

# A comparative study of cross-platform tools for mobile application development

Michiel Staessen

Thesis voorgedragen tot het behalen  
van de graad van Master of Science  
in de ingenieurswetenschappen:  
computerwetenschappen,  
hoofdspecialisatie Software  
engineering

**Promotor:**  
prof. dr. ir. Erik Duval

**Begeleider:**  
ir. Gonzalo Parra

© Copyright KU Leuven

Without written permission of the thesis supervisor and the author it is forbidden to reproduce or adapt in any form or by any means any part of this publication. Requests for obtaining the right to reproduce or utilize parts of this publication should be addressed to the Departement Computerwetenschappen, Celestijnenlaan 200A bus 2402, B-3001 Heverlee, +32-16-327700 or by email [info@cs.kuleuven.be](mailto:info@cs.kuleuven.be).

A written permission of the thesis supervisor is also required to use the methods, products, schematics and programs described in this work for industrial or commercial use, and for submitting this publication in scientific contests.

Zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van zowel de promotor als de auteur is overnemen, kopiëren, gebruiken of realiseren van deze uitgave of gedeelten ervan verboden. Voor aanvragen tot of informatie i.v.m. het overnemen en/of gebruik en/of realisatie van gedeelten uit deze publicatie, wend u tot het Departement Computerwetenschappen, Celestijnenlaan 200A bus 2402, B-3001 Heverlee, +32-16-327700 of via e-mail [info@cs.kuleuven.be](mailto:info@cs.kuleuven.be).

Voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de promotor is eveneens vereist voor het aanwenden van de in deze masterproef beschreven (originele) methoden, producten, schakelingen en programma's voor industrieel of commercieel nut en voor de inzending van deze publicatie ter deelname aan wetenschappelijke prijzen of wedstrijden.



---

## Preface

*Michiel Staessen*

# Contents

Preface	i
Abstract	iv
1 Introduction	1
1.1 The mobile device landscape	1
<i>Smartphones</i> 1, <i>Tablets</i> 3	
1.2 The problem of fragmentation	3
<i>Fragmentation within iOS</i> 4, <i>Fragmentation within Android</i> 4	
1.3 Cross-platform tools to the rescue	5
2 Literature Study	6
2.1 Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM)	6
<i>Arbitrary scoring models</i> 6, <i>Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)</i> 7, <i>Fuzzy MCDM</i> 10	
2.2 Software evaluation methodology	11
2.3 Mobile Architectures	12
<i>Native App</i> 12, <i>Web App</i> 13, <i>Hybrid App</i> 14, <i>Interpreted App</i> 15, <i>Cross Compiling</i> 16	
3 Methodology	17
3.1 Define selection criteria	17
3.2 Identify potential candidates	18
3.3 List selected alternatives	18
3.4 Define evaluation criteria	20
<i>Interviews with Capgemini employees</i> 20, <i>Literature</i> 23	
3.5 Evaluate selected alternatives	25
<i>Proof-of-Concept application</i> 26, <i>Evaluation methodology</i> 27	
3.6 Select the most suitable alternative	28
4 Selected Tools	29
4.1 Apache Cordova	29

	<i>Architecture</i> 29, <i>Supported platforms</i> 29, <i>Documentation</i> 29, <i>Future &amp; Financial backing</i> 29, <i>Additional Tools</i> 29	
4.2	Motorola Rhodes . . . . .	29
	<i>Architecture</i> 29	
4.3	Native SDKs? . . . . .	30
5	Evaluation . . . . .	31
5.1	Weighting the evaluation criteria . . . . .	31
5.2	Evaluate the alternatives . . . . .	32
	<i>Platform support</i> 34 , <i>Toolset reuse</i> 35 , <i>Code reuse</i> 35 , <i>Access to hardware</i> 36 , <i>Integration with platform-specific services</i> 37 , <i>Native Look &amp; Feel</i> 38 , <i>UI element capabilities</i> 38 , <i>Performance</i> 39 , <i>Skill reuse</i> 41 , <i>Tooling</i> 42 , <i>Testing</i> 43	
5.3	Costs versus benefits . . . . .	44
6	Conclusion . . . . .	46
A	Requirements documentation of the proof-of-concept application . . . . .	48
A.1	Class Diagram . . . . .	48
A.2	Mock-ups . . . . .	48
	<i>Login screen</i> 48, <i>Home screen</i> 49, <i>Wizard: Step 1 (Your Info)</i> 49, <i>Wizard: Step 2 (Overview)</i> 49, <i>Wizard: Step 2 (review expense from abroad)</i> 49, <i>Wizard: Step 2 (review domestic expense)</i> 49, <i>Wizard: Step 3 (add expense domestic expense)</i> 49, <i>Wizard: Step 3 (add expense expense from abroad)</i> 49, <i>Wizard: Step 4 (Sign &amp; Send)</i> 49, <i>Wizard: Validation Dialog</i> 49, <i>Wizard: Validation element coloring</i> 49, <i>History</i> 49, <i>Smartphone version</i> 49	
	Bibliography . . . . .	50



---

## Abstract

The abstract environment contains a more extensive overview of the work. But it should be limited to one page.

---

# Introduction

The mobile industry is without a doubt one of the most vibrant industries at the moment. It is characterized by rapid growth and intense competition which has led to fragmentation.

This chapter presents an overview of the evolution in the mobile device landscape, explains the problem of fragmentation and how cross-platform tools (CPTs) can solve this problem.

## 1.1 The mobile device landscape

### 1.1.1 Smartphones

Mobile phones have been around since the nineties and before but the smartphone as we know it now has only been around since the (nearly simultaneous) introduction of the iPhone 3G and the HTC Dream in 2008. In the last five years, smartphone sales have grown tremendously. According to quarterly studies by Gartner<sup>1</sup> [5, 6, 7, 9, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 13, 21, 18, 19, 20, 22], smartphone sales have grown 544% since the second quarter of 2008 (see Figure 1.1). Smartphones are becoming ubiquitous and in some regions like the United States, smartphone penetration has already reached more than 50% [30].

Operating systems are heavily subjected to network effects, i.e. the value of a platform is proportional to the number of people using it. This makes it hard for new platforms to gain traction which is visible in Figure 1.1 and Figure 1.2. Android and iOS are currently the most popular platforms and other platforms are either in decline (like Symbian and BlackBerry, formerly RIM) or have a hard time getting traction (like Windows Phone).

However, there is so single major platform. The IDC<sup>2</sup> even predicts that Windows Phone will gain a significant market share by 2016 and that 90% of the worldwide smartphone

---

<sup>1</sup>Gartner is an American research and advisory firm, specialized in information technology, <http://www.gartner.com>.

<sup>2</sup>International Data Corporation is another American research, analysis and advisory firm, specializing in information technology, telecommunications and consumer technology, <http://www.idc.com>.

TODO: Update Graph




FIGURE 1.1: Growth of worldwide smartphone sales and smartphone penetration.

Source: Gartner [5, 6, 7, 9, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 13, 21, 18, 19, 20, 22]

TODO: Update Graph




FIGURE 1.2: Growth of worldwide smartphone operating system market share.

Source: Gartner [5, 6, 7, 9, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 13, 21, 18, 19, 20, 22]

market will then be covered by Android, iOS and Windows Phone [23]. Therefore it is very reasonable to assume that there will always be more than one major platform.



### 1.1.2 Tablets

A similar scenario is playing out in the tablet industry. According to other studies by both Gartner [12, 17] and the IDC [24], tablets will continue to gain popularity and sales will be mainly driven by iPads and Android tablets (see Figure 1.3).




FIGURE 1.3: Prediction of worldwide tablet sales and market share.  
Source: Gartner [12, 17]

Even though both companies do not agree on which platform will serve the most devices, they both predict there will be at least three major platforms: iOS, Android and Windows.

## 1.2 The problem of fragmentation

The competition among mobile device manufacturers has led to fragmentation on many levels. For consumers, carriers and manufacturers, fragmentation is usually a good thing. The more different devices there are, the easier it is for consumers to pick the device that fits their needs.

For developers on the other hand, fragmentation is usually a bad thing. They will have to develop and test their applications on multiple devices to be able to guarantee the desired experience. This is expensive and time consuming.

Fragmentation is a multi-dimensional problem. From Figure 1.2 and Figure 1.3 it is already clear that the operating system or platform is one obvious dimension; this is called platform fragmentation. Other dimensions include device configuration, runtime, user interface, etc.

The next subsections will discuss fragmentation issues within iOS and Android.

### 1.2.1 Fragmentation within iOS

Devices running iOS (commonly referred to as iDevices) are available in different shapes and sizes. Yet, there are only a limited number of (similar) device configurations in two form factors: iPhone (covering iPhone and iPod Touch devices) and iPad. Apple uses these form factors to distinguish three kinds of applications: iPhone apps (designed to run on iPhone form factor only), iPad apps (designed to run on iPad only) and universal apps (designed to run on both form factors).

**TODO: describe runtime fragmentation**

Overall, Apple can manage fragmentation quite well and fragmentation is rather low within iOS.

### 1.2.2 Fragmentation within Android

Android is an open source platform, developed by Google. Manufacturers are allowed to tailor it for their devices and many of them have grabbed this opportunity to differentiate their products. On april 24 2013, the Google Play store officially supported 2827 device configurations, distributed across 59 manufacturers. The ability to alter the operating system has largely contributed to the success of Android.

There is however virtually no incentive for device manufacturers to maintain their Android flavours and as a result they do not often provide updates for their devices. This has led to the notorious runtime fragmentation among Android devices (see Figure 1.4).




FIGURE 1.4: Historical runtime fragmentation on Android. The data from this graph was aggregated from [1] using the Internet Archive (<http://archive.org>).

These flavours also contribute to user interface fragmentation because manufacturers ship their devices with a custom user interface to differentiate their product.

Because of the sheer number of Android devices, there is also a large number of CPUs, screen sizes, display resolutions, pixel density configurations and many more. All these differences contribute to device fragmentation.

Long story short, the Android platform is characterized by fragmentation in all dimensions.

## 1.3 Cross-platform tools to the rescue

In the current economy, information is a company's most valuable asset and the rate at which information exchange takes place increases every day. Mobile Internet-enabled devices are a valuable resource for this purpose and, as a consequence, many companies want mobile applications for their businesses.

However, in an ever-changing and unpredictable industry like the mobile industry, it is very unwise to target a single platform. This could eventually lead to lock-in situations which companies try to avoid at all costs. Consequently, they will ask for a cross-platform solution.

Cross-Platform Tools (CPTs) can help solving this problem. They reduce entry barriers (access to new platforms) and exit barriers (lock-in) by allowing developers to create cross-platform applications from a single codebase [27].

