

# Refactoring Detection in JavaScript

Mosabbir Khan Shibli

A Thesis  
in  
The Department  
of  
Computer Science and Software Engineering

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of  
Master of Computer Science (Computer Science) at  
Concordia University  
Montréal, Québec, Canada

November 2021

© Mosabbir Khan Shibli, 2021

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY  
School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: **Mosabbir Khan Shibli**

Entitled: **Refactoring Detection in JavaScript**

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

**Master of Computer Science (Computer Science)**

complies with the regulations of this University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final examining committee:

\_\_\_\_\_ Chair  
*Dr. Chair*

\_\_\_\_\_ External  
*Dr. ExternalToProgram*

\_\_\_\_\_ Examiner  
*Dr. Examiner1*

\_\_\_\_\_ Examiner  
*Dr. Examiner2*

\_\_\_\_\_ Thesis Supervisor  
*Dr. Nikolaos Tsantalis*

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. LEILA KOSSEIM, Graduate Program Director

December 7, 2021 \_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Mourad Debbabi , Dean  
Gina Cody School of Engineering and Computer Science

# Abstract

## Refactoring Detection in JavaScript

Mosabbir Khan Shibli

TODO Para1

TODO Para2

TODO Para3

TODO Para4

# Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude and thanks to my supervisor, Dr. Nikolaos Tsantalos. His invaluable guidance and continuous support opened a new horizon of knowledge to me.

I would also like to thank my colleagues, Mohammad Sadegh Aalizadeh, Mehran Jodavi, and Ameya Ketkar who shared their best experiences and were amazing in teamwork and helped me to learn a lot in my journey at Concordia.

Thank you.

Mosabbir Khan Shiblu

# Contents

<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Motivation . . . . .	1
1.2 Thesis Statement . . . . .	1
1.3 Objectives and Contributions . . . . .	1
1.4 Outline . . . . .	1
<b>2 Related Wok</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Refactoring Detection Approach . . . . .	2
2.1.1 Detection Using Meta Data . . . . .	2
2.1.2 Detection by Static Source Code Analysis . . . . .	2
2.1.3 Real-time Detection . . . . .	3
<b>3 Then</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4 Conclusion and future work</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Appendix A First Appendix</b>	<b>9</b>



# List of Figures

B.1 Concordia University . . . . . 12

B.2 Gina Cody School of Engineering and Computer Science (vertical) . . . . 12

B.3 Gina Cody School of Engineering and Computer Science (horizontal) . . . 12

# List of Tables



# **Chapter 1**

## **Introduction**

TODO

### **1.1 Motivation**

TODO

### **1.2 Thesis Statement**

TODO

### **1.3 Objectives and Contributions**

TODO

### **1.4 Outline**

The rest of the thesis is organized as follows...

# **Chapter 2**

## **Related Work**

Leo Brodie [2] first mentioned the word “Refactoring” in his book “Thinking Forth”, originally published in 1984. In addition to describing refactoring techniques, the author also discussed many software development principles and practices.

Over the past few decades, various techniques for detecting refactoring activities have been proposed, implemented, and validated.

### **2.1 Refactoring Detection Approach**

#### **2.1.1 Detection Using Meta Data**

#### **2.1.2 Detection by Static Source Code Analysis**

Demeyer et al. [3] introduced the first strategy for identifying the refactored elements between two system snapshots. They defined four heuristics based on the changes of object-oriented source code metrics such as method size, class size, number of inherited or overwritten methods to identify refactorings of three general categories (Split/Merge Class, Move Method, and Split Method). To validate their technique, they applied it on different versions of three software systems. However, the precision of their evaluation was

seemingly on the lower side, for example, for Move Method refactorings (limited to super, sub, and sibling classes) the reported average precision was 23%. On the other hand, the paper concluded that from the perspective of reverse engineering, the proposed heuristics were extremely useful to uncover where, how, and maybe why implementation had drifted from its original design.

Antoniol et al. [1] used an automatic technique based on Vector Space cosine similarity to compare identifiers in different classes in order to detect the renaming and splitting of classes. Since it's based on a similarity threshold, it does not perform very well for classes with many changes and may require threshold adjustment on a case basis.

Weißgerber and Diehl [11] developed the first technique for identifying class-level/locally-scoped refactorings i.e refactorings that occur within one class, and thus, within the same file (e.g. Rename Method). Their approach first extracts and identifies added and deleted refactoring candidates (fields, methods, and classes) by parsing deltas and then comparing each pair's name similarity from a version control system. For ambiguous candidate pairs, it uses a clone detection tool CCFINDER [8] to compare their bodies and then rank them. CCFINDER is also configured to ignore whitespaces/comments and to match consistently renamed variables, method names, and references to members. Finally, they used random sampling to estimate the precision whereas commit messages were inspected manually to find documented refactorings in order to compute the recall.

### **2.1.3 Real-time Detection**

Murphy-Hill et al. [9] tracked the usage history of refactoring commands available in Eclipse IDE using a plugin and found that developers had performed about 90% of their refactorings manually instead of opting for the refactoring tool. Additionally, they often interleave refactorings with other behavior-modifying programming activities. Furthermore, developers rarely explicitly report their refactoring activities in commit messages.

Negara et al. [10] developed CODINGTRACKER which infers refactorings from continuous code changes with the help of a refactoring inference plugin. Using their tool, they constructed a large corpus of 5,371 refactoring instances performed by 23 developers working on their IDEs. Their approach reported a precision and recall of 93% and 100% respectively for a sample of both manually and automatically performed refactorings.

