

# Ten simple rules for teaching sustainable software engineering

Kit Gallagher<sup>1</sup>, Richard Creswell<sup>2</sup>, Ben Lambert<sup>3</sup>, Martin Robinson<sup>2</sup>, Chon Lok Lei<sup>4</sup>, Gary R. Mirams<sup>5</sup>, David J. Gavaghan<sup>1\*</sup>

**1** Doctoral Training Centre, University of Oxford, UK

**2** Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford, UK

**3** Department of Statistics, University of Oxford, UK

**4** Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Macau, Macau, China

**5** Centre for Mathematical Medicine & Biology, School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

\* david.gavaghan@dtc.ox.ac.uk

## Introduction

Computational methods and associated software implementations are central to every field of scientific investigation. Modern biological research, particularly within systems biology, has relied heavily on the development of software tools to process and organize increasingly large datasets, simulate complex mechanistic models, provide tools for the analysis and management of data, and visualize and organize outputs [1–3].

However, developing high-quality research software requires scientists to develop a host of software development skills, and teaching these skills to students is challenging. While researchers are often highly competent in programming, many lack a wider skillset in software development, and generate research results via code that is not designed to be re-used after publication. This causes a multitude of negative effects on scientific research including a lack of transparency and open access [4], poor development and deployment practices [5], and a lack of executable reproducibility—where code cannot even be run [6]. This has implications for the sustainability of the research software base.

Given the importance of high-quality software to effective research in computational biology, there has been significant literature on the growing importance placed on ensuring reproducibility [7, 8] and good development practices [9–11] in computational research. However, less attention has been devoted to informing the specific teaching strategies which are effective at nurturing in researchers the complex skillset required to produce high-quality software that, increasingly, is required to underpin both academic and industrial biomedical research. Biologists and computational researchers, even if aware of the importance of high-quality software to their research, are typically left to fend for themselves in developing the necessary skills to produce reusable software, and formal education is lacking. The software that they develop is therefore typically ‘single-use’ in that it is discarded after publication of the results they generate. Any researchers wishing to use the same computational framework are then forced to re-implement this in their own software, and the cycle repeats.

Two recent articles in the Ten Simple Rules collection [12, 13] have discussed the teaching of foundational computer science and coding techniques to biology students. We advance this discussion by describing the specific steps for effectively teaching the necessary skills a scientist needs to develop sustainable software packages which are fit

for (re-)use in academic research or more widely. Although our advice is likely to be applicable to all students and researchers hoping to improve their software development skills, our guidelines are directed towards an audience of students that have some programming literacy but little formal training in software engineering, typical of early doctoral students. These practices are also applicable outside of doctoral training environments, and we believe they should form a key part of postgraduate training schemes more generally in the life sciences.

The following rules have been fine-tuned through generations of doctoral students at the *EPSRC CDT in Sustainable Approaches to Biomedical Science: Responsible and Reproducible Research (SABS:R<sup>3</sup>) CDT* at the University of Oxford. The SABS:R<sup>3</sup> programme trains doctoral students in cutting-edge, collaborative systems approaches to biomedical research, with a strong focus on computational methods. Uniquely, it provides comprehensive training in advanced software development and software engineering to all of its students, in the context of industrially-derived research within the biomedical sciences.

Students initially take a three-week classroom training programme in the principles of software engineering. This course is designed to introduce important themes in software development and convey its importance; we discuss key aspects of this in the first four rules. To make this training immediately relevant, all students subsequently undertake an industry-supported group software development project over the course of their first year, allowing them to learn and apply their software skills in a realistic setting. These projects require students to develop high-quality software in support of some scientific or industrial project or investigation, involving a variety of fields including epidemiology, pharmacokinetics, and medical imaging. Two such projects have additionally led to scientific publications [14, 15]. We have fine-tuned the design and implementation of these projects over a series of student cohorts and share some of the lessons we have learnt in Rules 5–8, before finally discussing the output from these projects, and how they may be sustained after the students finish their training.

## Rule 1: Place value on good software development

Within the results-focused setting of academia (and particularly a PhD), good software development has often been considered a secondary priority — ‘nice if you have time, but not essential’. This may be attributed to the perceived lack of academic recognition for software outputs [16, 17], diminishing the motivation and financial support for upholding good practices.

