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**Introduction**

Software evolution, at its core, is the process of continuously improving or changing code to ensure that it maintains a working status as software requirements and operating systems change. The largest and most important part of this is the concept of keeping overall cost down in the lifecycle of a software, avoiding having to entirely replace expensive software. While the concept of software evolution is important the problem is that maintenance is expensive and as a program continues to change, the risk of reduced comprehension comes into play. In the case of comments, the main focus of our research, they should always provide cognitive support, reinforcing ideas and concepts that are present in the source code [Storey 2005] [Détienne 1990]. The concept of cognitive support can be reinforced in comment structure by including beacons, which are familiar pieces that are pulled directly from the code [Von Mayrhauser and Vans 1995] [Storey 2005].

To support the study of comprehension we have to not look at just the pieces of code and comments that lead to improved understanding, in fact just as important as these pieces is understanding how people read and comprehend code. Two prominent ways people read and comprehend code the first is the top down approach and the second is bottom up. Top down comprehension relies largely on inference and hypothesizing what exactly is going on at any given time in the source code, choosing to guess what a called function is doing and waiting until they read the function definition later on. In contrast the bottom up approach focuses on understanding the smaller pieces of the source code first and working up to the large functions until eventually you are interoperating the main function [Storey 2005] [Maletic and Kagdi 2008] [Détienne 1990] [Von Mayrhauser and Vans 1995].

The most expensive, time consuming, and longest part of the software development life cycle is widely known to be maintenance, and work is always being done to try and simplify this lengthy portion of the life cycle. 90 percent of the total cost of software comes from maintenance, and the amount of time that we must spend in maintenance is directly proportional to the amount of time programmers spend comprehending the code they are reading [Borstler and Paech 2016]. It is this concept of comprehension, alongside maintenance, that is the basis for why our research is needed.

The problem that we are trying to alleviate is with the presence of commented out code in software and the fact that it seems to be becoming more and more common. Commented out code is any piece of source code that has been disabled by means of commenting the line it is on, for example //float alpha = .05. There are many different issues that this can cause, leaving security vulnerabilities easily visible to would be attackers. Often times by looking at commented out code we can see the logic behind how a particular section of code was built, at times it can also identify a clear problem, for example if //if(val==-1){has been commented out, and is not utilized in the main source code, there is an implication that val equaling -1 is something that causes a problem. In this case an attacker can now explore methods that may cause val to equal -1 and assuming that they succeed this could lead to potential security issues or a full out crash of their software.

Another problem stems from comprehension, which was explained in depth in the previous paragraphs. In the case of comprehension there are times that commented out code may lead to confusion, especially if something that is commented out seems to be unrelated to the section that it is in, or if a piece of commented out code directly contradicts logic present in and around where it has been commented out. Of course, alongside comprehension, when you consider the long-term maintenance of code, the simple question of why a piece of code has been commented out is likely to come up. In this case it is likely unknown as to whether or not the commented out code is a security vulnerability, is a feature that needs to be implemented later, is it reference code that was used to build another section earlier on, or does it cause a total crash if it is run? There is a legal precedent to the problem of commented out code now too. Companies are being sued for leaving commented out code that does not belong to them in their source code. Companies are also encountering problems with commented out code being moved back into an active status. We discuss specific cases in detail in Chapter

Our goal with this current research is to offer a method for detecting commented out code within a software project, with the hopes that we can improve maintenance time and mitigate confusion later on when commented out code is found. Our thought process is that if we can detect commented out code rapidly throughout the development phase of the software when there is a direct route to question why it has either been added in or commented out at the time of origin rather than trying to decipher the meaning later on. Of course the benefits are not limited merely to maintenance, by detecting commented out code early we have the ability to protect companies from disclosing security vulnerabilities that may be outlined in sections of commented out code or to avoid sections of commented out code that have the potential to be accidently made active, for example comments held in an *if(0)* block.

*If(0){  
ResetTotal();*

*PrintTicket();}*

## Knight Capital Case Study

A prominent example of the need for more research into commented out code comes from the Knight Capital case which occurred on August 1, 2012. On that day, an updated copy of Knight Capital’s stock purchasing software was deployed on seven of their eight servers with a fatal flaw, a flag was set to activate a portion of dead code meant purely for simulation purposes. The activation of this commented out code led to the purchase of over seven billion dollars’ worth of stock in the span of one hour and even after all of the returns and buy backs would still leave the company at a net loss of 440 million dollars after just one hour of their software running [Dolfing 2019]. All of this loss could have easily been avoided if dead code was not permitted to be in the final launch version of the companies’ software, but this is a task that is easier said than done with the sheer size of projects growing every day.

