

International Journal of Reliability, Quality and Safety Engineering
© World Scientific Publishing Company

MICROSCOPIC MODEL OF SOFTWARE BUG DYNAMICS: CLOSED SOURCE VERSUS OPEN SOURCE

DAMIEN CHALLET*

*Nomura Centre for Quantitative Finance, Mathematical Institute, Oxford University, 24–29 St-Gile’s
Oxford OX1 3LB, United Kingdom*

and

YANN LE DU†

*The Rudolf Peierls Centre for Theoretical Physics, Oxford University, 1–3 Keble Road
Oxford, OX1 3NP, United Kingdom*

Received (received date)

Revised (revised date)

We introduce a simple microscopic description of software bug dynamics where users, programmers and a maintainer interact through a given program, with a particular emphasis on bug creation, detection and fixing. When the program is written from scratch, the first phase of development is characterized by a fast decline of the number of bugs, followed by a slow phase where most bugs have been fixed, hence, are hard to find. Releasing immediately bug fixes speeds up the debugging process, which substantiates bazaar open-source methodology. We provide a mathematical analysis that supports our numerical simulations. Finally, we apply our model to Linux history and determine the existence of a lower bound to the quality of its programmers.

Keywords: Software Reliability Growth Model, Bug creation, debugging, Microscopic Model, Open Source, Closed Source, Linux

*challet@maths.ox.ac.uk

†yann@thphys.ox.ac.uk

1. Introduction

The importance of reliable software is obvious nowadays, as computers control an growing part of our life. At the same time the complexity of software is ever increasing. A particularly important problem is the management of software projects so as to minimize development cost or release software on time, while ensuring the quality of software. Appropriate methodologies of programming and team synchronization are designed to avoid errors in the first place^{1,2}, but it is common wisdom that software development goes through a cycle of trial and errors and that it is very hard to estimate the overall quality of software and the time needed to deliver a well-tested product. Theoretical approaches of software reliability are done via so called reliability growth models, which focus on how much errors a program contains, that is, the failure rate, or the time between two failures, with a particular emphasis on predicting these quantities (for a review, see Lyu's book⁶, Chapter 3). There is a hierarchy of approaches: early studies are of macroscopic nature: one measures the evolution of a quantity that depends on the errors in a given program, such as the time to next failure. In order to make useful predictions, one uses fitting functions, also known as models. A more recent approach is mesoscopic, that is, splits a program in several modules, each having their own propensity to fail. Remarkably, the evolution of the global failure rate is universal, and the latter decreases as power-law, that is, very slowly^{4,5}.

Our work supplements current vast literature on the topic⁷ by describing what happens when a bug is fixed. Indeed, almost all the reliability growth models assume that a bug is fixed as soon as it is detected and that doing so nothing else is broken. We propose to remedy that by using a simplified microscopic framework where the fundamental unit is the software bug, not code units modules or even submodules. Doing so, one may indentify fundamental microscopic laws, and above all, the crucial ingredients of software reliability: in this paper, we not interested in *predicting* reliability, but in understanding on what microscopic processes it depends. Starting at the microscopic level and being able to compute analytically what macroscopic properties emerge brings much insights: a large part the success of modern Physics come from the development of microscopic models and mathematical methods for dealing with a great many of elementary units. What is meant by *model* is not a fitting function, that is, an arbitrary a priori relationship between measurables that fits more or less convincingly data, but how elementary units are born, interact with each other or with external constraints, and die. Such microscopic models are usually much simplified, but capture the *essence* of a given situation because they contain the most fundamental interactions that give rise to relevant phenomenology. For instance, a atom of iron contains 26 protons, 26 neutrons and 26 electrons, each in interaction with each other and with those of the neighbouring atoms; in order to understand how microscopic interactions lead to magnetism, a collective phenomenon, it is enough to replace each atom with one binary variable and assume a nearest-neighbour interaction. This is the path that we propose to follow in this article. Our aim is to keep the most important *microscopic* interactions in a very

simple and extendable framework that allows for more realistic ingredients to be added if need be, but that should reproduce qualitatively important properties of software quality evolution. The number of parameters must be very small, otherwise one is very likely to be unable to understand the relative importance of each ingredient.