Despite this, it has more widely been accepted within industrial software development communities (and is increasingly accepted within academic environments) that investing additional time to uphold common software development practices improves overall productivity across a wide range of project scales and fields [18–20]. By sharing these views with students at the start of their research careers, it is possible to challenge pre-conceived notions that established coding practices inherently slow down research.

Our experience, both as PhD supervisors and PhD students, is that while students are often enthusiastic to learn software development as a new skill, the benefits to scientific research of a formal grounding in sound software engineering practices may not be immediately apparent at the start of the PhD. The advantage of, for example, taking a test-driven approach are typically realised later in the PhD, as codes developed early in the PhD can be extended and built upon with confidence. As we discuss further in Rule 8 below, the benefits can be reinforced through structured peer-mentoring. Over time, this results in a body of robust and reusable open-source software underpinning the long-term research within the group, and these benefits become more immediately obvious and self-sustaining.

Several other 10 Simple Rules articles have already provided excellent descriptions of best software development practices to aspire towards, and we point the reader to these guides on documentation [21], usability [11], robustness [22] and version control [23].

## **Rule 2: Support students to develop good coding practices**

There are a variety of schools of thought for proper coding practices, and giving students a degree of freedom over the standards they adopt can encourage accountability and teaches the role of such practices. However, it is often helpful to provide some initial pointers for what good code is. This will help student groups to come to a consensus that aligns with widely used programming practices, while still leaving enough room for interpretation. We suggest that instead of letting students develop completely their own coding standard, they are given general directions in the form of a few bullet points, such as:

- What are the conventions in your programming language?
- Has your function/class/method got more than one responsibility? Can its scope be simplified by defining more than one function/class/method?
- Do you have unit tests for all public classes, methods and functions?
- How will you ensure everyone's code and documentation follows the same style?
- How will your intended users easily install and use the software?
- What operating systems and external dependency versions will you support?
- Are there clear guidelines for third parties wishing to contribute, seek support or report issues in the software?

These are intended only as a guide, akin to the popular concept of 'code-smells' which represent failures to adhere to good coding standards and are associated with increased code maintenance [24,25]. However it is worth noting that many disciplines have domain-specific standards; for example it is common-place to require less rigid testing on front end visual components, while testing may focus more heavily on overall function for Artificial Intelligence components, rather than solely testing each constituent method individually [26].

## **Rule 3: Stress the role and importance of open-source development**

We encourage open-source development using sites such as GitHub, and find that most students are enthusiastic about sharing their work in this way. This may not always be completely possible, if industrially-partnered research projects involve proprietary data or methods that must be hidden, but the benefits of open-source development for early career researchers [27, 28], software quality [29, 30] and research in general [31, 32] are well documented.

Having a public facing repository means that software may attract those in the wider community to act as co-developers, which can also encourage students to take more ownership and care of the quality of the repository. As other users can see, use or even contribute to their code, software development principles discussed in Rule 2 such

as ensuring code quality and good documentation have immediate benefits. Previous teaching projects [33] within the SABS:R<sup>3</sup> programme have attracted external collaborators across the globe, as a result of effective publishing through GitHub and clear open-source contribution guidelines.

## **Rule 4: Use agile development practices**

Among different development paradigms, agile development is one of the most relevant to scientific research, providing a formal framework to adapt to changing demands and evolving research questions [34, 35]. Project goals are typically not fully defined at the conception of a project and are often informed by preliminary and intermediate results, so the ability to easily refactor (reorganise and tidy) the code-base is essential. Agile development methodologies account for this through concise planning horizons, working towards coding targets that can be feasibly accomplished in a reasonable time frame (typically one month). This approach facilitates the rapid creation of working prototypes, and mitigates the phenomenon of ‘analysis paralysis’, a pitfall that arises when attempting to anticipate too many potential future requirements.

One key aspect to agile development is the adoption of test-driven development, wherein the code to test and verify desired functionality/output is written before the source code for that function. This requires students to consider the best interface for their new code, and frame their testing around the required functionality of their codebase, rather than tailoring tests to the particular implementation of that function in the source code. Test-driven approaches help facilitate the addition of wide-ranging functionality to a pre-existing codebase, as well as placing a greater emphasis on code testing and validation, and can increase productivity more generally [36]. Other relevant features of this programming methodology include continuous integration, collective code ownership via pair programming, and frequent refactoring, which are discussed in Rules 7–8. For more details of the use of this approach, see the eXtreme programming framework [37], and an example of how this may be applied in a scientific context when developing the Chaste software [38].

