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CODE SMELLS
Code Smells

• A code smell is a hint that something has gone wrong somewhere in your code.
• A smell is sniffable, or something that is quick to spot.
• A smell doesn’t always indicate a problem
Bad Smells: Classification

• Most Common: **code duplication**

• Class / method organization
  – Large class, **Long Method**, Long Parameter List, Lazy Class, Data Class, ...

• Lack of loose coupling or cohesion
  – Inappropriate Intimacy, Feature Envy, Data Clumps, ...

• Too much or too little delegation
  – Message Chains, Middle Man, ...

• Non Object-Oriented control or data structures
  – Switch Statements, Primitive Obsession, ...

• Other: Comments
Code duplication (1)

Class

Method 1
- code
- code

Method 2
- code

Method 3
- code

- Extract method
- Rename method

Class
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Method X();
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Method 3
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Method X
- code
Code duplication (2)

Same expression in two sibling classes:

- Same code: Extract method + Pull up field
- Similar code: Extract method + Form Template Method
- Different algorithm: Substitute algorithm
Code duplication (3)
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code
Code duplication (3)

Same expression in two unrelated classes:

- Extract class
- If the method really belongs in one of the two classes, keep it there and invoke it from the other class
Long method

```java
//700LOC
public boolean foo() {
    try {
        synchronized () {
            if () {
                } else {
            }
            for () {
                if () {
                    if () {
                        if () {
                            if () {
                                if ()
                                    {
                                        if ()
                                            for () {
                                                }
                                            }
                                        } else {
                                            if () {
                                                for () {
                                                    }
                                                }
                                            } else {
                                            if () {
                                                for () {
                                                    }
                                                    }
                                                } else {
                                            if () {
                                                for () {
                                                    }
                                                    }
                                                } else {
                                            if () {
                                                for () {
                                                    }
                                                    }
                                                } else {
                                            if () {
                                                for () {
                                                    }
                                                    }
                                                } else {
                                            if () {
                                                for () {
                                                    }
                                                    }
                                                } else {
                                            if () {
                                                for () {
                                                    }
                                                    }
                                                } else {
                                            if () {
                                                for () {
                                                    }
                                                    }
                                                } else {
                                            if () {
                                                for () {
                                                    }
                                                    }
                                                } else {
                                            if () {
                                                for () {
                                                    }
                                                    }
                                                } else {
                                            if () {
                                                for () {
                                                    }
                                                    }
                                                } else {
                                            if () {
                                                for () {
                                                    }
                                                    }
                                                }
            } else {
            } else {
        } else {
            }
        }
    } else {
    }
}
```

• Remember this?

Source:
http://thedailywtf.com/Articles/Coding-Like-the-Tour-de-France.aspx
Solution: Refactoring

• Refactoring is a change to a program that doesn’t change the behavior, but improves a non-functional attribute of the code (not reworking).

• Examples:
  – Improve readability
  – Reduce complexity

• Benefits include increased maintainability, and easier extensibility

• Fearlessly refactor when you have good unit tests
Refactoring a long method

```java
void printOwing() {
    Enumeration e = _orders.elements();
    double outstanding = 0.0;
    // Print banner
    System.out.println("******************");
    System.out.println("***** Customer *****");
    System.out.println("******************");
    // Calculate outstanding
    While (e.hasMoreElements()) {
        Order each = (Order) e.nextElement();
        outstanding += each.getAmount();
    }
    // Print details
    System.out.println("name: " + _name);
    System.out.println("amount" + outstanding);
}
```
Refactoring a long method

```java
void printOwing() {
    Enumeration e = _orders.elements();
    double outstanding = 0.0;

    // Print banner
    System.out.println("******************");
    System.out.println("***** Customer *****");
    System.out.println("******************");

    // Calculate outstanding
    while (e.hasMoreElements()) {
        Order each = (Order) e.nextElement();
        outstanding += each.getAmount();
    }

    // Print details
    System.out.println("name: " + _name);
    System.out.println("amount" + outstanding);
}
```
Refactoring a long method

```java
void printOwing() {
    Enumeration e = _orders.elements();
    double outstanding = 0.0;

    printBanner();

    // Calculate outstanding
    While (e.hasMoreElements()) {
        Order each = (Order) e.nextElement();
        outstanding += each.getAmount();
    }

    // Print details
    System.out.println("name: " + _name);
    System.out.println("amount" + outstanding);
}
```

```java
void printBanner()
{
    System.out.println("******************");
    System.out.println("***** Customer *****");
    System.out.println("******************");
}
```

