

tool-recommender-bot

Chris Brown and Emerson Murphy-Hill

Department of Computer Science

North Carolina State University

Raleigh, NC

Email: dcbrow10@ncsu.edu, emerson@csc.ncsu.edu

Abstract—Recommendation systems were developed to improve the adoption of useful software tools and features designed to save time and effort in completing tasks that are often ignored by users. Previous research suggests that peer-to-peer recommendations is an effective mode of tool discovery, and the receptiveness of recommendees is a vital characteristic in determining the outcome of tool suggestions. To help increase awareness of useful tools, we developed and evaluated a new system *tool-recommender-bot* designed to integrate aspects of peer interactions and user receptivity into automated tool recommendations for software developers of real-world applications. Our findings suggest that *tool-recommender-bot* is awesome, cool, and very effective in improving tool discovery.

Index Terms—Software Engineering; Tool Recommendation; Tool Discovery; Open Source

I. INTRODUCTION

Software has permeated nearly every area of our society. To keep up with the increasing demand for technology, software quality has become an increasingly important metric for software development teams. Processes such as peer code reviews, unit tests, continuous integration, test automation, and more have been implemented to ensure software maintains a high quality.

Despite increased attention to the quality of code, the process of finding and fixing bugs in software, or debugging, is becoming more time-consuming and costly. A study by the National Institute of Standards and Technology reported that software engineers spend 70-80% of their time at work debugging, and on average it takes 17.4 hours to debug one error [14]. Additionally, these errors can cost companies millions of dollars. For example, a recent bug found in the cryptocurrency Ethereum resulted in the loss of \$30 million.¹ Additionally, the price of repairing these code failures is becoming more expensive over time [2].

To make software engineers more effective and efficient in their work, many types of tools have been created to automatically perform code analysis, refactoring, security checks, and more for programmers. One such type is static analysis tools. Static analysis tools can improve software quality by automatically inspecting code without running the program. These tools can be useful for finding code defects early in the development process before code is released. According to a report from IBM, the relative cost for fixing errors also drastically increases the longer the fault exists in the code

base through the software development lifecycle [4]. Previous studies also show that static analysis tools are effective in preventing bugs in code to save money for companies in addition to time and effort for developers [1].

Although quality is a primary concern for software producers and consumers, developers often ignore these useful tools which help improve the quality of their code [7]. There are many barriers to tool adoption, and one of the main reasons useful tools are ignored or underutilized is the discoverability barrier. This refers to when users are unaware of a tool's existence within software [11]. The tool discovery problem will continue to persist as applications become more “bloated” with features [10]. This lack of awareness of static analysis tools can lead to significant amounts of wasted time and money in the software industry.

To solve the static analysis tool discovery problem, we developed a new recommender system called *tool-recommender-bot*. *tool-recommender-bot* was designed to automatically recommend static analysis tools to software engineers. Previous research has shown that user-to-user recommendations, or peer interactions, are the most effective mode of increasing awareness of tools among software users [13]. We designed our system to make suggestions by integrating characteristics of peer interactions and concepts from the software engineering industry. To evaluate the effectiveness of our system, we studied the following research questions (RQs):

RQ1: How often can we expect *tool-recommender-bot* to make recommendations?

RQ2: How useful are recommendations from *tool-recommender-bot* to developers?

To answer these questions, we evaluated our system on open source Java projects to observe how many tool suggestions would be made based on past changes to the code base. We also examined how software developers reacted to receiving tool recommendations from our system. The main research contribution of our work is introducing the design and evaluation of a new automated recommendation system *tool-recommender-bot*, a novel approach to improving the discovery of static analysis tools for software engineers by simulating tool recommendations made between peers.

¹<https://qz.com/1034321/ethereum-hack-a-coding-error-led-to-30-million-in-ethereum-being-stolen/>

II. RELATED WORK

Our work builds on previous research studying the lack of tool adoption by software engineers, methods for improving tool discovery, and existing approaches for automated tool recommendations.

Previous research has explored reasons why software engineers don't use helpful tools. Murphy-Hill and colleagues studied developers to uncover why programmers don't use refactoring tools for maintaining software [12]. Johnson et al gathered data from software engineers to determine their perspective on static analysis tools and reasons for underuse [8].

