(NodeText, Node, ObservableProperty, Object, Object)		89%		50%	1	2	1	9	0	1
writeToFile(int[])		92%		100%	0	2	2	11	0	1
calculateListAdditionDifference(ObservableProperty, NodeList, int, Node)		100%		n/a	0	1	0	8	0	1
replaceEolTokens(List, LineSeparator)		100%		100%	0	2	0	5	0	1
calculateListReplacementDifference(ObservableProperty, NodeList, int, Node)		100%		n/a	0	1	0	5	0	1
calculateListRemovalDifference(ObservableProperty, NodeList, int)		100%		n/a	0	1	0	5	0	1
calculateSyntaxModelAfterListAddition(CsmElement, ObservableProperty, NodeList, int, Node)		100%		n/a	0	1	0	4	0	1
calculateSyntaxModelAfterListReplacement(CsmElement, ObservableProperty, NodeList, int, Node)		100%		n/a	0	1	0	4	0	1
calculateSyntaxModelAfterListRemoval(CsmElement, ObservableProperty, NodeList, int)		100%		n/a	0	1	0	4	0	1
calculateSyntaxModelAfterPropertyChange(CsmElement, Node, ObservableProperty, Object, Object)		100%		n/a	0	1	0	3	0	1
calculateSyntaxModelForNode(CsmElement, Node)		100%		n/a	0	1	0	3	0	1
calculateSyntaxModelAfterPropertyChange(Node, ObservableProperty, Object, Object)		100%		n/a	0	1	0	1	0	1
calculateSyntaxModelForNode(Node)		100%		n/a	0	1	0	1	0	1
lambda\$calculatedSyntaxModelForNode\$1(Node, List, Change, CsmElement)		100%		n/a	0	1	0	1	0	1
lambda\$calculatedSyntaxModelForNode\$0(Node, List, Change, CsmElement)		100%		n/a	0	1	0	1	0	1
static {...}		100%		n/a	0	1	0	1	0	1
LexicalDifferenceCalculator()		100%		n/a	0	1	0	1	0	1
getNewLineToken(LineSeparator)		100%		n/a	0	1	0	1	0	1
Total	301 of 1,256	76%	32 of 113	71%	26	85	60	252	1	23

4.2 cleanLines

The clean line function had a branch coverage of 75% with the original test suite.

JavadocParser

Source file "com/github/javaparser/JavadocParser.java" was not found during generation of report.






















Element	Missed Instructions	Cov.	Missed Branches	Cov.	Missed	Cxty	Missed	Lines	Missed	Methods
parse(String)		0%		0%	2	2	12	12	1	1
trimRight(String)		0%		0%	3	3	3	3	1	1
cleanLines(String)		78%		75%	4	9	3	13	0	1
parseBlockTag(String)		0%		n/a	1	1	4	4	1	1
lambda\$3(String)		0%		n/a	1	1	1	1	1	1
lambda\$2(String)		0%		0%	2	2	1	1	1	1
lambda\$5(String)		84%		75%	2	5	1	8	0	1
isABlockLine(String)		0%		n/a	1	1	1	1	1	1
lambda\$4(Javadoc, String)		0%		n/a	1	1	1	1	1	1
parse(JavadocComment)		0%		n/a	1	1	1	1	1	1
JavadocParser()		0%		n/a	1	1	1	1	1	1
startsWithAsterisk(String)		100%		90%	1	6	0	8	0	1
static {...}		100%		n/a	0	1	0	2	0	1
lambda\$6(String)		100%		100%	0	2	0	1	0	1
Total	177 of 341	48%	15 of 44	65%	20	36	26	53	9	14

Created with [JaCoCo](#) 0.8.11.202310140853

After adding 9 tests to the test suite the branch cover was improved up to 93%

JavadocParser





































































Source file "com/github/javaparser/JavadocParser.java" was not found during generation of report.