Research in this area is exceptionally limited and the debate on text detection is an ever changing and evolving field. In order to detect commented out code we break down every line into individual characters and store them in a dictionary which is then further broken down into frequencies of each character in comparison to the total number of characters in the line. In order to automate the process, we develop a data artifact that is read and evaluated by hand in order to create an environment that is optimized for training our automation process. Our research sets out to answer two questions, is it possible to use character frequency to identify commented out code and is it possible to automate this process within an acceptable margin of error, alpha = .05.

In Chapter 2, we go over related works focused primarily in natural language processing. In Chapter 3 we detail the process of data collection. Chapter 4 focuses on the analysis of the data that we have obtained and processed in the data artifact. Chapter 5 provides an in-depth discuss on decision trees, our machine learning method. Chapter 6 talks about the results of the automation process on test data. Chapter 7 focuses on our threats to validity as well as thoughts on solutions to them. Chapter 8 outlines our plans for future work based off of the results from this study. Finally, Chapter 9 is our conclusion, giving a brief overlay on all our results.

# 

**Related Work**

Despite the growing need to detect commented out code, there has not been much research. As such this we primarily focus the related work discussion on a few related area. In, section 2.1. , we provide related work related to major works in automatic code generation and studies on nature of comments themselves. The second section, Natural Language Processing, focuses on various works in natural language processing that does not fit in either comment generation or automated summarization. The final section, Automated Summarization and Text Detection, focuses on research and studies that work on automatization of both detection and summarization of various types of source code and text.

## Comment Generation and Comment Studies

Comment generation for source code has a large variety of different benefits, from increasing the quality of preexisting comments, adding documentation where there is none at all, and aiding in the understanding of the source code for users outside the original writing base [Song et al. 2019]. Generating comments this way is not without its problems however, because of the complexities of both varying structures of languages and coding styles in addition to different naming conventions often times comments will require some amount of human verification in order to ensure they make sense. Additionally, because there is no one way to form a sentence in a language, auto generating text can sometimes sound unnatural or just be gibberish [Song et al. 2019]. Not only is automatic generation difficult but the actual process of generating the comments is extremely computationally expensive. The reason being is that you first need to process all of the text and analyze it using a variety of different machine learning models such as a VSM or LSI model and then take those results and run them through deep neural networks in order to produce viable output [Song et al. 2019].

Another application of machine learning within the study of comments is the study of comment coverage within source code. This research is directly applicable to work such as automatic comment generation as a way to verify that the comments that are being generated provide a good quality study of the source code in question. One such method of coverage analysis is to use word2vec which allows the user to create connections based on semantic similarities within the comments and the code [Chen et al. 2019]. To analyze and condense the massive amount of data that is produced by word2vec [Chen et al. 2019] recommend the application of random forest machine learning algorithms. This is because not only are they very powerful when it comes to the analysis of classifiers and have many well-established implementations, but random forests are also very good for bagging and bootstrapping data. The results of the research provided by [Chen et al. 2019] give us four different types of comments which they filtered out of their study as non-prose and low purpose, Code Comments, which we call commented out code, Task Comments which are notes such as TODO or FIXME, IDE comments, which are special comments designed to communicate to the IDE directly, and non-text comments which are links to websites or other comments that are not directly related to the source code.

## Natural Language Processing

One of the current areas of research that is related to natural language processing and which is focused on source code is reviewing text similarity, readability and detection. One method of analyzing readability and comprehension is to directly analyze the comments left by the authors of source code. Borstler and Paech [Borstler and Paech 2016] note that one of the largest problems within the field of comment research is that much of the research is more than 20 years old, and higher degrees of decomposition has greatly changed the effect comments have on comprehension. When considering the quality of comments, each is analyzed individually to determine not only if it covers the strategic components of the code well but also if it provides additional information that is relevant to the overall comprehension of a code snippet [Borstler and Paech 2016].

A large part of natural language processing when considering comment and comprehension analysis includes not just the quality of coverage but also external factors that are considered such as native language, subject experience and subject background [Zhou et al. 2019] [Borstler and Paech 2016] [Flisar and Podgorelec 2019]. A method of analyzing comments and source code that takes these methods into account which is very popular in natural language processing is using vector decentralization to normalize semantic cognition through utilization of word2vec [Zhou et al. 2019]. These vectors can be grouped and analyzed for similarity that focuses on the raw value of the grouped terms, which provides a solution to some of the problems, such as native language, natural language processing engineers are facing with code today [Zhou et al. 2019]. Similar to this method of vector grouping is the use of word embedding which is becoming more popular in recent studies [Flisar and Podgorelec 2019]. Word embedding focuses on low dimensional real value vectors rather than looking at groupings of words for semantic value [Flisar and Podgorelec 2019]. These varying methods all come to the same conclusion, comments should be meaningful and related to the source code that they are in, which is something that commented out code does not do.