Improving tool discovery...

Existing automated tool recommendation systems...

Improving awareness of software engineering tools...

III. TOOL

Our approach to improving tool discovery, tool-recommender-bot, aims to increase awareness and use of programming tools among software developers. This section describes the design and implementation of our system.

A. Design

Previous research shows that recommendations between peers is an effective way to increase tool discovery and adoption [?]. Many automated help systems are designed to simulate user-to-user recommendations in order to increase awareness of application tools and features, for instance Microsoft Clippy[?].

To better understand what makes peer interactions an effective mode of tool discovery, our prior work observed how colleagues recommend tools to each other while working on tasks. Our results found that *receptiveness* is a significant factor in determining the effectiveness of a tool recommendation, while other characteristics, such as politeness and persuasiveness, do not significantly impact the outcome [3]. We designed tool-recommender-bot to integrate user receptivity into our approach for making tool recommendations to increase awareness of programming tools.

Receptiveness

Previous work emphasizes the importance of receptivity. Fogg outlined best practices for creating persuasive technology to change user behavior, and argued designers must choose a receptive audience [6]. Our prior work defined receptiveness using two criteria introduced by Fogg: 1) demonstrating a desire and 2) familiarity with the target behavior and technology. Below we explain how tool-recommender-bot was designed to recommend programming tools to software developers based on their desire and familiarity.

1. Desire

The primary desire of software users is to have enjoyable and problem-free experiences with software. Developers of

these applications also have similar desires, to create high-quality and functioning programs for users. A 2002 study revealed that software engineers demonstrate this desire by spending the majority of the software development process and 70-80% of their time testing and debugging code [14]. To aid developers in finding, fixing, and preventing various issues in code, many different types of tools have been created to help accomplish these tasks. However, despite the existence of effective tools for detecting errors, the number of bugs in software is increasing [9]. We aim to increase awareness of these tools to improve software quality and developer productivity, ultimately meeting users' and developers' desire for less buggy software.

To target this desire of mistake-free code, our initial implementation of tool-recommender-bot automatically recommends ERROR PRONE.² ERROR PRONE is a static analysis tool created by Google to check for errors in Java code based on a suite of bug patterns. These tools are useful in debugging and creating desirable applications, however they are often underutilized by software engineers [7].

2. Familiarity

Choosing an audience familiar with the target behavior is also vital to increasing adoption. To increase use of helpful programming tools, such as static analysis tools, our system focuses on making recommendations to software engineers within the context of the projects they develop. Familiarity with source code is important for creating software applications, and code understandability is one of the most important factors for software development, maintenance, debugging, and testing [15].

To choose a familiar audience, our approach makes recommendations on Github³, a popular source code management and version control website that hosts millions of projects and serves millions of users. tool-recommender-bot makes its recommendations on pull requests, or proposed changes to source code submitted by programmers. Developers making these changes should be knowledgeable about the changes they propose as well as the code base to which they are contributing. Our approach suggests ERROR PRONE when reported errors are fixed by developers in pull requests to capitalize on their familiarity with their modifications. The GitHub interface allows users to review and comment on pull requests in situ with the proposed changes, and this is where we make our recommendations.

B. Implementation

tool-recommender-bot builds on four key concepts to automatically recommend tools to users and improve tool discovery based on our design goals for targeting developer receptivity.

1. Continuous Integration

Our system utilizes continuous integration to recommend useful tools before pull request changes are integrated into

²<http://errorprone.info>

³<https://github.com>

the main repository, or merged. tool-recommender-bot is implemented as a plugin for Jenkins, “the leading open source automation server” for source code deployment and delivery.⁴ The system uses Jenkins to clone Github repositories and periodically check for newly-opened pull requests every 15 minutes. When a new pull request is found, our system uses Jenkins to automatically run our approach to recommend ERROR PRONE.