Element	Missed Instructions	Cov.	Missed Branches	Cov.	Missed Cxty	Missed Lines	Missed Methods
parse(JavadocComment)	 4	0%	n/a	1	1	1	1
lambda\$cleanLines\$3(String)	 3	92%	 3	5	62%	2	5
JavadocParser	 3	0%	n/a	1	1	1	1
cleanLines(String)	 98	100%	 1	15	93%	1	9
parse(String)	 75	100%	 2	2	100%	0	2
startsWithAsterisk(String)	 34	100%	 10	6	100%	0	6
trimRight(String)	 22	100%	 4	3	100%	0	3
parseBlockTag(String)	 20	100%	n/a	0	1	0	4
static (...)	 14	100%	n/a	0	1	0	2
lambda\$parse\$1(String)	 9	100%	n/a	0	1	0	1
lambda\$cleanLines\$4(String)	 8	100%	 2	2	100%	0	2
lambda\$parse\$0(String)	 7	100%	 2	2	100%	0	2
lambda\$parse\$2(Javadoc, String)	 6	100%	n/a	0	1	0	1
isABlockLine(String)	 5	100%	n/a	0	1	0	1
Total	10 of 343	97%	4 of 44	90%	5	36	2
Created with JaCoCo 0.8.11.202310140853							

4.3 isApplicable

MethodResolutionLogic

Source file "com/github/javaparser/resolution/logic/MethodResolutionLogic.java" was not found during generation of report.

Element	Missed Instructions	Cov.	Missed Branches	Cov.	Missed Cxty	Missed Lines	Missed Methods
isApplicable(MethodUsage, String, List, TypeSolver)		0%		0%	29	29	66
isApplicable(ResolvedMethodDeclaration, String, List, TypeSolver, boolean)		0%		0%	39	39	61
isMoreSpecific(ResolvedMethodDeclaration, ResolvedMethodDeclaration, List)		0%		0%	44	44	49
findMostApplicable(List, String, List, TypeSolver, boolean)		0%		0%	23	23	45
isAssignableMatchTypeParametersMatchingOName(ResolvedReferenceType, ResolvedReferenceType, Map)		0%		0%	19	19	35
inferTypes(ResolvedType, ResolvedType, Map)		0%		0%	25	25	35
replaceTypeParam(ResolvedType, ResolvedTypeParameterDeclaration, TypeSolver)		0%		0%	9	9	18
findMostApplicableUsage(List, String, List, TypeSolver)		0%		0%	8	8	15
isAssignableMatchTypeParameters(ResolvedType, ResolvedType, Map)		0%		0%	8	8	12
groupTrailingArgumentsIntoArray(ResolvedMethodDeclaration, List, ResolvedType)		0%		0%	7	7	14
isMoreSpecific(MethodUsage, MethodUsage)		0%		0%	8	8	13
matchTypeVariable(ResolvedTypeVariable, ResolvedType, Map)		0%		0%	4	4	11
areOverride(MethodUsage, MethodUsage)		0%		0%	5	5	8
isAssignableMatchTypeParameters(ResolvedReferenceType, ResolvedReferenceType, Map)		0%		0%	4	4	8
groupVariadicParamValues(List, int, ResolvedType)		0%		0%	2	2	7
getMethodsExplicitAndVariadicParameterType(ResolvedMethodDeclaration, int)		0%		0%	3	3	6
isExactMatch(ResolvedMethodLikeDeclaration, List)		0%		0%	3	3	4
findMostApplicable(List, String, List, TypeSolver)		0%		0%	2	2	4
isArrayOfObject(ResolvedType)		0%		0%	4	4	3
solveMethodInType(ResolvedTypeDeclaration, String, List, boolean)		0%		0%	2	2	3
isJavaLangObject(ResolvedType)		0%		0%	3	3	1
findCommonType(List)		0%		0%	2	2	3
convertToVariadicParameter(ResolvedType)		0%		0%	2	2	1
isApplicable(ResolvedMethodDeclaration, String, List, TypeSolver)		0%		0%	1	1	1
lambda\$findMostApplicable\$3(String, List, TypeSolver, boolean, ResolvedMethodDeclaration)		0%		0%	1	1	1
getLastParameterIndex(int)		0%		0%	1	1	1
distinctByKey(Function)		0%		0%	1	1	2
solveMethodInType(ResolvedTypeDeclaration, String, List)		0%		0%	1	1	1
lambda\$findMostApplicableUsage\$4(String, List, TypeSolver, MethodUsage)		0%		0%	1	1	1
lambda\$distinctByKey\$1(Set, Function, Object)		0%		0%	1	1	1
lambda\$findMostApplicable\$2(String, ResolvedMethodDeclaration)		0%		0%	1	1	1
lambda\$replaceTypeParam\$0(ResolvedTypeParameterDeclaration, TypeSolver, ResolvedType)		0%		0%	1	1	1
static (...)		0%		0%	1	1	1
MethodResolutionLogic()		0%		0%	1	1	1
Total	2,016 of 2,016	0%	464 of 464	0%	266	266	429