## Automated Summarization and Text Detection

As an alternative to the generation of comments within source code the possibility of generating full summaries of source code provides an option that helps to mitigate some of the shortcomings of generating text [Haiduc et al. 2010]. This method of summary has two different routes that it can take, one of which is the idea of extracting valuable information and placing it directly in the summary while the other method focuses on abstraction, which chooses to provide a general overview of the source code. Both methods rely on the same base method however, the first step is to take all of the terms out of the source code and then convert the terms into a corpus sorted by frequency to determine which terms are the most relevant [Haiduc et al. 2010]. These types of summarizations can be evaluated in much the same way as the generated comments, because they are built on natural language premises an LSI or VSM model can be built to compare them at a mathematic level, however the best method is human analysis and questionnaires [Haiduc et al. 2010] [Song et al. 2019]. Ultimately, this means that these types of summarization methods are very similar to comment generation, but they work on a much larger scale.

This type of large scale summarization serves other purposes however, for example if you are able to look at the bigger picture of code like this then it is very possible to create a method that can detect and track conversations about a piece of source code over email. [Bacchelli et al. 2010] recommended a method for actually accomplishing this using a series of different linking techniques that are not limited to the studies on natural language processing. Of course when considering methods outside of natural language processing such as regular mailing lists that are bound to projects you can get an idea of whether or not conversation about source code is occurring, but in the end you will need to analyze the actual content of those emails to determine if they are directly related and to which part of the source code they are related to [Bacchelli et al. 2010]. This is an important distinction because while a project may end up with 30,000 emails there may only be a few hundred actual links to the project itself [Bacchelli et al. 2010].

The concept of text detection, particularly in relation to email is something that is becoming more and more common and is becoming needed in today’s society. For example, in the field of detecting opinion spam new research has been published utilizing neural networks to identify spam that is deliberately misleading in its review [Ren and Ji 2019]. There is a major difference between detecting the spam itself and detecting spammers, in our case what we care about is the spam detection. Detecting spam occurs in a series of three main phases, no unlike the method that we are using in our own research. First, they use human beings to read and identify spam that they consider to be malicious or misdirecting. Second, the results are filtered using filtering algorithms, most of which are proprietary. Finally the data is fed through performance evaluation to verify filter quality such as F1 score, Roc and AUC [Ren and Ji 2019].

**Data Collection**

In order to ensure that all of the comments found in the source code are properly pulled for analysis the language parsing tool, srcML, is used[Collard and Maletic]. At its core srcML is a tool designed to take source code and automatically convert it into an XML representation. srcML processes source code independent of the preprocessor, which functions well for the purposes of this project because it means that when comments are being extracted from the source code we do not have to worry about things such as missing external libraries. Further, because srcML does not need to compile the code in order to analyze and extract information, it is able to run extremely quickly. This is great for the purpose of this thesis due to the large number of files that are being analyzed. A major reason that srcML is selected as the extraction tool for this project is because of the tools ability to leave the original structure of the source code entirely intact, meaning that whitespace, comments, and all preprocessing comments are left untouched.

Once source code has been converted to XML using srcML, the user is able to write XPath, a query language for selecting nodes from an XML document, queries to pull any specific information needed from the original source code quickly and easily. This allows us to ignore the actual code in the source and just the comments can be extracted. The original path of the files is preserved and in the case of scanning whole directories XSLT, a language for transforming XML documents into other XML documents, may be used in conjunction to create an archive of these queries. Currently, the greatest limitation of srcML is that it can only parse C, C++, C#, and Java though for the purposes of this research this is not an issue.

## Corpus Selection

To ensure that the quality of the base source code that is being used in this project we pull highly trafficked projects from GitHub using the filter preferences on GitHub which tracks star and fork rates. The reason for this is two-fold, first, projects that have higher rates of traffic are likely to be better maintained as there is greater scrutiny on the projects, and second, these projects are more likely to be written by programmers with greater experience and better represent the general population of programmers. Based on this, the 20 topmost trafficked C, C++, C# and Java projects have been selected and pulled for the use in building the data artifact used in this project. srcML currently only supports C, C++, C# and Java, however, as these are among the most popular languages used in industry and open source, we do not consider this a significant threat to validity in our current research.

## Comment Extraction

To do this the first step is to convert the entire series of projects into one large archive XML file of all of the code present in all of the source code of each of the 20 projects. An XPath query is used to extract all the comments from the archive. The extracted comments are placed in a new archive by srcML. The query we use is:

*srcml --xpath “//src:comment” project.xml -o comments.xml*

In the case of this research, this is the appropriate step to take as the rest of the source code is not needed. Since the long term goal of this research is to use automated verification of comments through machine learning it is important to ensure that the initial variables being given to the machine learning algorithm are as accurate as possible, to this end a manual verification approach was decided by reviewing thousands of lines of comments term by term.