Our model shows that software projects can converge to a bug-free state even with imperfect programmers and maintainers. However, if there is any number of users that fill bug reports on imaginary problems and if the programmers modify the code without double-checking, the bug-free state is not a fixed point of the dynamics. Our model is also able to explain why programs whose source code is openly available, the so-called open-source software (OSS)⁹, are able to reach a high quality, despite the fact that its programmers are sometimes less skilled than those working for closed-source software (CSS) companies. OSS has become quite relevant because of the rise of successful open-source project such as Linux¹⁰ or Apache.¹¹ There are broadly speaking two types of open source projects, often called bazaar and cathedral, as put by Raymond.¹² Bazaar projects such as Linux release new versions "early and often", and welcome contributions by everybody, while cathedral projects release new versions at a lower pace, and are crafted by a smaller group of programmers. In that respect cathedral OSS stands between CSS and bazaar OSS.

2. Definition of the model

Our approach is to create a minimal model, that does not describe in all its subtlety how software testing is done, but the microscopic processes of bug discovery and elimination, which are remarkably absent from current literature, where it is assumed that a bug is corrected immediately when discovered. Being minimal, this model allows for easy addition of relevant extensions; we shall discuss some of them in the Outlook Section.

In our model, a program is defined as a collection of L parts $i = 1, \dots, L$, or modules; a part provides a basic functionality such as file loading. Each part has M subparts. The total number of subparts LM will be referred to as the size S of the project. We shall make the assumption of independence, which means that if a given (sub)part is buggy, the other (sub)parts are not affected; this is clearly not the case in real life, as bug influence propagate¹⁷ on the functional/object dependence network¹⁶ (see also ⁶, Chapter 13, pp 538). Another assumption is that all the parts have the same number of sub-parts; this is a less important assumption that can be easily remedied by assuming a probability distribution function for the number of subparts of each part i , denoted by M_i , which would increase the number of parameters of the model.

Let us introduce some important notations that characterize the state of the program at time t . Subpart j of part i ($j = 1, \dots, M$) is either bug free — in which case its state is denoted by $s_{i,j}(t) = 0$ —, or buggy ($s_{i,j}(t) = 1$). A feature request is considered as a bug. At time t , part i has $b_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^M s_{i,j}(t)$ bugs, and the total

number of bugs is $B(t) = \sum_{i=1}^L b_i(t)$. Finally, the number of defective parts, i.e., those having at least one bug is $D(t) = \sum_{i=1}^L \Theta(b_i(t))$ where $\Theta(x) = 1$ if $x > 0$ and 0 otherwise, is the Heaviside function.

The dynamics of the program results from the interaction between those who use the program, detect bugs and complain about them, and those who try to correct them. To this end, we consider N_u users. At each time step, each user is assumed to use one part, say, i , chosen at random, and to report a buggy behavior with a probability P_u that depends on fraction of bugs b_i/M in part i : this corresponds to the assumption that all the subparts are equally likely to be used in a time-step. Instead of assuming that P_u is a generic function of b_i/M , we shall only retain its first order term:

$$P_u = \delta \frac{b_i}{M}. \quad (1)$$

The parameter δ describes the fraction of subparts used in a time-step, and also includes the propensity of the users to report bugs. Interestingly, keeping the zeroth order of P_u is akin to suppose that the users report bugs erroneously. Previous work assumed that $P_u = \text{cst.}$ ⁸ In our view, P_u must contain a feedback from the actual number of bugs, otherwise bug reporting is a process completely disconnected from the actual program.

Each bug report only consists of the number of the buggy part because the user cannot describe in more details where the program is faulty. The bug list is hence a table indicating which parts are reportedly buggy, and its length is $R(t)$. It is the medium of interaction between the users and the programmers.

