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Abstract
For evolving object oriented software, the design changes are the critical factor. A reverse engineering technique should exploit whatever information is available concerning the changes of a piece of code. The change based reverse engineering would be more scaleable, because it focus reverse engineering efforts on changing pieces of code instead of the full code base. The research involves in implementing a modular reverse engineering technique for Object oriented Medium sized projects designed through UML for Java environment. The research analyze the drift in design from the earlier version of the software to the current version after a Quality indication supplied by the Design Phase Tool. The Design Phase Tool assists Reverse engineering tasks as it supplies the change information in the software which was captured in the design stage itself for later verification. The research takes critical analysis of the following object oriented metrics, class size, method size, Design size, Inheritance. The research differs from...
Moose metrics, which is a related work in Reverse engineering in that it gives more emphasis on reliable statistical information for analysis and also the ease of implementation to the Development environment. The research has implemented the Reverse engineering procedure through an extension to its existing research model Design Phase Tool developed with Java.
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### 1. Introduction

#### 1.1 Reverse Engineering

The research has intended on the reverse engineering of object-oriented legacy systems, most of the software systems are perform this model, Furthermore, initial adopters of object oriented technology are influential that the benefits they expected to recognize by exchange to objects have been very difficult to understand and locate themselves with hard by and upcoming legacy systems affect with object-oriented technology. The notion of mathematical foundation to recognize grouping of objects that have general features is adopted [19]. It has proved useful for understanding object-oriented programs. The model is well-established in the software engineering environment. [1atics] They conferred concepts lattice suitable for understanding object-oriented programs. They provide some insights into the relation following the high-level associations between the components. They also highlight the potential application of this new approach by providing an illustration for cylindrical lattice representations.

To remove redundancy and to use data transformation to improve two techniques of software quality assessment: derive threshold values and fault classification using the derived metrics. Data distribution has been used before to identify thresholds values using the mean and the standard deviation. They use redundancy removal technique in dataset to reduce problem of over-fitting and scaling. The derived thresholds were used to classify classes are compared such as polymorphism, late-binding, incremental class definitions, etc.

#### 1.2 General Approaches to Reverse Engineering

The purpose of a reverse engineering a software system is to build progressively more advanced models of the system [STOR 99] to be able to make up to date decisions regarding the software. While this is not a complex system for small software systems, where code reading and examination is often enough, in the case of legacy software systems which lean to be large – hundreds of thousands or millions of lines of poorly documented code are no exception – this becomes a hard problem because of their sheer size, complexity, and because of the problems make miserable such systems [PARN 94]. he reverse engineer must gather information about the system in order to build a progressively refined mental model of a software system.
Moreover, at the beginning of a reverse engineering process one does not find the complete information, only a general view of the system can be identified. Running the software and/or generate and analyze execution traces. The use of dynamic information, e.g., information gathered during the execution of a piece of software, has also been used in the context of reverse engineering [RICH 99, JERD 97, RICH 02], but has drawbacks in terms of scalability (traces of a few seconds can become very big) and interpretation (thousands of message invocation can hide the important information one is looking for). Interviewing the users and developers can give significant imminent into a software system, but is difficult because of the individual perspectives of the interviewed people and because it is hard to honor and reuse these approaching. Using various tools, visualizes, slicers, query engines, etc. and techniques visualization, clustering, concept analysis, etc. to generate high-level views of the source code. Tool support is provided by the research society in different conduct and visualization tools are extensively used.

2. Reverse Engineering Metrics Related works
Several researchers have contributed towards reverse engineering from year 2002. We have referred some of the works like Polymetric view based on code crawler by Michele Lanza and Stephane Ducasse as well as Moose Metrics by Aline Lucia. Both the research has taken huge sized projects and generates visualization information to the reverse engineer. We have taken small and medium sized projects and has provided direct values with object oriented metrics. A table is available in the appendix section giving more details [Table 1]

2.1 Stages in Reverse Engineering Process

Before initial a reverse engineering, it is necessary to choose which major goals to follow and which ones are merely of secondary value. In the following, the research work present a short canonical list of main goals we have inferred from our own reverse engineering experience, and which is a subset of the goals.