4.4 compareConsideringTypeParameters

There is no coverage reporting for compareConsideringTypeParameters. This is because for some reason the jacoco isn't reporting the coverage for the javaparser-symbol-solver-testing module. However since there is at least one test that's called with the function, the coverage is either the same or more. There are at least one test which use a function that depends on compareConsideringTypeParameters - ReferenceTypeImpl::isAssignableBy(). However we cannot see coverage from this.

4.5 isAssignableMatchTypeParametersMatchingQName

There is 4 tests added to isAssignableMatchTypeParametersMatchingQName function.

However, as the picture shows, the tracker shows there is no coverage for this function. When calling the function in the test, it will increase the coverage. Although the tracker isn't reporting the coverage, the coverage is increase because it call the isAssignableMatchTypeParametersMatchingQName as least 2 times from isAssignableMatchTypeParameters function. So the actual coverage is increased, but we can't see the coverage of this.

MethodResolutionLogic

Source file "com/github/javaparser/resolution/logic/MethodResolutionLogic.java" was not found during generation of report.

Element	Missed Instructions	Cov.	Missed Branches	Cov.	Missed	Cxty	Missed	Lines	Missed	Methods
isApplicable(MethodUsage, String, List, TypeSolver)	0%	0%	0%	0%	29	29	66	66	1	1
isApplicableResolvedMethodDeclaration(String, List, TypeSolver, boolean)	0%	0%	0%	0%	39	39	61	61	1	1
isMoreSpecificResolvedMethodDeclarationResolvedMethodDeclarationList	0%	0%	0%	0%	44	44	49	49	1	1
findMostApplicableListStringListTypeSolverboolean	0%	0%	0%	0%	23	23	45	45	1	1
isAssignableMatchTypeParametersMatchingQNameResolvedReferenceTypeResolvedReferenceTypeMap	0%	0%	0%	0%	19	19	35	35	1	1
inferTypeResolvedTypeResolvedTypeMap	0%	0%	0%	0%	25	25	35	35	1	1
replaceTypeParamResolvedTypeResolvedTypeParameterDeclarationTypeSolver	0%	0%	0%	0%	9	9	18	18	1	1
findMostApplicableUsageListStringListTypeSolver	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	8	15	15	1	1
isAssignableMatchTypeParametersResolvedTypeResolvedTypeMap	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	8	12	12	1	1
groupTrailingArgumentsIntoArrayResolvedMethodDeclarationListResolvedType	0%	0%	0%	0%	7	7	14	14	1	1
isMoreSpecificMethodUsageMethodUsage	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	8	13	13	1	1
matchTypeVariableResolvedTypeVariableResolvedTypeMap	0%	0%	0%	0%	4	4	11	11	1	1
areOverrideMethodUsageMethodUsage	0%	0%	0%	0%	5	5	8	8	1	1
isAssignableMatchTypeParametersResolvedReferenceTypeResolvedReferenceTypeMap	0%	0%	0%	0%	4	4	8	8	1	1
groupVariadicParamValuesListintResolvedType	0%	0%	0%	0%	2	2	7	7	1	1
getMethodsExplicitAndVariadicParameterTypeResolvedMethodDeclarationint	0%	0%	0%	0%	3	3	6	6	1	1
isExactMatchResolvedMethodLikeDeclarationList	0%	0%	0%	0%	3	3	4	4	1	1
findMostApplicableListStringListTypeSolver	0%	0%	0%	0%	2	2	4	4	1	1
isArrayOfObjectResolvedType	0%	0%	0%	0%	4	4	3	3	1	1
solveMethodInTypeResolvedTypeDeclarationStringListboolean	0%	0%	0%	0%	2	2	3	3	1	1
isJavaLangObjectResolvedType	0%	0%	0%	0%	3	3	1	1	1	1
findCommonTypeList	0%	0%	0%	0%	2	2	3	3	1	1
convertToVariadicParameterResolvedType	0%	0%	0%	0%	2	2	1	1	1	1
isApplicableResolvedMethodDeclarationStringListTypeSolver	0%	0%	0%	0%	1	1	1	1	1	1
lambda\$findMostApplicable\$3StringListTypeSolverbooleanResolvedMethodDeclaration	0%	0%	0%	0%	1	1	1	1	1	1
