

# Assignment 1

## Rashmi Mudduluru

UW user ID: rashmi4

January 8, 2018

## 1 Development difficulty 1: Insufficient documentation

ExtendedReflection is an assembly that provides callback hooks into **managed .NET** code. I wanted ~~to use this profiler~~ to instrument the reads and writes of a program **at runtime** and perform some analysis. It turned out that these hooks were very poorly documented. For instance, there was a hook named MethodCall, but it was not documented whether it would be inserted before or after making the call. Similarly, there was insufficient documentation for many of the parameters of these callbacks. I had to do quite a bit of reverse engineering to figure out the semantics of the callbacks that I required.

Although this profiler is not used widely, it is a very powerful **tool**. During the development stage, it might seem that one is wasting time on documentation or adding comments. But, the repercussions of this are that the end users' productivity goes down significantly.

Partially automated tools could help in such scenarios. For instance, **a tool that creates a comment header** before each method with fields for return type and all the parameters would help the developer by **performing a lot of the repetitive documentation**. Further, the tool should be able to check if the values of these fields are meaningful. For instance, simply repeating the name of the parameter or writing one word comments, etc. should be pointed out as documentation errors. Another useful feature would be **to give an example of the method usage**. The automated tool could possibly generate an example with arguments and the developer could elaborate further.

## 2 Development difficulty 2

Many times, developers introduce new functionality either as part of a new feature or a bug fix. But, they do not add corresponding tests to the test suite. Also, when there is a runtime bug reported that was not caught by the compile

time tests, it is difficult to reproduce the error and developers look at logs to identify the issue and provide a fix. In this scenario, adding a test case that replicates the runtime behavior is desirable but often overlooked.

I was part of a team working with a message passing system and encountered a runtime error. The cause for this was that a particular node received an empty event and there was no corresponding action for this event. The exact sequence of events had to be inferred from the sequence of events in the log. This is a cumbersome activity and one could end up spending hours or even days. Typically runtime profiling and analysis creates overheads that are not acceptable in production code. We need analysis tools that can incur minimal runtime overheads while **giving the necessary information**. One possible solution is to build tools that use compile time knowledge to reduce the amount of information that needs to be tracked at runtime. This information can then be used to deduce the sequence of events that cause the unexpected behavior and the bug can be reproduced.

### 3 Development difficulty 3

Any team working on building a product follows the modular development approach. Typically an interface for a function specifies the types of inputs that it accepts and the also the return type. Consider the interface for a function that takes an integer as its input and returns an integer. In a modular setting, the implementation of this function might be done by one developer and another developer might call this from a different function. In this particular instance, although the interface only expects an integer, the implementation assumed that it is always positive. So there was a call to this method with a negative integer which resulted in a bug. The test cases were not exhaustive enough to catch this scenario. **Automatic test generation could have helped in this case**. Also, what might help is to **have static analyses integrated with the IDE that generate these kinds of tests** seamlessly.

### 4 Time spent: 5 hours