## Manual Classification

The entire process of manual verification covered a spread of 2,935 lines of comments from amongst the 20 different projects and covers a mix of all four languages selected for this project. We verify all comments on a line-by-line basis. In the case of block comments, each line was reviewed and classified separately. The reason for reviewing even block comments in this manner is that it is very possible to have a block comment that is a mix of both commented out code and standard English prose. The manual verification process took a total of 185 hours both of initial review and second pass verifying the classification. The whole process was performed over the course of two months. The results of this manual verification have been stored inside a data artifact in the form of a 7-column csv file for ease of use and the sake of future research regarding this topic.

Table 1 BLOCK COMMENT SAMPLE

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **comment** | **file** | **block comment** | **language** | **contains code** | **is code** | **contains standard terms** |
| // 0-1 Knapsack problem - Dynamic programming | 0-1 Knapsack.cpp | n | C++ | n | n | n |
| // #include <bits/stdc++.h> | 0-1 Knapsack.cpp | n | C++ | y | y | include |
| // void Print(int res[20][20], int i, int j, int capacity) | 0-1 Knapsack.cpp | (4-27) | C++ | y | y | void, int |
| // { | 0-1 Knapsack.cpp | (4-27) | C++ | y | y |  |
| // if(i==0 || j==0) | 0-1 Knapsack.cpp | (4-27) | C++ | y | y | if |
| // { | 0-1 Knapsack.cpp | (4-27) | C++ | y | y |  |
| // return; | 0-1 Knapsack.cpp | (4-27) | C++ | y | y | return |

Each of the 7 columns of the csv file represent what we feel are the most important notes on each comment though only two of the columns will actually be used for the machine learning process, namely the comment itself and the column that specifies whether or not a line is code while the remainder is present for the purpose of continued research. The first of these columns contains the comments themselves, in the case of block comments, each line is stored independently and each of the 7 columns are filled out for each line, as described in the previous paragraph. In the interest of maintaining the integrity of the data, all of the blank lines within block comments have been kept as well and are stored on their own lines. To maintain comments of all different types the markers for the comments are also maintained in these lines. Some examples of this include ‘//’, ‘/\*’, ‘\*’, ‘///’ and in the case of C++ and C style block comments potentially no marker at all. The purpose of this was to determine if certain types of comments were more likely to generate false positives in the machine learning algorithm and, if this was the case, to ensure that we manipulate the comments by removing these markers before feeding them into the machine learning algorithm. The second through fourth columns are used primarily for bookkeeping purposes but do provide important information especially towards future research.

The second column is the name of the source-code file from which the comment has been pulled from. This file name is extracted from the path information provided by srcML in the XML archive used in the production of this data artifact. The third column of the csv file is labeled block comment, and there are two different ways that this is marked down. If this column is marked with a n then the line is not part of a block comment. If the line is given a range of numbers then those numbers represent the range of lines that are a block comment that the line is a part of, note here this number applies only to the csv document rows and not to the source code itself. The fourth column is labeled as language and represent the coding language that the source code was written in. We decided to add this column for the purpose of both future research and to ensure that anyone viewing the data artifact will know what language the comment was written in regardless of whether or not they are familiar with all of the different file endings attributed to a language. The language column is followed by two different column’s that are related to one another, the first is the contains code column and the second is the code column.

The first of these two columns, the contains code column, is the fifth column of the csv file and was determined to be extremely important when verifying false positives when catching commented out code with the machine learning algorithm. The primary thing that we check for when determining whether or not to mark this comment with a yes are function names and equations. While equations seem to be less common function names may be included in order to aid in the description of what a section of source code does or to mark what functions need to be called within an area of the source code. The sixth column, which is the column labeled is code, is the second column directly important to the machine learning algorithm. This column is very straight forward and is marked with either a y or n depending on whether or not it is determined that a comment line is commented out code. However, it is important to note that this has nothing to do with the actual source code itself, rather, we decided to mark anything that if uncommented a compiler would attempt to compile it as code. for example, in the C family any line that appears like the line below would cause a crash if any of the variables had not been declared beforehand.

*// totalCost = price + salesTax - discount;*

The seventh column, standard terms, is only ever filled when a comment line is commented out code. The primary purpose of this column is to provide a list of terms that could be used as a bag of words when identifying lines of commented out code. for example, in C++ *#include, return, void, int, string, virtual, float, and double* are all fairly common within code and are terms that could be used to identify commented out code. We are also marking things such as if, else, else if etc. though these are less likely to be helpful due to the fact that they are common English words. In Figure 1 Block Comment Sample a sample section of the csv is shown to help visualize everything that has been discussed in this chapter.