To analyze the source code, we target projects that use the Maven⁵ build automation and software management tool for Java applications. Our approach uses Maven to automatically handle dependencies and perform the static analysis when the project builds. We inject ERROR PRONE as a Maven plugin to repository’s *pom.xml* project object model file to add it to the build process. tool-recommender-bot then builds both the original version of the code before the proposed changes were made (base) and the changed version of the repository with the pull request modifications implemented (head) to inspect differences. Using Maven allows tool-recommender-bot to run on a large number of Java projects that use the popular build tool and also makes our approach extendable to recommend other tools implemented as Maven plugins in future work.

2. Fix Identification

After analyzing the base and head versions of the code, our approach parses the build output of each version to determine if any reported errors were fixed in the pull request. ERROR PRONE identifies faults found in the source code, and we developed an algorithm using that information to determine if changes made to the code in the head version fix the identified bug. Our technique uses the code differencing tool GumTree [5] to identify actions (addition, delete, insert, move, and update) performed between pull request versions and parse the code to convert the text into abstract syntax trees.

To determine if an error was fixed, we take several things into consideration: First, our approach ignores instances where only delete actions were detected between the base and head versions of a file. This avoids making recommendations in situations where bugs were removed but not necessarily fixed in refactoring tasks, such as deleting and moving code, renaming classes, etc. Second, we ignore occurrences of deprecated classes because, similarly, the error reported was not fixed but removed. Third, we do not consider error fixes that were made by changes to a different file because we want to make recommendations where the developer is familiar with the changes that occurred. These help us minimize the number of false positives and errant recommendations in our approach.

3. Fix Localizaton

When a fix is identified in the pull request, tool-recommender-bot then aims to find the location of the fix in the head version. To find the modified line that fixed a bug, we use GumTree to parse the Java file and convert it into abstract syntax trees. We look for the action closest to the offset of the

TABLE I
EVALUATION PROJECTS

Project	Java Files	LOC	Pull Requests
---------	------------	-----	---------------

Details on projects used for study including GitHub repository name, number of Java files, lines of Java code, and total pull requests.

error node calculated from the bug line number reported by ERROR PRONE. If the closest action is not a delete, then our approach take the location takes the location of that action. Otherwise, if the line was removed our algorithm searches for the closest sibling node or if none exists then the location of the parent.

4. Code Review

Code reviews from co-workers are often standard practice in software development. Pull requests are the primary method of code contributions and code reviews on Github [16]. Our approach simulates peer reviews by making recommendations for static analysis tools as a comment to the pull request. Github provides functionality for making comments at specific lines of code in a pull request, and tool-recommender-bot recommends ERROR PRONE as a comment at the fix location line from the previous step. Additionally, our system uses language similar to comments between co-workers in recommendations, such as using “Good job!” to compliment developers on their work’ [?].

To further increase the adoption of static analysis tools, we report other instances of similar errors found by ERROR PRONE in the base version of the code. In the recommendation, tool-recommender-bot adds links to at most two locations where ERROR PRONE found the same error as the one that was fixed. We hope this encourages the use of ERROR PRONE to find more bugs in the pull request before the code is merged into the code base. Figure 1 presents a recommendation from our system on a pull request review.

IV. METHODOLOGY

A. Projects

To evaluate the effectiveness of our recommendation system, we assessed tool-recommender-bot on five real-world open-source software applications. To narrow down projects for our evaluation, we picked Github repositories that met the following criteria:

- one of the top Trending projects⁶ on Github based on activity by the community at the time of this writing,
- primarily written in the Java programming language⁷,
- build with Maven,
- and are owned by a GitHub organization, instead of personal user account projects.

B. Study Design

We divided our study into two segments to address each research question:

⁴<https://jenkins.io/>

⁵<https://maven.apache.org/>

⁶<https://github.com/trending>

⁷<https://java.com>

- 1) *RQ1*: Last 100 pull requests on repositories...
- 2) *RQ2*: Followed up with pull request authors to gather data on recommendation...

V. RESULTS

A. How often can we expect tool-recommender-bot to make recommendations?

Tons of recommendations...

No false positives...

B. How useful are recommendations from tool-recommender-bot to developers?

Excellent responses from recommendees...

Statistically significant data...

VI. DISCUSSION

A. Observations

B. Implications

Here's what our results say about ways to improve tool recommendation systems...