2.2 Reverse Engineering Goals
The goals of a reverse engineer are to identify and locate the important inheritance hierarchies. The reverse engineer also gathers answers to the question about the size of the subject system. Besides, it assists to spot special classes in terms of number of methods or number of attributes.

### 2.3 Our Reverse Engineering Model

![Reverse Engineering Model](image)

**Figure 2: Reverse Engineering Model**

The Reverse engineering approach is an extension on our previous research High Level Design Phase Quality Indication model [2] designed to Provide Design Phase quality indication for UML Based small and medium sized Object Oriented projects developed with Java. The concept was assisted through a Software tool designed for this research (Design Phase Tool)[2]. The Tool uses a modular approach to Object Oriented Metrics and records the classes that comply with Object oriented standards and indicate visual suggestion for classes, which has deviation. The tool also has provisions for recording the results of Design phase evaluation with Metrics results in Database for future reverse engineer reference.

The research model provide straightforward values of classes, attributes, methods, depth of inheritance, number of methods in a class, number of attributes in a class and their deviations from the Object oriented Metrics to the reverse engineer. The values are presented in our model in a straightforward way, which are advantages over the other approaches.

The Research Model suggest the Following Metrics which has great influence on Reverse Engineering

1. Class Size Metrics
2. Inheritance Metrics
3. Number of Methods Metrics
4. Number of Attribute Metrics
5. Depth of Inheritance

### 3. Experimental Approach of our Reverse Engineering Model

Most of the legacy systems tend to be large hundreds of thousands of lines of poorly documented code. There is a definite need for effective approaches
which help in program understanding and problem detection. Since the object-oriented paradigm does not support a sequential reading order the reverse engineer requires to identify where to appear into the system to recognize its formation. Our approach helps the reverse engineer get a mental picture by viewing the Small or medium-sized object-oriented system by means of a High Level Design Quality Indication model with traditional metrics as well as new metrics to capture the complete Object oriented programming issues. The model captures the approach of the system in the design stage itself in a modular way and indicates the imperfections as well as record major structure information as well as design imperfections as history information of the project. This valuable piece of information can surely assist reverse engineer during any of his reengineering or maintenance requirement. The Tool supplies real values of the system, which can greatly assist the reverse engineer to quickly perform his reverse engineering task in terms of.

1) Providing an easy interface to investigate the object-oriented system and gather important information like the Design size, Design stage Complexity, Variations from the object-oriented standards.
2) Providing Object-oriented Metrics values of the class.
3) Providing both Projects based and Individual class based investigation approach to gather information on the Object-oriented systems.
4) Providing recording option for the results for future maintenance or reverse engineer reference requirements.

3.1 High Level Design Quality Indicator [HLDQI]

The HLDQI methodologies suggest a practical standard during the design phase of a small and medium-sized object-oriented system and validate the design with the standard values. The values were based on the useful response composed from numerous industrial object-oriented developers and followed by Industries.

Based on the quality of design, HLDQI suggests the following: If, the input design (Java source code generated by UML)
- Exceed the HLDQI standards, it strongly recommends for Redesign.
- Less than HLDQI standards, it needs still more optimization in the design.
- Equal to HLDQI standards, it strongly agrees to HLDQI and is considered to be stable, maintainable and easily understandable with reduced maintenance cost and also extends the functionalities for any reverse engineering or reengineering requirements.

The DPT tool gives a visual indication (red color) for variations from the HLDQI standards. During the design imperfection development the tool also support in calculating the redesign cost efforts based on metrics recommended by Lorenz and Kidds [18] for improved optimization of the Project at an initial phase itself throughout its expansion.

4. OBJECT ORIENTED METRICS SYSTEMS
A. Traditional Metrics

There are many metrics that are applied to traditional [31] functional development, from experience in object oriented software development the research, has identified three of these metrics that are applicable to object oriented development, such as complexity, size, and readability. To measure the complexity, the cyclomatic complexity is used.