Cross-Platform Tools try to solve three major problems [27]:

1. **Fragmentation** The fragmentation issues described above are a pain for every developer. They need to test their applications on a large number of devices in order to be able to guarantee the desired user experience. A CPT can help to identify platform quirks and can provide workarounds.
2. **Access to new platforms and screens** Targeting a new platform or screen (for instance, television sets or car consoles) is often hard. Developers need to learn yet another SDK and/or programming language in order to deliver applications for the platform or screen. Using a CPT can drastically reduce the effort needed to target a new platform or screen.
3. **Development inefficiency** Maintaining codebases for multiple platforms is a difficult task. When using a CPT, all code is contained within a single codebase and no time is lost while synchronizing features and other maintenance tasks across codebases.

TODO: Finish chapter, which can be read where + define scope, make boundaries

TODO: write introductory text

## 2.1 Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM)

Finding the right software package is often a daunting task. In order to suit the end-user's needs, the software should meet a large number of – sometimes conflicting – requirements and will result in making important trade-offs. Because of these characteristics, software selection can be modeled as a Multiple-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) problem [25, 26].

There are two categories of MCDM problems: Multiple-Attribute Decision Making (MADM) problems and Multi-Objective Decision Making (MODM) problems. The first category involves sorting and ranking of a limited number of available alternatives, based on a number of decision criteria. In the latter category, there are no alternatives specified beforehand and the number of alternatives is effectively infinite [28].

The software selection process belongs to the category of MADM problems. Their goal is to find the best alternative in a set of alternatives and at the same time create a ranking of all these available alternatives TODO: [].

There are a plethora of solution methods for the MADM problem. The following subsections will describe the most frequently used methods in literature, together with their advantages and disadvantages.

TODO: General remark for all methods: Separate costs from benefits, allowing to make a cost-benefit analysis afterwards.

### 2.1.1 Arbitrary scoring models

TODO: Question: Is this an appropriate name?

There are a number of arbitrary scoring models but they all have one thing in common: for each criterion, the values are translated to a numerical score. In some cases, this

score can be derived from the value of the criterion itself (e.g. speed, age, cost, ...). In other cases, a mapping is provided (e.g. in order to obtain a score  $s$ , at least features  $f_1$ ,  $f_2$  and  $f_3$  should be supported).

Different methods are available to select potential candidates using these scores [28]:

- When the “dominance” method is used, one alternative should clearly outperform the other alternatives for at least one criterion.
- When the “maximin” method is used, the final score of each alternative is equal to the lowest score of all criteria for this alternative.
- When the “maximax” method is used, the final score of each alternative is equal to the highest score of all criteria for this alternative.
- When the “conjunctive” method is used, an alternative should exceed certain thresholds for *all* criteria.
- When the “disjunctive” method is used, an alternative should exceed certain thresholds for *at least one* criterion.

Additionally, the importance of the criteria can be accounted for by assigning weights. The final score can be calculated as the weighted sum, weighted product or weighted average.

The strength of these methods is that they are the most easy to use. However, scores and weights are assigned arbitrarily and might get tough when there are a lot of criteria. Also, not all criteria are suitable for conversion into a numerical scale [25].

### 2.1.2 Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)

The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) is “a multi-criteria decision making approach in which factors are arranged in a hierarchic structure” [32]. It is developed by Thomas L. Saaty and is based on pairwise comparisons of both criteria and alternatives.

The strengths of the AHP are (1) that it enables decision makers to structure a problem into a hierarchy, (2) that it provides a powerful tool for handling both quantitative and qualitative multi-criteria decision making problems and (3) that this system can deal with inconsistency [25].

The weaknesses of AHP are (1) that it is a time consuming method due to the large number of pair-wise comparisons and (2) that it is susceptible to rank-reversal, i.e. the ranking may change when new alternatives are added.

The analytic hierarchy process consists of three stages. In the first stage, the factors that are important for the decision are organized into “a hierarchic structure descending from

an overall goal to criteria, subcriteria and alternatives in successive levels” [32]. Organizing the factors in such structure helps the decision maker in getting an overview of the potentially complex relationships and also helps to assess the relative importance of the issues in each level.

Structuring information in a tree is also backed by experiments of psychologist George Miller. He found that people can only deal with a few facts simultaneously; more precisely, seven plus or minus two [? ].

In the second stage, the analytic hierarchy process establishes a ranking of the alternatives. This ranking is based on (imprecise) judgements, resulting from pairwise comparison.

Consider  $n$  alternatives  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$  and a property  $X$  that can be accurately measured for every alternative. The value of property  $X$  is given by  $w_i$  for alternative  $A_i$ . For instance, consider  $n$  stones with weights  $w_i$ , measured in grams.

The relative difference between all alternatives with respect to property  $X$  can now be summarized in a matrix

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} w_1/w_1 & w_1/w_2 & \dots & w_1/w_n \\ w_2/w_1 & w_2/w_2 & \dots & w_2/w_n \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ w_n/w_1 & w_n/w_2 & \dots & w_n/w_n \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.1)$$

Note that:

- $A$  is reciprocal, i.e.  $a_{ij} = 1/a_{ji}$
- elements on the diagonal are equal to one. This is easy to understand because there cannot be any difference between two identical objects.

If any row of  $A$  were to be multiplied by a vector containing all values  $(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n)^T$ , the result would be a row of identical entries  $(w_i, w_i, \dots, w_i)$ .

In reality though, the values  $w_i$  are unknown and the ratios  $a_{ij} = w_i/w_j$  cannot be calculated. However, an expert could estimate these ratios. The authors have developed a fundamental scale (see Table 2.1), which can be used to rate the difference between alternatives [32].

No human is perfect though and nor will be the estimates. The matrix  $A' = [a'_{ij}]$  with estimated ratios will therefore be a small perturbation of  $A$ .

As a result, the aforementioned multiplication would not yield a row of identical values but instead it would yield a row of differing values, scattered around  $w_i$  (because of the

Intensity of im- portance on an absolute scale	Definition	Explanation
1	Equal importance	Two activities contribute equally to the objective
3	Weak importance of one over another	Experience and judgement slightly favour one activity over another
5	Essential or strong im- portance	Experience and judgement strongly favour one activity over another
7	Very strong or demon- strated importannce	An activity is favoured very strongly over another; its dominance is demonstrated in practice
9	Absolute importance	The evidence favouring one activity over another is of the highest possible order of affirmation
2, 4, 6, 8	Intermediate values be- tween adjacent scale val- ues	When compromise is needed
Reciprocals of above nonzero	If activity $i$ has one of the above nonzero numbers assigned with activity $j$ , then $j$ has the reciprocal value when compared with $i$ . This is a reasonable assumption.	
Rationals	Ratios arising from the scale	If consistency were to be forced by obtaining $n$ numerical values to span the matrix

TABLE 2.1: The fundamental scale for pairwise comparison[32]

errors in judgement). Consequently, it seems reasonable to represent  $w_i$  by the average of these values.

$$w_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n a'_{ij} w_j \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (2.2)$$

This system of equations can be solved for  $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n)^T$  if  $n$  is allowed to change. The problem now reads

$$w_i = \frac{1}{\lambda_{max}} \sum_{j=1}^n a'_{ij} w_j \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (2.3)$$

which is equivalent to the eigenvalue problem  $Aw = \lambda_{max}v$  and its solution is unique to within a multiplicative constant. Small perturbations of  $a_{ij}$  could generally lead to large perturbations of  $\lambda_{max}$  and  $w$  but it can be shown that this is not the case for reciprocal matrices [31, p. 192 – 197].

The eigenvector  $w$  is normalized by dividing its entries by their sum to obtain the *priority vector*, containing appropriate weights or scores for all alternatives.

Since this method is based on human judgement, which inherently contains errors, there needs to be a way to measure the amount of error in the result.

Reconsider  $A$ . This is a positive, reciprocal matrix and is also consistent, i.e. all entries satisfy the condition

$$a_{jk} = \frac{a_{ik}}{a_{ij}} = \frac{w_i}{w_k} \times \frac{w_j}{w_i} \quad i, j, k = 1, \dots, n. \quad (2.4)$$

That is, all  $n$  alternatives form a chain.

The trace of a matrix, the sum of the elements on the main diagonal, is equal to the sum of its eigenvalues. Because all rows of  $A$  are linearly dependent,  $A$  has rank one. Consequently, all eigenvalues except one are zero. Hence,  $tr(A) = n$ , the order of  $A$ , is the largest or principal eigenvalue of  $A$ .

The amount of inconsistency, resulting from human judgement, can therefore be represented by  $\lambda_{max} - n$ , which measures the deviation of the judgements from the consistent approximation [32].

The authors define a *consistency index*,  $C.I. = (\lambda_{max} - n)/(n - 1)$ . This consistency index is compared to the average consistency index of a large number of random reciprocal matrices of the same order, called the *random index* ( $R.I.$ ), listed in Table 2.2. When the *consistency ratio* ( $C.R.$ ), the ratio  $C.I./R.I.$ , is 10% or less, the estimate  $w$  is considered acceptable. Otherwise, new judgements should be collected in order to improve consistency.

n	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
RI	0	0	0.58	0.90	1.12	1.24	1.32	1.41	1.45

TABLE 2.2: Random indices (R.I.) for reciprocal matrices of order 1 to 9

EXAMPLE TODO: Add example?

### 2.1.3 Fuzzy MCDM

TODO: Write section

Fuzzy logic was introduced in the mid '60s by Zadeh and was later applied to MCDM problems in the late '70s. Fuzzy logic allows to reason with imprecisely specified criteria like very high performance, low performance, etc. In classical approaches like those described above imprecision is dealt with first. When using the fuzzy approach, these imprecisions are only dealt with in the end, and only if necessary.

Fuzzy MCDM is based on three concepts [? ]:



1. The set of alternatives is a *fuzzy set*, i.e. the alternatives aren't precisely defined. The decision will thus be taken in a *fuzzy environment*.
2. The decision is based on an aggregation of fuzzy preferences among alternatives.
3. The decision is based on an evaluation of alternatives using a linguistic description.

More concrete, let  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$  be a finite set of given alternatives and let there be  $m$  imprecisely defined criteria. Every alternative satisfies a criterion to a certain degree or does not satisfy it at all. In other words, for each criterion  $G_j, j = 1, \dots, m$  there is a set  $G_j \subset A$  containing the alternatives satisfying the criterion and the degree in which an alternative  $a_i$  fulfills  $G_j$  is expressed by the membership degree  $G_j(a_i)$ .

In order to decide the MCDM problem, constraints must be defined for each criterion. These constraints are specified as fuzzy sets as well meaning that a constraint  $C_j$  is associated with a set  $C_j \subset A$  containing the alternatives fulfilling  $C_j$  in a certain degree. Again, a membership degree  $C_j(a_i)$  is given.

Consequently, there are two fuzzy sets for every  $j, j = 1, \dots, m$ , namely  $G_j$  and  $C_j$ . The decision can now be obtained by composition and is given by the fuzzy set

$$D = (G_1 \alpha C_1) \beta \dots \beta (G_m \alpha C_m) \quad (2.5)$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are suitable fuzzy set operations. The alternative  $a_k$  with the highest membership degree  $D(a_k)$  is the best alternative.

