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Abstract

We provide an evaluation of 15 software visualization tools applicable to corrective maintenance. The tasks supported as well as the techniques used are presented and graded based on the support level. By analyzing user acceptance of current tools, we aim to help developers to select what to consider, avoid or improve in their next releases. Tool users can also recognize what to broadly expect (and what not) from such tools, thereby supporting an informed choice for the tools evaluated here and for similar tools.

1 Introduction

Several studies have advocated the use of software visualization tools for corrective maintenance (CM) [Baecker et al. 1997; Swanson 1976]. However, although several tool surveys exist on the Internet, it is still hard to answer the questions "does this tool fit my user profile, context, and needs?" (for tool users) and "what do the users most (dis)like in a tool?" (for tool developers). In a previous study [Sensalire and Ogao 2007b], we collected feedback from software engineers who used such tools for program understanding in general, and extracted several desirable features of SoftVis tools. In this paper, we refine and focus the set of desirable features on SoftVis tools for CM. We aim to guide users in selecting SoftVis tools for CM, based on their desirable features, either from the tools discussed here or from a larger, more general, set. Next, we aim to discover possible correlations between perceived tool acceptance levels and the usage of certain visual techniques, to further clarify what makes a tool accepted (or not).

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 overviews related work. Section 3 presents our classification model for desirable tool features. Section 4 presents the evaluated tools and evaluation procedure (Sec. 5). Section 6 discusses our evaluation results. Section 7 concludes the paper.

2 Related Work

Price et al. [Price et al. 1993] compared 12 tools against 6 desirable features categories: scope, content, form, method, interaction and effectiveness. The tools were however not related to a single application area. Maletic et al. [Maletic et al. 2002] compared 5 software tools along 5 axes: task, audience, target, representation, and medium. Similar to Price et al., the scope of this taxonomy and tools is quite broad. Since a tool’s audience strongly depends on its purposes [Maletic et al. 2002], evaluating similar-purpose tools would be more insightful [Koschke 2003]. Here, Storey et al. [Storey and German 2005] compared 12 tools that provide awareness of human activities during software development against the categories of intent, information, presentation, interaction and effectiveness. In corrective maintenance, Baecker et al. analyzed three classes of SoftVis techniques used for debugging [Baecker et al. 1997]: animation, improved typographic representations, and error sonification. Earlier, we evaluated ten general-purpose SoftVis software-understanding tools [Sensalire and Ogao 2007a]. This evaluation forms the basis of our extended study of SoftVis tools for CM.

3 Classification Model

We classify SoftVis tools using four categories of desirable features: Effectiveness, Tasks supported, Techniques used and Availability. These features and the scales their presence is measured on are derived from several user interviews [Sensalire and Ogao 2007b]. We use either a low, medium, high scale or a simpler yes, no scale, as described next.

3.1 Category A: Effectiveness

An effective tool arguably helps users to solve the problems it was designed to assist with. Effectiveness is task-specific, hence hard to measure in general. Yet, we identified three non-functional properties that effective SoftVis tools should have, as follows.

Scalability: A scalable tool supports CM tasks on systems of millions of LOC and/or thousands of classes and/or source files. Tools created for educational purposes, proof-of-concept, or research prototypes are given low; high if they support large-scale code (as defined above); and medium if falling in between.

Integration: This measures how easily several tools can be switched and exchange data to complete a given task in an IDE or similar setup. A tool that input and output data from/to other tools, and also senses and displays data changes, is given high. Tools that co-exist in an IDE but do not actively exchange data and/or events with peer tools are given medium. Standalone tools are given low.

Query support: Tools that work in batch mode are given low. Tools that support just lexical queries get medium. Tools that correlate queries and visualizations (query highlighting) or use complex queries (e.g., syntax-aware or type-based) get high.

3.2 Category B: Tasks supported

We consider the following tasks: detecting code smells, code refactoring, trace analysis, and debugging support. While not exhaustive, these are typical for CM, and also well understood by our interviewed users.

Detecting code smells / Refactoring: Code smells signal bad programming, design, or code, and are often used to drive refactoring. Tools that support neither refactoring nor code smells detection, e.g. debuggers, get low. Tools that can detect smells but do not suggest
how to correct these, e.g. static analyzers, get medium. Tools that detect and suggest how to correct smells get high.

**Trace analysis:** Traces are defined as data gathered during a program’s execution. Tools that can neither generate nor show traces get low. Tools that generate but cannot display traces, e.g. profilers, or display but not generate traces, e.g. data viewers, get medium. Tools that generate and display traces get high.

**Debugging support:** Tools that do basic debugging, e.g. breakpoints, code stepping, and simple text watches, get low. Tools that show higher-level debugging facts, e.g. bug or testcase data, get medium. Tools that show both low and high-level debugging data, or relate bugs to actions carried out to remove them, get high.

### 3.3 Category C: Availability

Availability relates to the programming languages a tool supports, whether it is free or commercial, and the platform on which it runs. A tool must be available to evaluate it, so we do not grade this aspect, but just provide a textual description.