## **Rule 5: Create a project that is ambitious, relevant, and exciting**

In general, we learn skill-based knowledge best by doing, rather than through taught lectures or textbooks [39, 40]. For this reason, we developed annual group projects for students to consolidate the software development skills introduced in taught courses. These problems should not be toy projects; they should be challenging, real-world problems that have not been tackled before. We have found that this novelty motivates students to engage more directly with the project [41].

These projects should also have wider relevance outside of pure pedagogy, be it to academic research or industrial applications. This typically necessitates a larger scale problem than typical teaching/textbook problems, requiring a team of students to tackle it together. This resembles effective software engineering in industry, where good software is developed in large, multi-disciplinary groups. This will be in contrast with the primarily individual experience that students typically gain during undergraduate research projects, where individual scripts are written to answer a specific research question rather than creating a tool for exploring a wider field of research. These larger projects help to contextualise the role and uses of research software, as well as developing student’s experience and confidence in working with a large codebase. A few examples of projects we have previously run with student cohorts are linked below for reference:

- Epidemiological agent-based modelling (EpiABM) software, based on CovidSim model de
- An educational game based on the process of designing new drugs, developed in collabora
- Extensible quality control tool for clinical images, developed in collaboration with GE He

Ensuring that these projects have tangible outputs is also key to student engagement. The key output for these projects is a complete software package, which should be open-source (see Rule 3) to enable the wider research community to engage with this work. Furthermore, in SABS:R<sup>3</sup>, projects were developed in collaboration with industrial partners to tackle problems in their respective fields, and many of these industrial partners have subsequently used the open-source research outputs in house. The industrial partners have also supported the projects, funding access to compute resources or providing access to databases to enable these projects to have real-world impact.

Providing publishing opportunities, either within dedicated software journals or through scientific journals in cases where the software has been used for notable scientific applications, can also provide a concrete end goal for students. Thus far, three cohorts within the SABS:R<sup>3</sup> programme have published (or prepared for publication) descriptions of their software and associated scientific findings in reputable journals [14,15]; further scientific and software publications are anticipated in future years of the program.

## Rule 6: Set up multi-cohort projects

We have also run multi-cohort projects, with each cohort working to extend the codebase of the previous cohort. The benefits of this were twofold; firstly it allows more ambitious projects to be tackled which might not be attainable in a year. These projects could also adapt to changes in the project motivation — for example a project developing broad epidemiological inference software at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic [14], was redirected to develop agent-based modelling software [15] following the high-profile use of this approach in UK governmental response to the pandemic [44]. This software package was recently extended by a subsequent year group to interface with spatial data repositories, and integrate accurate population information into epidemiological models [45]. This approach ensured relevancy of the software being developed, and that it would continue to be supported and maintained after the original developers graduated from the teaching course.

Secondly, developing someone else’s codebase is a useful skill and encourages students to write their own code with future developers in mind. While most teaching in academic settings focuses on developing a new codebase, this is rarely the reality of software development in academia or industry, and it is common for new starters to struggle adapting to working on legacy code instead of developing their own new projects [46]. By providing experience of this in a teaching setting (and often with the luxury of access to the previous developers — see Rule 8) it provides students with the skills required to implement changes in long-standing research software codebases. At a time when the majority of research software is no longer updated or maintained [47], learning how to debug and extend a legacy codebase can be invaluable to both your own and others’ research.

## Rule 7: Encourage collaboration within mixed-ability groups

Software development is rarely a solo endeavour, and this should be reflected in the teaching environment. Graduate training courses are often an ideal setting for this, as the reduced focus on individual assessment relative to undergraduate education allows for a more collaborative work environment, with students working in groups on a common project. Group work encourages students to learn from each other's coding styles, as well as 'soft-skills' such as communication and teamwork within the specific context of software development. It also requires the use of version control software, and developing skills such as branch management, bug tracking, and code review that students may not have considered in individual projects.