*TODO: Add an example: For example, when buying a house these criteria could be nice neighbourhood, great parking facilities, reasonable price, etc.*

## 2.2 Software evaluation methodology

Based on their literature review [25], the authors have proposed a generic, six-stage methodology for the selection of software packages [26].

1. **Define selection criteria.** In the first stage, the evaluator defines the essential requirements for the software. If a certain software package does not meet a selection criterion, it is not considered to be a suitable candidate and it should not be considered for further evaluation.
2. **Identify potential candidates.** During the next step, the evaluator searches for potential candidates. This step will result in a list of potential candidates.
3. **List selected alternatives.** In this step, the evaluator will use the requirements from stage 1 to filter the list obtained from the previous stage.

4. **Define evaluation criteria.** In this stage, the evaluator has to define the evaluation criteria, arrange them in a hierarchy and define the value scales for each criterion.
5. **Evaluate selected alternatives.** During this phase, the evaluator will make a detailed comparison of the alternatives using the criteria obtained from the previous stage. A methodology like AHP can be used in this stage.
6. **Select the most suitable alternative.** In this final step, all alternatives are ranked using the comparison results from the previous stage. Now, the best alternative can be chosen from the list of candidates. In general, a number of software packages will be taken into consideration and a selection will be made after additional steps (like for instance a cost-benefit analysis and/or contract negotiations with the vendor).

In the original paper [25], the authors also suggest to include an additional evaluation stage after the selected packages has been implemented and integrated. During that stage, one should verify that the selected package does indeed meet the requirements.

## 2.3 Mobile Architectures

TODO: Explain Mobile Hub/Mobile Orchestrator

TODO: discuss cost for each architecture

There are already a number of paradigms for cross platform mobile application development [4]. This section presents an overview of the available strategies by comparing different aspects: performance, look and feel, platform access, programming languages, development cost and distribution.

### 2.3.1 Native App

A native app is an application that is specifically designed to run on a particular platform. It is the default approach to develop applications for mobile devices. Figure 2.1 shows an illustration of the overall architecture of such an app.

Native apps are developed with the supplied SDK. Developers will need to get acquainted with the programming language used by said SDK but in return they will get full access to the platform and its features. As a result, the best performance can be obtained with this kind of app.

For the user interface, developers can use lots of interface elements such that they can present a familiar look and feel to the end user.

Native apps can be easily distributed through an online marketplace like for instance the App Store or Google Play.




FIGURE 2.1: Overall architecture of a native app.

Because native apps are designed to run on one platform only, this development strategy is not very well suited for cross platform development. If an application should run on multiple platforms, it has to be developed for each platform separately. This is costly.

### 2.3.2 Web App

Web apps are websites that are optimized for mobile browsers. Since every platform comes with a browser, this is the easiest way to get an application running on all platforms. An overview of the overall architecture for this kind of app is given in Figure 2.2.

Web apps are not nearly as powerful as native apps. First of all, the application is not stored on the device. Web apps require an active internet connection which cannot always be guaranteed. Second, they are built with web technologies like HTML, CSS and JavaScript, which have to be interpreted by the browser at runtime. Third, web apps cannot access the system which means they cannot make use of the many unique features of a mobile device.

With HTML5, web apps can get more powerful. They will be able to access device features, like the camera and other sensors [3]. They will not even require an active internet connection because they can be cached on the device. However, HTML5 is still a draft and a lot of mobile browsers lack proper HTML5 support.

From a user interface perspective, web apps can be a problem as well.

**TODO: complete paragraph**

Web apps are distributed easily: the only requirement is a valid URL. Web apps cannot be installed on the device though, but there are workarounds using Web Clips on iOS [2]




FIGURE 2.2: Overall architecture of a web app.

and bookmarks on Android.

### 2.3.3 Hybrid App

Hybrid applications are the logical next step, combining native apps and web apps. The actual application is a web site, embedded in a web view, part of a native wrapper. The embedded website can access (parts of) the system through a bridge. An overview of the overall architecture is shown in Figure 2.3.




FIGURE 2.3: Overall architecture of a hybrid app.

Hybrid apps are part native app, part web app. Performance will be similar to web apps but some parts can be optimized by using native code. The websites inside the hybrid app are also much more powerful because they can access many device features that aren't available in HTML(5) through the bridge.

When it comes to the user interface, hybrid apps suffer from the same problem as web apps.

Because hybrid apps are wrapped in a native container, they can be distributed just like native applications, through online marketplaces.

#### 2.3.4 Interpreted App

In an interpreted app, instructions in some language are translated to native instructions at runtime. Figure 2.4 shows the overall architecture of an interpreted app.




FIGURE 2.4: Overall architecture of an interpreted app.

Performance of interpreted apps depends on the interpreter and interpreted language but is better than web apps on average, though not as good as native apps.

In an interpreted app, the user interface description is interpreted and rendered on the device using native interface elements. An interpreted app will have a familiar look and feel.

From the outside, interpreted apps – just like hybrid apps – look like native apps and can be distributed through online marketplaces.

### 2.3.5 Cross Compiling

Instead of translating instructions at runtime, one could translate instructions at compile time. The process is called cross compiling and the result is a truly native app. The overall architecture is sketched in Figure 2.5.




FIGURE 2.5: Overall architecture for cross compiled apps.

### Summary

Table 2.3 summarizes the results of the discussed strategies. It is important to note that there is no universal strategy that fits all use cases. A strategy must be chosen carefully, taking into account the client's wishes.

	Native	Web	Hybrid	Interpreted	Cross Compiled
Performance	high	low	rather low	average	high
Platform Access	✓	× / ✓	✓	✓	✓
Look & Feel	native	non-native	non-native	native	native
Distribution	marketplace	URL	marketplace	marketplace	marketplace
Development cost	high	rather low	average	average	average

TABLE 2.3: Summary of cross platform mobile application development strategies.

### Summary

This chapter describes the methodology used to compare and rank the studied cross-platform tools. The methodology follows the suggested 6-step approach presented in [26] (see chapter 2.2). The six steps are:

1. Define selection criteria
2. Identify potential candidates
3. List selected alternatives
4. Define evaluation criteria
5. Evaluate selected alternatives
6. Select the most suitable alternative

Every step will be further expanded in the following sections.

### 3.1 Define selection criteria

In this first step, the selection criteria for the tool are recorded. These requirements will be used later (in step 3) to filter a list of potential candidates.

As the research presented in this thesis is conducted on behalf of CapGemini, the selection criteria are determined by their consultants and were recorded during the kick-off meeting on October 15, 2012. In order to qualify as a viable cross-platform tools, it has to meet the following requirements:

- **It *must* produce “native” Android and iOS applications.** CapGemini focusses mainly on Android and iOS because their clients mainly focus on these platforms. Support for other platforms is desirable but not not a necessity.

- **It *must* be able to produce *both* tablet and smartphone applications, preferably from the same codebase.** Some clients want tablet applications, some clients want smartphone apps, some clients want both.

This list of essential requirements is extended with additional requirements. These are not essential as they can be circumvented in some way though they will generally result in higher productivity.

- **It *should* be usable to create enterprise applications with.** CapGemini specializes in the development of data-driven enterprise applications. Such applications usually contain a lot of forms and don't require high performance graphics (like for instance in 3D games). Even though it is possible to develop an enterprise application on top of a 3D engine, it will probably not result in good productivity.
- **It *should* have a certain degree of maturity** Ideally, the tool should be maintained for as long applications are created with it (and maintained).
- **It *should* have good support, provided by either the vendor or by the community.** In case of a problem, there should be a way to get support.

## 3.2 Identify potential candidates

In this stage, the evaluator tries to identify as much potential candidates as possible. These candidates do not necessarily have to meet the requirements from the previous stage as this is merely a discovery phase. The result of this stage will be a list of potential candidates.

Discovery of cross-platform tools has already been done extensively by VisionMobile. The latest cross-platform tools report [27] contains a list of 100 cross-platform tools they tracked as part of their research. Because additional internet searches did not reveal new tools, this list is used as output of this stage.

## 3.3 List selected alternatives

In this phase, the candidates obtained from the previous stage are filtered with the selection criteria from the first stage. The result of this stage is a list of alternatives worth investigating.

The list of tools from the previous stage contains a plethora of tools. Using the requirements from stage 1, a large number of tools can be left out:

- tools that do not produce native applications for Android and iOS;
- tools that do not produce tablet and smartphone applications;



- special-purpose tools that are not well suited for the intended use, e.g. specialized 3D engines;
- tools with an uncertain future, e.g. Flash-based systems or cutting-edge tools;
- tools that do not offer good support.

From 100 potential candidates, 7 tools listed in Table 3.1 were selected.

Name	Architecture	Type
Apache Cordova	Hybrid	Open Source
Appcelerator Titanium	Interpreted	Open Source
Motorola Rhodes	Interpreted	Open Source
Trigger.io	Hybrid	Commercial
MoSync	Cross-Compiled + Hybrid	Open Source
Kony	Hybrid	Commercial
Xamarin	Cross-compiled	Commercial

TABLE 3.1: The remaining tools after application of the selection criteria.

This thesis will compare two of these tools with each other and with the native development kits for both Android and iOS. The selected tools are Apache Cordova (formerly known as PhoneGap) and Motorola Rhodes.

Apache Cordova was chosen because of its popularity among developers and Motorola Rhodes was chosen because it focusses on enterprise applications.

Appcelerator Titanium and Xamarin were not selected because they are evaluated by another student with the same research topic.

Trigger.io was not selected because it was too similar to Apache Cordova at first sight: same architecture, same languages, ...

**TODO: From what I read now, I should have selected MoSync, why didn't I? Don't really have a reason for it except maybe that I didn't research it quite well. Was also not prioritized by CapGemini but might have been my influence...**

Kony — even though apparently using the the same architecture as Apache Cordova — targets enterprise applications, which made it a very good rival for Motorola Rhodes. However, there was no free trial available for Kony, which resulted in the selection of Motorola Rhodes.

Apache Cordova and Motorola Rhodes are discussed in more detail in chapter 4.

## 3.4 Define evaluation criteria

This is probably the most important of all stages. Setting up good grounds for comparison is paramount. The criteria are therefore carefully extracted from interviews with CapGemini employees and literature.

### 3.4.1 Interviews with Capgemini employees

A finished application is the result of a cooperation of different people with various roles. Every person experiences mobile application development in another way. In order to gain a better understanding of these experiences, three interviews with CapGemini employees were planned: one interview with a developer, one interview with a mobile architect and one interview with a sales representative.

The goal of these interviews is to reveal important criteria that should be considered during the evaluation of the cross-platform tools. The following sections present a summary of these interviews.

#### *Developer*

Developers are responsible for the development of the application. They can provide valuable insights into the typical technical issues that are encountered when developing a mobile application.

**DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT** One of the relevant topics for application developers is the development environment since they will spend most of their time in it. Typically, the development environment is built on top of a Windows operating system and the Eclipse<sup>1</sup> IDE. This IDE is preferred because it is fast, efficient and highly customizable, which are desirable qualities for a good IDE. Also, most of the documentation is explicitly written for Eclipse.

**DEVELOPMENT CYCLE** Development happens locally and changes are deployed in an *unstable* environment. When features are ready to be tested, they are promoted and pushed to a *staging* environment, where they will be tested by for instance a number of end users. When the features are tested and ready to ship, a new production release is planned. In case mobile devices are involved, the application is tested on the device as much as possible.

The code is also checked overnight on a continuous integration server, which runs all unit tests together with a number of other useful tools like FindBugs<sup>2</sup>. Every morning, a detailed report of the state of the code is generated.

**REQUIREMENTS FOR CROSS-PLATFORM TOOLS** The requirements for cross-platform tools are that it (1) should work properly, (2) should not be too complex, (3) has at least decent performance (preferred over ease of use) and (4) that it is customizable graphically. Most clients have specific styling requirements.

---

<sup>1</sup><http://eclipse.org>

<sup>2</sup>FindBugs uses static analysis to find common bugs, <http://findbugs.sourceforge.net>.

**ATTITUDE TOWARDS NEW LANGUAGES AND TOOLS** Learning new tools and languages is not considered problematic as long as it is worth investing in and/or requested by clients. Typically, one or more developers familiarize themselves with the tool/language and teach the other developers during a training session. Also, Capgemini has good partnerships to fall back on in case of a problem.

#### *Mobile architect*

The architect is responsible for the overall design of the application and makes the important decisions regarding used technology. Therefore, this person is best suited to describe the typical application structure and the trade-offs that have to be made constantly.

**FOCAL POINTS IN MOBILE ARCHITECTURES** Mobile architectures consist mainly of two major components: a front-end component and a back-end component. On the side of the front-end (the mobile application), the most important factor is the degree of integration with the device.

On the side of the back-end, the most important factors are the services the application needs to integrate with. An additional server, called the *mobile orchestrator* or *mobile hub*, will handle this integration and expose it in a single interface to the mobile application. This protects the back-end from the increased number of requests and allows for caching and other integrations like targeted advertisement campaigns.

**REQUIREMENTS FOR CROSS-PLATFORM TOOLS** There are a number of requirements for cross-platform tools:

- **Adoption** How many developers are using this tool? The number of users is mostly a good measure for the quality of the tool. A large user base is also beneficial when facing problems because it is more likely to get answers.
- **Future proof** Will the tool survive? Is there enough financial backing or community effort? It is not very wise to start a project that relies on a tool that has an unclear future.
- **Documentation** Good documentation is priceless as it can save numerous hours of digging through code.
- **Support** In case of a problem, is there an official channel to open a ticket? This could be either paid support or good community support. Either way, it should solve the problem. Delay due to unsolvable problems is unacceptable.
- **Customizability** Clients have specific requirements with regard to user interfaces and the tool should make this possible. Also, can the tool be expanded with plugins? A plugin architecture can contribute substantially to the customizability of the tool.

- **Supported devices** Which devices and runtimes does the tool support? In a B2B<sup>3</sup> context, devices are mostly controlled by an organization and the tool does not need to support many devices. In a B2C<sup>4</sup> context on the other hand, the organization cannot control the devices and consequently, the tool should support a lot more devices. Does the tool cover most or all of the used devices in this case?
- **Performance** The benefits of cross-platform development must justify the costs in terms of performance. If it took virtually no time to develop the application but it is slow, the application is useless.
- **Tools** Does this cross-platform tool allow to reuse the development tools that are already in use? Most people are more productive with the tools they are familiar with.

**USABILITY** Usability is a big concern when developing cross-platform. Users are accustomed to the native look & feel and wish to see new applications with similar styling. Even HTML5 applications are designed to mimic the native look & feel of the device. It is therefore hard to write applications with a single code base, even though this is desirable. Only when the application has a custom user interface that is in no way related to the native look & feel of the devices, the user interface can be reused across devices.

#### *Sales representative*

The sales representative records the client's requirements and sells the application. The salesman is therefore capable to describe the typical client requirements.

**APPLICATION TYPES** Roughly speaking, there are two types of applications: consumer applications and business critical applications. The first type of application often involves a lot of marketing and branding, which is not Capgemini's core business. For this kind of applications, businesses usually consult a marketing agency that makes this kind of (rather short-lived) mobile applications.

Capgemini focusses on the second type of application. These applications mostly handle data and do not rely on device specific hardware like for instance GPS or NFC<sup>5</sup>. However, clients are becoming aware of these device features and are starting to request this kind of device integration.

**CUSTOMER REQUIREMENTS** When clients come to Capgemini with a problem that they would like to solve with a mobile application, they typically do not have special technical requirements. These requirements are most often formulated in other terms. One example is the choice for native versus cross-platform. It could happen that the client has not yet decided on which devices to use or that the client does not want to create a lock-in situation by choosing for a single vendor. In that case, the application clearly has to work cross-platform. Clients could also wish to use NFC technology, which rules

---

<sup>3</sup>Business-to-business, or commerce between businesses

<sup>4</sup>Business-to-consumer, or commerce between a business and consumers

<sup>5</sup>Near Field Communication, a wireless technology based on RFID

out iOS as a platform. When there is no compelling reason to choose for either of both, Capgemini can help the client to make an appropriate decision. Performance is almost never a primary requirement. Perhaps this is implicitly assumed?

### *Summary of interviews*

**TODO: List of criteria resulting from interviews again?**

#### 3.4.2 Literature

The criteria extracted from the interviews are complemented with criteria from literature. As mentioned before in the literature study, only criteria that are used for evaluating benefits are selected here. By separating costs and benefits, a reliable cost-benefit analysis can be made in the end. The evaluation criteria from literature originate from reports by VisionMobile and Gartner.

VisionMobile<sup>6</sup> has conducted a worldwide survey about cross-platform tools. They received answers from over 2400 developers across 91 countries. The survey includes a question about the key reasons to select a particular tool and also includes a question about the key reasons to drop a cross-platform tool. The top 10 for both questions is summarized in Table 3.2 and Table 3.3.

Rank	Key reason to select tool	Share
1	It supports the platforms I am targeting	61%
2	Allows me to use my existing skills	43%
3	Low cost or free	40%
4	Rapid development process	33%
5	Easy learning curve	23%
6	Rich UI capabilities	19%
7	Access to device or hardware APIs	10%
8	High Performance / low runtime overhead	9%
9	Well suited for games development	8%
10	Good vendor support and services	8%

TABLE 3.2: Top 10 reasons to select a particular cross-platform tool. Respondents could enter their top 3 and only the response for the tools that are selected by 50+ developers are counted, which is 1512 responses [27].

It is clear from Table 3.2 and Table 3.3 that the key reasons for selecting a certain tool are more or less the same for dropping a tool. Common themes are (1) Platform support, (2) skill reuse, (3) development cost, (4) productivity or development time, (5) learning curve, (6) user interface capabilities, (7) device APIs and (8) performance. Non-common themes are (9) game development suitability, (10) vendor support, (11) tooling and testing and (12) concerns about the future of the tool.

<sup>6</sup>VisionMobile is an ecosystems analyst firm, <http://www.visionmobile.com/>.

Rank	Key reason to drop tool	Share
1	Low performance / high runtime overhead	29%
2	Does not support the platforms I am targeting	25%
3	Steep learning curve	24%
4	Restricted UI capabilities	22%
5	Does not let me use my existing development skills	22%
6	High costs	22%
7	Slow development process	21%
8	Challenges with debugging	18%
9	Access to device or hardware APIs	17%
10	Uncertainty of vendor future or platform roadmap	14%

TABLE 3.3: Top 10 reasons to drop a particular cross-platform tool. Respondents could enter their top 3 and only the responses for the tools that were dropped by 50+ developers are counted, which is 1109 responses [27].

From this list, (3), (4), (5) and (9) are omitted: (3) is clearly a cost, (4) is also a cost, albeit less clearly. However, developers need to be paid and consequently, development time is a cost. Capgemini does not develop games, which rules out (9). The interviews also revealed that typically somebody specializes in a certain tool or language and subsequently trains other developers and in case somebody gets stuck, there is almost always somebody to provide the necessary support. This should improve the learning curve and therefore eliminates (5) as an issue **TODO: Is this valid argumentation? :/**.

Gartner has also done similar research in 2011 [11]. The report of this research is not freely available but the criteria they identified are more or less clear from the table of contents. The criteria mostly overlap with the criteria from VisionMobile but also add (13) toolset reuse and (14) code reuse and organize them in three categories: portability, native experience and development experience.

#### *Summary of literature*

**TODO: List the criteria from literature once more?**

#### *Summary of evaluation criteria*

The identified criteria from the interviews and literature are combined into a single hierarchy of evaluation criteria. The criteria are organized in three categories, similar to the Gartner report.

**TODO: I think I need to explain more why exactly these criteria are selected... After all, they are based on literature and interviews and I should point that out better...**

- **Portability** describes the ability to reuse certain assets of a project when migrating to another platform.
  - **Toolset reuse** describes the reuse of development platforms like IDE's, operating systems, etc.
  - **Code reuse** expresses the amount of code that can be reused across platforms
  - **Platform support** describes the number of platforms that are supported by the cross-platform tool. For this criterion, only platforms other than Android and iOS are relevant as support for Android and iOS is a selection criterion.
- **Application Experience** describes the experience of the finished product: integration with the device, user interface and performance.
  - **Native Integration** describes the integration with native services.
    - \* **Access to hardware** describes the quality and extensiveness of device APIs.
    - \* **Platform-specific services** describes integration with platform-specific services like for instance Passbook<sup>7</sup>.
  - **UI capabilities** describes the ability to create a rich user interface.
    - \* **Native Look & Feel** describes whether native user interface elements can be used.
    - \* **UI element capabilities** describes the capabilities of user interface elements.
  - **Performance** describes the overall performance of the application, like the snappiness of the user interface.
- **Productivity** is a measure for the ease of development.
  - **Skill reuse** describes the ability to reuse existing skills.
  - **Tooling** describes the quality of the development environment.
  - **Testing** describes the quality of software testing tools.

### 3.5 Evaluate selected alternatives

In this stage, the actual evaluation of the selected tools takes place. The evaluation is based on the AHP method, described in section 2.1.2. Therefore, all alternatives are compared in pairs with respect to the criteria recorded in the previous stage. In order to gain the experience that is needed to formulate accurate judgements, every tool is used to create a proof of concept application, or parts thereof.

The proof of concept application is described in section 3.5.1, the evaluation method is described in section 3.5.2. The actual evaluation of the tools is described in chapter 5.

---

<sup>7</sup>Passbook is an iOS application to gather electronic tickets in one place.

