

Item 270

git_comments:

git_commits:

1. **summary:** TINKERPOP-1340 added since tags to javadoc for GraphTraversal CTR
message: TINKERPOP-1340 added since tags to javadoc for GraphTraversal CTR

github_issues:

github_issues_comments:

github_pulls:

github_pulls_comments:

github_pulls_reviews:

jira_issues:

1. **summary:** docs do not state at what version an API was introduced (or deprecated)
description: An all-to-common problem for new developers coming to the TinkerPop is figuring out which APIs work against the graph they are using. Since TinkerPop is ahead of many graph implementation out there (Titan/TP 3.0.1, Stardog/TP 3.0.2, Blazegraph/TP 3.1.0 -- kudos to Sqlg and Unipop for TP 3.2.0!), it's really important that developers know which APIs in the current docs are valid. Ideally the developers would go directly to that version of the TP docs, but that doesn't always happen thanks to Google. I propose doc updates on each Graph Traversal Step in the [reference docs|<http://tinkerpop.apache.org/docs/current/reference/#graph-traversal-steps>] and in the javadocs (on [__.java|http://tinkerpop.apache.org/javadocs/current/full/org/apache/tinkerpop/gremlin/process/traversal/dsl/graph/__.html] and on specific step implementations, i.e. [AddEdgeStep.java|<http://tinkerpop.apache.org/javadocs/current/full/org/apache/tinkerpop/gremlin/process/traversal/step/map/AddEdgeStep.html>]). It should state the specific version (3.y.z) the API was introduced or deprecated.

jira_issues_comments:

1. **body:** [~pluradj] i've implemented a portion of what you described here, by adding {{@since}} tags to the javadoc on {{GraphTraversal}}:
<https://github.com/apache/tinkerpop/commit/c12e6ae517811d4d1634e2dbfa88c142021e68a2>
<https://github.com/apache/tinkerpop/commit/52040aa71b73843a0ccf6b757d762afe98df4db9> I don't think it works well in the reference documentation as there isn't always a 1 to 1 mapping between the API and what's presented there. For example, there might be an method that was introduced at 3.0.0-incubating but got a fresh overload in 3.2.3 but is documented singularly in the reference docs - not sure how we would reference those situations well. I would say there is a similar issue with reference docs that group similar steps together. Do you feel like that's enough to close this issue?
label: documentation
2. Yes, this looks good. We'll be able to redirect version questions on the mailing list specifically to the GraphTraversal javadoc. Thanks for handling this.