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Motivation

Are there fundamental time-lag relationships among software production factors?

Can they be harnessed to improve software development?
Empirical Studies of Software Development

Typical investigated relationships in software, e.g., size and defects

- Are caused by external-to-software factors
  - Short term trends: product adoption, extent of usage
  - Long term trends: world economy, business practice, technology

- Have unclear mechanism of action

- Typically not usable in practice
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Investigating SW evolution by observing only software

≡

Divining reality from shadows on a cave wall
Proposed Solution

- Investigate short-term and recurring relationships with a clear mechanism originating from the way software is created and used
- Use information from outside software development cave
- Answer actual software engineering questions
  - How to to evaluate the effectiveness of QA practices?
    - e.g., by comparing two releases of software
  - Do easy-to-get measures, e.g., defects, approximate quality?
Approach

- Start from clear assumptions
- Observe fundamental relationships
- Validate
- Build more complex propositions using validated relationships

Define: *Bug*  
A user-observed (and reported) program behavior (e.g., failure) that results in a code change.

Define: *Action Will Introduce a Bug*  
Action will increase the chances of a *Bug* occurring in the future.
Assumed background knowledge

Developers create software by making changes to code
- All changes are recorded by a Version Control System
- A release of software is simply a dynamic superposition of changes

Before:

```c
int i = n;
while(i++)
    printf(" %d", i--);
```

one line deleted

two lines added

two lines unchanged

After:

```c
//print n integers
int i = n;
while(i++ && i > 0)
    printf(" %d", i--);
```
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Other attributes: date, developer, defect number,
submit comment: e.g, “Fix bug 3987 - crashing when menu item is selected”
First Fundamental Law of Software Evolution

Formulation
Code change will introduce bugs

Mechanism

- New code has defects
- New code exercises existing code differently
- Program behavior changes

Note: platform changes cause code changes

Evidence

- New releases bring new bugs
- Model: a business-driven feature implementation code change leads to $N \sim Poisson(\lambda)$ fixes with delay $T \sim Exp(\mu)$ [1]
Model prediction for one release

![Graph showing weekly changes in person weeks for different types of changes over calendar weeks from 2001 to 2002. The graph includes lines for new feature changes, actual fix changes, and predicted fix changes.]
Model prediction for 11 releases (using earlier release)

- - - Actual fix changes

--- New feature changes

--- Predicted fix changes
Corollary 1: Need to Normalize by Change to Obtain Quality

How to normalize by change?

- Divide by the number of pre-release changes
- Divide by the LOC added or changed

Hypothesis 1

Increase ↑ in the number of customer-found defects per pre-release change (a simple-to-obtain measure) affects users’ perception of software quality negatively ↓
Qualitative evidence: No

Quotes from a quality manager

“**we tried to improve quality:** get most experienced team members to test, do code inspections, conduct root cause analysis, ...”

“**Did it work?** i.e., is this release better than previous one?”

Everyone uses **defect density** (e.g., customer reported defects per 1000 changes or lines of code), but “it **does not reflect** the feedback from customers.”
Let’s Peek Outside the Software Development Cave
Does the increase in
the number of users and
the amount of usage
introduce bugs?
Second Fundamental Law of Software Evolution

Formulation
Deploying to more users will introduce bugs

Mechanism
- New use profiles
- Different environments

Evidence

Release with no users has no bugs
Third Fundamental Law of Software Evolution

Formulation
Longer (and heavier) use will introduce bugs

Mechanism

- New inputs and use cases are encountered over longer periods
- More extreme environmental conditions happen over longer periods

Evidence

- Bugs tend to be encountered even after year(s) of usage
- See Commandments below
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Does every user and every year of usage introduce the same number of bugs?
Commandment 1: Don’t Install Right After the Release Date

Formulation
Users who install close to the release date will introduce more bugs

Mechanism
- Later users get builds with patches
- Services team understands better how to install/configure properly
- Workarounds for many issues are discovered

Evidence

![Graph showing fraction of customers observing SW issue over time](image)

- Quality ↑ with time after the launch, and is an order of magnitude better one year later [2]
Commandment 2: Don’t Panic After Install/Upgrade

Formulation
A user will introduce more bugs close to their install/upgrade date

Mechanism
- Software is not hardware: parts do not wear off
- Misconfiguration or incompatibility with the environment

Evidence

- Two thirds of customer issues (leading to a software fix) are reported within three months of install
- Sample: 87 release/product combinations
Corollary 1: Customer Quality

Formulation

Software release quality from users perspective is the fraction of:

- The number of users reporting a bug shortly after the installation over
- The number of users who install soon after the release date
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Formulation
Software release quality from users perspective is the fraction of:

- The number of users reporting a bug shortly after the installation over
- The number of users who install soon after the release date

“We live or die by this measure”

VP for quality
Testing Hypothesis 1: Defect Density Reflects Customer Quality
Testing Hypothesis 1: Defect Density Reflects Customer Quality

![Graph showing customer defects per pre-release change and percentage of customers with defects within 3 months of install.]