getLastParameterIndexint	0%	0%	0%	0%	1	1	1	1	1	1
distinctByKeyFunction	0%	0%	0%	0%	1	1	2	2	1	1
solveMethodInTypeResolvedTypeDeclarationStringList	0%	0%	0%	0%	1	1	1	1	1	1
lambda\$findMostApplicableUsage\$4StringListTypeSolverMethodUsage	0%	0%	0%	0%	1	1	1	1	1	1
lambda\$distinctByKey\$1SetFunctionObject	0%	0%	0%	0%	1	1	1	1	1	1
lambda\$findMostApplicable\$2StringResolvedMethodDeclaration	0%	0%	0%	0%	1	1	1	1	1	1
lambda\$replaceTypeParam\$0ResolvedTypeParameterDeclarationTypeSolverResolvedType	0%	0%	0%	0%	1	1	1	1	1	1
static {...}	0%	0%	0%	0%	1	1	1	1	1	1
MethodResolutionLogic()	0%	0%	0%	0%	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total	2,016 of 2,016	0%	464 of 464	0%	266	266	429	429	34	34

5 Refactoring plan

5.1 calculatedSyntaxModelForNode - Henrik Åkesson

```
1 private void calculatedSyntaxModelForNode(CsmElement csm, Node node
    , List<CsmElement>elements, Change change)
2 private boolean instanceofCsmSequence(CsmElement csm, Node node,
    List<CsmElement> elements, Change change)
3 private boolean instanceofCsmComment(CsmElement csm)
4 private boolean instanceofCsmSingleReference(CsmElement csm, Node
    node, List<CsmElement> elements, Change change)
5 private boolean instanceofCsmNone(CsmElement csm)
6 private boolean instanceofCsmToken(CsmElement csm, List<CsmElement>
    elements)
7 private boolean instanceofCsmOrphanCommentsEnding(CsmElement csm)
8 private boolean instanceofCsmList(CsmElement csm, Node node, List<
    CsmElement> elements, Change change)
```

```

9 private boolean instanceofCsmConditional(CsmElement csm, Node node,
    List<CsmElement> elements, Change change)
10 private boolean instanceofCsmAttribute(CsmElement csm, Node node,
    List<CsmElement> elements, Change change)
11 private boolean instanceofCsmStringAndStringLiteralExpr(CsmElement
    csm, Node node, List<CsmElement> elements, Change change)
12 private boolean instanceofCsmStringAndTextBlockLiteralExpr(
    CsmElement csm, Node node, List<CsmElement> elements, Change
    change)
13 private boolean instanceofCsmCharAndCharLiteralExpr(CsmElement csm,
    Node node, List<CsmElement> elements, Change change)
14 private boolean instanceofCsmMix(CsmElement csm, Node node, List<
    CsmElement> elements, Change change)
15 private boolean instanceofCsmChild(CsmElement csm, List<CsmElement>
    elements)
16
17 NLOC    CCN    token    param    length
18    53      17     286      4      59 calculatedSyntaxModelForNode
19     8       2      63      4       8 instanceofCsmSequence
20     6       2      21      1       6 instanceofCsmComment
21    19       7     145      4     20 instanceofCsmSingleReference
22     6       2      21      1       7 instanceofCsmNone
23     7       2      34      2       7 instanceofCsmToken
24     6       2      21      1       7 instanceofCsmOrphanCommentsEnding
25    63      16     538      4     63 instanceofCsmList@309-371
26    13       3      92      4     13 instanceofCsmConditional
27    13       3     113      4     13 instanceofCsmAttribute
28    11       4     108      4     15
    instanceofCsmStringAndStringLiteralExpr
29    12       4     125      4     15
    instanceofCsmStringAndTextBlockLiteralExpr
30    11       4     108      4     12
    instanceofCsmCharAndCharLiteralExpr
31    10       2      87      4     11 instanceofCsmMix
32     7       2      34      2       7 instanceofCsmChild