There are N_p programmers. In addition to hunting bugs according to Eq. (1), each of them tries to correct one part chosen at random from the bug report list, say, i , and reviews all the subparts of part i . This process is assumed to fix a buggy subpart with probability ϕ and to break a working subpart with probability β ; Mathematically,

$$P[s_{i,j}(t+1) = 0 | s_{i,j}(t) = 1] = \phi, \quad P[s_{i,j}(t+1) = 1 | s_{i,j}(t) = 0] = \beta \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, M. \quad (2)$$

The parameters ϕ and β encode the programmers' abilities, which are chosen to be uniform; once again, this assumption does not change qualitatively the properties of the model; it is very simple to introduce heterogeneity here, at the cost of additional parameters. In the simplest version of our model, the programmers implement directly the modifications to the source code. In practice however, in larger projects, the programmers propose these modifications (so-called patches) to the maintainer.

The role of the maintainer is to determine whether a patch improves the code or not. The maintainer measures the number of bugs in the current code \hat{b}_i and in the modified code \hat{b}'_i . He decides to accept the patch if he perceives that the patch is an improvement ($\hat{b}'_i < \hat{b}_i$), and removes part i from the bug list. The measure is made as follows: he reviews the code of all sub-parts of part i , and detects correctly a buggy sub-part with probability ν , and a working sub-part with probability ω .

How to estimate β , ϕ , ν and ω from real data is discussed in section

This completes the definition of the model: the creation, detection and removal of bugs are fully specified, as are the interactions between the users, programmers, maintainer and the code. There is however a subtle point: the users are implicitly assumed to use always the latest version of the program. The time has come therefore to differentiate between open source and closed source projects. One of our aims is to show where the difference lies between these two strategies, and to this end, one is allowed for making it more pronounced by suitable assumptions. Bazaar open source projects release “often and early” new versions; running the latest, or a very recent, version of a given program is easy and probably quite common. Closed source projects on the other hand, do not release as nearly as often new versions, because they tend to prefer to release well-tested version whenever possible. The cost of new versions of commercial software also deters a fraction of the users to upgrade systematically. In summary, because of the very nature of these two development processes, *all other things being equal* OSS users necessarily upgrade faster than CSS users. This is translated in our model in the following way: OSS users always use the latest version, while CSS users upgrade every T time steps. T includes the lesser propensity of CSS to upgrade and the time between two releases; for the sake of simplicity, we shall speak of releases every T time steps. The CSS users continue to report bugs of the latest release, while the CSS programmers work exclusively on the yet unreleased code. One objection to this hypothesis is that in real life there are alpha and beta testers, which greatly help the CSS programmers to hunt bugs. While this is correct, it is obvious that the number of alpha and beta testers is smaller than N_u , thereby reducing the ability of detecting bugs. In addition, we shall only study comparable situation, hence the *all other things being equal* mention. Nothing prevents the extension of our model to alpha/beta testers and to simulate various project configurations, but this is beyond the scope of the paper.

In closed-source projects, the programmers are faced with a dilemma when a part is reported as buggy by a user after it has been already tentatively fixed since the last release. Indeed, the users report bugs on the last release, whereas the programmers work on the next one, both gradually diverging. The programmers can either ignore bug reports on an already modified part, or modify again the current code. In the latter case, the modification can be systematic, or after verification that the part in the current code is also seemingly buggy (according to Eq. (1)). Without verification, $D(t)$ is not a monotonically decreasing quantity, as a newly bug-free part can be partly broken by this process.

Finally all the parameters of this model can be changed at each time step, and will be in Section 4, thus

3. Results

We shall first report numerical experiments and then propose qualitative analytical explanations of the observed behaviours. Our aim is not to validate our with real-life figures, but to check whether it behaves reasonably, and what parameters




Fig. 1. Number of defective parts (left panel) and number of bugs (right panel) in an open source project (continuous lines), closed source projects with no bug report resubmission allowed between releases (dashed lines) $L = 100$, $M = 20$, $N_u = 100$, $N_p = 10$, $\delta = 1$, $\phi = 0.9$, $\beta = 0.1$, $\omega = 0.9$, $\nu = 0.9$. $T = 1$ for OSS and $T = 50$ for CSS.

are the most important for improving the quality of a software project.

