

Large Scale Evolutionary Analysis on Software Systems

Pooyan Behnamghader pbehnamg@usc.edu USC Center for Systems and Software Engineering



Outline



Introduction

- Recent contributions
- Large Scale Evolutionary Analysis Example
 - A Large-Scale Study of Architectural Evolution in Open-Source Software Systems
 - Tool Requirements, Architectural Change, Evolutionary Trend Example
- Scale and Challenges
- ARCADE-Controller (ATLAS)
- New Results
 - New Results: FindBugs, PMD, CheckStyle, SonarQube, UCC, SLOCCount
- Discussion



Introduction



Recent contributions:

- A Large-Scale Study of Architectural Evolution in Open-Source Software Systems.
 - Pooyan Behnamghader, Duc Le, Joshua Garcia, Daniel Link, Arman Shahbazian and Nenad Medvidovic.
 - Journal of Empirical Software Engineering. (Accepted Sept. 20, 2016/In Press.)
 - Domains: Software Architecture Recovery, Mining Software Repository
- Using Visual Symptoms for Debugging Presentation Failures in Web Applications
 - Sonal Mahajan, Bailan Li, Pooyan Behnamghader, William G. J. Halfond
 - 2016 IEEE International Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST)
 - Domains: Software Testing, Web Interface Analysis

Both studies initially had **scalability** issues



Large Scale Evolutionary Analysis Example



A Large-Scale Study of Architectural Evolution in Open-Source Software Systems

Research Questions:

- RQ1: To what extent do architectures **change** at the system level?
- RQ2: To what extent do architectures **change** at the component level?
- RQ3: Do architectural **changes** at the system and component levels occur concurrently?
- RQ4: Does significant architectural **change** occur between minor system versions within a single major version?



Analysis Tool Requirements



- Architecture recovery techniques to extract architectural models from implementation level artifacts.
- Metrics to calculate system level and component level architectural changes.





Architectural Change







Evolutionary Trend Example

A2A



Architectural changes among minor versions of apache-ant-ivy Recovery techniques:

- PKG (gross organization)
- ACDC (module dependency)
- ARC (semantic view)
 Change metric:
- A2A (System-level)

♦ PKG ■ ACDC ▲ ARC 100 ۸ 80 60 40 20 0 0.6.0 0.7.0 0.8.0 0.9.0 0.0. 1.0 .2.0 .3.0 .4.0 .2.0 0.5.0 0.0. 1.0 3.0 N N N N VERSION



The Scale of the Study



The largest study of architectural recovery and architectural evolution to date:

- 23 subject systems
- 931 examined system versions
- 140 MSLOC analyzed code
- 2793 analyzed architectural models
- Comparing pairs of architectural models using two change metrics

The challenges in this scale:

- Dealing with issues of each case study
- Comparing the results of multiple analyses on same data points
- Collaborating in a team



Challenges



• Case Study

- Different structure/modules/build automation tool for each system/version
 - e.g., the "core" module locates in a different subdirectory in older versions.
- Unsuitable case studies
 - e.g., the architecture is too small to be meaningful for some specific analysis.
- Analysis
 - Implementing tool for a new technique that does not have any ground-truth
 - e.g. your algorithm is wrong or there is a bug in the implementation.
 - You realize it when you see weird evolutionary patterns in your data
 - Using already existing of-the-shelf implementation of a solid technique
 - The implementation is simply buggy. (e.g. non-deterministic implementation)
- Teamwork!



It Would be Much Easier if...



- For each case study we could declare
 - the remote repository.
 - build command(s).
 - interesting modules, subsystems, or packages.
 - interesting version sets
- For each analysis we could declare
 - how to prepare the environment for the analysis.
 - how to run analysis on each system/version.
 - how to interpret and compare the results, and generate statistics.
- We could define a portable workflow to automatically run the study
 - on a powerful remote server.
 - distributed over the cloud.



ARCADE-Controller (ATLAS)



- Cloud Instances
 - Download and compile the source code
 - Run the analysis on the subject system
 - Send the artifacts to the analysis server
- Analysis Server
 - Compares the artifacts using change metrics
 - Gets the statistics



ARCADE-Controller (ATLAS) - cont.



- The ability to define a solid workflow for the analysis
 - Replicability
- The ability to employ cloud-computing power to run large-scale analyses in a reasonable amount of time
 - Scalability
- The ability to use the same subject systems for different analyses
 - Data Consistency and Reusability
- The ability to run each analysis in a cloud instance as a sandbox
 - Running static (e.g., ARCADE) and dynamic (e.g., FieryEye¹) analysis

1. FieryEye is dynamic web-interface analyzer. We used the same technique to resolve the scalability issues for FieryEye.



New Results



- Architectural evolution
 - Architecture recovery and architectural changes: ACDC, ARC, PKG, A2A, CVG
- All it takes from downloading the source code from the repository to generating the statistics is "push a button"!
 - Both on a local machine or on the cloud
- There are already several subject systems configured in the framework
 - The capability to collect a large amount of data without much effort!
- How about the evolution of other aspects (e.g., defects, style, debt) of a software system?
 - FindBugs, PMD, CheckStyle, SonarQube, UCC, SLOCCount



FindBugs



- Finds bugs in Java programs.
- Analyze programs compiled for any version of Java.
- Requires binary releases





PMD



- Finds common programming flaws like:
 - unused variables
 - empty catch blocks
 - unnecessary object creation

o ...

- Source code analyzer
- Supports a variety of languages





Checkstyle



- Helps programmers write Java code that adheres to a coding standard.
- Highly configurable
 - Sun Code Conventions
 - Google Java Style





SonarQube



- Manages code quality.
- Covers the 7 axes of code quality:





USC Viterbi

UCC (Unified Code Count)



- Counts, compares, and collects logical differentials between two versions of the source code of a software product.
- USC Center for Systems and Software Engineering



'iterbi

School of Engineering



SLOCCount (calculates basic COCOMO model)



- Counts physical source lines of code.
- Basic COCOMO model
 - Person-Months = 2.4 * (KSLOC**1.05)
 - Months = 2.5 * (person-months**0.38)
 - Estimated Average Number of Developers= Effort/Schedule
 - Average salary = \$56,286/year, overhead = 2.40.

iterbi

School of Engineering



Discussion



Suggestions

- What other static analysis tools can be added to the framework?
- What dynamic analysis tools can be added to the framework?
- Would it be interesting if we extend the framework to study difference between commits and the impact of each developer?

