

# Errors in K.4 Comprehensive SARIF file #444

**Closed**

pascalberger opened this issue on Dec 15, 2019 · 4 comments

## Assignees



## Labels

2.1.0-candidate-standard-public-comment

bug

resolved-fixed

**pascalberger** commented on Dec 15, 2019

There are multiple errors in the sample provided in "K.4 Comprehensive SARIF file":

- The `.` on line 95 is outside of the quoted text:

```
"shortDescription": {  
  "text": "The run ended".  
},
```

Should be:

```
"shortDescription": {  
  "text": "The run ended."  
},
```

- Exception message should be a string not an object on line 231:

```
"exception": {  
  "kind": "ExecutionEngine.RuleFailureException",  
  "message": {  
    "text": "Unhandled exception during rule evaluation."  
  }  
}
```

Should be:

```
"exception": {  
  "kind": "ExecutionEngine.RuleFailureException",  
  "message": "Unhandled exception during rule evaluation."  
}
```

- Invalid enumeration value for `baselineState` on line 419:

```
"baselineState": "existing",
```

Based on point 3.27.24 in the specs `existing` is not a valid value here.

- There's a missing `,` on line 641:

```
"module": "platform",  
"threadId": 52  
"parameters": [  
  "null",
```

Should be:

```
"module": "platform",  
"threadId": 52,  
"parameters": [  
  "null",
```

- There's a missing closing `}` on line 713:

```
{  
  "offset": 100,  
  "fullyQualifiedName": "collections.dll!collections::list::add",  
  "kind": "function",  
  "parentIndex": 0  
  {  
    "offset": 22,  
    "fullyQualifiedName": "collections.dll!collections::list::add+0x16",  
    "parentIndex": 1  
  }  
}
```

Should be:

```
{  
  "offset": 100,  
  "fullyQualifiedName": "collections.dll!collections::list::add",  
  "kind": "function",  
  "parentIndex": 0  
},  
{  
  "offset": 22,  
  "fullyQualifiedName": "collections.dll!collections::list::add+0x16",  
  "parentIndex": 1  
}
```



2

**michaelcfanning** commented on Dec 23, 2019

Contributor

@pascalberger, great feedback, thanks for providing it.

**dm42** commented on Dec 24, 2019

Contributor

@lgolding and @michaelcfanning - Just FYI, @pascalberger has followed good practice and submitted this issue both to github and to the sarif-comment list. Conversations I've had in the past with Chet and Paul indicate that we should process this comment as if it came during the public comment period even though it came earlier. That means we can label it as a public review comment and include it in our process.

**lgolding** added the `2.1.0-candidate-standard-public-comment` label on Dec 24, 2019**lgolding** commented on Dec 24, 2019

Contributor

Thanks @pascalberger!

@michaelcfanning @dm42 I labeled this `2.1.0-candidate-standard-public-comment`.

**lgolding** self-assigned this on Dec 24, 2019**dm42** commented on Jan 13

Contributor

For OASIS bookkeeping, here are the links to the sarif-comment e-mails representing these comments:

<https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sarif-comment/201912/msg00000.html>  
<https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sarif-comment/201912/msg00001.html>  
<https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sarif-comment/201912/msg00002.html>  
<https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sarif-comment/201912/msg00003.html>



  **lgolding** added bug resolved-fixed labels 12 days ago

 **lgolding** closed this 12 days ago

---

#### Assignees

 **lgolding**

---

#### Labels

**2.1.0-candidate-standard-public-comment**

bug

resolved-fixed

---

#### Projects

None yet

---

#### Milestone

No milestone

---

#### Linked pull requests

Successfully merging a pull request may close this issue.

None yet

---

#### 4 participants