With larger-scale projects (see Rule 5), it is inevitable (and indeed desirable) that projects will be modular, and readily broken into separate tasks. Despite this, it is important to ensure that the different aspects to the project should still interact where possible so that learners are not working in isolation on their own sections. This interaction often happens explicitly (for example when developing a computational pipeline where elements must interface effectively), but ensuring individual students are not isolated working on separate aspects of the codebase is crucial to ensuring that the students learn from each other's experience. Peer-to-peer learning may be strengthened by promoting a shared responsibility in code review, developing teamwork and communication skills within a computational environment as well as exposing students to new approaches and design patterns in their peers' code. These approaches also help avoid premature specialisation, where students only learn about their own features and miss out on skills from other areas; similarly, all learners should be comfortable documenting and testing their own code, rather than leaving this to a single individual.

We have found it most effective for students to have the chance to work together in-person, enabling collaborative activities such as regular stand-up meetings and pair programming. When students are working remotely, appropriate collaboration tools should be employed and project leaders should take care to ensure that all students remain actively involved in the project in order for the benefits of collaborative activities such as pair programming to still be realized [48, 49].

Students are not a homogeneous group however; they will enter any programme with differing levels of experience, experience in different aspects of computational science, maybe even in different programming languages or undergraduate degrees. While this is typically seen as a disadvantage in taught courses, it can be treated as an advantage within group projects. Collaboration within groups allows students to share their various skill sets, becoming their own teachers as they share their particular specialties to the benefit of all [50].

Students with more experience of coding can also take on leadership roles in team management, or inform the overall software architecture. By contrast, the less experienced students may learn from the code styles of the more experienced, with pair programming a particularly effective tool to develop their skills and familiarity with the language(s) used in the project [51, 52]. This can also be used to compensate for differing experience in the particular programming language(s) being used for the project — for example students who have more extensive general software experience, but in other languages, can both teach and learn from students with direct experience in the project language(s).

Ideally, groups should be large enough to contain students with a variety of skill levels and enable some degree of specialization between students, but small and cohesive enough for all students to maintain familiarity with all aspects of the project. We have found that groups of 4–5 students works very well.

## Rule 8: Organise student and peer supervision

Practical courses at graduate level are often limited in scope by the availability of senior academics to offer supervision. Instead, more senior students on the course can act in supervisory roles for these projects — able to provide hands on supervision, and a more informal resource (away from senior academics) to answer questions about unfamiliar aspects of software development (such as unit testing). Drawing students from previous cohorts that worked on the same project is particularly advantageous, ensuring familiarity with the underlying codebase. This relationship is also beneficial for the supervising student — as well as learning through their teaching they also have first-hand experience of the struggles new developers may have picking up their codebase, and how they could mitigate this in future projects.

This supervision also mimics professional structures common in industry, where junior developers will typically submit work to senior developers for code review. More formal use of version control features and code review also instills good practice for learners (and supervisors) who may later wish to transition to careers in the tech sector. The code review process can also be utilised to update other members of the team on features within the code, and formalise the protocol for introducing significant changes into the main codebase, including those that affect wider functionality.

Encouraging peer code review, where learners begin to review each other's pull requests, is also highly beneficial to ensure continual feedback on code outputs. This form of comprehensive peer supervision can be supported by implementing comprehensive continuous integration checks on test coverage and code quality, reducing some of the supervision requirements in student projects by automatically highlighting issues in the students' code which they must resolve themselves [53].

## Rule 9: Focus on the process, not the final outcome

Although projects should be ambitious and exciting (Rule 5), the final outcomes of these projects should never come at the expense of the learning process — students will gain more from having the time and freedom to write higher quality code at a slower pace, rather than rushing to complete targets. This approach can provide students with a unique opportunity to explore new features and patterns of the language in a way that is rarely achieved elsewhere in their studies when working to deadlines. If the initial project aims turn out to be too ambitious, projects should be rescope to focus on some smaller goals which the students can more confidently achieve without ever feeling the need to forego good software engineering practices. Alternatively, students can be divided into different streams working on different aspects of the project, or initially be assigned an easier toy project to develop various software development skills before launching into more ambitious year-long projects where they learn to balance best practices with time and resource limitations. Course leaders should endeavour to foster a creative environment where students are focused on achieving the desired functionality in the best way possible (rather than the most functionality possible), enabling students to produce higher quality outputs, and develop stronger software development skills to take forwards into their future projects.

