

# The Effects of UML Modeling on the Quality of Software

Ariadi Nugroho



# The Effects of UML Modeling on the Quality of Software

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,  
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus Prof. Mr. P.F. van der Heijden,  
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties  
te verdedigen op donderdag 21 oktober 2010  
te klokke 13.45 uur

door

Ariadi Nugroho  
geboren te Blitar – Indonesia, 1979

## Promotiecommissie

Promotor : Prof. dr. Joost N. Kok  
Co-Promotor : Dr. Michel R.V. Chaudron  
Overige Leden : Prof. dr. Thomas H.W. Bäck  
Prof. dr. Frank S. de Boer  
Prof. Jon Whittle (University of Lancaster)  
Dr. Marcela G. Bocco (University of Castilla-La Mancha)



The work in this thesis has been carried out under the FINESSE project (des7015) supported by the STW (Stichting Technische Wetenschappen), the Netherlands.



The work in this thesis has been carried out under the auspices of the research school IPA (Institute for Programming research and Algorithmics).

ISBN 978-90-9025677-1

This thesis is dedicated to my family...



# Publications

During my Phd research, I have co-authored several publications. I list these publications below in chronological order.

1. **A Survey of the Practice of Design – Code Correspondence amongst Professional Software Engineers.**  
Ariadi Nugroho and Michel R.V. Chaudron.  
Proceedings of the 1st International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement (ESEM), September 2007.
2. **On the Relation between Class-Count and Modeling Effort.**  
Ariadi Nugroho and Christian F.J. Lange.  
Proceedings of Model Size Metrics Workshop (Co-located with MODELS Conference), October 2007.  
*Received best paper award.*
3. **A Survey into the Rigor of UML Use and its Perceived Impact on Quality and Productivity.**  
Ariadi Nugroho and Michel R.V. Chaudron.  
Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement (ESEM), October 2008.
4. **Managing the Quality of UML Models in Practice.**  
Ariadi Nugroho and Michel R.V. Chaudron.  
In Model-Driven Software Development: Integrating Quality Assurance. Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference - Imprint of: IGI Publishing; 2008.
5. **Empirical Analysis of the Relation between Level of Detail in UML Models and Defect Density.**  
Ariadi Nugroho, Bas Flaton, and Michel R.V. Chaudron.  
Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems (MODELS), September 2008.  
*Received best papers awards from ACM SIGSOFT and Springer.*
6. **Evaluating the Impact of UML Modeling on Software Quality: An Industrial Case Study.**

Ariadi Nugroho and Michel R.V. Chaudron.

Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems (MODELS), October 2009.

**7. Level of Detail in UML Models and its Impact on Model Comprehension: A controlled Experiment.**

Ariadi Nugroho

Information and Software Technology Journal, 2009.

**8. Assessing UML Design Metrics for Predicting Fault-prone Classes in a Java System.**

Ariadi Nugroho, Michel R.V. Chaudron, and Erik Arisholm.

Proceedings of the 7th International Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR), May 2010.



# Contents

|          |                                                                   |           |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>                                               | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1      | Quality in Modeling . . . . .                                     | 1         |
| 1.2      | Problem Statement . . . . .                                       | 2         |
| 1.3      | Objective of the Study . . . . .                                  | 2         |
| 1.4      | Research Methodology . . . . .                                    | 3         |
| 1.5      | Contributions and Outline . . . . .                               | 4         |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Background</b>                                                 | <b>7</b>  |
| 2.1      | The Unified Modeling Language . . . . .                           | 7         |
| 2.1.1    | UML Diagram Types . . . . .                                       | 8         |
| 2.1.2    | The Widespread Use of UML as a Modeling Language . . . . .        | 9         |
| 2.2      | Style and Rigor in UML Modeling . . . . .                         | 11        |
| 2.3      | The State of the Art in Quality Assurance of UML Models . . . . . | 13        |
| 2.3.1    | Quality Models of UML Models . . . . .                            | 13        |
| 2.3.2    | Methods and Techniques for Assessing UML Model Quality . . . . .  | 17        |
| 2.3.3    | Predictions of Software Quality based on Design Metrics . . . . . | 20        |
| 2.4      | Conclusion . . . . .                                              | 23        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>The Use of UML in Practice</b>                                 | <b>25</b> |
| 3.1      | Introduction . . . . .                                            | 25        |
| 3.2      | Related Work . . . . .                                            | 26        |
| 3.3      | Survey Design . . . . .                                           | 27        |
| 3.4      | Respondent Background . . . . .                                   | 27        |
| 3.5      | Results . . . . .                                                 | 29        |