```

Listing 6: Manual CC count

5.2 cleanLines - Anton Sederlin

To reduce the high complexity in cleanLines the function can be split up into smaller units. The simplest way to achieve this is by splitting up the function on each decision. One alternative is to create a new cleanLines method that calls multiple helper methods containing a subspace of the original decisions each. This refractory strategy results in a reduction of $CCN = 5/14 = 65\%$. The new methods and their metrics can be wived bellow:

```

1 List<String> cleanLines(String content) {}
2 List<String> processLines(String[] lines) {}
3 String getProcessedSubstring(String line, int asteriskIndex){}
4 List<String> normalizeWhitespace(List<String> lines){}
5 boolean startsWithWhitespace(String line){}
6 void removeLeadingWhitespace(List<String> lines){}
7 void removeEmptyLines(List<String> lines){}
8 NLOC    CCN    token    param    length

```

9	13	4	88	1	18	cleanLines@92-109@
10	12	3	73	1	15	processLines@111-125@
11	9	4	70	2	10	getProcessedSubstring@127-136@
12	3	2	45	1	3	normalizeWhitespace@138-140@
13	3	3	35	1	3	startsWithWhitespace@142-144@
14	3	1	29	1	3	removeLeadingWhitespace@146-148@
15	8	5	100	1	9	removeEmptyLines@150-158@

Listing 7: Manual CC count

5.3 isApplicable - Robert Skoglund

To reduce the high complexity in `isApplicable`, we split the function to make five extra functions. These first four extra functions retrieves the conditions to be check for in the final extra function. We did opt to fetch certain constant variables multiple times for each function, this might not be the best option for performance depending on how heavy these variables can take to fetch. An example of these constant variables would be the `typeParameters` variable which is use in multiple of the new extra functions. This was done to reduce the amount of parameters used in the extra functions, some would otherwise need 8+ parameters instead of max 4 for each (except last which has 5).

```

1 public static boolean isApplicable(MethodUsage methodUsage, String
   needleName, List<ResolvedType> needleParameterTypes, TypeSolver
   typeSolver)
2 private static ResolvedType getExpectedArgumentType(MethodUsage
   methodUsage, List<ResolvedType> needleParameterTypes, int idx,
   ResolvedType actualArgumentType)
3 private static ResolvedType
   inferParameterTypesAndReplaceTypeVariables(MethodUsage
   methodUsage, ResolvedType expectedArgumentType, List<
   ResolvedType> needleParameterTypes)
4 private static ResolvedType handleTypeVariableReplacementCases(
   MethodUsage methodUsage, ResolvedType expectedArgumentTypeInput
   , TypeSolver typeSolver)
5 private static ResolvedType handleTypeVariableBoundsCases(
   MethodUsage methodUsage, ResolvedType
   expectedTypeWithoutSubstitutions, TypeSolver typeSolver)
6 private static boolean isAssignable(ResolvedType
   expectedArgumentType, ResolvedType
   expectedTypeWithSubstitutions, ResolvedType
   expectedTypeWithInference, ResolvedType
   expectedTypeWithoutSubstitutions, ResolvedType
   actualArgumentType)
7 NLOC   CCN   token  param  length
8      30     8    255     4      56 isApplicable@435-490
9      16     5    127     4      27 getExpectedArgumentType@493-519
10     22     5    186     3      29
   inferParameterTypesAndReplaceTypeVariables@521-549
11     19     5    180     3      25
   handleTypeVariableReplacementCases@551-575
12     19     5    170     3      21
   handleTypeVariableBoundsCases@577-597