Fig. 1 reports the typical dynamical behavior of projects that start from scratch ($s_{i,j} = 1$ for all i and j): the number of defective parts $D(t) \propto \exp(-\lambda t)$ for large t , as often assumed in reliability growth models.¹ At a more microscopic level, one can distinguish two phases: in the early easy stage, the users find and report many bugs, keeping $R(t) \gg N_p$. The vast majority of bugs are fixed during this phase, where $B(t)$ decreases linearly with time. When $R(t) \sim N_p$, a slow regime appears, where $B(t) \sim \exp(-t/\tau)$; in this regime, the average number of bugs per defective part $B(t)/D(t)$ is small and fluctuates around a value that depends on the chosen parameters.

Ignoring bug reports on already modified code is the best option for CSS; this even outperforms OSS at short time scales, because the programmers only work on fully buggy parts, hence the bug fixing rate is higher (right panel of Fig. 1). Verification is generally a bad idea when bugs are sparse, because the probability that both a user and a programmer agree that a part is buggy is small, hence verification slows down the process.

The global temporal evolution can be characterized by the time to completion, i.e., the time needed to obtain a bug-free project, denoted by t_c . We shall investigate in particular its average $\langle t_c \rangle$ over several runs. For the sake of speed, we stop the simulations when $B(t) = 1$: since the decrease of $B(t)$ is exponential in this phase, $\langle t_c \rangle$ would be roughly doubled if one waited until $B = 0$.

The average time to completion increases roughly linearly with T (Fig 3), hence, closed source projects are always slower to reach a perfect state than open source projects, *all other parameters being equal*. The reason why increasing T penalizes the performance of the project is obvious from Fig 2: after each release, the number of relevant bug reports coming from the users falls rapidly to zero, and the programmers are left on their own; as a consequence, the fast and slow regimes




Fig. 2. Dynamics of the number of bugs and bug reports in closed source projects ($T = 500$). $L = 1000$, $M = 40$, $N_u = 1000$, $N_p = 10$, $\delta = 1$, $\phi = 0.9$, $\beta = 0.1$, $\omega = 0.9$, $\nu = 0.9$




Fig. 3. Average time to completion t_c as a function of the time between releases T . Full symbols: $L = 1000$, $M = 10$, empty symbols $L = 2000$, $M = 5$; $N_u = 100$, $N_p = 10$, $\delta = 1$, $\phi = 0.9$, $\beta = 0.1$, $\omega = 0.9$, $\nu = 0.9$ average over 100 runs.




Fig. 4. Average time to completion $\langle t_c \rangle$ as a function of the number of subparts per part M at constant size $LM = 1000$ for open source projects (full circles), closed source without bug report resubmission (empty squares), and closed source with bug report resubmission (full diamonds). $N_u = 1000$, $N_p = 10$, $\delta = 1$, $\phi = 0.9$, $\beta = 0.1$, $\omega = 0.9$, $\nu = 0.9$, closed source $T = 150$, average over 100 runs. Continuous lines are for eye-guidance only.




Fig. 5. Average time to completion t_c versus the number of users (left panel) and the number of programmers (right panel). $L = 1000$, $M = 10$, $\delta = 1$, $\omega = 0.9$, $\nu = 0.9$; $N_p = 10$ (left panel), $N_u = 1000$ (right panel). $\phi = 0.9$, $\beta = 0.1$ (diamonds and circles), $\phi = 0.7$, $\beta = 0.3$ (squares), and $\phi = 0.6$, $\beta = 0.1$ (triangles); average over 100 runs.

alternate.

Suppose that the project size S is known in advance and fixed to $S = LM$. What L and M are optimal? Fig. 4 plots $\langle t_c \rangle$ as a function of M at fixed $S = LM$ for open and closed source. It turns out that there is always an optimal value of M for any set of parameters or project type, whose position depends on all the parameters, and that the plot is much shallower for OSS projects, implying that the values of L and M are not crucially important for them..

Fig. 5 shows how $\langle t_c \rangle$ depends on N_u and N_p : $\langle t_c \rangle$ is reasonably well fitted by $c_1 + c_2 N_u^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha \sim 1$: the rate of improvement is slow as N_u increases; even worse, it reaches a plateau c_1 whose value depends on the number of programmers N_p and their abilities; the exponent α also depends on the programmers abilities, but not on their number. Similarly, adding more programmers decreases $\langle t_c \rangle$. In this case, the exponent α depends on the number of users, but not on the programmers abilities. In other words, hiring more programmers or having more users is an inefficient way of improving the speed of debugging when N_u or N_p is large enough. Interestingly, having better programmers decreases $\langle t_c \rangle$, while the abilities of the maintainer has much less dramatic an influence.