To achieve this, giving students the opportunity to explore and develop familiarity with common software development tools is important. As introduced in Rule 7, learning to use version control tools such as Git is an important skill in itself, and has been addressed in 'Ten Simple Rules for Taking Advantage of Git and GitHub' [23]. Students should be taught and encouraged to utilise features of GitHub widely, for example to document bugs and planned features through issues or peer-review each other's code through pull requests. Similarly, familiarity with the functionality of Integrated De-

velopment Environments (IDEs), including built-in debugging and refactoring tools, is important for efficient software development and is associated with students' improved learning and productivity [54]. Learners may also find it helpful to use static analysis tools, such as PVS-Studio, which provide feedback on code style to develop awareness of clean code practices.

Furthermore, outcomes may not simply be limited to the academic output, or even the function of the code. The importance of software development practices can be emphasised, including software development goals as well as functionality — for example a group may target publishing complete documentation online, or 100% unit test coverage. When a software project is used as part of a scientific publication, the quality of the underlying software development (for example, in user-friendliness, extensibility, and reproducibility) should be highlighted in the publication.

## **Rule 10: Building a community can ‘future-proof’ your project**

Our experience over the last two decades highlights the potential benefits of providing advanced training in software development in the context of a ‘live’ applied research project. Our first experience of this approach was in 2005, when we used the initial development of the Chaste (Cancer, heart and soft tissue environment) physiological modelling software [38,55–57] to teach test-driven, agile software development practices to a cohort of ten PhD students and several post-doctoral researchers. Over the intervening period, Chaste has become one of the leading such platforms, and is in continual use by research groups across the world. Over 50 early career researchers have contributed to its development, and several of the original Chaste developers now use it within their own research groups in academia, industry, and at regulatory authorities. Although this success is unlikely to be replicated in every such training-driven and hence student-led development project, our similar experience in developing the EpiABM software discussed above, and in the development of PINTS (Probabilistic inference on noisy time series) [58] suggests that this approach has the potential to deliver sustainable and reusable software platforms to the research community with surprising frequency. The key here, we believe, is the generation of a community of researcher-developers who take collective ownership of the code and, through joint publications and frequent code releases, have a joint interest in its continued maintenance and use. Building such communities can future-proof a code base, and perhaps suggests a new and more sustainable model for the development of the computational tools and software that increasingly underpin research.

## **Conclusion**

Instilling good software development practices in early career researchers is invaluable in ensuring the impact of their computational outputs, but software development does not always receive as much attention in student scientific computational training as it deserves. Our experience running doctoral training programs focused on software development for 15 years has shown that this is best achieved through active learning on ambitious group-projects targeting real world problems, mentored by older students on the programme. Feedback from students has supported these views, with many students being enthusiastic about learning and applying sustainable software development practices using the approaches we have discussed here and continuing to apply the practices in their own work after the conclusion of the course. This teaching pathway has demonstrated a track record of success in open-source software development, with a range of



widely used software packages developed by students later in the PhDs [59–63].

We hope that other graduate training schemes may consider adopting these strategies in their own institutions, to promote the value in sustainable software development, and the research benefits it can bring.

## Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the work of Steve Crouch and James Graham from the Software Sustainability Institute, for their helpful instruction on the topic of software engineering in the graduate training courses. We also thank David Augustin for providing helpful comments on the notes which led to this paper.

## Funding

KG, MR, DG acknowledge funding from the EPSRC CDT in Sustainable Approaches to Biomedical Science: Responsible and Reproducible Research - SABS:R3 (EP/S024093/1). GRM acknowledges support from the Wellcome Trust via a Wellcome Trust Senior Research Fellowship (grant no. 212203/Z/18/Z). CLL acknowledges funding support from the Science and Technology Development Fund, Macao SAR (FDCT) (reference no. 0048/2022/A) and the University of Macau (MYRG2022-00023-FHS).