A.1 METRIC 1: Size

Size of a class is used to evaluate the ease of understanding of code by developers and maintainers. Size can be measured in a variety of ways. These include counting all physical lines of code, the number of statements, the number of blank lines, and the number of comment lines. Lines of Code (LOC) counts all lines. Non Comment Non Blank (NCNB) is sometimes referred to as source lines of code and counts all lines that are not comments and not blanks. Executable Statements (EXEC) is a count of executable statements regardless of number of physical lines of code. Executable statements are the measure least influenced by programmer or language style. Thresholds for assess the meaning of size measures be different depending on the coding language, (here the research uses Java) and the complexity of the method. However, since size influence ease of accepting by the developers and maintainers, classes and methods of huge size will always pose an advanced threat. [17, 97]

B. Object-Oriented Specific Metrics

As confer, many unusual metrics have been planned for object-oriented systems. The object-oriented metrics that were selected measure principle structures that, if improperly designed, negatively influence the design and code quality attributes. The selected object oriented metrics are primarily applied to the concepts of classes, coupling, and inheritance.

B.1 METRIC 2: Weighted Methods per Class (WMC)

The sum of the complexities of the Methods in the current class. If all method complexities are considered to be unique. WMC is equal to the

Number of Methods WMC 0 : Integer = self.allOperations 0=size 0

Let C be a class, with methods M1, M2,... , Mk
Let c1, c2,... , cbe the complexity of the methods

\[ WMC = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \]

"Complexity is deliberately not defined more specifically here in order to allow for the most general application of this metric" Viewpoints: (of Chidamberand Kemerer) Number of methods and their complexity is an indicator of the time and effort required to develop & maintain an object. The larger the number of methods in an object, the greater the potential impact
on the children objects with large number of methods are likely to be more application specific, limiting the possible reuse

**B.2 METRIC 3: Response for a Class (RFC)**

The Number of Methods in the current class that might respond to a message received by its object, including Methods both inside and Outside of the class. RFC

\[
\text{RFC}() = \text{Integer} = (\\text{self.allOperations()}.\text{union(self.allOperations()}.\text{method.allClients()}\rightarrow \text{asSet()}\rightarrow \text{size()})
\]

Where \{R\} is the set of Methods called by Method I and

\{M\} = set of all Methods inb class

Ri is dependant in the implementation of the Method i.

**B.3 Metric 4 – Lack of Cohesion (LCOM)**

The degree of similarity of methods in the current class (by counting instance variable sets used by all possible Method pairs) LCOM

\[
\text{LCOM}() \rightarrow \text{set of instance variable of Methods in Known only after completing the implementnation of the Method. So this metric is code dependant and cannot be extracted in the design phase.}
\]

Let C be a class, with methods M1, M2, ..., Mm

Let \{Ik\} is the set of instance variables used by method Mk

Let \(P = \{\text{(Ik, Ij)} \mid \text{Ik and Ij do not intersect}\}\)

Let \(Q = \{\text{(Ik, Ij)} \mid \text{Ik and Ij do intersect}\}\)

If |P| > |Q| then LCOM = |P| - |Q| else

- LCOM = 0 LCOM is a count of the number of methods whose similarity is zero minus a count of the number of methods whose similarity is not zero. The larger the number of similar methods the more cohesive the class.

**B.4 METRIC 5: Coupling Between Object Classes (CBO)**

The Number of other classes that are coupled to the current one.

CBO

\[
\text{CBO}() = \text{Integer} = \text{self. CoupledClasses()}.\rightarrow \text{size()}
\]

**B.5 METRIC 6: Depth of Inheritance Tree (DIT)**

The length of the longest path of Inheritance form the current class to the root of the tree.

DIT

\[
\text{DIT}() = \text{Integer} \text{If.self.isROOt() then 0}
\]

Else if PARN() = 1 then

1+\text{self.parents()}\rightarrow

iterate(elem.\text{GeneralizableElement}.\rightarrow \text{acc+elem.oclAsType(Class).DIT()})

Else

\text{self.parents()}.\rightarrow
iterate(elem:GeneralizableElement a
cc:Integer=0
}acc+elem.oclAsType(Class).DIT())
endif
endif
Here the real time practical induced inheritance is considered. The user defined complexity in inheritance is measured and attempt is made to standardise the complexity involved in depth of inheritance.

**B.6 METRIC 7: Number of Children (NOC)**

The number of classes that inherit directly from the current class.