- Black line: Customer Defects Per Pre-Release Change
- Red dashed line: % of customers with defect within 3m. of install
Testing Hypothesis 1: Defect Density Reflects Customer Quality

- Better: Customer Defects Per Pre-Release Change
- Worse: % of customers with defect within 3m. of install

Customer Defects Per Pre-Release Change:
- M1: r1.1
- M2: r1.2
- M3: r1.3
- M4: r2.0
- M5: r2.1
- M6: r2.2

% of customers with defect within 3m. of install:
- C1: r1.1
- C2: r1.2
- C3: r1.3
- C4: r2.0
- C5: r2.1
- C6: r2.2
Testing Hypothesis 1: Defect Density Reflects Customer Quality

![Graph showing customer defects per pre-release change and percentage of customers with defects within 3 months of install. The graph indicates trends that suggest better or worse quality over different release versions.](image-url)
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![Graph showing customer defects per pre-release change and percentage of customers with defects within 3 months of install.](image)

- **Customer Defects Per Pre-Release Change**
- **% of customers with defect within 3m. of install**
Testing Hypothesis 1: Defect Density Reflects Customer Quality

Perfect anti-correlation?!
Trying Another Product

Perfect anti-correlation again?!
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Why customers like high defect density?
Why customers like high defect density?
Why customers like high defect density?

Customers don’t care about defect density

- Most customers try to avoid bugs
  - By not jumping to a major dot zero release
  - By not installing immediately when new release is available

Software salesmen don’t care about defect density

- They want their customers to avoid bugs
  - By warning about products that are likely to cause problems

Software support people don’t care about defect density

- They want their customers to report as few problems as possible
  - By delaying wide installation of new releases
Lemma 1: Major Releases Have Few Customers

Minor releases have two to five times more customers

Note: based on 38 major and 49 minor releases in 22 products
Commandment 3
Thou Shalt Have a Constant Rate of Customer Issues

Mechanism

- The only thing customers like less than a Bug is
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Commandment 3
Thou Shalt Have a Constant Rate of Customer Issues

Mechanism

- The only thing customers like less than a Bug is
  - The bug that does not get fixed for a long time
- Team handling customer issues can not expand and collapse instantaneously and has limited throughput

Evidence

Monthly numbers of new customer issues is relatively constant
Law of Minor Release

Formulation
Minor releases have high defect density but low chances that any given customer will observe a defect.

Definition
Major Releases Have More Code Change

Mechanism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CQ</strong></td>
<td><strong>Defect Density</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected systems</td>
<td>Customer reported defects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay constant</td>
<td>The size of the release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems installed within 7m of GA</td>
<td>Effort/Changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stay constant
Move in opposite directions
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**Formulation**
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Law of Minor Release

**Formulation**
Minor releases have high defect density but low chances that any given customer will observe a defect.

**Definition**
Major Releases Have More Code Change

**Mechanism**

| Numerator       | Denominator
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| **CQ**          | **Defect Density**
| Affected systems | Customer reported defects |
| Stay constant   | The size of the release |
| Move in opposite directions | Effort/Changes |
| Systems installed within 7m of GA |                 |
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Discussion

- There exist Laws of Software Evolution, but
  - Focus on short-term, repeating relationships with a clear mechanism
  - Look outside SW cave to observe them
  - Chose practical questions

- Practice hints
  - Development process view does not represent customer views
  - Maintenance — the most important quality improvement activity
Audris Mockus, David M. Weiss, and Ping Zhang.
Understanding and predicting effort in software projects.

Audris Mockus, Ping Zhang, and Paul Li.
Drivers for customer perceived software quality.
Abstract

The traditional view of software quality focuses on counting bugs — issues that are observed and reported by users and implemented as changes to the source code. Fewer bugs intuitively (and obviously) imply higher software quality. This hasty conclusion, however, ignores complex equilibrium resulting from actions of different groups of participants in software production: developers, users, support, and sales. For example, users improve software quality by discovering and reporting defects that are too costly to be discovered otherwise. As new functionality is delivered in major releases, quality conscious users often stay on the sidelines until a second minor release delivers properly working features, bug fixes, and stability improvements. The major releases, being of lower quality, have fewer users and, consequently, fewer bugs. I will discuss several fundamental laws of software production system that explain this paradox in a quantitative manner. Each law has a clear mechanism of action, is grounded in resource and physical constraints, and is empirically validated. The laws provide guidelines on how to measure, understand, and improve quality of software.
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