

# Project 1 Report [Team-2]

Ashwini Tokekar (201405446), Deepak Kathayat (201101213), M.S.Soumya (201450872)

2016-02-15 Mon

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Java Code analysis</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Design smells . . . . .	2
2.1.1	Proposed design diagram . . . . .	3
2.2	Code Smells . . . . .	3
2.2.1	Code smells within classes . . . . .	3
2.2.2	Code smells between classes . . . . .	4
2.3	Code metrics . . . . .	4
2.3.1	Code Pro . . . . .	5
2.3.2	CCCC . . . . .	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Refactored code analysis</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>6</b>

## 1 Introduction

This document describes in detail an analysis of the codebase given for the Virtual Labs VLSI lab experiment-6 *Schematic design of D-latch and D-flipflop*. It also enlists a comparison of the code metrics of the Java code and the re-factored code in JavaScript.

## 2 Java Code analysis

The Schematic Design of D-Latch and D-flip-flops was initially written in Java. This section describes the analysis of the code written in Java. The experiment consists of two parts namely the D-flip-flop and the D-Latch. The experiments were to be tested on two types of triggers namely the positive edge trigger and the negative edge trigger. Hence, given code base consists of 4 java files namely *exp6\_flipfloppositive.java*, *exp6\_flipflopnegative.java*, *exp6\_latchpositive.java* and *exp6\_latchnegative.java*. Each file consists of around 3500 lines of java code. In the following sections a detailed analysis of the design and the code is narrated.

### 2.1 Design smells

There are several visible design smells in the existing code. For determining the structure and design of the given code-base we used the *ObjectAid Eclipse Plugin*. The following are the class diagrams of the four java files.

From the diagrams above the following design smells can be inferred:

1. Inappropriate use of patterns: It is evident from the above class diagram that suitable design patterns were not used to design the structure of the codebase.
2. Missing Abstraction: All the class files follow the same structure causing lots of redundancy in the methods. Using abstraction would have helped in reducing redundancy and also easier in understanding functionality.
3. Insufficient Modularization: Some classes are too large and could have been modularized further.
4. Leaky Encapsulation: Some of the encapsulation is unnecessary and bloated. There are several variables which can be combined together as one and used across all the classes.

### 2.1.1 Proposed design diagram



## 2.2 Code Smells

In this section we describe the code smells that were detected in the given code.

### 2.2.1 Code smells within classes

**No comments** No comments are used throughout the code explaining some finer details that need to be noted. This made some parts of the code incomprehensible.

**Long Methods** Most of the methods are long which makes the scope of their variables incomprehensible.

**Long Parameters List** The class `MyPanel` has several parameters which makes it very complex to understand.

**Combinitorial Explosion** The code in all the positive and negative files for both latch and the flipflop are mostly duplicated except for the values of the parameters. This need can be avoided by the use of proper inheritance.

**Conditional complexity** Some of the classes contain complex conditionals which can be avoided altogether by proper structuring.

**Uncommunicative names** Most of the variable names and method names do not suggest their purpose and are incomprehensible.

**Inconsistent names** The names of the methods in one class are intermingled with the names of other classes and do not lead to a proper understanding of the flow or their functionality.

**Dead code and speculative Generality** Some of the code is never used and most of it was modified to solve the problem, rather a hack to get its functionality working.

### 2.2.2 Code smells between classes

**Refused Bequest** There are a few classes which inherit other classes but rarely use the inherited functionality.

**Divergent Change** If any change is made in one class the trace of the change needs to be identified to make the change consistent across all the classes.

**Indecent Exposure** Most of the parameters and methods are public and are exposed.

## 2.3 Code metrics

The code metrics for the given code were measured using two tools *CCCC* and *Code Pro*. The results of the code metrics are listed in the following sections.

### 2.3.1 Code Pro

The results of the code metrics generated by code pro are as shown in the image below:

Results for test		<a href="#">[top]</a>
Metric Name	Value	
Abstractness	0%	
Average Block Depth	0.65	
Average Cyclomatic Complexity	6.27	
Average Lines Of Code Per Method	35.36	
Average Number of Constructors Per Type	0.62	
Average Number of Fields Per Type	13.62	
Average Number of Methods Per Type	5.01	
Average Number of Parameters	1.67	
Comments Ratio	21.1%	
Efferent Couplings	46	
Lines of Code	12,747	
Number of Characters	616,618	
Number of Comments	2,699	
Number of Constructors	36	
Number of Fields	790	
Number of Lines	19,357	
Number of Methods	291	
Number of Packages	6	
Number of Semicolons	7,933	
Number of Types	58	
Weighted Methods	2,051	

### 2.3.2 CCCC

The results are generated in HTML format which are easy to view in HTML itself rather than in screen shots of the page hence we are providing a link to the HTML page here in the document. Click [here](#) to view the results for D-flip-flop and [here](#) for D-latch. The results are present in the “/code-metrics-results/java-code/CCCC/” directory.

## 3 Refactored code analysis

Because of the large number of code smells and design smells the code was refactored using JavaScript. The code metrics for the JavaScript were obtained in HMTL format. The results are present in the “/code-metrics-results/js-code/code-pro/” directory. The file for the full result is present in the “exp6flipfloppositive.html” and “explatchpositive.html” for the flip-flop and

#### FLIP FLOP Metrics

- **Sloc** :55
- **Maintainability**:45.53
- **Jshint**:0.00
- **Complexity** :
  - **Sloc** : logical:40, physical :55
  - **Cyclomatic** :1,
  - **Halstead** : **operators** : { "distinct":8,"total":85 }, **operands**: { "distinct":28,"total":139 },
  - **Cyclomatic density** : 2.5
- **Length**:224,
- **Vocabulary**:36,
- **Difficulty**:19.857142857142858,
- **Volume**:1158.063200323078,
- **Effort**:22995.826406415406,
- **Bugs**:0.3860210667743593,
- **Time**:1277.5459114675225

latch files respectively.

#### LATCH METRICS

#### LATCH METRICS

- **Sloc** :67
- **Maintainability** :43.15704726965145}
- **Complexity** :
  - **Sloc** :{logical:48,physical :67},
  - **Cyclomatic**:1,
  - **Halstead**:{**operators**:{distinct:8,total:102,}, **operands**:{distinct:31,total:168}}
- **Length**:270
- **Vocabulary**:39
- **Difficulty**:21.677419354838708
- **Volume**:1427.358599092807
- **Effort**:30934.947696463427
- **Bugs**:0.47568619969760234
- **Time**:1718.6082053590792
- **Cyclomatic density**:2.0833333333333333

## 4 Conclusion

From the metrics above it is evident that the use of design patterns for while designing and keeping in mind a few best practices while writing the code helps improve the maintainability of the code to a great extent.

Comparison table:

Table 1:

S.no	Metric	Java	JavaScript
1.	Lines of code	12,747	55
2.	Cyclomatic complexity	6.27	1
3.	Maintainability index	12.35	45.5308









