Abstract

Integrating ecosystem data into developer tools can be very beneficial but is usually complicated. By automating the routine parts of this task we can reduce the amount of work needed to develop these tools. We have developed a framework that allows developers to quickly develop new tools that use ecosystem data. This framework automates the execution of user-defined analyses on ecosystem projects, allowing the developer to focus only on what ecosystem data is needed for her tool and how to present it.
Finally, we discuss the limitations of the framework as well as interesting directions for future work and improvements in Section 4.

2 Class clash prevention tool

To better understand the process of developing ecosystem-aware tools we discuss how to implement a simple tool we call “Class clash preventer”.

Pharo Smalltalk does not have a concept of namespace. This means that different projects could define a class with the same name, which could cause problems if such project needed to co-exist in the same image. We call this a class clash. Class clash prevention tool\(^1\) is an ecosystem-aware tool that informs a developer if a newly created class shares a name with another class in the ecosystem, thus preventing later class clashes.

All ecosystem-aware tools that leverage EMF are developed in 3 steps: developing the back end, registering the back end with EMF and developing the front end. At no point is the developer concerned about the scope or structure of the ecosystem, as this is defined in advance as part of EMF. The following subsections describe each of the steps in general and the case of the Class Clash prevention tool.

2.1 Back end

The role of the back end part of a ecosystem-aware tool is to gather relevant data from the ecosystem and store it for later access by a front end. In the case of the class clash prevention tool relevant data consists of class names from all ecosystem projects mapped to the name of the project that defines it.

EMF offers an API to obtain a list of project classes and the project name, so creating such a mapping is trivial. Since the default database in EMF is MongoDB we store this data as JSON documents represented in Pharo Smalltalk as Dictionary objects. EMF provides an API for storing the data to MongoDB. All the functionality of the class clash prevention tool back end is wrapped in the `emfPoweredAnalysis` method of the `ClassClashDataGatherer` class whose source code is shown in Listing 1. This method iterates over all classes of the project (lines 4–5) and creates a new entry for the database (lines 7–11) which encodes the relation between the class name and the project name. Finally, the entries are stored to the database at the end (line 12).

\footnotesize

\begin{verbatim}
1 ClassClashDataGatherer>>emfPoweredAnalysis
2 | toBeStoredToDb |
3 toBeStoredToDb := OrderedCollection new.
4 EMFUtils projectClasses
5 do: [:pc | 
6 | classToProject |
7 classToProject := Dictionary new
8 at: 'className' put: pc name;
9 at: 'project' put: EMFUtils projectName;
10 yourself.
11 toBeStoredToDb add: classToProject . ].
12 self saveToDB: toBeStoredToDb.
\end{verbatim}

Listing 1: Implementation of the class clash prevention tool back end.

2.2 Config file

EMF uses an XML configuration file to describe the steps needed to perform an analysis on a project. The configuration file for the class clash prevention tool is shown in Listing 2. This configuration contains only one target (lines 2–16) as it is used only for the class clash prevention tool. The XML schema allows multiple targets to be specified, one for each analysis. This target has a “pre” step (lines 4–10), specifying the Gofer\(^2\) script that loads the source code of the back end of the tool described in subsection 2.1 and an “analysis” step (lines 12–15) specifying how to run the loaded back end code by invoking the `emfPoweredAnalysis` method on an instance of `ClassClashDataGatherer`. Since no post processing is needed for this tool, the “post” step is absent from the configuration.

Once this configuration file provided to the EMF, all the specified steps from the configuration file, and thus all the analyses, will be run once a week to gather fresh data from the ecosystem.

\footnotesize

\begin{verbatim}
1 http://smalltalkhub.com/#!/~spasojev/ClassClash http://smalltalkhub.com/#!/~spasojev/ClassClashFrontEnd
2 http://pharobooks.gforge.inria.fr/PharoByExampleTwo-Eng/latest/Gofer.pdf
\end{verbatim}
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Listing 2: EMF configuration file for the class clash prevention tool.

2.3 Front end
Once the EMF data gatherer runs, and the data is gathered by the class clash prevention tool back end, it is available for serving by the data providing module of EMF. At this point, the front end of the class clash prevention tool can function. We implement the front end as a plugin for Nautilus\(^3\) which reacts to a new class being created. Once that event is detected, the front end sends the name of the new class to the data providing module which returns from the database a list of all projects that contain a class with that name. This list is then presented to the developer.

3 Ecosystem-aware tools
In this section we describe the ecosystem-aware tools we developed using EMF. We developed these tools in order to demonstrate the versatility of EMF and to verify that it does satisfy the requirements of a unified framework for ecosystem-aware tools.

3.1 Ecosystem-aware type inference
Dynamically typed languages lack information about the types of variables in the source code. Developers care about this information as it supports program comprehension. Basic type inference techniques are helpful, but may yield many false positives or negatives.

In ecosystem-aware type inference we track how many times messages are sent to instances of available types throughout the source code for all available projects from the ecosystem. This means that the back end of the ecosystem-aware type inference builds a weighted mapping from types to selectors, where the weight is the number of times a message with that selector was sent to an instance of that class.

