



# Department of Computer Science Federal University of Bahia

## DEVELOPERS' PERCEPTION ABOUT CODE ANOMALIES IDENTIFIED BY THRESHOLD VALUES SUGGESTED BY DIFFERENT STRATEGIES

**Luan Passos, Rebeca Sousa,  
Thamiris Gomes  
Eduardo Almeida**

# INTRODUCTION

- Code Anomaly x Metric-based Techniques;
- Metrics are used to measure the quality of a system;
- Threshold Values infer in the measurement process;
  - Problems in identifying these threshold values;



# OBJECTIVES

- Evaluate the ContextSmell tool;
- Compare the accuracy of the strategies used;
- Understand the strategies behind solving design problems;
- Improve the ContextSmell tool;



# CASE SELECTION

- Fraunhofer;
- 6 professionals;
- Systems developed in JAVA;
- 2 participants in the project;
- WEB System;



# RESEARCH QUESTIONS

RQ1 - Are there differences in the accuracy of the techniques in deriving threshold values for metrics at the method level?

- RQ2 - What design decisions influenced the developers to indicate methods as false positives?



# DATA COLLECTING

- Execution of design problem recommendation tool;
  - 286 classes e 54.737 lines of code;
  - 353 methods indicated and analyzed by ContextSmell
- Questionnaire based on the results of the tool
  - Quantitative data
  - Qualitative data



# PREPARATIONS AND EXECUTION

- Create a development environment to realize the study;
- Set fixed threshold values, based in what was proposed in (ALVES; 2010);
- Define e configurate systems that will be used as the design reference;
- Define participants and what systems will be analyzed by each one of them;
- Execute the .jar file “ContextSmellView.jar”, of the ContextSmell tool in the available environment.



# THRESHOLD VALUES DERIVING STRATEGIES

- A – Fixed values based in the table found in (ALVES, 2010);
- X – Threshold values extracted from systems considering their architectural roles (ANICHE, 2016);
- R – Fixed threshold values extracted from systems that follow the same design rules;
- D - Threshold values extracted from systems that follow the same design rules and considering their design roles;





# DATA ANALYSIS

## ○ Tabela 1 – Long Method (LOC)

|                 | A    | R    | D    | X    |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|
| True Positives  | 35   | 43   | 29   | 67   |
| False Negatives | 64   | 56   | 70   | 32   |
| False Positives | 6    | 8    | 2    | 9    |
| True Negatives  | 4    | 2    | 8    | 1    |
| Recall          | 0,35 | 0,43 | 0,29 | 0,68 |
| Precision       | 0,85 | 0,84 | 0,94 | 0,88 |
| Accuracy        | 0,36 | 0,41 | 0,34 | 0,62 |
| F-measure       | 1,06 | 1,30 | 0,87 | 2,03 |



# DATA ANALYSIS

## ○ Tabela 2 – Cyclomatic Complexity (CC)

|                 | A    | R    | D    | X    |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|
| True Positives  | 50   | 29   | 22   | 16   |
| False Negatives | 7    | 28   | 36   | 41   |
| False Positives | 41   | 50   | 2    | 12   |
| True Negatives  | 9    | 0    | 47   | 38   |
| Recall          | 0,87 | 0,50 | 0,37 | 0,28 |
| Precision       | 0,54 | 0,36 | 0,91 | 0,57 |
| Accuracy        | 0,55 | 0,27 | 0,64 | 0,50 |
| F-measure       | 2,61 | 1,5  | 1,11 | 0,84 |



# DATA ANALYSIS

## ○ Tabela 3 – High Coupling (Efferent)

|                 | A    | R    | D    | X    |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|
| True Positives  | 23   | 19   | 42   | 43   |
| False Negatives | 42   | 46   | 23   | 22   |
| False Positives | 0    | 1    | 2    | 4    |
| True Negatives  | 6    | 5    | 4    | 2    |
| Recall          | 0,35 | 0,29 | 0,65 | 0,66 |
| Precision       | 1,00 | 0,95 | 0,95 | 0,91 |
| Accuracy        | 0,41 | 0,34 | 0,65 | 0,63 |
| F-measure       | 1,05 | 0,87 | 1,93 | 1,98 |



# DATA ANALYSIS

- Tabela 4 – Number of Parameters (NOP)

|                 | A    | R    | D    | X    |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|
| True Positives  | 36   | 31   | 36   | 15   |
| False Negatives | 18   | 23   | 18   | 39   |
| False Positives | 3    | 5    | 0    | 1    |
| True Negatives  | 6    | 4    | 9    | 8    |
| Recall          | 0,67 | 0,57 | 0,67 | 0,28 |
| Precision       | 0,92 | 0,86 | 1,00 | 0,94 |
| Accuracy        | 0,67 | 0,56 | 0,71 | 0,37 |
| F-measure       | 2    | 1,72 | 2    | 0,83 |



# RESULTS

- RQ1 - Are there differences in the accuracy of the techniques in deriving threshold values for metrics at the method level?
- Yes, there is a difference in the threshold deriving accuracy between the strategies.

| Acurácia | A    | R    | D    | X    |
|----------|------|------|------|------|
| LOC      | 0,36 | 0,41 | 0,34 | 0,62 |
| CC       | 0,55 | 0,27 | 0,64 | 0,50 |
| Efferent | 0,41 | 0,34 | 0,65 | 0,63 |
| NOP      | 0,67 | 0,56 | 0,71 | 0,37 |



# RESULTS

- Consider the design roles for threshold derivation
  - LOC: técnica X had the highest accuracy with 0,62
  - CC: técnica D had the highest accuracy with 0,64
  - AE: técnica D had the highest accuracy with 0,65
  - NOP: técnica D had the highest accuracy with 0,71



# RESULTS

- RQ2 - What design decisions influenced the developers to indicate methods as false positives?
  - Disregard Long Method for File Manipulations methods;  
“updateFiles”



# THREATS TO VALIDITY

- Developer's personal experience;
- Developer's experience in the project;
- Undefined Architectural Roles;





# ETHICAL QUESTIONS

- Info not consented to sharing by company;
  - Project Name;
  - Source Code;
  - Project Documentation;
  - Intellectual and/or Industrial Properties related to confidential information;



# REFERENCES

- ANICHE, Maurício et al. SATT: Tailoring Code Metric Thresholds for Different Software Architectures. In: **Source Code Analysis and Manipulation (SCAM), 2016 IEEE 16th International Working Conference on**. IEEE, 2016. p. 41-50.
- ALVES, Tiago L.; YPMA, Christiaan; VISSER, Joost. Deriving metric thresholds from benchmark data. In: **Software Maintenance (ICSM), 2010 IEEE International Conference on**. IEEE, 2010. p. 1-10.
- FONTANA, Francesca Arcelli et al. Automatic metric thresholds derivation for code smell detection. In: **Proceedings of the Sixth International Workshop on Emerging Trends in Software Metrics**. IEEE Press, 2015. p. 44-53.
- LANZA, Michele; MARINESCU, Radu; DUCASSE, Stéphane. Objectoriented metrics in practice: using software metrics to characterize. **Evaluate, and Improve the Design of Object-Oriented Systems**, p. 220, 2006.
- FOWLER, M. et al. Refactoring: Improving the Design of Existing Code. **Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley**, 1999.