**Data Analysis**

When attempting to determine whether or not a comment, or a line of a block comment, is a piece of commented out code things become much more complicated then when a trained programmer is simply able to review it. Over the progress of this research we consider a Syntax-based Approach, a Bag of Words Approach, and ultimately decide on a Frequency Approach. The first of these methods which had proven to be fairly ineffective on larger test cases is what we would call the syntax-based approach.

## Syntax-based Approach

In the syntax-based approach the method for analysis of lines is simplistic and is broken down into a series of different 3 checks. The first check, run on every line, is whether or not the line contains a semicolon, which has the direct ability to generate a number of false positives depending on the writing style of the programmer (i.e., if they tend to use semicolons in standard comments). The second and third checks rely both on checking for the opening and closing of parenthesis and curly braces respectively. This was not something that we had at first expected to be a problem, and in fact it was, as in cases where optional snippets of code had been commented out such as *//if(x > 10){* (assuming the line following this comment is another if statement), the automation process would disregard these sections as it did not find the opening or closing piece that it was looking for. The second approach, which was considered but never implemented is a bag of words approach.

## Bag of Words Approach

This bag of words approach is not to be confused with the keyword approach mentioned earlier in the data collection chapter, which proposes the use of common terms as an additional method of verification. Rather, the concept of this approach is to break down an entire piece of source code and create a bag of words from it, which could then be used to cross check comments for terms that are present in the line which are found to be frequent in the bag of words. For example, if we scan an entire script broken down by the spaces and then scan the comments for matching terms then we could potentially identify variables and function names held within the comments. While this could be helpful in finding commented out code that is modifying common variables or using common variables as part of a greater equation, it has a number of strong failing points. First, when considering variable names, one time use variables, variables created in a piece of commented out code, and commented out functions are all highly likely to be ignored due to the fact that in comparison to other terms in the bag of words they may only have an appearance rate of 1-3 times in the entire source code where as a term like int, void, or count will appear much more frequently. The other issue with this method comes down to explanations of how code functions, in the case of thorough documentation where a programmer may be referencing function names and variable names, to many of such references is likely to cause false positives. This brings us to our third and most current approach, what we call the frequency approach.

## Frequency Approach

The original basis of the frequency approach is derived from the works of Dvorak [Nakic-Alfirevic and Durek 2004] who is famous for designing alternate versions of the key board layout used on English typewriters and computers. To simplify the concepts explained in the related works chapter, Dvorak examined which letters are most frequently used in the English language and relocated their positions to allow for easier and less strenuous typing. This concept of common characters in English words brought forth a very powerful idea, what if we check the frequency of ASCII characters found in lines of both English prose style comments and commented out code and compared them against each other? What the data shows us when analyzing the results of these frequencies is that there are key differences between English prose and commented out code, and not only are these differences present, some of them are quite extreme. As shown in Figure 2 large frequency differences, there are thirteen symbols which have a frequency near to or greater than one percent more common in commented out code versus in a standard comment. The most staggering of these numbers is actually the frequency of spaces found in commented out code, for which a number of assumptions are made. Likely, one of the largest reasons for this is good indentation practices leaving large amounts of whitespace in commented out code. However, upon closer analysis of some samples where spacing rates were particularly high it was noted that the average character length of terms tended to be much shorter in commented out code, a prime example being:

Figure 2

*// i = a + b;*

In this example the average size of a term is roughly 1 character and a total of five non-space based characters being present, now when you consider the fact that there is also eight spaces in the line, that means that the spaces are making up over 50% of the lines total number of characters. Further, taking into consideration Mayzner’s work and Googles[Norvig] follow-on research using modern computational methods, it has been determined that the average length of an English word is 4.7 characters. This means that in the same space of total characters, fifteen, on average 3 words would fit, assuming that it ends in a period and contains 2 spaces. Importantly, what this means is that spaces would be making up about 13% of the total number of characters in the line which is roughly 80% less spaces than the commented-out code example. These methods continue to hold true at different frequencies for a wide variety of different characters besides the ones mentioned previously, though in smaller amounts. One of the benefits of using a method like this is by scanning a variety of source code you are able to create frequency distributions that are consistent. In the case of the final frequency distributions used in this research the values are pulled from code and comments from amongst different projects, ensuring that it gets a good general representation of what a frequency distribution should look like and helps with generalizability and avoiding overfitting. Of course, an added benefit to this is if you are examining code and comments that are required to follow a very specific structure then the process is equally as beneficially once the scanning process is complete. The way this is done is by taking each line one at a time and verifying each character converted to lowercase for normalization against a dictionary of characters and then consequently stored in the dictionary. Once the entire line has been read and all characters have been stored and a final count of characters is obtained the frequency of each character is calculated and stored in a list, ensuring that they remain in order by using key based verification. These frequencies can then be used individually, as a group, or averaged into a single working list as shown in Table 1.