= self.CHIN()

**B7: Metrics 8: Design Size Metrics**

Practical Software Measurement (PSM) [10] PSM defines a generic process for selecting software measures and using the resulting information to manage projects. This report is based on a broad survey of the literature that which assesses the state of the art and practice in object-oriented measurement and modeling, and maps the information collected onto the PSM framework. It proposes a metrics called the Design Size Metrics (Events, States, Use cases)[1a] as those elements in the project decides the scope of the object oriented Programming under investigation.

Size (S) = Size (C)

The above equation calculates the total size of the system S by calculating number of lines of code of each class C. Here component (C) implies the classes, use cases [11,12] and the Events. In other research paper [8] they have developed Quality Model for Object Oriented Design (QMOOD). It measures the functional, structural, and relational details of the system based on high-level attributes. In their model, they calculate reusability based on coupling, cohesion, design size, and messaging. Our research focus on Events States and Use cases [11,12]and verified the efforts. The RUP (Rational Unified Process) part of UML is based on the use case concept. A use case [33] captures a contract between the stakeholders, also called primary actors of system about its behaviour. The use case athers the different sequences of behaviour, or scenarios together [2]. In short, use case is a good way of eliciting requirements at the earlier stages of software development.

1. Number of Actors associated with a Use case (NAU): This metric computes the number of actors that are associated with a use case and it is useful to measure the importance of the requirement expressed by the use case. The reason for this argument is that the requirements that many actors concern are likely to be important for the system to function properly as a whole. Note that we do not count normal system classes for this metric, because this metric concerns the interactions between systems and its stakeholders.
2. Number of Messages associated with a Use case (NMU): As explained before, a use case is further refined through its scenario. In UML, there are two scenario diagrams, i.e. sequence diagram and collaboration diagram. These two kinds of scenario diagram are completely isomorphic meaning one kind of diagram can be automatically replaced with another kind without the loss of information contained in it. The NMU metric counts the number of messages comprising the scenario of a use case. This metric is useful for tracing requirements into design-level elements.

3. Number of System Classes associated with a Use case (NSCU): This metric counts the number of classes whose objects participate in the scenario of a use case. Note that this metric does not include actors as this is done with the NAU metric. Like NMU, NSCU is good for estimating the impact of a requirement change onto the system. Any changes of use cases spread to classes and the interactions of their objects, and vice versa.

The design size is calculated based on all the above parameters Events, States and Use case (NAU, NMU, NSCU) of the classes involved.

B8: Metrics 9: Effort Metrics

The industry estimates a skilled developer codes an OOPS project class in 10 days and a beginner will do it in 20 days so there is a significant effort contributed by the developer’s skill towards the Project. The Project type is also an important factor. It can be a small sized, medium sized or Large project (which intakes that much number of developers and the efforts will be contributed by that much number of people. Design wise, our effort estimate[24,25] identifies Key class or supporting class in the redesigning effort intimated by the DPT tool. The key class has close attachment to most of the elements in the project than the supporting class and redesigning a key class will involve significantly more efforts. The effort estimate[13] also take into consideration the real time issues for effort estimate , the project type, developer skills and the user interface type which also were found to have influence over the efforts in the development. The effort estimate factor yields an early estimate of the total effort needed by the application. It can be calculated as

$$\text{Ef} = K \times U \times Ex$$

Effort estimate (Ef), Number of key classes (K), Complexity created by user interface (U), and Experience of the developer (Ex).

As suggested earlier during redesigning the efforts depend on the subject taken for redesigning. Also when the User Interface type involves drag and drop facilities the system involves more complexity from real time exceptions. The experience of the developer is based on the quickness of the developer in arriving at a design effort for a class. The Project manager will carry a statistics of the developer profile. We have taken an Industry procedure and we have also given real time consideration regarding cost per hour while calculating the redesigning efforts.
4. Case study

The Case study took the following applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Data</th>
<th>Metrics (A)</th>
<th>Metrics (B)</th>
<th>Metrics (C)</th>
<th>Metrics (D)</th>
<th>Metrics (E)</th>
<th>Metrics (F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Classes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Methods</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CouplingFactor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. No. of Parameters/Method</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCOM (Metrics)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF (Metrics)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Error (Metrics)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research has concerned Object oriented system designed with UML for the case study. These systems use Java language for its expansion and use Windows/Linux platform for its implementation. The design of the system was prepared through IBM Rational UML designer and Java source code was generated through the Rational tool. The skeletal java source code were then validated with the DPT tool and the results were generated.