---

|          |                                                                                |           |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 3.5.1    | UML Model Completeness . . . . .                                               | 29        |
| 3.5.2    | Level of Detail Used in UML Models . . . . .                                   | 31        |
| 3.5.3    | Model – Code Correspondence . . . . .                                          | 33        |
| 3.5.4    | The Use of UML and Productivity . . . . .                                      | 39        |
| 3.5.5    | The Use of UML and Software Quality . . . . .                                  | 41        |
| 3.6      | Discussion . . . . .                                                           | 42        |
| 3.6.1    | Targeting Completeness & Level of Detail . . . . .                             | 42        |
| 3.6.2    | Toward a Better Correspondence . . . . .                                       | 43        |
| 3.6.3    | Improving Productivity and Quality with UML Modeling . . . . .                 | 43        |
| 3.6.4    | Threats to Validity . . . . .                                                  | 44        |
| 3.7      | Conclusions and Future Work . . . . .                                          | 45        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>The Effects of Using UML on Defect Density and Fixing Effort</b>            | <b>47</b> |
| 4.1      | Introduction . . . . .                                                         | 47        |
| 4.2      | Related Work . . . . .                                                         | 48        |
| 4.3      | Design of Study . . . . .                                                      | 49        |
| 4.3.1    | Objective . . . . .                                                            | 50        |
| 4.3.2    | Hypothesis Formulation . . . . .                                               | 50        |
| 4.3.3    | Measured Variables . . . . .                                                   | 51        |
| 4.4      | Case Study . . . . .                                                           | 53        |
| 4.4.1    | Project Context . . . . .                                                      | 54        |
| 4.4.2    | Data Collection and Preprocessing . . . . .                                    | 55        |
| 4.4.3    | Analysis Methods . . . . .                                                     | 57        |
| 4.5      | Testing Hypothesis 1: The Effect of UML Modeling on Defect Density . . . . .   | 57        |
| 4.5.1    | Descriptive statistics . . . . .                                               | 57        |
| 4.5.2    | Controlling for the Confounding Factors . . . . .                              | 58        |
| 4.5.3    | Assessing the Effect . . . . .                                                 | 59        |
| 4.6      | Testing Hypothesis 2: The Effect of Modeling on Defect-fixing Effort . . . . . | 61        |
| 4.6.1    | Descriptive Statistics . . . . .                                               | 61        |
| 4.6.2    | Assessing the Effect . . . . .                                                 | 65        |
| 4.7      | Interpretation of Results . . . . .                                            | 69        |
| 4.7.1    | Threats to Validity . . . . .                                                  | 71        |
| 4.8      | Conclusions and Future Work . . . . .                                          | 72        |

