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# Introduction

This document contains results of the code analysis of parcial 3 Resul.

# Configuration

* Quality Profiles
  + Names: Sonar way [Python];
  + Files: AY9ZHr7BtE8vwW8FoL1F.json;
* Quality Gate
  + Name: Sonar way
  + File: Sonar way.xml

# Synthesis

## Analysis Status

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reliability | Security | Security Review | Maintainability |
| A.png | **A.png** | **A.png** | **A.png** |

## Quality gate status

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Quality Gate Status | **OK.png** |



## Metrics

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Coverage | Duplication | Comment  density | Median number of lines of code per file | Adherence to coding standard |
| 0.0 % | **0.0 %** | **1.8 %** | **49.5** | **99.7 %** |

## Tests

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total | Success Rate | Skipped | Errors | Failures |
| 0 | **0 %** | **0** | **0** | **0** |

## Detailed technical debt

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reliability | Security | Maintainability | Total |
| - | - | 0d 5h 59min | 0d 5h 59min |

## Metrics Range

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Cyclomatic  Complexity | Cognitive  Complexity | Lines of code per file | Comment  density (%) | Coverage | Duplication (%) |
| Min | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Max | 147.0 | 134.0 | 446.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Volume

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Language | Number |
| Python | 446 |
| Total | 446 |

# Issues

## Charts

## Issues count by severity and type

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type / Severity | INFO | MINOR | MAJOR | CRITICAL | BLOCKER |
| BUG | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| VULNERABILITY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CODE\_SMELL | 0 | 114 | 0 | 7 | 0 |

## Issues List

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Description | Type | Severity | Number |
| String literals should not be duplicated | Duplicated string literals make the process of refactoring error-prone, since you must be sure to update all occurrences. On the other hand, constants can be referenced from many places, but only need to be updated in a single place. Noncompliant Code Example With the default threshold of 3: def run(): prepare("this is a duplicate") # Noncompliant - "this is a duplicate" is duplicated 3 times execute("this is a duplicate") release("this is a duplicate") Compliant Solution ACTION\_1 = "action1" def run(): prepare(ACTION\_1) execute(ACTION\_1) release(ACTION\_1) Exceptions No issue will be raised on: duplicated string in decorators strings with less than 5 characters strings with only letters, numbers and underscores @app.route("/api/users/", methods=['GET', 'POST', 'PUT']) def users(): pass @app.route("/api/projects/", methods=['GET', 'POST', 'PUT']) # Compliant def projects(): pass | CODE\_SMELL | CRITICAL | 6 |
| Cognitive Complexity of functions should not be too high | Cognitive Complexity is a measure of how hard the control flow of a function is to understand. Functions with high Cognitive Complexity will be difficult to maintain. See Cognitive Complexity | CODE\_SMELL | CRITICAL | 1 |
| Method names should comply with a naming convention | Sharing some naming conventions is a key point to make it possible for a team to efficiently collaborate. This rule allows to check that all method names match a provided regular expression. Noncompliant Code Example With default provided regular expression: ^[a-z\_][a-z0-9\_]\*$ class MyClass: def MyMethod(a,b): ... Compliant Solution class MyClass: def my\_method(a,b): ... | CODE\_SMELL | MINOR | 15 |
| Field names should comply with a naming convention | Sharing some naming conventions is a key point to make it possible for a team to efficiently collaborate. This rule allows to check that field names match a provided regular expression. Noncompliant Code Example With the default regular expression ^[\_a-z][\_a-z0-9]\*$: class MyClass: myField = 1 Compliant Solution class MyClass: my\_field = 1 | CODE\_SMELL | MINOR | 19 |
| Local variable and function parameter names should comply with a naming convention | Shared naming conventions allow teams to collaborate effectively. This rule raises an issue when a local variable or function parameter name does not match the provided regular expression. Exceptions Loop counters are ignored by this rule. for i in range(limit): # Compliant print(i) | CODE\_SMELL | MINOR | 78 |
| Unused local variables should be removed | If a local variable is declared but not used, it is dead code and should be removed. Doing so will improve maintainability because developers will not wonder what the variable is used for. Noncompliant Code Example def hello(name): message = "Hello " + name # Noncompliant print(name) for i in range(10): foo() Compliant Solution def hello(name): message = "Hello " + name print(message) for \_ in range(10): foo() Exceptions \_ as well as tuples will not raise an issue for this rule. The following examples are compliant: for \_ in range(10): do\_something() username, login, password = auth do\_something\_else(username, login) | CODE\_SMELL | MINOR | 2 |

# Security Hotspots

## Security hotspots count by category and priority

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category / Priority | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH |
| LDAP Injection | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Object Injection | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| XML External Entity (XXE) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Insecure Configuration | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| XPath Injection | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Authentication | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Weak Cryptography | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denial of Service (DoS) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Log Injection | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Open Redirect | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Permission | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SQL Injection | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Encryption of Sensitive Data | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Traceability | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Buffer Overflow | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| File Manipulation | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Code Injection (RCE) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Command Injection | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Path Traversal Injection | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HTTP Response Splitting | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Others | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Security hotspots List