```


13	10	4	48	5	10	isAssignable@599-608
----	----	---	----	---	----	----------------------

Listing 8: Manual CC count

5.4 compareConsideringTypeParameters - Robin Eggertig

To reduce the cyclomatic complexity, we split the function into 3 more private functions. Two to handle the Wildcard and normal instance checks, and a last one for checking each parameter separately.

```

1  protected boolean compareConsideringTypeParameters(
    ResolvedReferenceType other)
2  private boolean compareConsideringTypeParameter(ResolvedType
    thisParam, ResolvedType otherParam)
3  private boolean compareConsideringVariableTypeWildcardParameter(
    ResolvedWildcard thisParam, ResolvedType otherParam)
4  private boolean compareConsideringVariableTypeInstanceParameter(
    ResolvedType thisParam, ResolvedType otherParam)
5  NLOC   CCN   token   param   length
6  20      8    147      1       21
    compareConsideringTypeParameters@442-462
7  15      5     73      2       15 compareConsideringTypeParameter@467
    -481
8  13      6     83      2       13
    compareConsideringVariableTypeWildcardParameter@482-494
9  14      8    181      2       14
    compareConsideringVariableTypeInstanceParameter@495-508
10 9       4    100      2       12
    compareConsideringVariableTypeParameters@509-520

```

Listing 9: Manual CC count

5.5 isAssignableMatchTypeParametersMatchingQName - Tsz Ho Wat

To reduce the cyclomatic complexity, split the function is a solution. Create multiple function to reduce the number of decision. The function CCN reduce from 19 to 7. The new method is below:

```

1  private static boolean isAssignableMatchTypeParametersMatchingQName(
    ResolvedReferenceType expected, ResolvedReferenceType actual,
    Map<String, ResolvedType> matchedParameters) {}
2  private static boolean checkQualifiedNames(ResolvedReferenceType
    expected, ResolvedReferenceType actual) {}
3  private static boolean checkTypeParameterSizes(
    ResolvedReferenceType expected,
    ResolvedReferenceType actual){}
4  NLOC   CCN   token   param   length
5  19      7    151      3       24 isAssignableMatchTypeParameters -
    MatchingQName@305-328@
6  3       1     26      2        3 checkQualifiedNames@330-332@
7  3       1     31      2        3 checkTypeParameterSizes@334-336@
8  9       3     65      3        9 isAssignableReferenceType@338-346@

```

```

10 9      3      73      3      9 isAssignableArrayType@348-356@
11 11     4      88      3     11 isAssignableTypeVariable@358-368@

```

Listing 10: Manual CC count

6 Self-assessment

The group is in the Use state. The agreed upon practises are being used to do real work. GitHub is being used to track issues to be completed and for assigning work. Discord is being used as the main communication channel for discussing general issues and problems with completing tasks, as well as for updating on current progress in the project. The work is going well, but some improvement in communication is still needed. At this state, everyone has become well accustomed to working with GitHub; branching, creating issues, merging and reviewing pull requests. Coding in Java is working well, with only some minor mistakes and inconsistencies. We should have put more effort on selecting a suitable project. The project we chose turned out to be badly suited for this assignment, even though it followed all the requirements, but this was discovered when too much work already was made, and there was not enough time to redo the assignment on a different project.

7 P+

At least one or more group members are aiming for P+ individually. See assignment #3 extra coverage for details for each of them.