Automated Code Review Tool

Mr. V. V. Mangave¹, Aditya Kulkarni², Pallavi Patil³, Tejas Nikam⁴, Snehal Chikane⁵, Anuj Gangane⁶

¹ Assistant Professor, Dept. of Computer Science Engineering, D Y Patil College of Engineering and Technology(Autonomous), Kasaba Bawada , Kolhapur, Maharashtra.

²³⁴⁵⁶B. Tech Students, Dept. of Computer Science Engineering, D Y Patil College of Engineering and Technology(Autonomous), Kasaba Bawada, Kolhapur, Maharashtra.

ABSTRACT

As software development undergoes continual evolution, the assurance of code quality remains paramount in the development lifecycle. This research paper introduces an innovative Automated Code Review Tool engineered to augment and streamline the code review process. The tool capitalizes on advanced static code analysis, machine learning algorithms, and industry best practices to automate the detection of code quality issues, security vulnerabilities, and compliance with coding standards.

The Automated Code Review Tool addresses the inherent challenges of manual code reviews, including human error, time constraints, and inconsistencies. Through automation, developers can expedite the identification and resolution of potential issues, thereby enhancing overall code quality and software reliability.

Key features of the tool encompass intelligent pattern recognition, real-time feedback, and customizable rule sets, enabling development teams to tailor the tool to

their project-specific requirements. Leveraging machine learning algorithms facilitates the tool's continuous learning from past reviews, thereby adapting to evolving coding practices and emerging security threats.

This paper presents the architectural framework and design principles underpinning the Automated Code

Review Tool, emphasizing its capacity to foster collaboration among development teams, reduce time-to-market, and ultimately contribute to the development of more robust and secure software. A comprehensive evaluation of the tool's efficacy across diverse development environments is conducted, offering insights into the practical implications of embracing automated solutions in real-world contexts.

Keywords: Automated Code Review Tool, Code quality, Static code analysis, Machine learning algorithms, Coding standards, Manual code reviews, Human error, Time constraints, etc.

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of the "Automated Code Review Tool" marks a significant paradigm shift in the realm of software development, revolutionizing the conventional methods employed by developers to ensure code quality and security. By harnessing the power of advanced algorithms and sophisticated analysis techniques, this innovative tool presents a holistic approach to code evaluation. Specifically tailored for Python codebases, it meticulously scrutinizes code to ascertain adherence to coding standards, pinpoint potential security vulnerabilities, uncover code duplications, and identify performance bottlenecks.

Facilitated through an intuitive web interface, developers can seamlessly submit their code for analysis and receive comprehensive reports detailing the findings. The tool's interactive nature empowers developers with actionable insights, including recommendations for addressing each flagged issue. By prioritizing automation, precision, and efficiency, the "Automated Code Review Tool" equips developers to deliver code that is not only cleaner and more secure but also optimized for high performance, thereby significantly augmenting the overall software development lifecycle.

Automated code review tools represent a pivotal innovation in the software industry, offering invaluable support to developers, quality assurance teams, and organizations alike in maintaining code quality, detecting issues, and upholding coding standards. In stark contrast to manual code reviews, which are often laborious, error-prone, and subject to individual biases, automated tools present a systematic, efficient, and impartial approach to code evaluation, fostering a culture of excellence and accountability within development teams.

LITERATURE SURVEY

In contemporary software development practices, automated code review tools have emerged as indispensable assets, offering a structured and efficient means of evaluating and enhancing code quality. Extensive literature highlights the crucial role played by the underlying algorithms powering these tools, which encompass static code analysis, data flow analysis, control flow analysis, and pattern matching. These algorithms play a pivotal role in pinpointing code issues, elevating code quality, and preemptively mitigating security vulnerabilities. Furthermore, they aid in upholding coding standards and fostering code readability and maintainability The integration of automated code review tools into modern development workflows is seamless, aligning harmoniously with the principles of continuous integration and delivery. Nonetheless, the literature acknowledges the presence of certain challenges, notably false positives and concerns regarding user acceptance, necessitating further investigation for optimal tool implementation.

Crucial to the efficacy of automated code review tools is the acceptance and adoption by users. The literature accentuates various factors influencing user acceptance, including tool usability, customizability, and the quality of feedback provided. A comprehensive understanding and adept management of these factors are imperative for the successful deployment and utilization of such tools.

In conclusion, this literature review serves as a foundational framework for subsequent discussions within this report. It underscores the indispensable role played by automated code review tools in contemporary software development, emphasizing their contribution to code quality and implications for security. However, it also underscores the imperative of addressing challenges associated with user acceptance and false positives in their application.



PROBLEM STATEMENT

Manual code reviews in software development pose challenges like human error and time constraints. This research aims to develop a web application for an Automated Code Review Tool, leveraging advanced algorithms to streamline code evaluation and enhance quality. Addressing concerns such as false positives and user acceptance, the goal is to create a user-friendly interface that improves efficiency and reliability in the code review process.

OBJECTIVES

Here are the specific objectives for Automated Code Review Tool as provided:

- 1. Development of a code quality optimization tool to enhance software reliability and efficiency.
- 2. Designing a security enhancement tool to fortify software against potential vulnerabilities and threats.
- 3. Creation of a code duplication reduction tool to improve code maintainability and readability.
- 4. Implementation of measures to ensure consistent coding style across projects, fostering collaboration and code uniformity.
- 5. Construction of a performance optimization tool to enhance the speed and efficiency of software applications.
- 6. Development of an automated fixing tool to expedite the resolution of identified code issues and enhance overall code quality.