---

|          |                                                                     |            |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>5</b> | <b>The Impact of Level of Detail in UML Models on Comprehension</b> | <b>73</b>  |
| 5.1      | Introduction . . . . .                                              | 73         |
| 5.2      | Related Work . . . . .                                              | 74         |
| 5.3      | Level of Detail . . . . .                                           | 76         |
| 5.4      | Experiment Planning . . . . .                                       | 77         |
| 5.4.1    | Subjects in the Experiment . . . . .                                | 77         |
| 5.4.2    | Variables in the Experiment . . . . .                               | 77         |
| 5.4.3    | Hypotheses Formulation . . . . .                                    | 77         |
| 5.4.4    | Experimental Design . . . . .                                       | 78         |
| 5.4.5    | Instrumentation . . . . .                                           | 80         |
| 5.5      | Experiment Operation . . . . .                                      | 86         |
| 5.6      | Data Analysis and Interpretation . . . . .                          | 87         |
| 5.6.1    | Analysis Procedure . . . . .                                        | 87         |
| 5.6.2    | Experiment Results . . . . .                                        | 88         |
| 5.6.3    | In-depth Analyses . . . . .                                         | 94         |
| 5.7      | Discussion . . . . .                                                | 98         |
| 5.7.1    | Reflection on the Results . . . . .                                 | 98         |
| 5.7.2    | Implications for Research and Practice . . . . .                    | 99         |
| 5.7.3    | Threats to Validity . . . . .                                       | 100        |
| 5.8      | Conclusion and Future Work . . . . .                                | 101        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>LoD in UML Models and its Relation with Defect Density</b>       | <b>103</b> |
| 6.1      | Introduction . . . . .                                              | 103        |
| 6.2      | Related Work . . . . .                                              | 104        |
| 6.3      | Level of Detail in UML Models . . . . .                             | 107        |
| 6.3.1    | Definition . . . . .                                                | 107        |
| 6.3.2    | Level of Detail Measures . . . . .                                  | 107        |
| 6.4      | Design of Study . . . . .                                           | 112        |
| 6.4.1    | Research Questions . . . . .                                        | 112        |
| 6.4.2    | Measured Variables . . . . .                                        | 112        |
| 6.4.3    | Other Factors to Be Controlled . . . . .                            | 113        |
| 6.4.4    | Analysis Method . . . . .                                           | 113        |
| 6.5      | Case Study . . . . .                                                | 113        |

|          |                                                                    |            |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 6.5.1    | Data Collection and Processing . . . . .                           | 113        |
| 6.6      | Data Analysis and Results . . . . .                                | 115        |
| 6.6.1    | Analysis Procedure . . . . .                                       | 115        |
| 6.6.2    | Descriptive Statistics . . . . .                                   | 116        |
| 6.6.3    | Correlation Analyses between LoD and Defect Density . . . . .      | 120        |
| 6.6.4    | The Functional Form of LoD - Defect Density Relationship . . . . . | 129        |
| 6.6.5    | The Relationship between LoD and Defect-fixing Effort . . . . .    | 131        |
| 6.7      | Discussion . . . . .                                               | 134        |
| 6.7.1    | Interpretation of Results . . . . .                                | 134        |
| 6.7.2    | Some Remarks for Modeling Practices . . . . .                      | 135        |
| 6.7.3    | Threats to Validity . . . . .                                      | 137        |
| 6.8      | Conclusion and Future Work . . . . .                               | 138        |
| <b>7</b> | <b>UML Metrics for Predicting Fault-prone Java Classes</b>         | <b>139</b> |
| 7.1      | Introduction . . . . .                                             | 139        |
| 7.2      | Related Work . . . . .                                             | 140        |
| 7.3      | UML Design Metrics . . . . .                                       | 142        |
| 7.4      | Design of Study . . . . .                                          | 144        |
| 7.4.1    | Measured Variables . . . . .                                       | 144        |
| 7.4.2    | Case Study and Data Collection . . . . .                           | 144        |
| 7.4.3    | Analysis Method . . . . .                                          | 145        |
| 7.5      | Results . . . . .                                                  | 146        |
| 7.5.1    | Univariate Analysis . . . . .                                      | 146        |
| 7.5.2    | Multivariate Analysis . . . . .                                    | 147        |
| 7.5.3    | Goodness of Fit of the Prediction Models . . . . .                 | 148        |
| 7.5.4    | Assessing Cost-effectiveness . . . . .                             | 151        |
| 7.6      | Discussion . . . . .                                               | 153        |
| 7.7      | Threats to Validity . . . . .                                      | 155        |
| 7.8      | Conclusion and Future Work . . . . .                               | 155        |
| <b>8</b> | <b>Conclusions</b>                                                 | <b>157</b> |
| 8.1      | Summary of Findings . . . . .                                      | 157        |