### 3.4 Category D: Techniques used

Assessing the types (and presence degree) of techniques used in a SoftVis tool can shed light on usability and ease of learning. Following previous taxonomies [Maletic et al. 2002] and user feedback [Sensalire and Ogao 2007b], we consider the following techniques:

- **2D or 3D Graphics** 2D graphics (present: yes-no) is sometimes seen as less expressive than 3D, but can be easier to learn and use. 3D graphics, measured on the same scale, can display more data, but may come with additional usability costs.

- **Animation** Animation can be used to show dynamic data, e.g. traces or code evolution. Effects such as smooth zooming and panning are here not considered animations.

- **Color usage** Tools that do not use color, e.g. command-line ones, are given low. Using a few saturated hues, e.g. to display categorical values, gives a medium. Tools that use blending for multivariate data display or color mapping of continuous value ranges get high.

- **User interaction** Tools that show static views get low. Tools that support a single task via user interaction, e.g. adjust a layout with the mouse [Source-Navigator-Team 2007], get medium. Tools that support two or more tasks by two or more medium-graded techniques, e.g. direct mouse manipulation and rubberbanding, get high.

- **Multiple views** Tools that use a single view get low. Several not-linked views are given a medium. Several linked views get a high.

- **Information density** Quantifies the amount of artifacts (e.g. code lines, classes, functions, or files) drawn per screen unit. For example, a text editor has low density, a UML browser medium density, and a dense-pixel treemap high density.

- **Navigation** We measure navigation options (panning, scrolling, zooming and viewpoint change) using a yes, no scale.

- **Dynamic visualization** Dynamic visualizations can display data generated on-the-fly while a program is running, e.g. debugging or tracing data. We use here a yes, no scale.

### 4 Evaluated Tools

We evaluated our desirable features on the following tools.

**Allinea DDT** debugs scalar, multi-threaded large-scale parallel applications. Visualization is used mainly to control program execution.

**CodeRush with RefactorPro** is a Visual Studio add-on that enables code refactoring by providing change options with hints visually within the code.

**CodePro AnalytiX** is an Eclipse plugin that provides code coverage analysis, dependency analysis, and visual report generation.

**Code Coverage** is a Java NetBeans plugin that colors code based on low coverage.

**CVSgrab** uses customizable dense pixel displays to correlate project activity from code repositories and bug data from a Bugzilla database.

**Gammatella** does remote monitoring by combining execution-metric-colored treemaps and SeeSoft-like views.

**JBIXBE** simplifies debugging of multi-threaded code, combining classical breakpoints, step-mode execution, and watches with execution flowcharts and UML-like class diagrams.

**JIVE** supports runtime analysis and code debugging using forward and backward stepping and visualizes execution history using interactive UML sequence diagrams.

**JSwat** provides debugging by a combination of standard IDE-like breakpoints, watches, and visualizations.

**Paraver** visualizes program traces using 2D dense pixel displays similar to CVSgrab.

**Project Analyzer** is an IDE that uses syntax highlighting and multiple code views to aid checking for error proneness as well as guiding on ways in which to improve the code.

**Source Navigator** provides syntax-highlighted and graph-based views to show code symbols and syntax relations, and also several grep-based queries.

**STAN** is an Eclipse plugin offering linked graph views, metric-colored treemaps, and metric histograms to understand and detect design flaws.

**Tarantula** helps finding faults or problems at code level, using a SeeSoft-like code coloring to show test pass or fail.

**VB Watch** provides code testing and debugging using multiple text views, metrics histograms, and metric-annotated call graphs.

### 5 Tools Evaluation

Our study participants were 16 professional developers, 12 male and 4 female. Only two had used a SoftVis tool before (Table 1). We used a pre-study questionnaire to select users having good skills (over 4 years in maintenance) and being fluent in 2 or 3 programming languages. We assigned tool groups to users matching the tools’ programming language and platform to the ones best known by the respective user, as follows: VBWatch, CodeRush (G1); JIVE, JBIXE, Source Navigator (G2); Allinea, Paraver, Code Coverage (G3); Project Analyzer, CodePro AnalytiX (G4); Tarantula, Gammatella (G5); CVSgrab (G6); and JSwat, STAN (G7).

Four source code bases were studied: ArgoUML for Java tools, the network simulator as 2 [Henderson 2008] for C++ tools, a proprietary code base for VB tools, and the ArgoUML and Visualization Toolkit repositories for CVSgrab. After a 15-minute tutorial, the participants performed six generic tasks to assess the tools’ capabilities for (a) Scalability, (b) Integration, (c) Query support, (d) Detecting code smells, (e) Trace analysis, and (f) Debugging, as follows:

- a. Analyze code for errors or error-proneness, from classes to files to packages to the whole project;
- b. Change code using a tool, analyze effects using other tools;
Table 1: Evaluation participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User</th>
<th>Languages known</th>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>Years in maintenance</th>
<th>Tool group evaluated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VB, Java, C#</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VB, C#</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Java, C++</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Java, C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C, C++, Java, C#</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>C++, Java</td>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>C++, VB, Java</td>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VB, Java, C#</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C++, Java</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C, VB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>C++, Java</td>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>C++, Java</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>C, Java, C++</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>C, Java, C#</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>C, Python, Java</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Evaluation Results

Tables 2 and 3 show the desirable features and supported techniques obtained by averaging the given grades for each tool.

