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Why Axel?

• Because I can write expert-level bad code.
Why Axel?

• >10 years of ROOT development: *the* tool for every physicist’s analysis

• Member of the C++ committee

• Introduced static analysis tool at CERN
Why you?

• Because you have an impact! Your code is part of XYZ or on top of XYZ, or replaces XYZ.

• But how do you do it? Example: “which language?”
  • “community” knowledge: no Haskell, please
  • your knowledge: no COBOL, please
  • practicality: no assembler, please
Practices

• More than one dev or more than one user: need to agree on “how”

• CERN has decades of piles of code, lessons learned:
  1. be reasonable!
  2. but enforce!
  3. fix rules early, adapt new ones slowly
Best Practices

WE WILL BE ADOPTING THE BEST PRACTICES IN OUR INDUSTRY, JUST LIKE EVERYONE ELSE.

IF EVERYONE IS DOING IT, BEST PRACTICES IS THE SAME THING AS MEDIocre.

STOP MAKING MEDIOCRITY SOUND BAD!

SORRY.
Best Practices

• Don’t follow today’s best Best Practices blindly
  • it will be ridiculed in a month anyway

• But having them is simpler than arguing for / reminding of each rule’s motivation

• See e.g. Bjarne Stroustrup @ CppCon
  http://sched.co/3vVp
Motivation

- Simpler, consistent read
  - improved communication with fellow coders
  - less ambiguities means more correct code
- Less bugs; better maintenance
- Best practices win against experimental coding
</prelude>
Menu Du Jour

- Coding convention
- Interface jargon
- Change management
- Multi-platform support
- Tests: code-correctness, functionality, static analysis, performance
Disclaimer

• I am not your best practices superhero

• Focus on C++
  • experience, usage, need
Coding Convention
Coding Convention

- What is this?

```python
func(val);
```
Coding Convention

• It’s a counter-example!

```python
func(val);
```

• `func`: Member function? Data member / function pointer? Some global function pulled in from header?

• `val`: local variable declared 100 lines up in the same function? Or member? Or enum constant? And where can I find it’s declaration?
Coding Convention

```c
fFunc(fgVal);
```

- It’s ROOT - you can tell from the names!
- It’s a function call
- fFunc is a member - so it’s a function pointer!
- fgVal is a static data member; must be in same class (or base)
Coding Convention

• Obvious case of improved clarity

• For APIs, user friendly:
  • get_track(), getTrack(), GetTrack() - or Track()?
  • IDEs can help - but not when reading code!

• Almost all projects employ it
Coding Convention

• Typical current examples for C++:
  • Joint Strike Fighter Air Vehicle C++ Coding Standards
  • MISRA C++
• Both absurd for reasonable environments
• Both have very reasonable ingredients: pick yours!
Coding Convention

• Enforcing needs checkers

• Non-trivial; checker must understand C++: what is a function, what is a member etc

• Many C-coding convention checkers (indentation!), few C++, even less open source

  • clang is now a reasonable alternative
Interface Jargon
Interface Jargon

PLEASE FOLLOW THE RULES

WE ENCOURAGE NEW MEMBERS TO REFRAIN FROM DRUG SPECIFIC LANGUAGE AND USING THE WORD SOBER
Interface Jargon

• Consistency - we know that already

• Safe code through good APIs!

  • unique_ptr / shared_ptr instead of Type* where ownership is managed; never require “new Type()”, “delete var”

  • document also parameter pre- and post-condition: arg1 must be != 0; arg2 will contain…
Interface Jargon

• Maintain common idioms throughout API; example C++ std library:
  • iterators; functor; make_XYZ; allocator etc

• Don’t screw with your users
  • if interface looks like A, don’t make it do B even if it’s better for you. Change the interface instead.
Threading Support

- Different levels
  - starts threads to compute faster \([\text{multithreaded}]\)
  - function can be used on same object in multiple, concurrent threads without side-effects \([\text{reentrant}]\)
  - function can be used on different objects in multiple, concurrent threads without side-effects (no statics)
  - must be locked when accessed through multiple threads \([\text{no threading support}]\)
Threading Support

• All kinds need to be clearly documented
• Reentrant part of API needs to be visible
• Common contract nowadays:
  • const API means it’s reentrant: no unlocked mutables! no caches! no hidden state changes!
  • no static variables (without locks)! State is passed as arguments
Threading Support

• Thus threading support is to some extent interface jargon (plus good design)

• This is work in progress; has changed rather recently
  • expect further changes; constexpr might play a bigger role soon
  • exposing to >64 threads might change requirements (Amdahl’s law!) + style
Interface Jargon + Threading Support

- Automated checking (beyond coding convention) almost impossible
- requires design work / understanding of the interfaces
- Employ change management instead!
Change Management
Change Management

• Monitor by a second pair of eyes: two brains are better than one, especially if one brain is biased

• Avoids bugs from creeping in

• Also exposes code, new features to additional / backup developers

• Exposes changes to larger horizon: we all think of changes in different contexts
Change Management

Wally, did you get those cost estimates I asked for last week?