---

|          |                                                                                                                      |            |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 8.1.1    | RQ1: How is the UML used in practice; and do software engineers perceive any benefits of using UML? . . . . .        | 157        |
| 8.1.2    | RQ2: What is the effect of using UML for modeling a software system on quality and productivity? . . . . .           | 158        |
| 8.1.3    | RQ3: What is the effect of the quality of UML models on model comprehension? . . . . .                               | 159        |
| 8.1.4    | RQ4: Does the quality of UML models correlate with the quality of the resulting software? . . . . .                  | 159        |
| 8.1.5    | RQ5: Can we predict fault-prone software modules or components based on the quality of the software model? . . . . . | 160        |
| 8.2      | Contributions . . . . .                                                                                              | 161        |
| 8.3      | Notes on Additional Case Studies . . . . .                                                                           | 162        |
| 8.4      | Recommendations . . . . .                                                                                            | 165        |
| 8.5      | Concluding Remarks . . . . .                                                                                         | 166        |
| 8.6      | Future Research . . . . .                                                                                            | 166        |
| <b>A</b> | <b>UML Survey Questionnaire</b>                                                                                      | <b>169</b> |
| <b>B</b> | <b>Model Comprehension Questionnaire</b>                                                                             | <b>175</b> |
| <b>C</b> | <b>Descriptive Statistics of the NS-OFI Data Set</b>                                                                 | <b>181</b> |
|          | <b>Summary</b>                                                                                                       | <b>193</b> |
|          | <b>Samenvatting</b>                                                                                                  | <b>195</b> |
|          | <b>Curriculum Vitae</b>                                                                                              | <b>197</b> |
|          | <b>Acknowledgements</b>                                                                                              | <b>199</b> |



# List of Tables

|      |                                                                                                                                                 |    |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 2.1  | Formal Released Versions of UML . . . . .                                                                                                       | 8  |
| 2.2  | Chidamber and Kemerers metrics suite for object-oriented design . . . . .                                                                       | 18 |
| 2.3  | Overview of Quality Prediction Studies . . . . .                                                                                                | 21 |
| 3.1  | List of statements on levels of detail in UML models . . . . .                                                                                  | 31 |
| 3.2  | Spearman correlation coefficient between model completeness and strictness<br>in implementing modeling constructs . . . . .                     | 38 |
| 3.3  | Spearman correlation coefficient between strictness in implementing modeling<br>constructs and productivity across development phases . . . . . | 40 |
| 4.1  | Measured Variables . . . . .                                                                                                                    | 52 |
| 4.2  | Project Summary . . . . .                                                                                                                       | 54 |
| 4.3  | Descriptive statistics of all Java classes . . . . .                                                                                            | 58 |
| 4.4  | Descriptive statistics of the randomly sampled Java classes from the IPS<br>project comparing NMC and MC . . . . .                              | 59 |
| 4.5  | Mann-Whitney test - Ranks of the measured variables of the NMC and MC<br>groups . . . . .                                                       | 60 |
| 4.6  | Mann-Whitney test - The significance of differences in the measured variables<br>between the NMC and MC groups . . . . .                        | 60 |
| 4.7  | Results of assessing the impact of UMLforCLASS on DDENS using ANCOVA                                                                            | 61 |
| 4.8  | Descriptive statistics of sampled defects from IPS comparing NMD and MD .                                                                       | 62 |
| 4.9  | Mann-Whitney test - Ranks of the measured variables of the NMD and MD<br>groups . . . . .                                                       | 66 |
| 4.10 | Mann-Whitney test - The significance of differences in the measured variables<br>between the NMD and MD groups . . . . .                        | 66 |
| 4.11 | Results of assessing the effect of UMLforDEFECT on FixEffort using ANCOVA—<br>accounting for the effects of the confounding factors . . . . .   | 69 |