## References

1. Ghosh S, Matsuoka Y, Asai Y, Hsin KY, Kitano H. Software for systems biology: from tools to integrated platforms. *Nature Reviews Genetics*. 2011;12(12):821–832. doi:10.1038/nrg3096.
2. Markowetz F. All biology is computational biology. *PLOS Biology*. 2017;15(3):e2002050. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.2002050.
3. Baxter SM, Day SW, Fetrow JS, Reisinger SJ. Scientific Software Development Is Not an Oxymoron. *PLoS Computational Biology*. 2006;2(9):e87. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.0020087.
4. Howison J, Bullard J. Software in the scientific literature: Problems with seeing, finding, and using software mentioned in the biology literature. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*. 2015;67(9):2137–2155. doi:10.1002/asi.23538.
5. Katz DS, Choi SCT, Lapp H, Maheshwari K, Löffler F, Turk M, et al. Summary of the First Workshop on Sustainable Software for Science: Practice and Experiences (WSSSPE1). *Journal of Open Research Software*. 2014;2(1):e6. doi:10.5334/jors.an.
6. Strijkers R, Cushing R, Vasyunin D, de Laat C, Belloum ASZ, Meijer R. Toward Executable Scientific Publications. *Procedia Computer Science*. 2011;4:707–715. doi:10.1016/j.procs.2011.04.074.
7. Sandve GK, Nekrutenko A, Taylor J, Hovig E. Ten Simple Rules for Reproducible Computational Research. *PLoS Computational Biology*. 2013;9(10):e1003285. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003285.
8. Peng RD. Reproducible Research in Computational Science. *Science*. 2011;334(6060):1226–1227. doi:10.1126/science.1213847.

9. Osborne JM, Bernabeu MO, Bruna M, Calderhead B, Cooper J, Dalchau N, et al. Ten Simple Rules for Effective Computational Research. *PLoS Computational Biology*. 2014;10(3):e1003506. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003506.
10. Brack P, Crowther P, Soiland-Reyes S, Owen S, Lowe D, Williams AR, et al. Ten simple rules for making a software tool workflow-ready. *PLoS Computational Biology*. 2022;18(3):e1009823. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009823.
11. List M, Ebert P, Albrecht F. Ten Simple Rules for Developing Usable Software in Computational Biology. *PLoS Computational Biology*. 2017;13(1):e1005265. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005265.
12. Carey MA, Papin JA. Ten simple rules for biologists learning to program. *PLoS Computational Biology*. 2018;14(1):e1005871. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005871.
13. Reyes RJ, Hosmane N, Ihorn S, Johnson M, Kulkarni A, Nelson J, et al. Ten simple rules for designing and running a computing minor for bio/chem students. *PLoS Computational Biology*. 2022;18(7):e1010202. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1010202.
14. Creswell R, Augustin D, Bouros I, Farm HJ, Miao S, Ahern A, et al. Heterogeneity in the onwards transmission risk between local and imported cases affects practical estimates of the time-dependent reproduction number. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*. 2022;380(2233). doi:10.1098/rsta.2021.0308.
15. Gallagher K, Bouros I, Fan N, Hayman E, Heirene L, Lamirande P, et al. Epidemiological Agent-Based Modelling Software (Epiabm); 2022. Available from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.04937>.
16. Way GP, Greene CS, Carninci P, Carvalho BS, de Hoon M, Finley SD, et al. A field guide to cultivating computational biology. *PLoS Biology*. 2021;19(10):e3001419. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3001419.
17. Hafer L, Kirkpatrick AE. Assessing open source software as a scholarly contribution. *Communications of the ACM*. 2009;52(12):126–129. doi:10.1145/1610252.1610285.
18. Blackburn JD, Scudder GD, Wassenhove LNV. Improving speed and productivity of software development: a global survey of software developers. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*. 1996;22(12):875–885. doi:10.1109/32.553636.
19. Canedo ED, Santos GA. Factors Affecting Software Development Productivity: An Empirical Study. In: *Proceedings of the XXXIII Brazilian Symposium on Software Engineering, SBES '19*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2019. p. 307–316. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3350768.3352491>.
20. Chue Hong N, Hettrick S, Pringle K, Ainsworth R, Aragon S, Crouch S, et al. Software Sustainability Institute Midterm Review; 2023. Available from: <https://zenodo.org/record/8205595>.
21. Lee BD. Ten simple rules for documenting scientific software. *PLoS Computational Biology*. 2018;14(12):e1006561. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006561.
22. Taschuk M, Wilson G. Ten simple rules for making research software more robust. *PLoS Computational Biology*. 2017;13(4):e1005412. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005412.