From our model we conclude that bazaar OSS methodology has the shortest average time to completion, all other parameters being equal, which is precisely the argument of Raymond.¹² However, this does not mean that bazaar OSS is always faster: cathedral OSS or CSS projects with a better set of parameters (more programmers, better programmers, more users) can outperform bazaar OSS even with large time between releases. On the other hand, the quality of bazaar OSS programmers does not need to be as high as those of cathedral OSS or CSS projects in order to achieve the same time of convergence to the bug-free state. Finally, our model suggests that cathedral OSS and CSS projects should try to minimize T so as to decrease their convergence time, for instance by implementing automatic




Fig. 6. Average number of bugs per part (upper panel) and fraction of defective parts (lower panel) versus time in a reconstructed Linux history. $M = 20$, $\delta = 1$, $\phi = 0.8$, $\beta = 0.05$ (thin line) $\beta = 0.1$ (thick lines), $\beta = 0.2$ (dashed line), $\omega = 0.5$, $\nu = 0.5$

upgrades. This of course requires that the users do not perceive a relatively high upgrade rate as an indication of low-quality software.

4. Mathematical analysis

While it is not possible to solve this model exactly, some understanding can be obtained through simple analysis. Bug reports are filled with an average frequency of $(N_u + N_p) \frac{\delta B(t)}{LM}$: each user/programmer has a probability $D(t)/L$ to use a part that contains at least one bug (by definition of $D(t)$, see page 4), and a probability $\delta \frac{B(t)}{D(t)}/M$ to report a bug. The probability that exactly two users/programmers use the same part and fill bug reports is proportional to $(N_u + N_p)(N_u + N_p - 1)(\delta D/L)^2 \langle (b_i/M)^2 \rangle_D / 2$ where $\langle \rangle_D$ stands for the average over all the defective parts; in later stages of debugging, this probability may be very small for appropriate parameters, and redundant bug reporting can be neglected.

The probability that a reported bug is already in the bug list is roughly $R(t)/D(t)$ (this assumes that all the defective parts have about the same number of bugs). Therefore, the number of relevant bug reports submitted at each time step is about $(N_u + N_p) \frac{\delta B(t)}{LM} (1 - R(t)/D(t))$ on average (without taking into account redundant report filling). Finally, neglecting the role of the maintainer, i.e. always accepting a patch, the number of bug reports removed from the list at each time step is $\min[R(t), N_p]$, hence

$$R(t+1) = R(t) + (N_u + N_p) \frac{\delta B(t)}{LM} (1 - R(t)/D(t)) - \min[R(t), N_p] + n_R(t) \quad (3)$$

where $n_R(t)$ is a white Gaussian noise of zero average.

The dynamics of the programmers is relatively simple to analyse: assume that part i is in the report list and is picked up by a programmer at time t . Then (dropping the index)

$$b(t+1) = b(t)\phi + [M - b(t)]\beta + n(t) \quad (4)$$

where $n(t)$ is a noise term of zero average and $\langle n(t)n(t') \rangle = \delta_{t,t'}[b(t)\phi(1-\phi) + (M-b(t))\beta(1-\beta)]$ where $\langle x \rangle$ stands for the average of x over time.

$$b^* = \frac{\beta M}{1 + \beta - \phi} \quad (5)$$

which is reached exponentially fast. A bug-free state corresponds to $b = 0$. When the users do not report imaginary bugs, that is, when $P_u(b/M)$ does not contain a constant, the boundary $b = 0$ is absorbing: if there are no more bugs in this part, no one will ever be found in it.