Extract method

```java
void printBanner()
{
    System.out.println("******************");
    System.out.println("***** Customer *****");
    System.out.println("******************");
}
```

Compile and test to see whether I've broken anything
void printOwing() {
    Enumeration e = _orders.elements();
    double outstanding = 0.0;
    printBanner();
    // Calculate outstanding
    While (e.hasMoreElements()) {
        Order each = (Order) e.nextElement();
        outstanding += each.getAmount();
    }
    // Print details
    System.out.println("name: " + _name);
    System.out.println("amount" + outstanding);
}
void printBanner() { ...}
Refactoring a long method

```java
void printOwing() {
    Enumeration e = _orders.elements();
    double outstanding = 0.0;
    printBanner();

    // Calculate outstanding
    While (e.hasMoreElements()) {
        Order each = (Order) e.nextElement();
        outstanding += each.getAmount();
    }
    printDetails(outstanding);
}
void printBanner(){...}
void printDetails(outstanding){
    System.out.println("name: " + _name);
    System.out.println("amount" + outstanding);
}
```

Compile and test to see whether I've broken anything
void printOwing() {
    Enumeration e = _orders.elements();
    double outstanding = 0.0;

    printBanner();

    // Calculate outstanding
    While (e.hasMoreElements()) {
        Order each = (Order) e.nextElement();
        outstanding += each.getAmount();
    }

    printDetails(outstanding);
}

void printBanner(){...}
void printDetails(outstanding){
    System.out.println("name: " + _name);
    System.out.println("amount" + outstanding);
}
Refactoring a long method

```java
void printOwing() {
    Enumeration e = _orders.elements();
    double outstanding = getOutstanding();
    printBanner();
    printDetails(outstanding);
}

void printBanner(){...}
void printDetails(outstanding){...}

double getOutstanding() {
    Enumeration e = _orders.elements();
    double result = 0.0;
    While (e.hasMoreElements()) {
        Order each = (Order) e.nextElement();
        result += each.getAmount();
    }
    return result;
}
```

Extract method reassigning a local variable

Compile and test to see whether I've broken anything
Many More Bad Smells and Suggested Refactorings

• Top crime: code duplication
• Class / method organization
  – Large class, Long Method, Long Parameter List, Lazy Class, Data Class, ...
• Lack of loose coupling or cohesion
  – Inappropriate Intimacy, Feature Envy, Data Clumps, ...
• Too much or too little delegation
  – Message Chains, Middle Man, ...
• Non Object-Oriented control or data structures
  – Switch Statements, Primitive Obsession, ...
• Other: Comments
ANTI-PATTERNS
Anti-patterns

• “Anti”-pattern
• Patterns of things you should NOT do
• Often have memorable names.
Common anti-patterns

- Spaghetti code
Common anti-patterns

• Spaghetti code
• The Blob
Common anti-patterns

- Spaghetti code
- The Blob
- Golden Hammer
Common anti-patterns

• Spaghetti code
• The Blob
• Golden Hammer
• Lava Flow
Common anti-patterns

- Spaghetti code
- The Blob
- Golden Hammer
- Lava Flow
- Swiss Army Knife
EVALUATING FUNCTIONAL CORRECTNESS
Reminder: Functional Correctness

• The compiler ensures that the types are correct (type checking)
  – Prevents “Method Not Found” and “Cannot add Boolean to Int” errors at runtime

• Static analysis tools (e.g., FindBugs) recognize certain common problems
  – Warns on possible NullPointerExceptions or forgetting to close files

• How to ensure functional correctness of contracts beyond?
Formal Verification

• Proving the correctness of an implementation with respect to a formal specification, using formal methods of mathematics.
• Formally prove that all possible executions of an implementation fulfill the specification

• Manual effort; partial automation; not automatically decidable
Testing

• Executing the program with selected inputs in a controlled environment (dynamic analysis)

• Goals:
  – Reveal bugs (main goal)
  – Assess quality (hard to quantify)
  – Clarify the specification, documentation
  – Verify contracts

"Testing shows the presence, not the absence of bugs"
Edsger W. Dijkstra 1969
Testing Decisions

• Who tests?
  – Developers
  – Other Developers
  – Separate Quality Assurance Team
  – Customers

• When to test?
  – Before development
  – During development
  – After milestones
  – Before shipping

• When to stop testing?

(More in 15-313)
TEST COVERAGE
How much testing?