### 3.5.1 Proof-of-Concept application

The proof-of-concept application is a rather small but typical enterprise application. It is not typical in the sense that it “looks” like the average application. Instead, it is rather typical in the sense that it contains the most requested features. This helps to ensure that the selected tools are thoroughly tested with regard to these essential features. This section describes these features in detail. The requirements documentation is available in [Appendix A](#).

#### *Context & scenario*

Employees of certain companies occasionally have to make costs for which they would like to be reimbursed. The process for this reimbursement typically involves keeping books, filling out forms and a lot of waiting while a superior deals with the request. Needless to say, there is a great potential for a mobile application here.

The application is designed to do just that. Employees can group a number of invoices into one request, provide evidence for the costs in the form of pictures, sign the document on a phone or tablet and send it to the backend. From there, the request is forwarded to a qualified person that will review the request and deal with it.

#### *Typical functional elements*

The proof-of-concept application includes a number of features that are typically required in any application.

- **UI elements** Most applications are useless without a user interface. This application incorporates a number of frequently used UI elements.
  - **Form elements** Virtually all input is captured with “forms”. The form elements should support read-write and read-only mode. This application uses different types of form elements to represent different kinds of data.
    - \* **Text** For inputting arbitrary text.
    - \* **Number** For inputting numbers.
    - \* **Email** For inputting email addresses.
    - \* **Password** For inputting passwords, the content of the input field not shown as characters but as symbols.
    - \* **Drop-down** For selecting an item from a list.
    - \* **Radio button** Also for selecting an item from a list.
    - \* **Toggle switch** To toggle a state on a property, e.g. an on/off switch.
  - **Button** Used to trigger some action.
  - **Tab bar** Used to switch between contexts.
  - **Activity indicator** A spinning wheel that is displayed when the user is needs to wait for a while because the applications is handling some request.



- **UI modes** The application must support multiple screen modes.
  - **Tablet UI** The display mode used on tablets. The layout typically consists of a narrow column on the left and a wide column on the right (also known as the master–detail interface).
  - **Phone UI** The display mode used on smartphones. Nearly the same layout but shows less detail master and detail views are decoupled in separate views.
- **Serialization** In order to communicate with the backend, data must be serialized using various formats. This application makes use of XML, JSON and plaintext.
- **Input validation** To make sure that the data that is entered is consistent and valid, some validation needs to be done on the device (and on the server).
  - **Data type validation** If a field only accepts numbers, it should automatically make clear to the user that other input than numbers is invalid.
  - **Custom validation** There might be some restrictions on some fields that are dependent on other selections in a form. For this kind of consistency checks, custom validation is essential.
- **Sorting** Data-driven apps display a lot of data. It is easier for the end user if the data can be sorted in the right way.
- **Offline mode** The application should still work when the device is offline.
- **Local Storage** The application needs to be able to store some data that is either persistent or cached.
- **Session management** Business applications are typically bound to a user account. Hence, session management on the client side is also required.

Most of these commonly requested features can be built on top of other features but that requires extra work. A tool is more interesting if it includes this functionality out of the box. Part of the evaluation is to investigate the ability to use these functions.

### 3.5.2 Evaluation methodology

The Analytic Hierarchy Process is used to evaluate the alternatives. First, a weight is assigned to every criterion. This weight is the normalized principal right eigenvector<sup>8</sup> of the pairwise comparison matrix containing the criteria in a single category. The weight of each criterion is multiplied by the weight of its parent.

Second, a weight is assigned to every combination of alternatives and criteria. All alternatives are compared in pairs with respect to a single criterion and the results are

---

<sup>8</sup>In AHP, the length of a vector  $\mathbf{v}$  is given by the sum of its entries, not by the Euclidian distance between  $\mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$ .

combined in a pairwise comparison of which the principal right eigenvector can be calculated. Again, the weights are given by the normalized eigenvector.

Last, the total weight of every alternative is calculated to obtain a ranking of the alternatives. In case of  $n$  alternatives and  $m$  criteria, the total weight of an alternative  $A_j$  is calculated as

$$a_j = \sum_{i=1}^m c_i w_i \quad j = 1, \dots, n \quad (3.1)$$

where  $c_i$  is the weight of the criterion  $C_i$  and  $w_i$  is the weight of alternative  $A_j$  with respect to criterion  $C_i$ . The alternative with the highest weight is “the winner”. However, the winning alternative may have the most benefits but it could also carry the highest costs. To make sure that the costs are justified, an additional cost-benefit analysis is performed.

Because this is the most important part of this thesis and too long to fit in here, the evaluation is discussed in detail in chapter 5.

### 3.6 Select the most suitable alternative

The final step of the software selection process is the selection itself. The decision maker chooses the best-suited alternative based on the results from the evaluation. Since the goal of this thesis is to find the best alternative for cross-platform development, this step is discussed in the conclusion (see chapter 6).

---

## Selected Tools

### 4.1 Apache Cordova

#### 4.1.1 Architecture

TODO: Cordova is a hybrid application, uses HTML5 + HTML5 polyfills if browser support is limited, plugin architecture, ...

#### 4.1.2 Supported platforms

#### 4.1.3 Documentation

#### 4.1.4 Future & Financial backing

TODO: Open source community, phonegap is adobe's distribution, ...

#### 4.1.5 Additional Tools

TODO: WEINRE, Ripple, Edge Inspect?, PhoneGap Build?

TODO: Elaborate description of Cordova, including architecture, kind of app, supported platforms, used programming languages, costs, financial backing, community support, official support, ...

### 4.2 Motorola Rhodes

#### 4.2.1 Architecture

TODO: Rhodes is an interpreted/hybrid application, uses ruby and HTML(5) for ui but has no support for HTML5 polyfills if browser support is limited, ...

TODO: Elaborate description of Rhodes, including architecture, kind of app, supported platforms, used programming languages, costs, financial backing, community support, official support, ...

## 4.3 Native SDKs?

## Evaluation

This chapter presents a detailed description of the evaluation of the alternatives, which are the combination of native Android and native iOS, Apache Cordova and Motorola Rhodes. The chapter is structured as outlined in section 3.5.2: first, the weights of the criteria are calculated; second, the weights of the alternatives are calculate and last, a cost-benefit analysis is performed.

### 5.1 Weighting the evaluation criteria

Because developers and architects do not necessarily share the same opinions about the evaluation criteria, the ranking of the alternatives could be different as well. Therefore, this evaluation covers these two perspectives separately and the results for both perspectives are compared in the end. Both the developer and the architect were asked to fill in a questionnaire containing all necessary pairwise comparisons (see Appendix ??).

The questioned people are the same people from the interviews earlier (see section 3.4.1) and the results of the questionnaire are illustrated in Table 5.1, Table 5.2, Table 5.3, Table 5.6, Table 5.4, Table 5.5.

<b>Architect</b>	Portability	App. Experience	Productivity	Priority vector
Portability	1	1/3	1/5	0.1047
App. Experience	3	1	5	0.6370
Productivity	5	1/5	1	0.2583
$\lambda_{max} = 3.5206, CI = 0.2603, RI = 0.58, CR = 0.4488$				
<b>Developer</b>	Portability	App. Experience	Productivity	Priority vector
Portability	1	1/7	1/5	0.0719
App. Experience	7	1	3	0.6491
Productivity	5	1/3	1	0.2790
$\lambda_{max} = 3.0649, CI = 0.0324, RI = 0.58, CR = 0.0559$				

TABLE 5.1: Pairwise comparison matrix for the top level of the decision tree.

The weights for the top level criteria are virtually the same for both the architect and the developer perspective. Table 5.2 also reveals a high inconsistency in the architect's judgement ( $CR > 0.1$ ). Analysis of the judgements shows that there is no loop, i.e. there is no chain  $A, B, C$  such that  $A$  is more important than  $B$ ,  $B$  is more important than  $C$  and  $C$  is more important than  $A$ . However, the judgement of portability vs. application experience does not reflect the judgement of application experience vs. productivity and the judgement of productivity vs. portability since  $1/3 \neq 1/5 \times 1/5$ . The inconsistency ratio for the judgement of the developer is acceptable as it is below 10%.

**TODO: Ask for a better judgement?**

<b>Architect</b>	Platform support	Toolset reuse	Code reuse	Priority vector
Platform support	1	1/3	1/7	0.0918
Toolset reuse	3	1	5	0.6248
Code reuse	7	1/5	1	0.2834
$\lambda_{max} = 3.7089, CI = 0.2545, RI = 0.58, CR = 0.6112$				
<b>Developer</b>	Platform support	Toolset reuse	Code reuse	Priority vector
Platform support	1	1/5	1/5	0.0909...
Toolset reuse	5	1	1	0.4545...
Code reuse	5	1	1	0.4545...
$\lambda_{max} = 3, CI = 0, RI = 0.58, CR = 0$				

TABLE 5.2: Pairwise comparison matrix for the category “portability”.

In the portability category (see Table 5.2), the differences between developer and architect are more pronounced. Just like before, the judgement of the architect shows a notable amount of inconsistency. Again, there is no loop but the comparison data violates the consistency property.

**TODO: Ask for better judgement?**

## 5.2 Evaluate the alternatives

In the subsections to follow, all alternatives get evaluated with respect to one criterion at a time. In every subsection, a description is given of what exactly is measured and how. The description also outlines what is taken into account for the evaluation, which scale is used and why. For every alternative, a rationale for the judgement or score is provided as well.

For some criteria, there is no absolute scale available to measure said property. In that case, judgements based on pairwise comparison, as proposed by Saaty [31], are used to evaluate the alternatives. These judgements arise from the experience of developing the proof-of-concept application. In addition, some criteria deal with features that are not

<b>Architect</b>	Native int.	UI capabilities	Performance	Priority vector
Native int.	1	1	3	0.4600
UI capabilities	1	1	1/3	0.2211
Performance	1/3	3	1	0.3189
$\lambda_{max} = 3.5608, CI = 0.2804, RI = 0.58, CR = 0.4835$				
<b>Developer</b>	Native int.	UI capabilities	Performance	Priority vector
Native int.	1	1	1/5	0.1428
UI capabilities	1	1	1/5	0.1428
Performance	5	5	1	0.7142
$\lambda_{max} = 3, CI = 0, RI = 0.58, CR = 0$				

TABLE 5.3: Pairwise comparison matrix for the category “Application Experience”.

<b>Architect</b>	Access to HW	Platform-specific svc.	Priority vector
Access to HW	1	1/3	0.2500
Platform-specific svc.	3	1	0.7500
$\lambda_{max} = 2, CI = 0, RI = 0, CR = 0$			
<b>Developer</b>	Access to HW	Platform-specific svc.	Priority vector
Access to HW	1	5	0.8333...
Platform-specific svc.	1/5	1	0.1666...
$\lambda_{max} = 2, CI = 0, RI = 0, CR = 0$			

TABLE 5.4: Pairwise comparison matrix for the category “Native integration” within the category “Application Experience”.