PROPOSED WORK

1.1 Dataset

To develop and train an automated code review tool, a comprehensive dataset is imperative. This dataset should encompass diverse code samples across multiple programming languages and domains, including snippets, scripts, and complete source files. Paired with these samples, gather corresponding code reviews covering various issues like coding style violations, bugs, security vulnerabilities, and improvement suggestions. Annotate the samples with labels denoting these issues for machine learning classification. Ensuring diversity, both in terms of code complexity and application domains, is crucial, drawing from opensource projects, personal endeavors, and enterprise codebases. It's essential to curate a sizable dataset with balanced representation of different issues, ensuring quality by conducting thorough quality assurance checks to eliminate noise and inconsistencies. Privacy and security concerns should be addressed by anonymizing or sanitizing sensitive code samples. Additionally, collect metadata such as project details, dates, and and if programming languages, available. incorporate version control information for tracking code evolution. This holistic dataset forms the foundation for training and validating the automated code review tool effectively.

1.2 System requirement

1) Hardware Requirements:

- I. Processor: Intel I3 processor
- II. Storage Space: 500 GB.
- III. Screen size: 15" LED
- IV. Minimum RAM: 4GB

2) Software Requirements:

OS: Windows 7 and above /UBUNTU



1.3 System Architecture



fig(a): System Architecture

- 1.1 User Interface: This is where users interact with the system, such as submitting text for analysis or reviewing plagiarism reports.
- 1.2 Web Server: This component acts as an intermediary between the user interface and the code analysis engine. It receives user requests from the interface, forwards them to the engine, and returns the results back to the user interface.
- 1.3 Code Analysis Engine: This is the core of the system, where plagiarism detection happens. It analyzes the submitted text, compares it against a database of source materials, and identifies any potential instances of plagiarism.
- 1.4 Database: This stores the source materials, such as research papers, articles, and code repositories that the code analysis engine compares the submitted text against.
- 1.5 Notification System: This component alerts users about the plagiarism analysis results. It can send notifications through email, pop-up messages, or other means.

I



RESULT



fig(a): Home page of Code Review Tool

This landing page promotes an automated code review tool. A call to action entices visitors to "Streamline your code reviews." Below, key sections like "Features," "About Us," and login/registration options are highlighted, suggesting a resource for developers seeking to optimize their code review process.



fig(b): Login page

Existing users can sign in, while new developers can create an account to unlock streamlined code reviews and enhanced development workflows.

Syntax	Analysis Result
	6: unmatched ')'
	9: expected ':'

fig(c): Syntax Analysis

Syntax analysis result provides a line-by-line breakdown of the code, highlighting its structure for security. Any syntax errors, like missing semicolons or incorrect variable declarations, are flagged for easy identification and correction.

••	********** Module test14
D:	\uploads\test14.py:1:0: C0114: Missing module docstring (missing-module-docstring)
D:	\uploads\test14.py:10:0: W0622: Redefining built-in 'str' (redefined-builtin)
	\uploads\test14.py:25:0: W0622: Redefining built-in 'sum' (redefined-builtin)
	\uploads\test14.py:4:6: E0602: Undefined variable 'undefined_variable' (undefined-
vā	
	\uploads\test14.py:7:0: C0413: Import "import math" should be placed at the top of
th	e module (wrong-import-position)
	\uploads\test14.py:10:0: C0115: Missing class docstring (missing-class-docstring)
	\uploads\test14.py:10:0: C0103: Class name "str" doesn't conform to PascalCase
na	ming style (invalid-name)
	\uploads\test14.py:10:0: R0903: Too few public methods (0/2) (too-few-public-
me	thods)
D:	\uploads\test14.py:14:0: C0116: Missing function or method docstring (missing-
fu	nction-docstring)
D:	<pre>\uploads\test14.py:14:21: W0613: Unused argument 'parameter' (unused-argument)</pre>
D:	\uploads\test14.py:18:0: C0116: Missing function or method docstring (missing-
IU	nction-docstring)
U:	<pre>\upioads\testi4.py:18:0: C0103: Function name "InvalidrunctionName" doesn't conform</pre>
	Shake_case haming Style (invalid-hame)
р. п.	<pre>(uploads)test14.py:25:0: C0116: Missing function or method docetring (missing-</pre>
fu:	nction-docstring)
n•	\unloads\test14_nv:7:0: W0611: Unused import math (unused-import)
۳.	(upbedds(costif);;;;;;; would import math (undod import)

fig(d): Security Analysis

This image presents a line-by-line breakdown of code vulnerabilities discovered during a security analysis. Potential errors and weaknesses are highlighted, alongside their corresponding code.

T



CONCLUSION

Modern software development demands continuous improvement in code quality, security, and collaboration. Automated code review tools address these needs by offering early detection of issues, enforcing coding standards, and promoting code clarity. Their scalability and customizability make them adaptable to diverse project requirements. By automating code inspections and fostering a culture of continuous learning, these tools empower developers to write cleaner, more efficient code. Consequently, the integration of automated code review tools becomes not just an option but a compelling necessity for organizations and developers striving for software excellence. As the software development landscape continues to evolve, these tools will undoubtedly play a pivotal role in shaping the future of software engineering.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are very thankful to Department of CSE, DYPCET to give us opportunity to work on Automated Code Review Tool. We sincerely express our gratitude to Mr. V. V. Mangave, CSE Department, DYPCET for giving constant inspiration to complete this work.

REFERENCES

i) "Building Secure and Reliable Systems" by Heather Adkins, Betsy Beyer, Paul Blankinship, and Ana Oprea.
ii) "Clean Code: A Handbook of Agile Software Craftsmanship" by Robert C. Martin.
iii) Refactoring: Improving the Design of Existing Code"

by Martin Fowler.

I