• You generally cannot test all inputs
  – too many, usually infinite

• But when it works, exhaustive testing is best!

• When to stop testing?
  – in practice, when you run out of money
What makes a good test suite?

• Provides high confidence that code is correct
• Short, clear, and non-repetitious
  – More difficult for test suites than regular code
  – Realistically, test suites will look worse
• Can be fun to write if approached in this spirit
Blackbox: Random Inputs

*Next best thing to exhaustive testing*

- Also know as *fuzz testing*, *torture testing*
- Try “random” inputs, as many as you can
  - Choose inputs to tickle interesting cases
  - Knowledge of implementation helps here
- **Seed random number generator so tests repeatable**
- Successful in some domains (parsers, network issues, ...)
  - But, many tests execute similar paths
  - But, often finds only superficial errors
Blackbox: Covering Specifications

- Looking at specifications, not code:

  - Test representative case
  - Test boundary condition
  - Test exception conditions
  - (Test invalid case)
Textual Specification

public int read(byte[] b, int off, int len) throws IOException

- Reads up to len bytes of data from the input stream into an array of bytes. An attempt is made to read as many as len bytes, but a smaller number may be read. The number of bytes actually read is returned as an integer. This method blocks until input data is available, end of file is detected, or an exception is thrown.
- If len is zero, then no bytes are read and 0 is returned; otherwise, there is an attempt to read at least one byte. If no byte is available because the stream is at end of file, the value -1 is returned; otherwise, at least one byte is read and stored into b.
- The first byte read is stored into element b[off], the next one into b[off+1], and so on. The number of bytes read is, at most, equal to len. Let k be the number of bytes actually read; these bytes will be stored in elements b[off] through b[off+k-1], leaving elements b[off+k] through b[off+len-1] unaffected.
- In every case, elements b[0] through b[off] and elements b[off+len] through b[b.length-1] are unaffected.

- Throws:
  - IOException - If the first byte cannot be read for any reason other than end of file, or if the input stream has been closed, or if some other I/O error occurs.
  - NullPointerException - If b is null.
  - IndexOutOfBoundsException - If off is negative, len is negative, or len is greater than b.length - off
Structural Analysis of System under Test

– Organized according to program decision structure

```java
public static int binsrch (int[] a, int key) {
    int low = 0;
    int high = a.length - 1;

    while (true) {
        if (low > high) return -(low+1);

        int mid = (low+high) / 2;

        if (a[mid] < key) low = mid + 1;
        else if (a[mid] > key) high = mid - 1;
        else return mid;
    }
}
```
Structural Analysis of
System under Test

– Organized according to program decision structure

```java
public static int binsrch (int[] a, int key) {
    int low = 0;
    int high = a.length - 1;

    while (true) {
        if ( low > high ) return -(low+1);
        int mid = (low+high) / 2;

        if      ( a[mid] < key )  low  = mid + 1;
        else if ( a[mid] > key )  high = mid - 1;
        else    return mid;
    }
}
```

Will this statement get executed in a test? Does it return the correct result?
Structural Analysis of System under Test

– Organized according to program decision structure

```java
public static int binsrch (int[] a, int key) {
    int low  = 0;
    int high = a.length - 1;
    while (true) {
        if ( low > high ) return -(low+1);
        int mid = (low+high) / 2;
        if      ( a[mid] < key )  low  = mid + 1;
        else if ( a[mid] > key )  high = mid - 1;
        else    return mid;
    }
}
```

Whitebox testing

Will this statement get executed in a test? Does it return the correct result?

Could this array index be out of bounds?
Structural Analysis of System under Test

– Organized according to program decision structure

```java
public static int binsrch (int[] a, int key) {
    int low = 0;
    int high = a.length - 1;
    while (true) {
        if ( low > high ) return -(low+1);
        int mid = (low+high) / 2;
        if  ( a[mid] < key )  low  = mid + 1;
        else if ( a[mid] > key )  high = mid - 1;
        else    return mid;
    }
}
```

Whitebox testing

- Could this array index be out of bounds?
- Does this return statement ever get reached?
- Will this statement get executed in a test?
- Does it return the correct result?
Code coverage metrics

- Method coverage – coarse
- Branch coverage – fine
- Path coverage – too fine
  - Cost is high, value is low
  - (Related to cyclomatic complexity)
Method Coverage