23. Perez-Riverol Y, Gatto L, Wang R, Sachsenberg T, Uszkoreit J, da Veiga Leprevost F, et al. Ten Simple Rules for Taking Advantage of Git and GitHub. *PLOS Computational Biology*. 2016;12(7):e1004947. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004947.
24. Yamashita A, Moonen L. Do code smells reflect important maintainability aspects? In: 2012 28th IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance (ICSM). IEEE; 2012. p. 306–315. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1109/icsm.2012.6405287>.
25. Lacerda G, Petrillo F, Pimenta M, Guéhéneuc YG. Code smells and refactoring: A tertiary systematic review of challenges and observations. *Journal of Systems and Software*. 2020;167:110610. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2020.110610.
26. Amershi S, Begel A, Bird C, DeLine R, Gall H, Kamar E, et al. Software Engineering for Machine Learning: A Case Study. In: 2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice (ICSE-SEIP). IEEE; 2019. p. 291–300. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1109/icse-seip.2019.00042>.
27. Allen C, Mehler DMA. Open science challenges, benefits and tips in early career and beyond. *PLOS Biology*. 2019;17(5):e3000246. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3000246.
28. McKiernan EC, Bourne PE, Brown CT, Buck S, Kenall A, Lin J, et al. Point of View: How open science helps researchers succeed. *eLife*. 2016;5:e16800. doi:10.7554/eLife.16800.
29. Fitzgerald. The Transformation of Open Source Software. *MIS Quarterly*. 2006;30(3):587. doi:10.2307/25148740.
30. Paulson JW, Succi G, Eberlein A. An empirical study of open-source and closed-source software products. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*. 2004;30(4):246–256. doi:10.1109/tse.2004.1274044.
31. von Krogh G, Spaeth S. The open source software phenomenon: Characteristics that promote research. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*. 2007;16(3):236–253. doi:10.1016/j.jsis.2007.06.001.
32. Pearce JM. The case for open source appropriate technology. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*. 2012;14(3):425–431. doi:10.1007/s10668-012-9337-9.
33. Gallagher K, Hayman E, Fan N, Heirene L, Lamirande P, Bouros I, et al. SABS-R3-Epidemiology/epiabm: Zenodo Release; 2022. Available from: <https://zenodo.org/record/7327444>.
34. Ahmed A, Ahmad S, Ehsan N, Mirza E, Sarwar SZ. Agile software development: Impact on productivity and quality. In: 2010 IEEE International Conference on Management of Innovation & Technology. IEEE; 2010. p. 287–291. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1109/icmit.2010.5492703>.
35. Sletholt MT, Hannay J, Pfahl D, Benestad HC, Langtangen HP. A Literature Review of Agile Practices and Their Effects in Scientific Software Development. In: Proceedings of the 4th International Workshop on Software Engineering for Computational Science and Engineering. SECSE '11. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2011. p. 1–9. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1985782.1985784>.

36. Madeyski L, Szala L. The Impact of Test-Driven Development on Software Development Productivity — An Empirical Study. In: Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2007. p. 200–211. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-75381-0\\_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-75381-0_18).
37. Beck K, Andres C. Extreme Programming Explained: Embrace Change. XP Series. Pearson Education; 2004. Available from: <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=-DNcBAAQBAJ>.
38. Pitt-Francis J, Pathmanathan P, Bernabeu MO, Bordas R, Cooper J, Fletcher AG, et al. Chaste: A test-driven approach to software development for biological modelling. *Computer Physics Communications*. 2009;180(12):2452–2471. doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2009.07.019.
39. Freeman S, Eddy SL, McDonough M, Smith MK, Okoroafor N, Jordt H, et al. Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2014;111(23):8410–8415. doi:10.1073/pnas.1319030111.
40. Prince M. Does Active Learning Work? A Review of the Research. *Journal of Engineering Education*. 2004;93(3):223–231. doi:10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809.x.
41. de los Ríos I, Cazorla A, Díaz-Puente JM, Yagüe JL. Project-based learning in engineering higher education: two decades of teaching competences in real environments. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 2010;2(2):1368–1378. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.202.
42. Quast N, Shepard K, Raja A, Adlard D, Durant G, Zhao S, et al.. Drug Discovery Game App; 2023. <https://github.com/SABS-Group-2-2021-22/drug-discovery-game-app>.
43. Wei Y, Turnbull O, Oladokun E, Wee H, Robinson M, Krol J, et al.. Extensible-Clinical-Imaging-QC-Tool; 2023. <https://github.com/SABS-Group-2-2021-22/drug-discovery-game-app>.
44. Ferguson N, Laydon D, Nedjati Gilani G, Imai N, Ainslie K, Baguelin M, et al.. Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand; 2020. Available from: <http://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/1/77482>.
45. Herriott L, Capel HL, Ellmen I, Schofield N, Zhu J, Lambert B, et al.. EpiGeoPop: A Tool for Developing Spatially Accurate Country-level Epidemiological Models; 2023. Available from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.13468>.
46. Craig M, Conrad P, Lynch D, Lee N, Anthony L. Listening to Early Career Software Developers. *J Comput Sci Coll*. 2018;33(4):138–149.
47. Hey T, Payne MC. Open science decoded. *Nature Physics*. 2015;11(5):367–369. doi:10.1038/nphys3313.
48. Cockburn A, Williams L. The Costs and Benefits of Pair Programming. In: *eXtreme Programming and Flexible Processes in Software Engineering XP2000*; 2000.
49. Schümmer T, Lukosch SG. Understanding tools and practices for distributed pair programming. *Journal of Universal Computer Science*, 15 (16), 2009. 2009;.

