

The Software Evolution Cup 2011 Retrospective and Results

Mircea Lungu

Things We Liked About Your Projects

> The solutions that had smart heuristics

- *Degree of confidence in a method being suspect*
- *Detectors with “veto” power*
- *“Clusters of methods”*

> Evolution Analysis

- *methods that have different LOC across the versions are likely not dead - people work on them!*

> The solutions that escalated the results

- *but also the solutions that argued why classes can't be considered dead unless one performs field analysis*

— Some really well written reports

- *We liked to see reports that talked also about the limitations*

Things We Liked About Your Projects (II)

- > Strategies that consider the possibility of getting input from the “maintainers” of the system
 - *on whether a cluster of methods are dead or not*
 - *on what are some of the entry points of the system*
- > Projects that focused on precision

Things We Liked About Your Projects (III)

> Dynamic analysis strategies

- *automatically instrumenting the classes that appear in the FAMIX models that are loaded from the disk*

> Cool new concepts

- *The “deadliest code”*
- *Undead code*

> People that got out of their comfort zone and tried new stuff

- *AspectJ*
- *Spy framework*
- *The Ecco meta-model for ecosystem analysis*

By the way, about sorting in Smalltalk...

> myCollection asSortedCollection: [:a :b | a LOC > b LOC]

Things That Tricked You

- > Methods and Classes that are called through reflection
- > Classes that were called elsewhere in the Ecosystem
- > Classes that are not referenced but are important for their hierarchy


“The team that provides the tool with the best **accuracy will be declared the winner of the Software Evolution Cup [...]”**



How we measured accuracy

- > [Accuracy is] the number of lines of code that are **correctly detected** as containing dead code **minus** the number of lines that are **incorrectly detected** as containing dead code
 - The following code is considered correctly detected dead code
 - *Code which is used elsewhere in the ecosystem but not in the projects that we gave you for analysis*
 - *Code which is only used in the test cases; it could still be dead*
 - *Results show that using combined strategies works best*

The Winner and The Runners Up

Group	Correct - Incorrect LOC	Members		Techniques
8	183	Olivier Flückiger		All
5	147	Cedric Reichenbach & Remo Diethelm		Static, Historical
3	128	Michael Rüfenacht & Simon Baumann		Static, Historical
6	92	Hervé Sierro & Frédéric Aebi		All
1	89	Mascha Kurpicz, Stefan Kodzhabashev & Samaneh Soleimani		Static, Dynamic, Historical

The “Total Recall” Alternate Definition

- > [Accuracy is] the total number of lines of code that are **correctly detected** as containing dead code
 - *We wanted to see how would the ranking have been if we did not penalize for lines of code incorrectly detected*
 - *Because the “official” definition is quite merciless and a few teams ended up with a negative overall lines of dead code*

The “Total Recall” Alternate Ranking

Group	Correct LOC	Members	Techniques
6	299	Hervé Sierro & Frédéric Aebi	All
8	194	Olivier Flückiger	All
5	168	Cedric Reichenbach & Remo Diethelm	Static, Historical
3	142	Michael Rüfenacht & Simon Baumann	Static, Historical
2	101	Julian Schelker & Roger Kohler	All

The “Swiss Precision” Alternate Definition

- > [Accuracy is] the total number of true positive artifacts detected in the Top 10
 - *Only two projects had 9 true positives in their Top 10*

The “Swiss Precision” Top Two Ranked Teams

Group	True Positive Artifacts	Members	Techniques
9	9	Simon Vogt & Markus Balsiger	All
2	9	Julian Schelker & Roger Kohler	All

Congratulations and thanks to everybody!
You did nice work.



[the winner, pass by my office to retrieve your diploma]



Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0

You are free:

- to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work
- to make derivative works
- to make commercial use of the work

Under the following conditions:



Attribution. You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor.



Share Alike. If you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under a license identical to this one.

- For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work.
- Any of these conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.

Your fair use and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/>