VII. LIMITATIONS

Internal

An external threat to the validity of our study is that we only observed open source projects hosted on Github in our evaluation. Our results may not generalize to closed source software projects and their developers. To minimize this, we selected popular real-world software applications on Github owned by organizations to avoid the use of personal development projects. Additionally, our recommendation system has limited generalizability due to the fact we currently only assess recommendations for the Error Prone static analysis tool on Java projects that build with Maven. Future work will look to extend tool-recommender-bot to include different types of tools, programming languages, and build systems.

VIII. FUTURE WORK

More tools to recommend (static analysis, security, etc.)

More programming languages instead of just java...

More build systems (ant, gradle, TravisCI, bazel)...

IX. CONCLUSION

tool-recommender-bot is awesome

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Ayewah, D. Hovemeyer, J. D. Morgenthaler, J. Penix, and W. Pugh. Using static analysis to find bugs. *IEEE software*, 25(5), 2008.
- [2] B. W. Boehm. Software engineering economics. *IEEE transactions on Software Engineering*, (1):4–21, 1984.
- [3] C. Brown, J. Middleton, E. Sharma, and E. Murphy-Hill. How software users recommend tools to each other. In *Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing*, 2017.
- [4] M. Dawson, D. N. Burrell, E. Rahim, and S. Brewster. Integrating software assurance into the software development life cycle (sdic). *Journal of Information Systems Technology & Planning*, 3(6):49–53, 2010.
- [5] J. Falleri, F. Morandat, X. Blanc, M. Martinez, and M. Monperrus. Fine-grained and accurate source code differencing. In *ACM/IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE '14, Vasteras, Sweden - September 15 - 19, 2014*, pages 313–324, 2014.
- [6] B. Fogg. Creating persuasive technologies: An eight-step design process. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Persuasive Technology, Persuasive '09*, pages 44:1–44:6, New York, NY, USA, 2009. ACM.
- [7] B. Johnson, Y. Song, E. Murphy-Hill, and R. Bowdidge. Why Don't Software Developers Use Static Analysis Tools to Find Bugs? In *Proceedings of the 2013 International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, ICSE '13, pages 672–681, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 2013. IEEE Press.
- [8] B. Johnson, Y. Song, E. Murphy-Hill, and R. Bowdidge. Why don't software developers use static analysis tools to find bugs? In *Proceedings of the 2013 International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE '13*, pages 672–681, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 2013. IEEE Press.
- [9] Z. Li, L. Tan, X. Wang, S. Lu, Y. Zhou, and C. Zhai. Have things changed now?: An empirical study of bug characteristics in modern open source software. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Architectural and System Support for Improving Software Dependability, ASID '06*, pages 25–33, New York, NY, USA, 2006. ACM.
- [10] J. McGrenere and G. Moore. Are we all in the same "bloat"? In *Proceedings of the Graphics Interface 2000 Conference, May 15-17, 2000, Montr'el, Qu'ebec, Canada*, pages 187–196, May 2000.
- [11] E. Murphy-Hill. Continuous social screencasting to facilitate software tool discovery. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE '12*, pages 1317–1320, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 2012. IEEE Press.
- [12] E. Murphy-Hill and A. P. Black. Why Don't People Use Refactoring Tools? In D. Dig, R. Johnson, F. Tip, O. De Moor, and J. Becicka, editors, *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Refactoring Tools (WRT)*. TU Berlin Technical Report, 2007.
- [13] E. Murphy-Hill and G. C. Murphy. Peer interaction effectively, yet infrequently, enables programmers to discover new tools. In *Proceedings of the ACM 2011 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, CSCW '11*, pages 405–414, New York, NY, USA, 2011. ACM.
- [14] S. Planning. The economic impacts of inadequate infrastructure for software testing. 2002.
- [15] S. Scalabrino, G. Bavota, C. Vendome, M. Linares-Vásquez, D. Poshyvanyk, and R. Oliveto. Automatically assessing code understandability: how far are we? In *Proceedings of the 32nd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, pages 417–427. IEEE Press, 2017.
- [16] Y. Yu, H. Wang, G. Yin, and C. X. Ling. Reviewer recommender of pull-requests in github. In *2014 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution*, pages 609–612, Sept 2014.