We thus must conclude that the only reason why a bug-free state can be reached when the programmers sometimes break working code ($\beta > 0$) is via fluctuations. The fluctuations around b^* are of order \sqrt{M} but b^* is of order M , hence, the larger M , the more difficult it is to reach $b = 0$ by chance, which explains why the time to completion increases as M increases in Fig. 4. Assuming that M is constant and no bias ($\phi = \beta$), it is easy to solve a diffusion equation in the interval $[0, M]$ with reflecting boundary at $b = M$ and absorbing boundary at $b = 0$ with initial condition $b(0) = M$, which gives

$$P(b, t) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{M}} \sum_{n \geq 1} \sin \left[\frac{\pi}{M} \left(\frac{1}{2} + 2n \right) b \right] e^{-C \left[\frac{\pi}{M} \left(\frac{1}{2} + 2n \right) \right]^2 t} \quad (6)$$

where the diffusion constant $C \propto M$. For large times, the survival probability $S(t) = \sum_b P(b, t)$ decreases as its slowest component, hence

$$S(t) \sim \sqrt{M} e^{-\frac{C^2 \pi^2}{4M} t} \quad (7)$$

This shows that $t_c \sim M^{3/2}$ for large M in this approximation. Given the fact that we did not take into account the potential that attracts b around b^* , this is clearly an under-estimation.

Since the number of bug fluctuates around b^* , it is sensible to assume that every part with at least one bug has b^* bugs and that it is the number of buggy parts that decrease.

The role of the maintainer is difficult to describe analytically as the formulae are cumbersome. But simple approximations bring some light. The average number of bugs $d(b)$ detected by the maintainer in a part that contains b buggy sub-parts is $b\nu + (M-b)(1-\omega)$, with fluctuations $\sigma^2(b) = b\nu(1-\nu) + (M-b)\omega(1-\omega)$. Therefore, approximating the probability that the maintainer perceives \hat{b} bugs when there are b bugs by a Gaussian distribution of average $d(b)$ and variance $\sigma(b)$, the probability that a maintainer rejects a patch with b' buggy sub-parts if the current code has b buggy sub-parts is, in a first approximation,

$$P(\hat{b}' > \hat{b}) \simeq \frac{1}{2} + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\frac{(x-d(b))^2}{2\sigma(b)^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma(b)} \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{erf} \left(\frac{x-d(b')}{\sqrt{2}\sigma(b')} \right) dx. \quad (8)$$

$d(b)$ is an increasing function of b if $\nu + \omega > 1$, i.e., if the maintainer is sufficiently gifted. In that case, it is easy to convince oneself that $P(\hat{b}' > \hat{b}) > \frac{1}{2}$ if $b' > b$. If $\nu + \omega < 1$, the fewer the bugs, the more bugs the maintainer thinks there are and $P(\hat{b}' > \hat{b}) < \frac{1}{2}$ when $b' > b$. The special case $\nu + \omega = 1$ yields simply $P(\hat{b}' > \hat{b}) = \frac{1}{2}$: he tosses a coin in order to determine whether to commit patches or not. In any case, the maintainer's role is merely that of a timescale: depending on his abilities, he will delay or speed up the rate of acceptance of good patches, and his quality can be defined as $P(\hat{b}' < \hat{b} | b' < b)$.

How to measure β , ϕ , ω and ν in real data can be done by noting that b_i can be observed indirectly via the rates of bug reports, which are proportional to the density of faulty sub-parts. Dividing the evolution equation of b_i (4) by M , one obtains the evolution of the density of bugs ρ_i , i.e. the bug reporting rate for part i if $\delta = 1$. Estimating β and ϕ is done by computing the average and the fluctuations of all $\rho_i(t)$, conditional on $\rho_i(t)$. Since both of them are proportional to $\rho_i(t)$, one can simply plot these two quantities versus ρ_i for all i , and perform least squares linear fits. Once β and ϕ are known, the parameters of the maintainer can be estimated in a similar way. First one should replace all references to bug numbers b and \hat{b} by rates ρ and $\hat{\rho} = \hat{b}/M$, etc, in Eq. (8). Then since β and ϕ are known, one also knows $P(\rho' | \rho)$, and, for any given estimation of ω and ν , one can therefore compute $P(\hat{\rho}' > \hat{\rho})$, which allows for the measure of the maintainer's characteristics.