Tool acceptance was heavily influenced by the amount of user interaction provided. Too little interaction impairs usability. Too much interaction makes learning hard, thus affecting usability too. This correlates with our earlier study [Sensalire and Ogao 2007b], where users disliked tools asking a lot of input before showing any output. Also, tools that did not enable users to tune at all the final images (layout, colors, annotations) were not desired.

Over half of the participants questioned the need for SoftVis tools, and mentioned their preference for the Eclipse IDE, feeling that it would suffice for their CM tasks. This supports the idea that new SoftVis tools should show clear advantages as compared to existing ‘plain’ IDEs. An evaluation such as the ours is relevant in proving the level to which a tool lives up to its claims. A lack of such studies may create skepticism on the users’ side. Tool developers can use the users’ IDE attachment to their benefit, by creating tools that plug into an IDE, or using the IDE metaphor in organizing visualizations. For example, the STAN tool was found natural as its visualizations follow the Eclipse displays. Five of the participants felt that education had a major role in industrial tool adoption, saying that they would have been more motivated to use SoftVis tools in their work if they had been exposed to them during their undergraduate training.

The preciseness of answering queries was ranked as very important. A tighter integration between analysis and presentation, as well as too integration, were deemed as extremely desirable by all users. Tool integration has a direct relation to the tool’s user interface and as such influences the tool’s usability. When a tool is integrated with an IDE, a familiar user interface is provided to the software developer as the menus for the new tool are incorporated within the existing IDE. Standalone tools, on the other hand, present a new learning challenge to the user, thereby reducing the ease of use. The medium to high levels of integration observed in our evaluation may be due to the ease with which Java engines enable data extraction and analysis. Hence, future tool developers can choose to support Java or may choose instead to exploit the lower support of other languages, e.g. C++, so as to develop tools for them.

Visual scalability, or information density, is not high in most tools. This can limit user acceptance. High information density allows one to monitor more at a given time, which is important for high-volume dynamic data such as traces, but also large code bases. Yet, very high density tools, e.g. CVSgrab, were quite hard to learn. This may prove an initial acceptance blocker. Overall, we believe tool developers should use multiscale methods to allow users to flexibly select the data amount shown at a given time.

6.1 Comparison with program comprehension studies

We now correlate our results with [Vans et al. 1999] who observed developers during industrial CM tasks. The CM actions involved chunking and hypothesis generation at different abstraction levels. Hence, SoftVis tools that support CM should let users view more abstraction levels to enable hypothesis generation. To (dis)prove a hypothesis, this further requires tool query support and query-view integration. Inability to query large code also makes it hard to do efficient chunking. Additional factors crucial in showing many abstraction levels are the multiple view support and IDE integration for inter-view navigation. Six of the 15 tools evaluated had high query support, while 8 tools had medium support. Most tools therefore tend towards high query support which is the preferred mode for CM [Sensalire and Ogao 2007b; Vans et al. 1999]. Maintenance professionals had varying information needs depending on expertise [Vans et al. 1999], most experienced ones tending to favor precise searches. This emphasizes the need for refined, high query support in SoftVis tools for CM. As program comprehension is an essential part of (corrective) maintenance, a further comparison of SoftVis tools in this area with studies of program comprehension tools would bring additional information.

7 Conclusions

We evaluated fifteen SoftVis tools that support corrective maintenance. Our aim was to detect patterns that can guide tool users and developers in their choice of tool to use or techniques to support. The patterns observed from the evaluation were further correlated with results on a program comprehension study in CM. Several features (IDE integration, scalability, multiple views, and query support) were strongly required by all users and provided by increasingly many tools. Some other features (3D, animation) were less present. This raises several open questions:

a) Do users reject 3D and animation in SoftVis tools for CM or are developers reluctant to provide them?

b) Would developers expose their tools in their early training be more willing to use them in their profession work?

c) When developing SoftVis tools for CM, when should the views of practicing professional be mainly involved: at the point of idea conception; during tool development; or when
Table 2: Tools against desirable features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOOLS</th>
<th>2D</th>
<th>3D</th>
<th>Animation</th>
<th>Color usage</th>
<th>User interaction</th>
<th>Multi views</th>
<th>Info. density</th>
<th>Navigation</th>
<th>Dynamic viz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alline DDT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CodeRush</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CodePro Analytix</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Coverage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVSSgrab</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gammatella</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBIXBE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIVE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSwat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraver</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Analyzer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Navigator</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAN</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranumla</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB Watch v2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Tools against techniques used

the tool is fully functional? Involvement at all points, although desirable, may not be practically feasible.

Future work includes refining the analysis on a set of specific tasks and sample code bases in order to provide a more quantitative evaluation of the tools’ abilities to address their tasks. A second direction is to extend our evaluation of SoftVis tools to adaptive, perfective and preventive maintenance.
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