**Decision Trees**

Within the field of machine learning there are many different options not just in algorithms but also in preconstructed implementations. Of course, one can also always take the option of producing an implementation of an algorithm themselves, however for the sake of transparency, reproducibility, and validity we use verified implementations from within the scikit-learn Python library. Choosing what type of algorithm, you are going to use for data is extremely important, sometimes an algorithm cannot function at all with the data you have available, other times using the incorrect algorithm will cause poor fit or present results that contradict the output.

For our data there are two major factors that we must consider, first, our data is completely non-linear meaning that any machine learning algorithms that rely on the data being linear immediately will not work. The second factor that is of particular importance is that we are working with classification of two distinct classes (i.e., standard comment or code), so choosing a machine learning algorithm that is known for classification is equally as important. Considering these two factors the obvious choice of machine learning algorithm is the decision tree.

In scikit-learn’s current state their decision tree algorithm is based off an optimized version of the Classification and Regression Trees (CART) algorithm. This is a variation of the popular C4.5 algorithm which proceeded ID3 style decision trees [scikit-learn developers]. One of the major changes that came with the C4.5 algorithm is the ability to handle non-categorical data, as well as a new method for pruning that focused on pruning if a rules precondition improved without the pruned node [scikit-learn developers]. Decision trees require the data used to train the tree to be as balanced as possible. This is because at its root, a decision tree is a series of binary decisions and the optimization of such a sorting method requires this sort of distribution[scikit-learn developers]. The idea is that as shown in Figure 3 each time a rule is created it is a simple yes or no question, is a value less than or greater than a certain number being a very common method.

The ability to handle various types of data, non-linear data, and work well for both classification and regression are not the only reasons why we chose decision trees however. Decision trees can be fully visualized as shown in Figure 3, which makes them both very easy to understand and equally easy to explain. This is aided by scikit-learn further using their export method which can allow you to color code and label the tree to aid in interpretation [scikit-learn developers]. To add to this decision trees use a white box method, and all the rules created are made clearly visible; this allows all rules to be statistically verified unlike with other methods such as neural networks [scikit-learn developers].

**Results**

The results of this research are attained through the use of a CART decision tree style model present in the Sci-kit Learn module for Python. The reason for choosing to use a decision tree is based off of the benefits that are naturally present when using them. First, decision trees are easy to understand and the model itself can be fully graphically visualized such as in the sample section of our decision tree in Figure 2 Decision Tree Sample.



Figure 2 DECISION TREE SAMPLE

Second, decision trees are able to handle blank data very well, this is extremely important when considering our data, this is because even if a line does not contain a symbol from the portion of selected ASCII characters that we are analyzing such as in this sample:

Table 2 LINE BREAKDOWN SAMPLE

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **a** | **b** | **c** | **d** | **e** | **f** | **g** | **h** | **i** | **j** |
| *0.0208* | *0.0208* | 0 | 0 | *0.0416* | *0.0208* | 0 | 0 | *0.0208* | 0 |
| **k** | **l** | **m** | **n** | **o** | **p** | **q** | **r** | **s** | **t** |
| *0.0208* | *0.0208* | 0 | 0 | *0.0625* | *0.0416* | 0 | *0.0208* | *0.0416* | *0.0625* |
| **u** | **v** | **w** | **x** | **y** | **z** | **!** | **@** | **#** | **$** |
| *0.0208* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **%** | **^** | **&** | **\*** | **(** | **)** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **0** | **-** | **\_** | **+** | **=** |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **{** | **[** | **}** | **]** | **|** | **\** | **:** | **;** | **‘** | **“** |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **<** | **,** | **>** | **.** | **?** | **/** | **space** | **~** | **`** | **\t** |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | *0.5625* | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **\n** | **\f** | **\r** | **\b** | **\v** | **\0** | **unk** |  |  |  |
| *0.0208* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |

It is still very relevant to our decision-making process. Third, because decision trees are a white box model, we can verify all of the decisions through either Boolean or mathematical approaches. Finally, when considering the immense size of software projects today and the rapid rate at software is growing the fact that the prediction process is logarithmic is extremely important.