4.1 Metrics for Case study

The DPT Tool has involved the following Metrics for collectively addressing the issue of Size of the project, Complexity of the project as well as Indirect Metrics of the project. The research considers the following Metrics for reviewing the size of the Project by the reverse engineer owing to the following factors. These factors have greater influence to add more scope or Project efforts.

1. No.of Classes 2. No.of Methods 3. Depth of Inheritance 4. Design Size

**Complexity Metrics**

- Weighted Method Count (WMC)
- Weighted Attributed Count (WAC)
- Coupling Between Objects (CBO)
- LCOM

**Indirect Metrics**

- Programmer productivity
- Defect detection density
- Module defect density

4.2 Results

The following are the results of the case study.

5.1 Size Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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1950
### Table 2: Size Metrics

5.2 Complexity Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coupling factor</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCOM</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFC(optimal =35)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Complexity Metrics**

5.3 Indirect Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCOM</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Indirect Metrics**

### 6. Conclusion and Future work

In this research a reverse engineering methodology was proposed for Object oriented projects. The methodology based on modular approach. The methodology uses HLDQI standard for Design Phase validation and DPT tool for implementing the idea. The research has also shown the useful aspects of DPT tool for reverse engineering tasks by providing the required design imperfections data as well as the class and method data, which will be a great help to the reverse engineer attempting an unknown system. Furthermore the research has also provided various types of views, which can help the reverse engineer to process the subject with less trouble. Also the research has supplied a case study using the methodology proposed to substantiate the concept with more confidence. The research also put forward the following idea about reverse engineering. Reverse engineering is not a systematic process, but that the understanding of the system with respect to the design structure, size and complexity.

**Future work**

The research has proposed a Reverse Engineering Methodology for small and medium sized projects. The future aspects of the research includes in extending the scope to fit for huge sized object oriented projects. Also to generate new type of views which can help the reverse engineer to reach the result with less time than now. The future research also plans to add provision for 2D and 3D view for consolidation idea of visualization.

### 7. Appendices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Name</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michele Lanza and Stephane Ducasse</td>
<td>Polymetric view – A light weight visual approach – using code crawler for C++ - a non linear approach[Polymetric]</td>
<td>Class metrics, Method metrics, Attribute Metrics</td>
<td>Can be used one or two weeks of a reverse engineering process. Requires traditional approach and systematic</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aline Lucia Baroni, Fernana do Brito e Abreu</td>
<td>MOOSE metrics[MOOSE]</td>
<td>WMC, DIT, NOC. Less emphasis on Indirect Metrics (CBO, RFC)</td>
<td>Deal with static structures not for behavior Visualization</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duraisamy et al. Maximo, Azucena et al</td>
<td>HLDQI Metamodel and conversion algorithm</td>
<td>All the above metrics and also emphasis on CBO and RFC. All the above</td>
<td>Medium sized projects</td>
<td>2004-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holger, Muller et al Pereira, Favre et al Salman, Basha et al Thakore et al Mrinal et al Abhijeet, Sagar et al Hugo, Jordi et al</td>
<td>Rigi Environment MDA based Approach UML (Extraction of State Transition Diagram) Software Quality Metrics UML (Sequence Diagram) UML Diagram Model Driven Reverse Engineering</td>
<td>All the metrics</td>
<td>projects</td>
<td>2010-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Related work

Figure 1: DPT tool generating results for WMC Metrics

Figure 2: DPT Tool providing option to save the metrics information through a file for future reference

Figure 3: DPT Tool showing print view of stored Metrics values of subject for future reference

Figure 4: DPT tool generating Metrics value for WAC Metrics for 11 classes
Figure 5: DPT tool generating Metrics values for CBO Metrics for 11 classes

Figure 6: DPT tool generating results of RFC Metrics of 11 classes

Figure 7: DPT tool generating Metrics values for LOC Metrics of 11 classes
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