Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications
and other research outputs

Graph-centric tools for understanding the evolution and relationships of software structures

Conference or Workshop Item

oro.open.ac.uk

Graph-Centric Tools for Understanding the Evolution and Relationships of Software Structures

Yijun Yu   Michel Wermelinger
Computing Department & Centre for Research in Computing
The Open University, UK

Abstract

We present a suite of small tools, implemented as a pipeline of text file manipulating scripts, that, on one hand, measure the evolution of any software structure that can be represented as a directed graph of software elements and relations and, on the other hand, visualise any three attributes of any set of software artefacts that can be related to the elements shown in the graph. We illustrate the applicability of the tool with our work on the evolution of the Eclipse architecture and the relation between bugs and components.

1. Introduction

Due to their generic and flexible nature, graph-based representations have been very popular in the reverse engineering literature and tools in order to represent software elements (e.g. functions) and their relations (e.g. calls between functions). In our own work we use graphs to represent the architecture of Eclipse: nodes represent plugins and arcs represent either a compile-time or a run-time dependency.

To support our research for understanding the evolution and relationship of software structures, we developed a suite of small tools that first extract the necessary data, then compute the necessary metrics (e.g., size, fan in/out), and finally visualise the results. However, we have taken care to make the suite relatively independent of our particular needs, in order to be useful to other researchers in a variety of contexts. Therefore, instead of developing the suite as a standalone application or as an extension for a particular IDE, we have adopted a simple pipeline architecture of scripts that manipulate text files. This makes it easier for researchers to interface their own tools with ours and to replace part of the pipeline in order to better suit their needs.

The overall architecture of our tool suite is shown in Figure 1 as a set of processes that convert input data files on the left into the output data files on the right. Among the processes, *fact extractors* obtain factual relations from artifacts of a single release of the software system and store the relations in Rigi Standard Format (RSF) files. Using customised Crocopat scripts (*.rml), *fact mergers* combine facts about selected individual releases into a single fact base by expanding every relation tuple with an attribute of the release id. *Metric calculators* compute from the fact base a number of metrics, such as growth, volatility, etc. The *reporters* present the metrics and the architecture in a number of ways, including various visualisations. Finally, the *bug analysers* extract, merge, calculate and present the bug reports on top of architectural graphs.

Our tools can be downloaded from http://computing-research.open.ac.uk/sead/archev, including sample projects and datasets. The demo will emphasize the tool suite's architecture and what relations are described in each RSF file, so that the audience can understand how to adapt our tools to their needs.

2 Examples

We have reported the utility of these tools using Eclipse as a case study: in [1] we analysed how the architecture evolved, e.g. if architectural changes are confined to major releases, while in [2] we checked whether certain design principles apply over the life-time of Eclipse's architecture, e.g. if cohesion among components increased.

We extract one architectural graph per release (from 1.0 till 3.3.1.1), using Eclipse's XML metadata files about its plugins. This is sufficient for our purposes, besides being much ore efficient than parsing source code.

In Eclipse, a module can be a single plugin or a component (group of plugins). The architecture is defined as a graph of compile-time or run-time dependencies between modules. Since any graph is represented by a binary adjacency relation in a RSF file, we wrote a simple converter to show a static graph in a tool like graphviz. However, we can also make use of animated graphs to show the evolution of the architectures throughout releases, using graph exploration systems such as Guess and CCVisu.

We also wish to see how bugs are related to components, e.g. which components have more critical bugs, and how

Figure 1. Overview of our toolset

bugs are reported and resolved, e.g. if severe bugs are reported first and if bugs are resolved by priority. Towards that end, we developed a compact visualisation to represent the hundreds of bugs reported for a component: within the corresponding component node in the graph, each bug is represented by a pixel while the hue, saturation and brightness (HSB) of the pixel represent bug attributes like status, priority and severity. Our scripts allow for any kind of element (in our case, bugs) to be associated to a graph's nodes, and for any element attribute to be represented by any of the three HSB dimensions.

In Figure 2 we chose an assignment that highlights the most important bugs, by using a red hue for new and reopened bugs, full saturation for highest priority and full brightness for highest severity. The figure shows the compile-time architecture of Eclipse components, and within each component, bugs are ordered by status, from unconfirmed bugs in red to re-opened bugs in pink. The majority of darker and less saturated colours indicates that most bugs have low severity and priority, respectively. Moreover, the size of each bitmap immediately shows which components had more bugs reported. A full-size figure can be found on http://mcs.open.ac.uk/yy66/wcre08.

References

[1] M. Wermelinger and Y. Yu. Analyzing the evolution of eclipse plugins. In *Proc. 5th Working Conf. on Mining Software Repositories*, pages 133–136. ACM, 2008.

[2] M. Wermelinger, Y. Yu, and A. Lozano. Design principles in architectual evolution: A case study. In *Proc. 24th Int'l Conf. on Software Maintenance*. IEEE, 2008. To appear.

Figure 2. Annotating the Eclipse architecture graph with bugs reports