- Trying to execute each method as part of at least one test

```java
    public boolean equals(Object anObject) {
        if (isZero())
            if (anObject instanceof IMoney)
                return ((IMoney)anObject).isZero();
        if (anObject instanceof Money) {
            Money aMoney = (Money)anObject;
            return aMoney.currency().equals(currency())
                && amount() == aMoney.amount();
        }
        return false;
    }

    public int hashCode() {
```

- Does this guarantee correctness?
Statement Coverage

- Trying to test all parts of the implementation
- Execute every statement in at least one test

```java
public boolean equals(Object anObject) {
    if (isZero())
        if (anObject instanceof IMoney)
            return ((IMoney)anObject).isZero();
    if (anObject instanceof Money) {
        Money aMoney = (Money)anObject;
        return aMoney.currency().equals(currency())
            && amount() == aMoney.amount();
    }
    return false;
}
```

- Does this guarantee correctness?
Structure of Code Fragment to Test

```
38 }
39  public boolean equals(Object anObject) {
40     if (isZero())
41         if (anObject instanceof IMoney)
42             return ((IMoney)anObject).isZero();
43     if (anObject instanceof Money) {
44         Money aMoney = (Money)anObject;
45         return aMoney.currency().equals(currency) ||
46             aMoney.currency().equals(currency) && aMoney.amount() == aMoney.amount();
47     }
48     return false;
49  }
50  public int hashCode() {
```

Flow chart diagram for junit.samples.money.Money.equals
Statement Coverage

• Statement coverage
  – What portion of program statements (nodes) are touched by test cases

• Advantages
  – Test suite size linear in size of code
  – Coverage easily assessed

• Issues
  – Dead code is not reached
  – May require some sophistication to select input sets
  – Fault-tolerant error-handling code may be difficult to “touch”
  – Metric: Could create incentive to remove error handlers!

```java
public boolean equals(Object anObject) {
    if (isZero())
        return ((IMoney)anObject).isZero();
    if (anObject instanceof IMoney)
        return ((IMoney)anObject).isZero();
    if (anObject instanceof Money) {
        Money aMoney= (Money)anObject;
        return aMoney.currency().equals(currency())
            && amount() == aMoney.amount();
    }
    return false;
}
```
Branch Coverage

• Branch coverage
  – What portion of condition branches are covered by test cases?
  – Or: What portion of relational expressions and values are covered by test cases?
    • Condition testing (Tai)
  – Multicondition coverage – all boolean combinations of tests are covered

• Advantages
  – Test suite size and content derived from structure of boolean expressions
  – Coverage easily assessed

• Issues
  – Dead code is not reached
  – Fault-tolerant error-handling code may be difficult to “touch”

```java
public boolean equals(Object anObject) {
    if (isZero())
        if (anObject instanceof IMoney)
            return ((IMoney)anObject).isZero();
    if (anObject instanceof Money) {
        Money aMoney = (Money)anObject;
        return aMoney.currency().equals(currency())
            && amount() == aMoney.amount();
    }
    return false;
}
```
Path Coverage

• Path coverage
  – What portion of all possible paths through the program are covered by tests?
  – Loop testing: Consider representative and edge cases:
    • Zero, one, two iterations
    • If there is a bound n: n-1, n, n+1 iterations
    • Nested loops/conditionals from inside out

• Advantages
  – Better coverage of logical flows

• Disadvantages
  – Infinite number of paths
  – Not all paths are possible, or necessary
    • What are the significant paths?
  – Combinatorial explosion in cases unless careful choices are made
    • E.g., sequence of n if tests can yield up to 2^n possible paths
  – Assumption that program structure is basically sound
## Coverage Report - All Packages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package Name</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Line Coverage</th>
<th>Branch Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Packages</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net.sourceforge.cobertura.ant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net.sourceforge.cobertura.check</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net.sourceforge.cobertura.coveragedata</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net.sourceforge.cobertura.instrument</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net.sourceforge.cobertura.merge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net.sourceforge.cobertura.reporting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net.sourceforge.cobertura.reporting.html</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net.sourceforge.cobertura.reporting.html.files</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net.sourceforge.cobertura.reporting.xml</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net.sourceforge.cobertura.util</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someotherpackage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report generated by Cobertura 1.9 on 6/9/07 12:37 AM.
Check your understanding

- Write test cases to achieve 100% line coverage but not 100% branch coverage

```c
int foo(int a, int b) {
    if (a == b)
        a = a * 2;
    if (a + b > 10)
        return a - b;
    return a + b;
}
```
Check your understanding