<b>Architect</b>	Native L& F	UI el. capabilities	Priority vector
Native L& F	1	5	0.8333...
UI el. capabilities	1/5	1	0.1666...
$\lambda_{max} = 2, CI = 0, RI = 0, CR = 0$			
<b>Developer</b>	Native L& F	UI el. capabilities	Priority vector
Native L& F	1	1/5	0.1666...
UI el. capabilities	5	1	0.8333...
$\lambda_{max} = 2, CI = 0, RI = 0, CR = 0$			

TABLE 5.5: Pairwise comparison matrix for the category “UI capabilities” within the category “Application Experience”.

addressed in the proof-of-concept application. In that case, the evaluation is based on the information that is found in the documentation.

<b>Architect</b>	Skill reuse	Tooling	Testing	Priority vector
Skill reuse	1	1/5	3	0.2021
Tooling	5	1	5	0.7007
Testing	1/3	1/5	1	0.0972
$\lambda_{max} = 3.1356, CI = 0.0678, RI = 0.58, CR = 0.1169$				
<b>Developer</b>	Skill reuse	Tooling	Testing	Priority vector
Skill reuse	1	1	3	0.4286
Tooling	1	1	3	0.4286
Testing	1/3	1/3	1	0.1428
$\lambda_{max} = 3, CI = 0, RI = 0.58, CR = 0$				

TABLE 5.6: Pairwise comparison matrix for the category “Productivity”.

TODO: Make sure every section clearly mentions these things...

### 5.2.1 Platform support

Remember from section 3.1 that support for Android and iOS is a selection criterion. This criterion only covers additional platforms, apart from Android and iOS. To reflect the value of each platform, every alternative is awarded the additional market share it can serve. In the end, these scores are normalized such that the sum of scores is equal to 1. The market share numbers are taken from Figure 1.2.

**ANDROID & IOS** Native code for Android and iOS is useless on other platforms. Hence, the combination of Android and iOS cannot contribute to reaching additional market share.

**APACHE CORDOVA** From Cordova's platform support (see section 4.1.2), it is safe to say that it supports the remainder of the mobile market. Cordova is therefore awarded the remaining 17% of market share: 6% for BlackBerry, 6% for Symbian, 2% for Windows Phone, 2% for Bada and 1% for the remainder of mobile platforms.

**MOTOROLA RHODES** Rhodes only supports BlackBerry and Windows Phone for which it is awarded 8% of market share: 6% for BlackBerry and 2% for Windows Phone.

**VERDICT** The normalized scores are listed in Table 5.7.

<b>Platform support</b>	Market share	Normalized weight
Android/iOS	0%	0
Cordova	17%	0.68
Rhodes	8%	0.32

TABLE 5.7: Evaluation of the alternatives with respect to “platform support”.



### 5.2.2 Toolset reuse

This criterion describes the ability to reuse the development environment or parts thereof when migrating to another cross-platform alternative. The evaluation is based on the recommended development environment setup for each alternative. Since there is no absolute scale available to measure this property, Saaty's fundamental scale (see Table 2.1) is used here.

**ANDROID & IOS** All iOS development is done with the Xcode IDE, which is available on Apple computers only. Every iOS developer must therefore have a rather expensive Mac. For Android development, any platform can be used in combination with the Android SDK and an Eclipse plugin (ADT) is available. On I/O 2013, Google also announced a new, freely available Android IDE, based on JetBrains' IntelliJ.

**APACHE CORDOVA** For HTML5 application development, any operating system with a web IDE or even a simple text editor will do. However, packaging the Cordova application in its native shell requires the native SDK's or the online build service, called PhoneGap Build, provided by Adobe. Unfortunately, this service cannot build additional plugins that are not part of the standard distribution. If a project makes use of custom plugins, the native SDK's are required.

**MOTOROLA RHODES** Development of Rhodes applications requires a Ruby installation and a Ruby IDE. A specially tailored Eclipse-based Ruby IDE, called RhoStudio, is distributed as part of RhoMobile. As with Cordova, packaging the app requires the native SDK or the online build service, called RhoHub, provided by Motorola.

**VERDICT** Motorola Rhodes and Apache Cordova have similar requirements and therefore they are treated equally in the comparison. Native development for Android and iOS is treated as a whole. Because of the strict requirements imposed by Apple, native development scores a little less compared to Cordova and Rhodes. However, not being able to build the application locally is not very practical either, which explains the scores listed in Table 5.8.

<b>Toolset reuse</b>	Android/iOS	Cordova	Rhodes	Priority vector
Android/iOS	1	1/3	1/3	0.1428
Cordova	3	1	1	0.4286
Rhodes	3	1	1	0.4286
$\lambda_{max} = 3, CI = 0, RI = 0.58, CR = 0$				

TABLE 5.8: Evaluation of the alternatives with respect to "toolset reuse".

### 5.2.3 Code reuse

This criterion measures the amount of code that can be reused when migrating to another platform. For this criterion, the amount of portable code is expressed as an estimated percentage of the total amount of application code. Native extensions are not taken into account as they are not part of the application logic. They are considered to be reusable dependency which has to be coded once.

**ANDROID & IOS** As mentioned before, native code for Android and iOS is useless on other platforms but native Android code is also useless on iOS and vice versa. Hence, code reuse on Android and iOS is 0%.

**APACHE CORDOVA** Code reuse is 100% for Cordova applications because all code is shared across all platforms. Since code of native plugins are not taken into account, this does not affect the score.

Note that a large amount of code can potentially be reused in other (non-mobile) platforms. Be that as it may, it is out of the scope of this evaluation and it is not taken into account either.

**MOTOROLA RHODES** Code reuse on Rhodes applications is also 100%. It is not taken into account that Rhodes has no support for custom plugins and that its code is not as widely deployable.

**VERDICT** The scores for each alternative are normalized and listed in Table 5.9.

Toolset reuse	Code reuse	Priority vector
Android/iOS	0%	0
Cordova	100%	0.5000
Rhodes	100%	0.5000

TABLE 5.9: Evaluation of the alternatives with respect to “code reuse”.

#### 5.2.4 Access to hardware

This criterion measures the ability to integrate the device’s hardware. For this criterion, the availability of device API’s (sensor API’s, output API’s and communication API’s) is studied and every alternative is awarded the fraction of device API’s it supports. Alternatives can either provide full support (there is a way to access a particular piece of hardware or software on both platforms), partial support (access to this type of hardware is available on one platform only) or no support. Note that most of these API’s are not used in the proof-of-concept application. Therefore, this comparison is mostly based on the documentation of the alternatives.

**ANDROID & IOS** Android provides support for all types of sensors but that does not imply that all these sensors are available in a particular device. Apple iDevices have less sensors and as such there is no support for every sensor in iOS.

**APACHE CORDOVA** Cordova tries to promote the web as a first-class platform for mobile applications. “The ultimate purpose of *Cordova* is to cease to exist” [29]. When HTML5 will be fully supported on all mobile browsers, Cordova will no longer be needed. Therefore, all Cordova API’s (try to) follow the HTML5 specification and do not provide support for all the sensors and communication because they are simply not in the specification.

Note that with Cordova’s plugin system, it can deliver the same level of integration as native Android and iOS. However, the plugin system is not taken into account here.

**MOTOROLA RHODES** Rhodes provides a reasonable amount device API's. All of them are available through ruby method calls. As of version 3.3.3, Motorola has removed a lot of API's and included them in their commercial product called RhoMobile Suite, for which additional API's are available.

**VERDICT** The studied device API's and the alternative's support for it are listed in Table 5.10.

API	Android	iOS	Cordova	Rhodes
Accelerometer	✓	✓	✓	✓
Geolocation	✓	✓	✓	✓
Gyroscope	✓	✓	–	✓
Light	✓	✓	–	✓
Magnetic Field	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pressure	✓	–	–	partial
Proximity	✓	✓	–	✓
Relative Humidity	✓	–	–	partial
Temperature	✓	–	–	partial
Microphone	✓	✓	✓	✓
Camera	✓	✓	✓	✓
Hardware buttons	✓	–	partial	partial
Vibration Motor	✓	✓	✓	partial
Speaker	✓	✓	✓	✓
System information	✓	✓	✓	✓
File System	✓	✓	✓	✓
Contacts	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bluetooth	✓	✓	–	✓
NFC	✓	–	–	–
Wi-Fi Direct	✓	–	–	–
USB / Accessory	✓	✓	–	–
Support	Average: 18/21		10.5/21	15.5/21

TABLE 5.10: Evaluation of the alternatives with respect to “access to hardware”.

### 5.2.5 Integration with platform-specific services

This criterion measures the ability of an alternative to integrate the application with platform-specific services that might not be available on all platforms, e.g. Passbook. The proof-of-concept application does not contain this kind of integration and consequently this evaluation is based on the documentation. Because there is no absolute scale to quantify this property, the evaluation is also based on judgements.

**ANDROID & IOS** Platform-specific services are part of the native SDK's. Therefore, this kind of integration is implemented the easiest in the native applications.

**APACHE CORDOVA** There are no API's for this kind of integration in the default distribution but fortunately, Cordova ships with an elaborate plugin-system which can be used to deal with it.

**MOTOROLA RHODES** There are no API's for this integration in Rhodes either. Moreover, Rhodes does not have a plugin system which could make this integration possible. Therefore, it is excluded from this category and not awarded any points.

**VERDICT** The scores are listed in Table 5.11. Integrating with platform specific services is clearly more easy with the native development kits.

<b>Performance</b>	Android/iOS	Cordova	Rhodes	Priority vector
Android/iOS	1	5	excl.	0.8333...
Cordova	1/5	1	excl.	0.1667...
Rhodes	excl.	excl.	excl.	0
$\lambda_{max} = 2, CI = 0, RI = 0, CR = 0$				

TABLE 5.11: Evaluation of the alternatives with respect to “platform-specific services”

### 5.2.6 Native Look & Feel

This criterion indicates whether or not an alternative is able to use native user interface elements. An application can either support the use of native user interface elements fully, partially or not at all.

**ANDROID & IOS** It needs no explaining that Android and iOS can use the native user interface elements.

**APACHE CORDOVA** The user interface of Cordova applications is built with HTML5, CSS and JavaScript and there is no possibility to use native user interface elements for it.

However, numerous attempts are made to recreate the native look & feel on top of HTML (like KendoUI, Moobile, etc.). Unfortunately, these projects need a lot of additional code to mimic the behaviour of native interface elements which influences the overall performance of the application in a adverse way.

**MOTOROLA RHODES** The user interface of Rhodes applications is also built with HTML and consequently cannot deliver the native look & feel to the end user.

**VERDICT** Despite the efforts of many projects to mock the native look & feel in web applications, it remains a privilege of Android and iOS. Hence, Android and iOS clearly do better compared to Cordova and Rhodes, as is illustrated in Table 5.12.

