

Documentation health

August 3, 2026

Documentation health

1087 symbols have a reference page in this documentation. This page says how each of them came to be described, because "documented" covers four situations a reader should not have to treat alike.

Where the descriptions come from

	Symbols	What it means for a reader
Written by the author	190 of 1087	A doc comment in the source. Nothing generated improves on this.
Generated, with citations	104 of 1087	Points at specific <code>file:line</code> ranges you can open and check.
Generated, without citations	261 of 1087	Often right, but nothing anchors it. Treat as a starting point.
Not described	532 of 1087	The page shows structure only — signature, members, references.

294 of 1087 descriptions can be checked against source — 190 because the author wrote them next to the code, 104 because the generator cited the lines it read. The rest are shown, and marked, for what they are.

Why there is no coverage percentage

A percentage counts whether a comment exists, so the cheapest way to raise it is to add empty ones. SonarQube withdrew its comment-density metric over this; studies of "covered" API documentation classify 43–51% of it as carrying no information; and a missing-comment warning has been measured producing 1,774 junk comments in a single codebase. The counts

above cannot

be moved that way — a doc comment that only restates the symbol name is not counted as one.

Where the gaps are

Undescribed symbols, by the part of the system they sit in.

- `packages/microservices` — 227 of 399 undescribed
- `packages/common` — 131 of 322 undescribed
- `packages/core` — 120 of 253 undescribed
- `packages/websockets` — 23 of 57 undescribed
- `packages/platform-express` — 14 of 22 undescribed
- `packages/platform-fastify` — 9 of 14 undescribed
- `packages/testing` — 2 of 11 undescribed