In order to ensure that we are receiving high quality and statistically sound results the decision tree was trained using stratified K-fold cross validation utilizing five folds. The reason behind choosing to utilize five folds is because there was a minimal change in using 5x2 but by cutting down to a single 5-fold run we are able to cut the runtime in half. We chose to use K-fold over naïve-bayes style verification because studies show the benefits of using K-fold are very clear and help to ensure that we are not having any issues with overfitting.[Kohavi]

Initial tests were then preformed on smaller samples of 250 lines of true comments and 250 lines of commented out code to prevent a training bias based on a dominate class and then mathematically verified to ensure that the results were holding true. Afterwards the questions generated by the tree were checked against the initial findings of the research that they were all mathematically sound questions. For example, the first question at the root of the tree asks whether or not a line is composed of less than or equal to 26.7% spaces and if the statement is true then the sample is likely a comment. This is a highly reliable question as initial research indicated that on average comments are constructed of approximately 24% spaces while commented out code is constructed of approximately 33% spaces.

Once the integrity of both the initial results and the decision tree model have been verified it is time to move on to larger data set to evaluate the overall quality of this identification approach, and the results are very promising. Over a series of 10 tests randomly selecting 1000 lines of comments from the 20 different projects we show an accuracy of 96.5%, a precision of 97.6%, a recall of 94.3% and a F1 score of 96.6%. All of these results were calculated automatically using metrics from Sci-kit Learn, the calculations for each metric are shown in Table 3 HEURISTICS EQUATIONS. Below is a breakdown sample of all 5 folds built into Table 2 HEURISTICS.

Table 3 HEURISTICS

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fold Number** | **accuracy** | **precision** | **recall** | **F1** |
| 1 | 98.50 | 98.15 | 99.07 | 98.60 |
| 2 | 97.00 | 100.00 | 94.00 | 96.91 |
| 3 | 97.50 | 95.65 | 98.88 | 97.23 |
| 4 | 98.50 | 99.00 | 98.02 | 98.51 |
| 5 | 98.00 | 99.01 | 97.09 | 98.04 |

Table 4 HEURISTICS EQUATIONS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Accuracy**  **Equation** |  |
| **Precision**  **Equation** |  |
| **Recall**  **Equation** |  |
| **F1**  **Equation** |  |

# 

**Threats to Validity**

Throughout the duration of our research there have been a few different points that point to threats to validity that we hope to both mitigate and eliminate in our future research. The first issue that we have encountered is the overall quality of the code and comments written in the 20 projects that we have pulled all of our data. In 6.1. External Validity we will present our concerns about the validity brought by our choices in projects that our data artifact is based on. In 6.2. Internal Validity we consider the second threat to validity that we face, which has to do with the way that we deal with unique or less common coding styles.

## External Validity

The problem here is twofold, our sample size is limited, and the quality of writing is very high. The first issue is relatively simple to resolve and mainly only requires that we increase our sample sizes, though this comes with a number of computational challenges it is overall something that we can fix. The second part of this issue however is more complex, due to the fact that the code and comments are written in a very clean and consistent manner it has the direct potential to skew our results. An example of this is when programmers use very poor or no spacing methods, when this happens it throws off the root of our decision tree which first checks whether or not there is a high frequency of spaces on the given line. This is the same issue that we encounter if programmers don’t use proper indentation as it throws off spacing counts again, which are as previously stated, the root of our tree. The majority of the code that we are working with for this project also tend to have concise and standard naming conventions. Now of course traditionally this allows for increased readability of code, but not everyone uses this coding practice, if a programmer prefers to use long variable names that fully describe what a variable is, this will cause the ratio of alphabetic variables to increase, which in rare cases can lead to a piece of commented out code failing to be identified.

## Internal Validity

A second threat to validity that we intend to fix with our future research comes from well-established styles of coding, two prominent examples of this is Hungarian Notation and Whitesmiths style. Both of these styles cause new symbols to have increased prominence in our research though the cause is different between the two of them. Whitesmith style causes distribution changes because of its necessity to have minimalistic and concise lines. An example of this is that in Whitesmith style all curly braces should be on their own lines, this means that any line of code containing a curly brace is made of only a curly brace and an end-line marker.

|  |
| --- |
| *If(total > 0)*  *{*  *salesTax = total \* taxRate;*  *}* |

Figure 3 WHITESMITH SAMPLE

Of course, this causes a massive increase in the frequency distribution of curly braces and end-lines even though these symbols do not generally have a lot of importance when reviewing individual lines to determine if it is commented out code or not. Hungarian Notation provides a unique addition to this issue that has been the topic of many thoughts on the future development of this research. Hungarian Notation uses a standard method of labeling variables so that by looking at only a variable name you can gain a basic understanding of both what it is and what purpose it may have. An example of this is the use of the lowercase letter *m* to indicate that a variable is a class member.

|  |
| --- |
| *mDiceRoll;* |

Figure 4 HUNGARIAN SAMPLE

Hungarian notation provides a unique problem, namely, variables are very repetitious and depending on what the script does different letters become extremely important in identifying commented out code, but only when it is written in this style. Because of this there is some debate on whether Hungarian Notation should either be excluded from the tool as an outlier or if a special tree should be used to handle cases like Hungarian Notation.