Similar to CODINGTRACKER [10], GHOSTFACTOR [6] and REVIEWFACTOR [7] infer fully completed refactorings by monitoring the fine-grained code changes in real-time inside the IDE. On the other hand BENEFACTOR [5] and WITCHDOCTOR [4] offer code completion by detecting ongoing manual refactorings.

## **Chapter 3**

**Then**

## **Chapter 4**

### **Conclusion and future work**

TODO

# Bibliography

- [1] G. Antoniol, M. Di Penta, and E. Merlo. An automatic approach to identify class evolution discontinuities. In *Proceedings. 7th International Workshop on Principles of Software Evolution, 2004.*, pages 31–40, 2004.
- [2] L. Brodie. *Thinking Forth*. Punchy Publishing, 2004.
- [3] S. Demeyer, S. Ducasse, and O. Nierstrasz. Finding refactorings via change metrics. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGPLAN conference on Object-oriented programming, systems, languages, and applications, OOPSLA '00*, page 166–177, New York, NY, USA, 10 2000. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [4] S. R. Foster, W. G. Griswold, and S. Lerner. Witchdoctor: Ide support for real-time auto-completion of refactorings. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE '12*, page 222–232, Zurich, Switzerland, 6 2012. IEEE Press.
- [5] X. Ge, Q. DuBose, and E. Murphy-Hill. Reconciling manual and automatic refactoring. *Proceedings - International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 211–221, 06 2012.
- [6] X. Ge and E. Murphy-Hill. Manual refactoring changes with automated refactoring validation. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2014*, page 1095–1105, New York, NY, USA, 5 2014. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [7] X. Ge, S. Sarkar, J. Witschey, and E. Murphy-Hill. Refactoring-aware code review. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing (VL/HCC)*, pages 71–79, 2017.
- [8] T. Kamiya, S. Kusumoto, and K. Inoue. Ccfinder: A multilinguistic token-based code clone detection system for large scale source code. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.*, 28(7):654–670, July 2002.
- [9] E. Murphy-Hill, C. Parnin, and A. P. Black. How we refactor, and how we know it. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE '09*, page 287–297, New York, NY, USA, 5 2009. Association for Computing Machinery.

- [10] S. Negara, N. Chen, M. Vakilian, R. Johnson, and D. Dig. A comparative study of manual and automated refactorings. volume 7920, pages 552–576, 07 2013.
- [11] P. Weissgerber and S. Diehl. Identifying refactorings from source-code changes. In *21st IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE'06)*, pages 231–240, 2006.



# Appendix A

## First Appendix

Hello, here is some text without a meaning. This text should show what a printed text will look like at this place. If you read this text, you will get no information. Really? Is there no information? Is there a difference between this text and some nonsense like “Huardest gefburn”? Kjift – not at all! A blind text like this gives you information about the selected font, how the letters are written and an impression of the look. This text should contain all letters of the alphabet and it should be written in of the original language. There is no need for special content, but the length of words should match the language.

$$\bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{i=n} x_i = \frac{x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n}{n}$$

Hello, here is some text without a meaning. This text should show what a printed text will look like at this place. If you read this text, you will get no information. Really? Is there no information? Is there a difference between this text and some nonsense like “Huardest gefburn”? Kjift – not at all! A blind text like this gives you information about the selected font, how the letters are written and an impression of the look. This text should contain all letters of the alphabet and it should be written in of the original language. There is no need

for special content, but the length of words should match the language.

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha x^2} dx = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{-\alpha x^2} dx} \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{-\alpha y^2} dy = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha}}$$

Hello, here is some text without a meaning. This text should show what a printed text will look like at this place. If you read this text, you will get no information. Really? Is there no information? Is there a difference between this text and some nonsense like “Huardest gefburn”? Kjift – not at all! A blind text like this gives you information about the selected font, how the letters are written and an impression of the look. This text should contain all letters of the alphabet and it should be written in of the original language. There is no need for special content, but the length of words should match the language.

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_0 q^k = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^n a_0 q^k = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_0 \frac{1 - q^{n+1}}{1 - q} = \frac{a_0}{1 - q}$$

Hello, here is some text without a meaning. This text should show what a printed text will look like at this place. If you read this text, you will get no information. Really? Is there no information? Is there a difference between this text and some nonsense like “Huardest gefburn”? Kjift – not at all! A blind text like this gives you information about the selected font, how the letters are written and an impression of the look. This text should contain all letters of the alphabet and it should be written in of the original language. There is no need for special content, but the length of words should match the language.

$$x_{1,2} = \frac{-b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a} = \frac{-p \pm \sqrt{p^2 - 4q}}{2}$$

Hello, here is some text without a meaning. This text should show what a printed text will look like at this place. If you read this text, you will get no information. Really? Is there no information? Is there a difference between this text and some nonsense like “Huardest

gefburn”? Kjift – not at all! A blind text like this gives you information about the selected font, how the letters are written and an impression of the look. This text should contain all letters of the alphabet and it should be written in of the original language. There is no need for special content, but the length of words should match the language.

$$\frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial z^2} = \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial t^2}$$

Hello, here is some text without a meaning. This text should show what a printed text will look like at this place. If you read this text, you will get no information. Really? Is there no information? Is there a difference between this text and some nonsense like “Huardest gefburn”? Kjift – not at all! A blind text like this gives you information about the selected font, how the letters are written and an impression of the look. This text should contain all letters of the alphabet and it should be written in of the original language. There is no need for special content, but the length of words should match the language.

# Appendix B

## Concordia Logos



Figure B.1: Concordia University



Figure B.2: Gina Cody School of Engineering and Computer Science (vertical)



Figure B.3: Gina Cody School of Engineering and Computer Science (horizontal)