We use this information in the front end to sort the potential types of a variable the developer cares about based on their likelihood of being the actual type in the context. The likelihood is computed based on how many times the messages sent to this variable have been observed to be sent to each potential type throughout the ecosystem. Using EMF, we implemented a prototype and used it to evaluate the approach. We show that, for our implementation, measuring the frequency of association between a message and a type throughout the ecosystem source code is helpful in identifying correct types.

3.2 Frequently used methods
Software developers are often unsure of the exact name of the method they need to use to invoke the desired behavior in a given context. This results in a process of searching for the correct method name in documentation, which can be lengthy and distracting to the developer.

\(^3\)http://smalltalkhub.com/#!/~Pharo/Nautilus
We can decrease the method search time by enhancing the documentation of a class with the most frequently used methods. Usage frequency for methods is gathered by analyzing other projects from the same ecosystem.

Using EMF, we implemented a proof of concept of the approach. We use the same data gathered for the ecosystem-aware type inference, but a different front end. Since methods are commonly searched for using a system browser called Nautilus, we developed a plugin for it which adds a section with the most commonly used methods for the currently observed class.

3.3 Ecosystem-aware type guessing

A common practice when writing Smalltalk source code is to name method arguments in a way that hints at their expected type (i.e., aString, anInteger, aDictionary). This practice makes code more readable and some tools (such as the auto complete feature in the Pharo Smalltalk code editor) improve the developer experience by “guessing” the type of the method argument based on these hints.

Using EMF we gather argument names throughout the ecosystem and generate a weekly report containing information about commonly used ones. This report can be used by the Type-guessing tool developer to include heuristics for better type guessing. Used these reports we developed heuristics that improved Pharo type-guesser by almost 40%.

3.4 Object repository

Unlike the previously described ecosystem-aware tools, which are augmentations of existing tools with ecosystem data, the Object Repository is just a back end for multiple potential front ends. The main idea behind the Object Repository is to enable front end tools to have “Objects on demand”. This means that the Object Repository mines, from the ecosystem, code snippets that, when executed, produce an instance of some class. These snippets are then stored and mapped to the class they can instantiate. A front end needs only to provide a class name, and the Object Repository will provide all available snippets that instantiate that class. These snippets have many potential use cases in software documentation, testing, program comprehension etc.

Our proof of concept implementation of the Object Repository relies on brute force execution of code segments obtained through converting AST nodes of methods to source code. We show that applying the proposed approach to the Pharo ecosystem, as defined in EMF, results in an Object Repository that can instantiate almost 80% of the available classes in these projects.

4 Discussion and open questions

In order to provide fresh data to the front end tools, EMF has to periodically re-run all the analyses on new versions of source code. In our implementation we chose a one week interval, but for some tools and some quickly evolving ecosystems this might not be enough. The main challenge here is that if we wish to have completely fresh data we need to re-run the analyses on every commit to every project in the ecosystem. This is especially problematic if the projects are hosted by a third party (e.g., github, smalltalkhub) which are not willing to give us notifications and full access at every commit, requiring us to poll these repositories for changes. One way this issue could be solved is if the code hosting providers offered a cloud solution for running analyses on the source code. Much like other “infrastructure as a service” solutions this should offer tool developers access to computing machines with preloaded source code of required projects, allowing the developer access to fresh data and providing a source of monetization for the hosting service.

If we manage to obtain every commit in real time there is still the issue that for every commit we need to re-analyze the entire ecosystem. Alternatively, we could express the analyses in such a way as to operate on single commits (i.e., “diffs” in the source code) which would make them much less elegant and understandable. Further we could define on a model of the ecosystem which is easier to update in real time and have the analyses be expressed in terms of that model, relying on source code only when absolutely necessary. In time, the model would have to be updated as new user needs are identified.

Another open question is how to define the scope of an ecosystem. In our implementation we relied on a human maintained meta-repository to define our ecosystem. It would be interesting to try to find a way to express certain constraints that would define the ecosystem of interest e.g., all projects using a particular library or framework. This ecosystem definition would allow to automatically extend or shrink the ecosystem scope as the individual projects evolve e.g., adopt or abandon the library we are interested in.

The main challenge for adoption is that EMF is, in its current form, limited to Pharo Smalltalk. In order to port it to more popular languages such as Java we would need a concise and expressive way to analyse the
source code of Java projects. Smalltalk has the advantage that, due to its high reflectivity and being partly self-implementing, analyses can be written in Smalltalk itself, operating on the source code of the project in question. This is mainly not true for other languages, and we would need to use additional tools (e.g., Moose or Rascal) to analyse the source code.

In the future, it might also be worthwhile considering porting EMF to cross language ecosystems e.g., the JVM ecosystem — the ecosystem of all languages that compile to Java byte code. This raises a whole new set of questions and challenges regarding interlanguage analysis, mapping concepts from one language to another, etc. Many of these can be addressed by using a language agnostic meta-model (e.g., Famix) but using any model reduces the amount of available information so finding the right level of abstraction is imperative.

Finally, we still need a comprehensive study on user needs when it comes to ecosystem-aware tools. The tools we developed were based on our own intuition and, even though our analyses show that ecosystem data improves these tools, future work would be best served by finding exact user needs, and ensuring that EMF can support tools that tackle those problems.

With all this said, we can still conclude that EMF is an easier way of developing ecosystem-aware tools. It frees the developer from the routine parts, and allows her to focus on what makes her new tool unique and useful. Also, the tools we developed using it support its applicability to a wide range of problems.
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