# 

**Future Works**

We envision four primary enhancements that we believe need to be handled in the future to extend the power and validity of this research. The first subject that we would like to see extended upon is handling specific coding styles such as Hungarian Notation, vertical alignment, Whitesmiths style, and indentation styles. The second focus of our future research is to extend the number of languages that our method works with. The third focus of our future research is to handle the various levels of coding skill as well as bad coding practices that are in use today. The final focus of our future research is to be able to search merge history within version control to identify exactly when and by whom code has been commented out.

When dealing with unique and specific coding styles such as Hungarian notation, vertical alignment, Whitesmiths style, and various indentation styles there are many different problems that must be considered. As discussed in further depth in the threats to validity section, Hungarian notation and Whitesmiths style cause different values that would not normally indicate commented out code to indicate commented out code. In these cases, it needs to be decided if unique trees need to be created for these problems or if there is a way to incorporate these styles into the current tree without causing trouble for the more common coding styles. Vertical alignment and various indentation styles that involve large amounts of spacing also provide a unique problem as the incorporation of excessive spaces can skew our values, again this is a problem that will either warrant the creation of unique trees for lines with excessive spacing or a way to modify the values without creating bias when integrating them into the tree. There is some argument that if they are not included in the tree creation however, that they will likely be properly identified in either case, though this is something that will require further analysis.

In the Chapter 6, it is discussed that the scope of this study is limited, because it has only worked with twenty projects from GitHub. This choice was made with the idea in mind that we wanted to have a very well written sample of code to work with for the first iteration of this project and it did give us access to almost 100,000 lines of comments. However, the code in these projects tend to be very well written and fairly uniform, and while this does give us a good example of what code and comments should look like it does not account for junior and veteran programmers who use out of date coding styles. Of course, a third group of coders, those who are self-taught, and who lack common and good practices and standards within our field also provide an additional layer of content that we wish to explore. When looking at these groups of programmers and their coding styles they have to potential to cause shifts in the data similar to the highly specific coding styles discussed earlier in this chapter. However, the difficulty here is that unlike with those coding styles which have established rules within their designs, the coding styles that we are talking about here are much harder to identify and will require a lot of research to automate their identification.

Finally, a big part of our future research, and one of the long-term purposes for this research is the ability to automate the process of locating exactly when commented out code has been introduced into the code base. Once we can identify when commented out code has been commented, then we can also figure out who actually commented out the code in the script. This allows us to ask the programmer exactly why they commented out the code in the first place hopefully find good solutions to the removal of this commented out code so that when a project is finally shipped it will be much easier to maintain. Additionally, we gain the ability to track commented out code as it enters and exits source code, develop a method for automatic removal and correcting developer behavior over time in order to prevent future issues and need for constant tracking.

# 

**Conclusion**

The field of natural language processing is old, and fraught with a number of large problems, not the least of which is how to deal with the complexities of human language. Our research has provided two major findings in the analysis of comments within scripts that we hope will allow our further research in natural language processing to progress. The first of these findings is that the analysis of the individual characters rather than the analysis of whole words is something that, as our research shows, produces tangible data that can be used with powerful machine learning methods at a low, order log(n), to produce effective results. These results as shown in Table 1 Heuristics demonstrate that we meet our 5% confidence level in all heuristics as we had hoped to achieve. The importance here is that the overall computational cost of dealing with these numbers within data frames is much lower than say a bag of words approach which requires the storage of and analysis of a constantly varying list of words that must also account for lemmatization and stemming if it is going to work properly. With our approach stemming and lemmatization has a very limited effect, as in the end we are looking at frequency of the occurrence of certain characters, chosen by an optimized machine learning algorithm.

Our second major finding that builds off of our first is that while there are an extremely large number of different characters that may be included when any one programmer is writing code, in reality only a small number of them truly matter when identifying commented out code. As has been repeatedly mentioned the greatest of these is spaces, which is a subject that we intend to research further as we deal with extraneous cases that seem to break this mold. That being said, our results are clear, when looking at the difference between a line of code and English prose the first and greatest difference that we are going to notice is the frequency of special characters and spaces. After reviewing our data, this is something that we cannot help but notice with the naked eye and defied our original expectations of what we thought that we were going to find.
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