No, I need constant supervision.

Can you do it now?

Do you have time to watch?
Change Management

• Can be pre- or post-publication

• Pre-publication
  • package tags / tag collector (dying concept)
  • package owner merges changes
  • formalized patch review
  • pair programming
Change Management

- Post-publication
  - commit review by package owner

- Post-review risks stability of HEAD of master / dev-branch
  - still reasonable for small changes

- here, too: be pragmatic, not dogmatic
Lessons at CERN

• If it works, it will break
  • new OS version, new compiler version, new language version

• Only way out: embrace change
  • put procedures in place to survive change
  • benefit from it instead of mitigating it
Multi-Platform Support
Multi-Platform Support

• Problems:

  • big- versus little-endian

  • OS API

  • lack of language support in compiler

• Experienced developers will get a feeling for which language constructs are causing problems
Multi-Platform Support

• Advantages
  • general robustness
  • easier to follow architecture changes
  • will x86_64 be the instruction set of 2030?
  • more compilers = more opinions on code, more warnings (that’s a good thing!)
Multi-Platform Support

- Checking by building on many platforms, regularly
- Code correctness tests!
Tests
DON'T YOU THINK THAT IF I WERE WRONG, I'D KNOW IT?"
Code Correctness Tests

• Large matrix of builds
  • build on all supported platforms
  • build with all supported configurations
• Ideally after every change
  • helps pinpoint culprits
• Current common grounds: the HEAD works.
Code Correctness Tests

- Run build (incremental or full)
  - check for errors versus platform
  - also check for warnings!

- Run tests

- Build snapshot binaries
  - continuous delivery or for bug fix verification
Code Correctness Tests

• Needs automation

• Typical tools: Jenkins / Hudson; Bamboo; TeamCity; BuildBot and others
  
  • schedule and initiate build on all required machines

  • collect output; filter errors, warnings

  • report (web, email) versus code revision
Functionality Tests

• “Does my software actually work?”

• Science by itself; ingredients:
  
  • unit tests; regression tests; integration tests
  
  • rules when to write a test
  
  • testing libraries: cppunit / GoogleTest / …

• Needs automation!
Topical Tests

- Memory error checkers - use after free / before initialization
  - e.g. valgrind

- Thread error checkers
  - e.g. hellgrind
Static Analysis

• Analyzes source code without running it; creating branch graph to follow possible if etc combinations

• Finds use after delete; impossible if conditions; memory errors etc
Static Analysis

```cpp
0: int func(char* buf) {
1:   strcat(buf, "<default>");
2:   int pos;
3:   if (buf[0] != '<') {
4:     std::cout << "Number between 0 and 8:\n";
5:     std::cin >> pos;
6:   }
7:   buf[pos] = 0;
8:   if (!buf) return -1;
9:   return pos;
}
```

- What’s wrong in this snippet?
Voluntary “Homework”

• Do a code review, simulating a static analysis tool

• Compile it here: https://godbolt.org/g/7UAWCt

• Send your optimal version of
  int func(char* buf)
  to axel@cern.ch and I’ll send you mine

  • let’s review one another’s version

  • by tomorrow (Friday) noon!
Static Analysis

- Several tools out there, for instance
  - basic checker: compiler warnings!
  - clang static analysis
  - Coverity
  - Differ in set of bugs checked; tracing capabilities (through function calls etc); user interface; false positive rate
CERN Lessons

• Static analysis **cannot** be replaced by test suite: it tests the things that “never happen”

• Improves code stability

• Developers feel “watched”: improves overall code quality
Performance Test

• Changes can deteriorate performance:
  • takes more CPU cycles to get an answer
  • takes more RAM
  • takes more I/O operations
  • takes more disk space

• Criteria vary depending on product
Performance Test

• Usually part of release baking

• Better yet: automate

• Problem: which changes are intentional?

• Tools vary with criteria; e.g. cgroups; massif; CDash
100%
Current Challenges

• Massive multi-threading
• Data-oriented programming
• C++11 and up
• Move every tool into the FOSS world
Conclusion (1/4)

• Good software development is an art by itself
  
  • complex; many aspects; need to juggle many tools and often conflicting goals
  
• Not a reason to avoid it, but needs brain energy
Conclusion (2/4)

- Using the right tools pays off:
  - 1 hour more work for one dev can mean 10 minutes saved for 10k users each
    
    ```
    $ python3 -c 'print(10.*1E4/60/24/5, "weeks!")'
    13.88888888888889 weeks!
    ```

- users will trust your software more
Conclusion (3/4)

• Help your team define missing procedures
• Review procedures, review tools, review effectiveness
  • cover all aspects: runtime + performance tests, static analysis - none of that is optional
  • automatize
• adjust developers’ pain to increase acceptance
Conclusion (4/4)

• Write good code!