

# Essay: A Metrics Suite for Object Oriented Design

Mats Stijlaart - University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

December 1, 2015

**Abstract - This is an essay on the paper 'A Metrics Suite for Object Oriented Design' by S. Chidamber and C. Kemerer which is dated from June 1994. Firstly there will be a brief summary about the paper itself followed by its merits and drawbacks.**

When object oriented design (OOD) starts to unfold in the industry, the need for feedback on this kind of software development increases. The writer addresses the problems that cause the need for a metrics suite that provides the required feedback on OOD. The existing metrics lack the theoretical ground, are not sufficient of OOD, technology dependent or too labor intensive to collect. The paper introduces six metrics as a suite: 'Weighted Methods Per Class' (WMC), 'Depth of Inheritance Tree' (DIT), 'Number of Children' (NOC), 'Coupling between object classes' (CBO), 'Response For a Class' (RFC) and 'Lack of Cohesion of Methods' (LCOM). These metrics are assessed with the software complexity metric properties introduced by Weyuker [TODO cite weyuker] and found to comply with most of the specified properties. Criticism on previous research was the lack of theoretical basis which is refuted on this paper by the use of the model provided by Weyuker and lack of empirical data, which is added by applying the metrics on two different OO applications (C++ and Smalltalk) using an automated tool. The main contribution of the paper can be summarized as a suite of six individual software complexity methods that can be combined to illuminate design problems and/or choices within an OOD.

The paper is well structured and meets the expectations from the reader. Where the writer introduces the problem (section II), he succeeds this with separate sections on the point of view and approach. This shows how the writer approaches the properties introduced with an OOD (section III) from which the metrics were abstracted, and how solve the lack of theoretical ground (section IV) and empirical data (section V). Section VI contains the research results. The writer iterates over different metrics and accompanies each metric with a point of view, performs an analytical evaluation and presents the empirical data and its interpretation. This section is concluded with a summary. The paper is ended with the concluding remarks.

While the paper does not have a research question it has a clear research problem, which is actually tackled. However the problem is divided in two parts. The first is the lack of metrics that relate to the properties that emerge from an OOD, which indicate the need for such metrics. The second part concentrates on the theoretical criticism of metrics applied to conventional non-OO applications. The second part is an argument to include a theoretical base in the research, but the provided substantiating research introduced by the writer merely focuses on complexity metrics instead of metrics in general. The writer lacks of explicitly scoping the research to complexity metrics, but abides to this point of view throughout the rest of the paper. With the constructive use of complexity as point of view and the use of a theoretical basis that is based on complexity measures Weyuker, the writer should have added this in the title, abstract or introduction of the paper. Also the concept of complexity is never introduced. The concept of software complexity could be interpreted in different ways with metrics introduces by McCabe [TODO cite McCabe] and Henry [TODO cite Henry].

Focusing on the first argument, existing metrics do not relate to the properties of OOD, the writer fails to demonstrate this or refer to previous works that indicate this. Although the reader can assume the lack of these metrics due to maturity of object oriented development in the industry at that time, it is not proper from the writers perspective to omit this assumption, without references to previous work that show this. The previous works that are referenced include suggestions and attempts for OOD metrics, but these sources, or the author lacks to indicate the missing relations of existing metrics with the OOD properties.

In the most important section of the paper the writer iterates over each proposed metric. The writer applies the same pattern for each metric, which implicitly sets the expectation for the reader. For each metric the writer gives a clear definition, theoretical basis and point of view. The description and the theoretical basis give the definition and the motivation for the metric. The point of view of each metric adds a more vivid argument for the need of each metric. Some of these arguments are more application type specific. For example: 'The larger the number of methods that can be invoked from a class, the greater the complexity of the class.' I cannot reason about the types of application that were developed in the time of the paper, but for example in the present day there are a lot of APIs that separate their data from their logic. Although this is a more procedural approach than OO, it is applied with OO languages. The method count with these designs is higher in the data objects while they tend to be much simpler than the code in the domain specific layer of an application. Independently from small doubtful point of views, the arguments that made are solid. Where the point of view of the paper is convincing, the theoretical basis lacks detail on a few points. For example:

- The definition of the NOC metric states: 'number of immediate subclasses subordinated of a class in the class hierarchy', however the theoretical basis states: 'it is a measure of how many subclasses are going to inherit the methods of the parent class'. The number of inheriting classes is not equal to the immediate subclasses of a class.
- The LCOM metric is a computation based on the intersection of accessed fields of two methods. To identify two methods with or without accessed field similarity, the writer uses the notion of pairs. These pairs however are computed using the Cartesian product of a list containing field access sets (which are mapped from the methods). The Cartesian product holds the reflexive relational property, which by definition will decrease the outcome with at least the number of the number of elements in the set consistent of the field access sets. The theoretical basis of LCOM states 'the larger the number of similar methods, the more cohesive the class', but a simple counter example shows that there is a bug in the definition. Assume we have a set of instance variables:  $\{I_1, I_2\}$  and a set of methods  $\{M_1, M_2\}$  where  $M_1$  uses  $I_1$  and  $M_2$  uses  $I_2$ , then from the LCOM definition,  $P = \{(\{I_1\}, \{I_2\}), (\{I_2\}, \{I_1\})\}$  and  $Q = \{(\{I_1\}, \{I_1\}), (\{I_2\}, \{I_2\})\}$ . This results in a LCOM value of 0 that indicates that the class is most cohesive, but  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  do not relate in a single matter. This problem is presented in other works such as Basili et al. [TODO cite basili] and Chai et al. [TODO cite chai]

These points show the some metrics are not sound in a manner that there is no symbiosis between the definition and the application.

After each metric is made clear the writer gives an analytical evaluation of the metric and presents the empirical data. The analytical evaluation is a formal proof, which indicates that each metric complies to the metric properties specified by Weyuker.

The writer summarizes the result in the last part of the paper, but also introduces new concepts on how the metrics combined could be used as design indicators, why some properties of the metrics model are not met and why and the future direction of research. I rather have seen this in separate sections, mainly due to the reason that these components deserve their own section. The introduced point of views of combined metrics is one of the main contributions of the paper as it has a closer relation to OOD than the individual metrics.

To conclude the paper is well structured and has a clear contribution. The research problem is clear, but the approach tends to focus mainly on complexity metrics and has some aspects that could be described more explicitly, and it has some inconsistencies in the metric definition and application. However the presented data is solid. As intended, the metrics can be used as indicators to prevent faults as Basili et al. [TODO cite basili] showed.

## References

- [weyuker] Evaluating software complexity measures
- [brooks] Brooks - Silver Bullet
- [mccabe] A complexity measure
- [henry] Software Structure Metrics Based on Information Flow
- [basili] A validation of object-oriented design metrics as quality indicators
- [chai] A Cohesion Measure for Classes in Object-Oriented Systems