When dealing with regressions, it turns out to be somewhat difficult for one developer to see all their regressions in a list.

Usually when QA finds and bisects a regression, they add a comment saying "Adding CC to: Jane Doe" and add the developer to CC. Filtering for such is possible, but unreliable. Sometimes the bisect is a false positive, but since comments cannot be edited, the "Adding CC to:" keeps the bug in the filter results.

Sometimes this comment is missing, although the bug was properly bisected to be a regression.

Recently I tried to make lists of all regressions by all our developers and ran into the above issues.

To make searching for "regressions by someone" more reliable I'd like to propose adding a new field to bug pages, named "Regression By" (or something similar). This would be an email type field, that could be added to regression bugs.

Could you reference this discussion, so we don't need to repeat it here?

Understood. Holding back til we've checked the older discussion. But case in point is tdf#146795 ...
Unfortunately I couldn't find it. I think in one of the old QA meetings, minutes are in https://wiki.documentfoundation.org/QA/Meetings but I couldn't find it.

Anyway, even if it was decided in the past like that, we can always re-evaluate, of course.

If developers don't mind to be mentioned in a text field, I'm happy to have it, I see the value. Maybe it could be just displayed to the users being part of the 'contributors' group, so just developers and people active in QA can see it...

#6 - 2022-02-03 16:15 - Gabor Kelemen

Xisco Fauli Tarazona I like the concept of limiting this fields visibility to the longer term contributors.

#7 - 2022-02-10 15:57 - Gabor Kelemen

Adolfo Jayme Barrientos wrote in #note-4:

> How one uses language matters, so let's try to entirely remove the person/ego thing out of the equation. Instead of "Regression by", it could be named "Regressed in" or "Bisect target", to refocus people to the commit itself, not the person.

I think this proposal has some other merit: it would be good to have a separate field (such as "Regressed in") in the bug description to store the link of the bisected commit, as this would be more ergonomic/convenient/quick compared to digging it out of 20-25 - sometimes contradicting - comments.

But the main idea is to explicitly associate people (at least the professionals, not the casual fly-by contributors) to their regressions, with the hope they are the right experts to fix/have insight to advise others on fixing such bugs.

I agree that it's probably not productive to slap newcomers with their regressions and the implicit expectation that "it would be nice of them to fix it" - this is not the intention here.