|      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |     |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 5.1  | LoD treatments in the UML model . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                              | 81  |
| 5.2  | Descriptive Statistics of subjects' knowledge/experience, comprehension correctness, and comprehension efficiency across groups . . . . .                                                                              | 88  |
| 5.3  | Ranks of knowledge/experience score across groups . . . . .                                                                                                                                                            | 90  |
| 5.4  | The results of the Mann-Whitney test showing the insignificance of the difference in knowledge/experience between the L-LoD and H-LoD groups . . . . .                                                                 | 90  |
| 5.5  | Group statistics for comprehension correctness and comprehension efficiency . . . . .                                                                                                                                  | 92  |
| 5.6  | The results of the independent t-test showing the significant effects of LoD on comprehension correctness and comprehension efficiency . . . . .                                                                       | 92  |
| 5.7  | The results of the two-way ANOVA for CO - Ability (using normalized data). The effect of LoD on comprehension correctness remains significant after the effects of Ability and LoD*Ability are accounted for . . . . . | 94  |
| 5.8  | The results of the two-way ANOVA for EF - Ability. The effect of LoD on comprehension efficiency is not significant after the effects of Ability and LoD*Ability are accounted for . . . . .                           | 94  |
| 6.1  | Distribution of defects across faulty classes . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                | 119 |
| 6.2  | Descriptive statistics of implementation classes modeled in class diagrams . . . . .                                                                                                                                   | 120 |
| 6.3  | Descriptive statistics of implementation classes modeled in sequence diagrams . . . . .                                                                                                                                | 120 |
| 6.4  | Correlation between independent variables of class diagram LoD (Spearman's) . . . . .                                                                                                                                  | 122 |
| 6.5  | Correlation between independent variables of sequence diagram LoD (Spearman's) . . . . .                                                                                                                               | 123 |
| 6.6  | Results of univariate regression for class diagram LoD measures . . . . .                                                                                                                                              | 123 |
| 6.7  | Results of multivariate regression for class diagram LoD measures . . . . .                                                                                                                                            | 125 |
| 6.8  | Results of multivariate regression analysis for sequence diagram LoD measures . . . . .                                                                                                                                | 125 |
| 6.9  | Results of univariate regression for sequence diagram LoD measures . . . . .                                                                                                                                           | 127 |
| 6.10 | Results of univariate regression for class diagram LoD measures — NS-OFI data set . . . . .                                                                                                                            | 128 |
| 6.11 | Results of univariate regression for sequence diagram LoD measures — NS-OFI data set . . . . .                                                                                                                         | 129 |
| 6.12 | Results of multivariate regression for class diagram LoD measures — NS-OFI data set . . . . .                                                                                                                          | 130 |
| 6.13 | Results of multivariate regression analysis for sequence diagram LoD measures — NS-OFI data set . . . . .                                                                                                              | 130 |
| 6.14 | Results of curve estimations between $SD_{msg}$ and defect density . . . . .                                                                                                                                           | 131 |
| 6.15 | Correlation between averaged MsgLoD and FixEffort (Spearman's) . . . . .                                                                                                                                               | 133 |



---

|     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |     |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 7.1 | Results of univariate analysis . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 146 |
| 7.2 | Results of multivariate analysis . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 147 |
| 7.3 | The Confusion Matrix . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 148 |
| 7.4 | Classification Accuracy of the Prediction Models (cross-validated using LOOCV)                                                                                                                                                                    | 148 |
| 7.5 | The Goodness of Fit of the Multivariate Models (probability threshold = 0.5)                                                                                                                                                                      | 149 |
| 7.6 | A Comparison of the goodness of fit . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 151 |
| 8.1 | Project Summary . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 163 |
| 8.2 | Results of multivariate analysis of sequence diagram LoD measures for the<br>BHN project. The results show that $SD_{msg}$ is not a significant predictor of<br>defect density, after controlling for the effects of coupling and complexity. . . | 164 |
| C.1 | Descriptive statistics of classes modeled in class diagrams – NS-OFI data set                                                                                                                                                                     | 181 |
| C.2 | Descriptive statistics of classes modeled in sequence diagrams – NS-OFI data<br>set . . . . .                                                                                                                                                     | 181 |



