Criteria	CK Metrics	MOOD Metrics	Lornez & Kidd Metrics
Empirically validated	**Yes** – the most cited OO metric suite in academic research with plenty of work correlating values to external attributes of fault-proneness, maintainability, testability, and more (Kitchenham, 2010).	**Limited** – A fraction (less than 5%) of the citations of the CK metric suite despite being published in the same year. Limited empirical validation work from Baroni et al (Baroni et al., 2003).	**Limited** – Nesi et al. did conduct some validation (Nesi et al., 1998) but overall there is a lack of empirical validation to support the use of this suite (Sharma et al., 2012).
Relevance to practitioners	**Yes** – metrics are simple and capture clearly understood design attributes.	**Limited** – system-wide measures appeal to project managers but lose a level of granularity that would be of interest to developers relative to CK Metrics (Harrison et al., 1998b).	**Limited** – As the metrics are fairly basic, they require a degree of further analysis before they are meaningful to practitioners.
Tool availability	**Yes** – Plenty of tools are available to practitioners to measure and monitor these metrics.	**No** – very few tools calculate MOOD metrics and they are not suitable for Java codebases (Abounader and Lamb, 1997).	**No –** No available tools that measure these metrics.