- Write test cases to achieve 100% line coverage and also 100% branch coverage

```c
int foo(int a, int b) {
    if (a == b)
        a = a * 2;
    if (a + b > 10)
        return a - b;
    return a + b;
}
```
Check your understanding

• Write test cases to achieve 100% line coverage and 100% branch coverage and 100% path coverage

```c
int foo(int a, int b) {
    if (a == b)
        a = a * 2;
    if (a + b > 10)
        return a - b;
    return a + b;
}
```
Coverage metrics: useful but dangerous

- Can give false sense of security
- Examples of what coverage analysis could miss
  - Data values
  - Concurrency issues – race conditions etc.
  - Usability problems
  - Customer requirements issues
- High branch coverage is not sufficient
Test suites – ideal vs. real

• Ideal test suites
  – Uncover all errors in code
  – Test “non-functional” attributes such as performance and security
  – Minimum size and complexity

• Real test Suites
  – Uncover some portion of errors in code
  – Have errors of their own
  – Are nonetheless priceless
STATIC ANALYSIS
public class CartesianPoint {
    private int x, y;
    int getX() { return this.x; }
    int getY() { return this.y; }
    public boolean equals(CartesianPoint that) {
        return (this.getX() == that.getX()) &&
               (this.getY() == that.getY());
    }
}
public boolean equals(CartesianPoint p) {
    return (p.x==this.x) && (p.y==this.y);
}
Stupid Subtle Bugs

```java
public class Object {
    public boolean equals(Object other) { ... }

    // other methods...
}

public class CartesianPoint extends Object {
    private int x, y;
    int getX() { return this.x; }
    int getY() { return this.y; }
    public boolean equals(CartesianPoint that) {
        return (this.getX() == that.getX()) &&
                (this.getY() == that.getY());
    }
}
```

- Classes with no explicit superclass implicitly extend `Object`.
- Can't change argument type when overriding `T`
- This defines a different equals method, rather than overriding `Object.equals()`.
Fixing the Bug

```java
public class CartesianPoint {
    private int x, y;
    int getX() { return this.x; }
    int getY() { return this.y; }

    @Override
    public boolean equals(Object o) {
        if (!(o instanceof CartesianPoint)) return false;
        CartesianPoint that = (CartesianPoint) o;
        return (this.getX() == that.getX()) &&
               (this.getY() == that.getY());
    }
}
```

Declare our intent to override; Compiler checks that we did it

Use the same argument type as the method we are overriding

Check if the argument is a CartesianPoint. Correctly returns false if o is null

Create a variable of the right type, initializing it with a cast
public boolean equals(CartesianPoint p) {
    return (p.x==this.x) && (p.y==this.y);
}

Description

FindBugs Problem (Of concern) (1 item)
- CartesianPoint defines equals and uses Object.hashCode()

FindBugs Problem (Scary) (1 item)
- CartesianPoint defines equals(CartesianPoint) method and uses Object.equals(Object)

Bug Info

CartesianPoint.java: 12

Navigation

CartesianPoint defines equals(CartesianPoint) method and uses Object.equals(Object)

**Bug:** CartesianPoint defines equals(CartesianPoint) method and uses Object.equals(Object)

This class defines a covariant version of the equals() method, but inherits the normal equals(Object) method defined in the base java.lang.Object class. The class should probably define a boolean equals(Object) method.

**Confidence:** Normal, **Rank:** Scary (8)
**Pattern:** EQ_SELF_USE_OBJECT
**Type:** Eq, **Category:** CORRECTNESS (Correctness)
Scanning archives (4 / 4)
2 analysis passes to perform
Pass 1: Analyzing classes (38 / 38) - 100% complete
Pass 2: Analyzing classes (4 / 4) - 100% complete
Done with analysis
FindBugs rule violations were found. See the report at: file:///home/travis/build/CMU-15-214/homework/3/build/reports/findbugs/test.html
:homework/3:test
CheckStyle
Static Analysis

- Analyzing code without executing it (automated inspection)
- Looks for bug patterns
- Attempts to formally verify specific aspects
- Point out typical bugs or style violations
  - NullPointerExceptions
  - Incorrect API use
  - Forgetting to close a file/connection
  - Concurrency issues
  - And many, many more (over 250 in FindBugs)
- Integrated into IDE or build process
- FindBugs and CheckStyle open source, many commercial products exist
Example SpotBugs Bug Patterns

- Correct equals()
- Use of ==
- Closing streams
- Illegal casts
- Null pointer dereference
- Infinite loops
- Encapsulation problems
- Inconsistent synchronization
- Inefficient String use
- Dead store to variable
Bug finding

```java
public Boolean decide() {
    if (computeSomething() == 3)
        return Boolean.TRUE;
    if (computeSomething() == 4)
        return false;
    return null;
}
```

**Bug**: FBTest.decide() has Boolean return type and returns explicit null

A method that returns either Boolean.TRUE, Boolean.FALSE or null is an accident waiting to happen. This method can be invoked as though it returned a value of type boolean, and the compiler will insert automatic unboxing of the Boolean value. If a null value is returned, this will result in a NullPointerException.