### 5.2.7 UI element capabilities

This criterion measures an alternative's potential to present a rich user interface. Both Cordova and Rhodes rely on HTML for their user interface. Therefore, the evaluation is based on a comparison of the native UI elements with their HTML5 counterparts. Plain

<b>Native Look &amp; Feel</b>	Native L&F	Priority vector
Android/iOS	Yes	1
Cordova	No	0
Rhodes	No	

TABLE 5.12: Evaluation of the alternatives with respect to “Native look &amp; feel”.

HTML only provides basic interface elements, which is why an additional UI framework, called Bootstrap<sup>1</sup>, was used to develop the proof-of-concept application.

**ANDROID & IOS** Android and iOS both have an elaborate portfolio of rich user interface elements. iOS lacks some basic form elements like radio buttons and checkboxes but these can be easily replaced with pickers and switches respectively.

**APACHE CORDOVA** Cordova applications are mobile web applications that are wrapped in a single webview. Hence, only HTML5 can be used to create the user interface. An application could be comprised of multiple pages or it could be comprised of a single page, in which case it is called a single-page application. The former approach requires page reloads, which feels unnatural in a mobile app (compared to native apps) whereas the latter approach can make the hybrid app behave more like a native app.

The Cordova proof-of-concept application is implemented as a single-page application with AngularJS<sup>2</sup>. This framework drastically improves productivity by reducing the required lines of code through declarative programming and bidirectional bindings between view and model.

**MOTOROLA RHODES** Rhodes also relies on HTML for its user interface. In contrast to Cordova, Rhodes is actually a complete web server with an MVC framework on top. Every request is handled locally by a controller action and the result is served in a webview. Developers can still choose to create single-page applications but device integration has to be realized through AJAX<sup>3</sup> calls, which requires extra work. The proof-of-concept application is implemented as a multi-page application because this is the default way to develop applications with Rhodes.

**VERDICT** The scores are listed in Table 5.13.

### 5.2.8 Performance

The performance criterion measures the responsiveness of the user interface and the application in general. Responsiveness in this case does not mean the ability to reflow UI elements to fit other screen sizes, responsiveness in this case represents the time it takes an application to respond to a trigger, like pushing a button.

<sup>1</sup><http://getbootstrap.com>

<sup>2</sup><http://angularjs.org>

<sup>3</sup>Asynchronous JavaScript and XML

Android	iOS	HTML5	Bootstrap 3
ActionBar	UINavigationController	–	navbar class
Split ActionBar	UIToolbar	–	navbar class
Tabs	UITabBar	–	nav-tabs class
ListView	UITableView	–	list-group class
GridList	UICollectionView	–	Grid system
ScrollView	UIScrollView	by default	–
Spinner	–	<select></select>	dropdown class
Picker	UIPickerView	<select></select>	modal class
DatePicker	UIDatePicker	<input type="date">	–
Button	UIButton	<button></button>	btn class
Text field	UITextField	<input type="...">	–
Slider	UISlider	<input type="range">	–
Progress bar	UIProgressbar	<progress>	progress class
Options Menu	UIActionSheet	–	–
Checkbox	–	<input type="checkbox">	–
Radio	–	<input type="radio">	–
On/off switch	UISwitch	–	btn-group class
Dialog	UIDialog	–	modal class
Alert	UIAlertView	alert(string)	–
Popup	–	–	modal class
Toast	–	–	alert class
TextView	UILabel	any text element	–
MapView	MKMapView	–	–
–	Popover (iPad)	–	popover script
Master-Detail	SplitView (iPad)	–	Grid System
WebView	UIWebView	<iframe>	–
Android & iOS combined: 26/26		HTML5 & Bootstrap combined: 24/26	

TABLE 5.13: Evaluation of the alternatives with respect to “UI element capabilities”.

Comparing the performance of these alternatives is hard because their architectures are completely different. For web applications, page load times could be a viable metric. However, only the Rhodes application uses page loads. There is no notion of page loads in native applications and the Cordova application is implemented as a single-page application. Hence, no absolute scale is available and the alternatives are evaluated based on judgement. The analytic hierarchy process can deal with inconsistency as long as the consistency ratio is low, i.e. equal or below 10%. In that case, the judgements are accepted.

Every implementation of the proof-of-concept application is tested on four devices:

- **HTC Wildfire S** An entry-level smartphone, released in May 2011 and running An-

droid 2.3.5 on a single core 600 MHz ARMv6 processor. It has 512 MB of RAM and a 3.2-inch display with a 320 by 480 pixel resolution (180 ppi).

- **HTC Flyer** An entry-level tablet, also released in May 2011 and running Android 3.2.2 on a single core 1.5 GHz ARMv7 processor. It has 1024 MB of RAM and a 7.0-inch display with a 600 by 1024 pixel resolution (170 ppi).
- **LG/Google Nexus 4** A high-end smartphone, released in November 2012 and running Android 4.2.2 on a quad core 1.5 GHz ARMv7 processor. It has 2048 MB of RAM and a 4.7-inch display with a 768 by 1280 pixel resolution (318 ppi).
- **iPhone 3GS** A smartphone, released in June 2009 and running iOS 6.1.3 on a single core 600 MHz ARMv6 processor. It has 256 MB of RAM and a 3.5-inch display with a 320 by 480 pixel resolution (165 ppi).

**ANDROID & IOS** The native SDK's are the most suited to take advantage of the device capabilities. Therefore, native applications always perform the best, provided they are well-designed.

**APACHE CORDOVA** Cordova wraps web applications. Hence, the performance of its applications greatly depends on the performance of the browser on the device. On older smartphones, the performance of the browser is often seriously lacking. The use of a single-page application solves this issue in a way, but the performance drop is still notable.

**MOTOROLA RHODES** A Rhodes application also relies on the native browser to display its user interface. The difference with Cordova is that Rhodes uses a local ruby web server to serve multi-page applications. The performance of the local web server is absolutely disappointing, resulting in utterly slow page loads (of up to 30 seconds for a single load on the slowest devices and 7 seconds on the fastest device).

**VERDICT** The judgements for this evaluation are listed in Table 5.14. The consistency ratio is rather high but still acceptable.

Performance	Android/iOS	Cordova	Rhodes	Priority vector
Android/iOS	1	5	9	0.7352
Cordova	1/5	1	5	0.2067
Rhodes	1/9	1/5	1	0.0581
$\lambda_{max} = 3, CI = 0.0585, RI = 0.58, CR = 0.10$				

TABLE 5.14: Evaluation of the alternatives with respect to “Performance”.

### 5.2.9 Skill reuse

This criterion expresses the ability to reuse skills from another field of expertise to develop mobile applications. This allows for better resource management. For this criterion, it is assumed that the organization has got a substantial expertise with Java EE (because Capgemini does).

**ANDROID & IOS** For organizations that already have got expertise with Java EE applications, the entry barrier for adding Android to the portfolio is rather low, since Android is based on Java. Adding iOS from that perspective is less straightforward, because Objective-C is a new programming language.

**APACHE CORDOVA** In order to develop Cordova applications, one needs to know the web. Since the web already belongs to the organization's expertise, this skill can be reused quite easily but developers will probably have to invest in their JavaScript skills. When custom plugins are needed, the scenario of native Android and iOS holds.

**MOTOROLA RHODES** For Rhodes applications, organizations can reuse their skills for creating the user interface. However, the application logic entirely written in Ruby, which is a new programming language for the organization.

**VERDICT** The native SDK's and Rhodes are similar because one needs to learn a new language for either of both. For the development of Cordova application, no notable new skills are required, explaining the scores listed in Table 5.15.

**TODO:** On the other hand, learning Objective-C appeared to be easier than learning Ruby (in combination with Rhodes) when developing the proof-of-concept application. The free online video lectures about iOS development by Paul Hegarty are very valuable.

Skill reuse	Android/iOS	Cordova	Rhodes	Priority vector
Android/iOS	1	1/5	1/5	0.1428
Cordova	5	1	5	0.7144
Rhodes	1	1/5	1	0.1428
$\lambda_{max} = 3, CI = 0, RI = 0.58, CR = 0$				

TABLE 5.15: Evaluation of the alternatives with respect to "Skill reuse".

### 5.2.10 Tooling

This criterion describes the overall quality of the supplied tools. This includes command-line interfaces, IDE's, emulators and others. Since there is no absolute scale available to measure the quality accurately, the alternatives are compared in pairs. Saaty's scale is used to express the scores that are based on the experience of developing the proof-of-concept application.

**ANDROID & IOS** The restrictions on Apple development may seem obstructive at first but it also allows Apple to deliver a well integrated development environment. Everything a developer could possibly need is available in Xcode, right out of the box. For Android development, an Eclipse plugin is available which integrates all the functionality of the SDK with the IDE.

**APACHE CORDOVA** Cordova does not ship with an elaborate IDE or special development tools. However, there are some tools that can ease the development of mobile web applications (WEINRE, Ripple emulator, etc.). Unfortunately, there is no integrated development environment.



**MOTOROLA RHODES** Rhodes comes with a bunch of command-line scripts. Sadly, the Android Debug Bridge (ADB) is poorly integrated **TODO: (see section ??)** and there is no option to transfer iOS applications to an iDevice from the command-line interface. Instead, either Xcode, iTunes or Fruitstrap is needed for the transfer.

**TODO: What about RhoStudio?**

**VERDICT** The scores about the quality of the tools are based on the experience from developing the proof-of-concept application and are listed in Table 5.16.

Tooling	Android/iOS	Cordova	Rhodes	Priority vector
Android/iOS	1	3	9	0.6716
Cordova	1/3	1	5	0.2654
Rhodes	1/9	1/5	1	0.0629
$\lambda_{max} = 3, CI = 0.0145, RI = 0.58, CR = 0.025$				

TABLE 5.16: Evaluation of the alternatives with respect to “Tooling”.

### 5.2.11 Testing

This criterion measures the ability to (1) write tests and (2) automate testing in a continuous integration environment. This criterion focusses mainly on unit testing and integration testing as these tests are most common. Mobile interface testing is rather hard and is not taken into account for this criterion. Alternatives are evaluated using judgements because there is no absolute scale on which this property could be quantified.

Continuous integration is actually not part of the scope for the proof-of-concept application. Nevertheless, this is an important topic in a production environment and therefore it is examined superficially.

**ANDROID & IOS** Android and iOS have built-in support for writing unit tests (1). Android is based on Java and consequently, the well-known JUnit framework can be used for writing tests. For iOS, a similar framework is readily available in Xcode for Objective-C.

For automated testing in a continuous integration environment (2), there are a number of options available. Continuous integration testing for Android can be set up quite easily with Jenkins<sup>4</sup>, even headless<sup>5</sup>. For iOS, there are a number of guides available describing how to set it up. However, a Apple hardware is still required. Other options include a hosted continuous integration service.

**APACHE CORDOVA** For JavaScript, the Jasmine testing framework<sup>6</sup> can be used to write tests (1). In combination with a test runner like Karma<sup>7</sup>, these test can be ran in a con-

<sup>4</sup>Jenkins is a popular continuous integration server, <http://jenkins-ci.org>

<sup>5</sup>On a server without a user interface

<sup>6</sup><http://pivotal.github.io/jasmine/>

<sup>7</sup><http://karma-runner.github.io/0.8/index.html>

tinuous integration environment. Better yet, this framework allows to automate testing on the actual mobile devices.

