Reviews: software and midterm

CSE403: Software Engineering

David Notkin Winter 2009

Reviews, etc.

- Reviews, walkthroughs, and inspections are all in a family of activities where an artifact (specification, code, etc.) is studied by a peer group to improve the artifact's quality
- There is a large and increasing literature that demonstrates the effectiveness (although not always the cost-effectiveness) of these approaches

Notkin (c) 1997

Reviews, etc.

- · N-heads are better than one
- Intended to
 - identify defects
 - identify needed improvements
 - encourage uniformity and conformance to standards
 - enforce subjective rules

Notkin (c) 1997

Purposes

- · Increase quality through peer review
- · Provide management visibility
- · Encourage preparation

· Explicit non-purpose

 Assessment of individual abilities for promotion, pay increases, ranking, etc.

Notkin (c) 1997

- Management usually not permitted at reviews

A formal activity

Walkthrough

- A programmer (designer) presents a program (design)
- · Values of sample data are traced
- · Peers evaluate technical aspects of the design

Inspections [Sommerville]

- Formal approach to code review
- Intended explicitly for defect detection (not correction)
- Defects include logical errors, anomalies in the code (such as uninitialized variables), non-complicance with standards, etc.

Notkin (c) 1997

Notkin (c) 1997

5

Inspection requirements

- · A precise specification must be available
- Peers must be knowledgeable about organizational standards
- Code should be syntactically correct and basic tests
 passed

Notkin (c) 1997

· Error checklist must be provided

Inspection process

- Plan
- Overview
- Individual preparation
 - Code, documentation distributed in advance

Notkin (c) 1997

- Meeting
- Rework
- Follow-up

Inspection teams

- · Four or more members
- · Author of code
- · Reader of code (reads to team)
- · Inspector of code
- · Moderator chairs meeting, takes notes, etc.

Description checklists Checklist of common errors drives inspection Checklist dependent on programming language Checklist dependent on programming language

Inspection rate

- · 500 statements/hour during overview
- · 125 statements/hour during individual prep
- · 90-125 statements/hour during review
- Inspecting 500 statements can take 40 person-hours

Notkin (c) 1997

 For 1MLOC, this would be about 40 person-years of effort

Notkin (c) 1997

11













Expectations

- One hour of work in two hours of time
- Read the required readings
- Review the lecture materials
- · Expect questions such as
 - "No Silver Bullet' preceded the development of agile methods by over a decade. What do you think Brooks' reaction to the Agile Manifesto would be, based on specific content in his paper?"
 - "Briefly discuss how Michael Jackson might react to a proof of correctness, using Hoare triples, of a priority queue assignment in CSE326."

19

 Answers that are short-and-sweet are much preferred to long-andrambling responses for which you hope to get partial credit because you said something that is true even if it doesn't relate to the question

UW CSE 403

Questions?