**Confidence**: Normal, **Rank**: Troubling (14)
**Pattern**: NP_BOOLEAN_RETURN_NULL
**Type**: NP, **Category**: BAD_PRACTICE (Bad practice)
Can you find the bug?

```java
if (listeners == null)
    listeners.remove(listener);

JDK1.6.0, b105, sun.awt.x11.XMSelection
```
Wrong boolean operator

```java
if (listeners != null)
    listeners.remove(listener);
```

JDK1.6.0, b105, sun.awt.x11.XMSelection
Can you find the bug?

```java
public String sendMessage(User user, String body, Date time) {
    return sendMessage(user, body, null);
}

public String sendMessage(User user, String body, Date time,
    List attachments) {
    String xml = buildXML (body, attachments);
    String response = sendMessage(user, xml);
    return response;
}
```
Infinite recursive loop

```java
public String sendMessage (User user, String body, Date time) {
    return sendMessage(user, body, null);
}

public String sendMessage (User user, String body, Date time, List attachments) {
    String xml = buildXML (body, attachments);
    String response = sendMessage(user, xml);
    return response;
}
```
Can you find the bug?

String b = "bob";
b.replace('b', 'p');
if(b.equals("pop")){...}
Method ignores return value

String b = "bob";
b = b.replace('b', 'p');
if(b.equals("pop")){...}
What does this print?

Integer one = 1;
Long addressTypeCode = 1L;

if (addressTypeCode.equals(one)) {
    System.out.println("equals");
} else {
    System.out.println("not equals");
}
What does this print?

Integer one = 1;
Long addressTypeCode = 1L;

if (addressTypeCode.equals(one)) {
    System.out.println("equals");
} else {
    System.out.println("not equals");
}
TEST DRIVEN DEVELOPMENT (TDD)
Three simple rules

1. You are not allowed to write any production code unless it is to make a failing unit test pass.
2. You are not allowed to write any more of a unit test than is sufficient to fail; and compilation failures are failures.
3. You are not allowed to write any more production code than is sufficient to pass the one failing unit test.
TDD Cycle

From Growing Object-Oriented Software by Nat Pryce and Steve Freeman
http://www.growing-object-oriented-software.com/figures.html
@sebrose http://cucumber.io
Why TDD?

“The act of writing a unit test is more an act of **design** than of verification.

It is also more an act of **documentation** than of verification.

The act of writing a unit test closes a remarkable number of feedback loops, the least of which is the one pertaining to **verification** of function”.
Advantages of TDD

- Clear place to start
- Much less code thrown away, less wasted effort
- Less Fear
- Side Effect: Robust test suite
A programming exercise that you repeat many many times, looking to make small, incremental improvements.

**CODE KATA**
Diamond Kata

• Given a letter, print a diamond starting with ‘A’ with the supplied letter at the widest point.

• For example: ‘C’ prints

```
   A
  B B
C   C
B B
  B B
   A
```
WE'LL DO IT LIVE!

TDD Demo
IMPRESSIONS?
TDD Research

- Hilton et al.: Students learn better when forced to write tests first
- Bhat et al.: At Microsoft, projects using TDD had greater than two times code quality, but 15% more upfront setup time
- George et al.: TDD passed 18% more test cases, but took 16% more time
- Scanniello et al.: Perceptions of TDD include: novices believe TDD improves productivity at the expense of internal quality
More TDD Research

• Fucci et al.: Results: The Kruskal-Wallis tests did not show any significant difference between TDD and TLD in terms of testing effort (p-value = .27), external code quality (p-value = .82), and developers' productivity (p-value = .83).

• Fucci et al.: Conclusion: The claimed benefits of TDD may not be due to its distinctive test-first dynamic, but rather due to the fact that TDD-like processes encourage fine-grained, steady steps that improve focus and flow.
WHY IS THIS HARD?