**MOTOROLA RHODES** Unit testing is also built-in into Rhodes. However, only few options seem to be available for automating testing in a continuous integration environment.

**VERDICT** The judgements are summarized in Table 5.17. All alternatives have support for unit testing. In that perspective, they are all equal. Rhodes seems to be less suited for continuous integration when compared to the other alternatives. The other alternatives perform equally because seem to support the same features.

Testing	Android/iOS	Cordova	Rhodes	Priority vector
Android/iOS	1	1	3	0.4286
Cordova	1	1	3	0.4286
Rhodes	1/3	1/3	1	0.1428
$\lambda_{max} = 3, CI = 0, RI = 0.58, CR = 0$				

TABLE 5.17: Evaluation of the alternatives with respect to “Testing”.

#### Global verdict

With the information from the evaluation above, the total weight  $a_j$  of every alternative  $A_j$  is calculated as

$$a_j = \sum_{i=0}^m c_i w_i \quad j = 1, \dots, n \quad (5.1)$$

where  $c_i$  is the weight of the criterion  $C_i$  and  $w_i$  is the weight of alternative  $A_j$  with respect to criterion  $C_i$ . The total weights are calculated for both the architect and developer and are listed in Table 5.18 and Table 5.19 respectively.

The ranking of the alternatives is the same for both. Conversely, the average total weight can be calculated without changing the order. Android and iOS clearly offer the most benefits with an average total weight of 60.80%. Cordova comes second with an average total weight of 27.04%. Rhodes finishes last with an average total weight of 12.15%.

When comparing the alternatives in pairs and using Saaty’s scale (see Table 2.1), one can conclude that:

- Android and iOS are a little better than Cordova ( $60.8/27.04 = 2.25$ ),
- Android and iOS are a little better than Cordova ( $60.8/12.15 = 5$ ) and
- Cordova is a little better than Rhodes ( $27.04/12.15 = 2.22$ ).

### 5.3 Costs versus benefits

<b>Architect</b>	$C_i$	$C_i w_{Android/iOS}$	$C_i w_{Cordova}$	$C_i w_{Rhodes}$
Platform support	0.0096	0.0000	0.0065	0.0031
Toolset reuse	0.0654	0.0093	0.0280	0.0280
Code reuse	0.0297	0.0000	0.0148	0.0148
Access to hardware	0.0733	0.0300	0.0175	0.0258
Platform-specific services	0.2198	0.1831	0.0366	0.0000
Native Look & Feel	0.1174	0.1174	0.0000	0.0000
UI element capabilities	0.0235	0.0110	0.0062	0.0062
Performance	0.2031	0.1493	0.0420	0.0118
Skill reuse	0.0522	0.0135	0.0333	0.0055
Tooling	0.1810	0.1216	0.0480	0.0114
Testing	0.0251	0.0108	0.0108	0.0036
$a_j$		0.6460	0.2438	0.1328

TABLE 5.18: Summary of the total weight and weighted scores of the alternatives with respect to the architect's weights.

<b>Architect</b>	$C_i$	$C_i w_{Android/iOS}$	$C_i w_{Cordova}$	$C_i w_{Rhodes}$
Platform support	0.0065	0.0000	0.0044	0.0021
Toolset reuse	0.0327	0.0047	0.0140	0.0140
Code reuse	0.0327	0.0000	0.0163	0.0163
Access to hardware	0.0772	0.0316	0.0184	0.0272
Platform-specific services	0.0155	0.0129	0.0026	0.0000
Native Look & Feel	0.0155	0.0155	0.0000	0.0000
UI element capabilities	0.0772	0.0363	0.0205	0.0205
Performance	0.4636	0.3408	0.0958	0.0269
Skill reuse	0.1196	0.0309	0.0762	0.0125
Tooling	0.1196	0.0803	0.0317	0.0075
Testing	0.0398	0.0171	0.0171	0.0057
$a_j$		0.5700	0.2971	0.1328

TABLE 5.19: Summary of the total weight and weighted scores of the alternatives with respect to the developer's weights.



## Appendices

# A

## Requirements documentation of the proof-of-concept application

### A.1 Class Diagram

### A.2 Mock-ups

#### A.2.1 Login screen




FIGURE A.1: Login screen

Figure A.1 shows the main screen when the user is not logged in. Use credentials to log in.

Validation: both fields must be filled in, otherwise error.

A.2.2 Home screen

A.2.3 Wizard: Step 1 (Your Info)

A.2.4 Wizard: Step 2 (Overview)

A.2.5 Wizard: Step 2 (review expense from abroad)

A.2.6 Wizard: Step 2 (review domestic expense)

A.2.7 Wizard: Step 3 (add expense domestic expense)

A.2.8 Wizard: Step 3 (add expense expense from abroad)

A.2.9 Wizard: Step 4 (Sign & Send)

A.2.10 Wizard: Validation Dialog

A.2.11 Wizard: Validation element coloring

A.2.12 History

A.2.13 Smartphone version



---

## Bibliography

- [1] Android (2013). Platform Versions, Screen Sizes and Densities and Open GL Version.
- [2] Apple (2010). Configuring Web Applications.
- [3] Firtman, M. (2012). Mobile HTML5.
- [4] Friese, P. (2012). Cross platform mobile development.
- [5] Gartner (2008a). Gartner Says Worldwide Smartphone Sales Grew 16 Per Cent in Second Quarter of 2008.
- [6] Gartner (2008b). Gartner Says Worldwide Smartphone Sales Reached Its Lowest Growth Rate With 11.5 Per Cent Increase in Third Quarter of 2008.
- [7] Gartner (2009). Gartner Says Worldwide Smartphone Sales Reached Its Lowest Growth Rate With 3.7 Per Cent Increase in Fourth Quarter of 2008.
- [8] Gartner (2010a). Gartner Says Worldwide Mobile Device Sales Grew 13.8 Percent in Second Quarter of 2010, But Competition Drove Prices Down.
- [9] Gartner (2010b). Gartner Says Worldwide Mobile Phone Sales Grew 17 Per Cent in First Quarter 2010.
- [10] Gartner (2010c). Gartner Says Worldwide Mobile Phone Sales Grew 35 Percent in Third Quarter 2010; Smartphone Sales Increased 96 Percent.
- [11] Gartner (2011a). Cross-Platform Mobile Development Frameworks. Technical report.
- [12] Gartner (2011b). Gartner Says Apple iOS to Dominate the Media Tablet Market Through 2015, Owning More Than Half of It for the Next Three Years.
- [13] Gartner (2011c). Gartner Says Sales of Mobile Devices Grew 5.6 Percent in Third Quarter of 2011; Smartphone Sales Increased 42 Percent.
- [14] Gartner (2011d). Gartner Says Worldwide Mobile Device Sales to End Users Reached 1.6 Billion Units in 2010; Smartphone Sales Grew 72 Percent in 2010.



- [15] Gartner (2012a). Gartner Says 428 Million Mobile Communication Devices Sold Worldwide in First Quarter 2011, a 19 Percent Increase Year-on-Year.
- [16] Gartner (2012b). Gartner Says Sales of Mobile Devices in Second Quarter of 2011 Grew 16.5 Percent Year-on-Year; Smartphone Sales Grew 74 Percent.
- [17] Gartner (2012c). Gartner Says Worldwide Media Tablets Sales to Reach 119 Million Units in 2012.
- [18] Gartner (2012d). Gartner Says Worldwide Sales of Mobile Phones Declined 2 Percent in First Quarter of 2012; Previous Year-over-Year Decline Occurred in Second Quarter of 2009.
- [19] Gartner (2012e). Gartner Says Worldwide Sales of Mobile Phones Declined 2.3 Percent in Second Quarter of 2012.
- [20] Gartner (2012f). Gartner Says Worldwide Sales of Mobile Phones Declined 3 Percent in Third Quarter of 2012; Smartphone Sales Increased 47 Percent.
- [21] Gartner (2012g). Gartner Says Worldwide Smartphone Sales Soared in Fourth Quarter of 2011 With 47 Percent Growth.
- [22] Gartner (2013). Gartner Says Worldwide Mobile Phone Sales Declined 1.7 Percent in 2012.
- [23] IDC (2012a). Android Expected to Reach Its Peak This Year as Mobile Phone Shipments Slow, According to IDC.
- [24] IDC (2012b). IDC Raises Its Worldwide Tablet Forecast on Continued Strong Demand and Forthcoming New Product Launches.
- [25] Jadhav, A. S. and Sonar, R. M. (2009). Evaluating and selecting software packages: A review. *Information and Software Technology*, 51(3):555–563.
- [26] Jadhav, A. S. and Sonar, R. M. (2011). Framework for evaluation and selection of the software packages: A hybrid knowledge based system approach. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 84(8):1394–1407.
- [27] Jones, S., Voskoglou, C., Vakulenko, M., Measom, V., Constantinou, A., and Kapetanakis, M. (2012). Cross-platform developer tools 2012 Bridging the worlds of mobile apps and the web. Technical report.
- [28] Kahraman, C. (2008). *Fuzzy Multi-Criteria Decision Making*, volume 16 of *Springer Optimization and Its Applications*. Springer US, Boston, MA.
- [29] LeRoux, B. (2012). PhoneGap Beliefs, Goals, and Philosophy.
- [30] Nielsen (2012). Smartphones Account for Half of all Mobile Phones, Dominate New Phone Purchases in the US.

- [31] Saaty, T. L. (1980). *The Analytic Hierarchy Process: Planning, Priority Setting, Resource Allocation*. Advanced book program. McGraw-Hill.
- [32] Saaty, T. L. (1990). How to make a decision: The analytic hierarchy process. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 48(1):9–26.

## Fiche masterproef

*Student:* Michiel Staessen

*Titel:* A comparative study of cross-platform tools for mobile application development

*Nederlandse titel:* "Een vergelijkende studie van cross-platform tools voor het ontwikkelen van mobiele applicaties"

*UDC:*

*Korte inhoud:*

Developing mobile applications (apps) for multiple platforms is an expensive and time consuming process. Therefore, many companies are seeking refuge in Cross-Platform Tools (CPTs) for the development of their apps. In cooperation with CapGemini, this thesis presents a comparison of two such cross-platform tools: Apache Cordova and Motorola Rhodes. Both tools are compared with each other and with native development. The comparison is based on a proof-of-concept application which should work on both smartphones and tablets with respect to both iOS and Android.

Thesis voorgedragen tot het behalen van de graad van Master of Science in de ingenieurswetenschappen: computerwetenschappen, hoofdspecialisatie Software engineering

*Promotor:* prof. dr. ir. Erik Duval

*Assessor:*

*Begeleider:* ir. Gonzalo Parra