



# DESIGN AND TESTING 2

## SPRINT 4

Group 2
Guerrero Cuenca, Claudia
Macarro Klepsch, Miguel
Volante González, José Manuel

Content
Current situation and retrospective of Sprint 4.

## Content

1. Finish level
2. Finished tasks
3. Retrospective
  - a. Team retrospective
  - b. Individual retrospective

## 1.- FINISH LEVEL

- Deliverable 1 up to 10 points (including custom AssertJ)
- Deliverable 2 up to 10 points (including Cucumber UI tests)
- Deliverable 3 up to 9 points

## 2.- FINISHED TASKS

### A)- Performance tests (level 6)

For each of our 22 user stories, we performed performance tests (both stress and load tests for a combination of a positive and negative scenario for each user story):

Team Member	Performance tests
Claudia Guerrero	US7 – US12, US18
Miguel Macarro	US1-US6,
Jose Manuel Volante	US13 – US17, US19-US21

The performance tests are described in the report performance.pdf.

### B)- Profiling (level 8)

We performed 4 profilings using glowroot on the user stories that gave the worst results in the performance testing:

Team Member	Profiling
Miguel Macarro	Profiling 1
Claudia Guerrero	Profiling 2
Jose Manuel Volante	Profiling 3
	Profiling 4

The profilings are detailed in part 1 of the document profiling.pdf

### C)- Code refactoring (level 8)

Claudia Guerrero performed 3 refactorings based on code smells. They are detailed in the report refactoring.pdf.

### D)- Optimization by refactoring based on profilings (level 9)

Because of a misunderstanding of the requirements, for level 9 we performed three (instead of one) refactorings based on profilings. Based on the profilings 2, 3, and 4, we improved the

corresponding user stories by refactoring the code:

Team Member	Optimization based on ..
Claudia Guerrero	Profiling 2
Miguel Macarro	Profiling 3
José Manuel Volante	Profiling 4

The refactorings based on profiling are described in the second part of the report profiling.pdf.

#### E)- Use of Sonarcloud

We used Sonarcloud to show the difference in code quality before and after the refactoring. The conclusions are included in the report refactoring.pdf

### 3.- RETROSPECTIVE

#### a.- Team retrospective

Generally, this Sprint went well because all members team work about the same and the tasks that proposed in the planning have been fulfilled.

We had quite a few problems with the performance tests using gatling. We had underestimated the time it took it perform them, making us fall behind schedule for this Sprint. This is one of the reasons why, unfortunately, we could not do a A+ project for this sprint.

The team has done three or four meetings all weeks. So if someone have a problem, the partners help with it in the meetings.  
For this reason, nobody has been stuck in any task.

#### b.- Individual retrospective

Regarding individual perspective of each, it is believed that the Sprint went well and we don't have any problem.

Individual performance in hours about this Sprint 3:

Member	Hours
Claudia Guerrero	55
Miguel Macarro	55
Jose Manuel Volante	55