# List of Figures

|      |                                                                             |    |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 2.1  | The Taxonomy of UML Diagram Types . . . . .                                 | 9  |
| 2.2  | Use Case Diagram . . . . .                                                  | 10 |
| 2.3  | Class Diagram . . . . .                                                     | 11 |
| 2.4  | Sequence Diagram . . . . .                                                  | 12 |
| 2.5  | Boehm's Quality Model . . . . .                                             | 14 |
| 2.6  | The ISO 9126 . . . . .                                                      | 15 |
| 2.7  | SQA and Software Quality Assessment in Software Development . . . . .       | 15 |
| 2.8  | Framework for quality of UML models . . . . .                               | 16 |
|      |                                                                             |    |
| 3.1  | Developers' country of origin (percentage of respondents) . . . . .         | 28 |
| 3.2  | Developers' project involvement in the past 10 years . . . . .              | 29 |
| 3.3  | Developers' perception on model completeness in projects . . . . .          | 30 |
| 3.4  | The occurrence of imperfections in UML models . . . . .                     | 31 |
| 3.5  | Respondents' agreement over approaches in using detail in models . . . . .  | 32 |
| 3.6  | The importance of correspondence . . . . .                                  | 34 |
| 3.7  | Developers' strictness in implementing different constructs . . . . .       | 35 |
| 3.8  | Methods used in maintaining correspondence . . . . .                        | 36 |
| 3.9  | Factors driving deviation in an implementation . . . . .                    | 37 |
| 3.10 | The use of UML and productivity . . . . .                                   | 39 |
| 3.11 | The use of UML and its impact on some software quality properties . . . . . | 41 |
|      |                                                                             |    |
| 4.1  | Defect solving procedure . . . . .                                          | 56 |
| 4.2  | Box-plots of defect density in NMC and MC group . . . . .                   | 59 |
| 4.3  | Box-plots of FixEffort in the NMD and MD groups . . . . .                   | 63 |

|      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |     |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 4.4  | The distribution of defect types of the 86 sampled defects—also showing the frequency of modeled and not modeled defect per type . . . . .                                                                                           | 64  |
| 4.5  | Box-plots of FixEffort, ModFile, TCBO, and TMCC in the NMD and MD groups (after data transformation) . . . . .                                                                                                                       | 67  |
| 4.6  | Box-plots of TKSLOC, DPRIO, and TPERS in the NMD and MD groups (after data transformation) . . . . .                                                                                                                                 | 68  |
| 5.1  | Example of level of detail in a class diagram . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                              | 76  |
| 5.2  | A class diagram in the UML model with low LoD (the M-Low model) . . . .                                                                                                                                                              | 83  |
| 5.3  | A class diagram in the UML model with high LoD (the M-High model) . . . .                                                                                                                                                            | 84  |
| 5.4  | Example of sequence diagrams created using different LoD treatments . . . .                                                                                                                                                          | 85  |
| 5.5  | A sample question of the model comprehension questionnaire . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                 | 86  |
| 5.6  | The profile of subjects' knowledge and experience . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                          | 89  |
| 5.7  | Box-plots of comprehension correctness between groups . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                      | 91  |
| 5.8  | Box-plots of comprehension efficiency between groups . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                       | 92  |
| 5.9  | Score of all questions in both groups . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                      | 95  |
| 5.10 | Subjects' perception on the UML model . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                      | 97  |
| 6.1  | Identical class diagrams modeled with different LoD . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                        | 108 |
| 6.2  | Overview of steps in collecting and processing data . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                        | 115 |
| 6.3  | Defect type distribution of the sampled findings . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                           | 117 |
| 6.4  | Histogram of defect distribution across the 122 faulty classes . . . . .                                                                                                                                                             | 119 |
| 6.5  | Box-plots of defect density, complexity, and coupling of the 122 faulty classes                                                                                                                                                      | 120 |
| 6.6  | Box-plots of the 23 faulty classes modeled in class diagrams (after log transformation) . . . . .                                                                                                                                    | 121 |
| 6.7  | Box-plots of the 30 faulty classes modeled in sequence diagrams (after log transformation) . . . . .                                                                                                                                 | 122 |
| 6.8  | Scatterplot showing the correlation between $SD_{msg}$ and defect density . . . .                                                                                                                                                    | 128 |
| 6.9  | Estimations of the form of functional relationship between $SD_{msg}$ and defect density . . . . .                                                                                                                                   | 132 |
| 6.10 | Scatterplot showing the correlation between MsgLoD and FixEffort . . . . .                                                                                                                                                           | 133 |
| 6.11 | The MetricView tool showing the LoD profile of classes in a class diagram. Classes with low LoD are marked with red borders. The color represents the value of an LoD metric. The stronger the color, the lower is the metric value. | 136 |
| 7.1  | Accuracy of the prediction models represented using ROC curves . . . . .                                                                                                                                                             | 150 |

7.2 Cost-effectiveness of the Prediction Models . . . . . 152

8.1 Cause-effect diagram summarizing the main findings of the study . . . . . 161

8.2 The relationships between  $SD_{msg}$  and defect density in the IPS and BHN projects . . . . . 164