50. Porter L, Bouvier D, Cutts Q, Grissom S, Lee C, McCartney R, et al. A Multi-Institutional Study of Peer Instruction in Introductory Computing. In: Proceedings of the 47th ACM Technical Symposium on Computing Science Education. SIGCSE '16. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2016. p. 358–363. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2839509.2844642>.
51. Hanks B, Fitzgerald S, McCauley R, Murphy L, Zander C. Pair programming in education: a literature review. *Computer Science Education*. 2011;21(2):135–173. doi:10.1080/08993408.2011.579808.
52. Salleh N, Mendes E, Grundy J. Empirical Studies of Pair Programming for CS/SE Teaching in Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*. 2011;37(4):509–525. doi:10.1109/tse.2010.59.
53. Sus JG, Billingsley W. Using continuous integration of code and content to teach software engineering with limited resources. In: 2012 34th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE). IEEE; 2012. p. 1175–1184. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1109/icse.2012.6227025>.
54. Dyke G. Which Aspects of Novice Programmers' Usage of an IDE Predict Learning Outcomes. In: Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education. SIGCSE '11. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2011. p. 505–510. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1953163.1953309>.
55. Osborne JM, Walter A, Kershaw S, Mirams G, Fletcher A, Pathmanathan P, et al. A hybrid approach to multi-scale modelling of cancer. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*. 2010;368(1930):5013–5028.
56. Mirams GR, Arthurs CJ, Bernabeu MO, Bordas R, Cooper J, Corrias A, et al. Chaste: An Open Source C++ Library for Computational Physiology and Biology. *PLoS Computational Biology*. 2013;9(3):e1002970. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002970.
57. Cooper FR, Baker RE, Bernabeu MO, Bordas R, Bowler L, Bueno-Orovio A, et al. Chaste: cancer, heart and soft tissue environment. *Journal of Open Source Software*. 2020;5(47). doi:10.21105/joss.01848.
58. Clerx M, Robinson M, Lambert B, Lei CL, Ghosh S, Mirams GR, et al. Probabilistic Inference on Noisy Time Series (PINTS). *Journal of Open Research Software*. 2019;doi:10.5334/jors.252.
59. Abanades B, Georges G, Bujotzek A, Deane CM. ABlooper: fast accurate antibody CDR loop structure prediction with accuracy estimation. *Bioinformatics*. 2022;38(7):1877–1880. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btac016.
60. Chinery L, Wahome N, Moal I, Deane CM. Paragraph—antibody paratope prediction using graph neural networks with minimal feature vectors. *Bioinformatics*. 2022;39(1). doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btac732.
61. Augustin D, Lambert B, Wang K, Walz AC, Robinson M, Gavaghan D. Filter inference: A scalable nonlinear mixed effects inference approach for snapshot time series data. *bioRxiv*. 2022;doi:10.1101/2022.11.01.514702.
62. Olsen TH, Moal IH, Deane CM. AbLang: an antibody language model for completing antibody sequences. *Bioinformatics Advances*. 2022;2(1). doi:10.1093/bioadv/vbac046.

63. Carbery A, Skyner R, von Delft F, Deane CM. Fragment Libraries Designed to Be Functionally Diverse Recover Protein Binding Information More Efficiently Than Standard Structurally Diverse Libraries. *Journal of Medicinal Chemistry*. 2022;65(16):11404–11413. doi:10.1021/acs.jmedchem.2c01004.