5. Dynamics of Linux

As shown above, the quality of OSS programmers does not need to be as high as CSS ones in order to achieve a bug-free state as rapidly *all other things being equal*. However, this does not mean that it can be vanishingly small: the quality of OSS programmers in successful projects has a lower bound. As an illustration, let us consider the history of Linux. From version 1.0, the number of programmers $N_p(t)$ can be obtained from the CREDITS file. It is well fitted by a $80 + 0.1d$ where d is the number of days since Linux 1.0. The number of users $N_u(t)$ is hard to estimate because of the free nature of Linux. Four estimates available on Internet¹³ can be fitted with with a power law $N_u(y) \propto [y - 1991]^{3.6}$ where y denotes the year and 1991 is Linux' date of birth. The size $S(t)$ can be measured in number of lines divided by the typical number of lines in a subpart; it has been fitted with a quadratic function,¹⁴ which is consistent with the linear increase of $N_p(t)$, as $S(t + 1) - S(t) \propto N_p(t)$. We can translate $S(t)$ (measured directly in the source code) into $L(t)$ and M by supposing that each subpart contains $M = 20$ lines of code. The other parameters that cannot be determined directly from Linux are obviously the qualities of the programmers and the maintainers (δ , β , ϕ , ω and ν). In an attempt to be pessimistic, and without prejudice for Linus Torvalds, we considered a random maintainer, that is, $\omega = \nu = 1/2$, and sub-optimal M ; δ is fixed to 1. The new parts of Linux are assumed to be first completely buggy.

Figure 6 shows a transition between two very different behaviors depending on the choice of ϕ and β : if the programmers abilities are high enough, Linux

converges fast to the slow regime, which is stable with respect to sudden increases of the system size, and where the number of bug per part decreases as a function time (e.g. $\phi = 0.8$ and $\beta = 0.05$); if the quality of the programmers is too low, Linux falls into the region where the number of bugs makes large excursions (e.g. $\phi = 0.8$, $\beta = 0.15$), resulting in a dramatic decrease of reliability. Since Linux is known to be stable, this shows that the quality of Linux programmers has a lower bound.^a Therefore, super-linear software growth can be sustained if the programmers are sufficiently skilled, and if there are enough programmers. The above picture can be generalized to any project whose parameters evolve in time.

6. Outlook

Our model is designed to be simple and generic so as to provides a generic modeling framework. Every simplifying assumption can be remedied. For instance, relevant extensions include users that upgrade their program after some delay, for instance, only after they have found a bug, or randomly after a new release has been released. Heterogeneous rates (δ , β , ϕ , ω , ν) and part sizes should be drawn from a suitable distribution; this will result in non-linearities in Eq. 1. One could also impose a restriction on the number of subparts that a programmer is able to review in one time-step. An important assumption of the present model is the independence of the parts, whereas they are linked by a scale-free asymmetric network,^{16,17} hence, bugs can propagate on this graph and affect other parts, making debugging harder.¹⁷ The next step is therefore to study this model on scale-free networks. In addition, the number of modifications per programmer is a truncated power-law in Linux, as is the number of bugs assigned and corrected per programmer in Mozilla.^{15,19} Therefore it may be possible that the decay of the number of bugs will not be exponential anymore, but follow a power-law, as assumed in some reliability growth models.^{18,3} Assigning a higher or lower bug fixing priority to the parts that have more bug reports may interact with the emergence of power-laws in the decrease of the number of bugs. Finally, programmers and maintainer could be modelled as agents that could learn from their mistakes. All these modifications are likely to reveal many fascinating subtleties of bug dynamics and the relationship between the micro- and macroscopic levels

7. Acknowledgments

DC thanks Wadham College for support. Useful suggestions from Ani Calinescu and Matteo Marsili are gratefully acknowledged.

1. J. Sommerville, *Software Engineering*, Addison-Wesley, Harlow (2001)
2. R. C. Martin, *Agile Software Development, Principles, Patterns, and Practices*, Prentice Hall (2002)
3. A. Biroli, *Reliability Engineering, Theory and Practice*, Springer, Berlin (1999)
4. Bishop and Blomfield, A conservative theory for long-term reliability growth prediction, *IEEE Trans. Rel.* bf 45(4), 550 (1996)

^aNote that we do not pretend to measure the real quality of Linux's programmers.

5. R. M. Brady, R. J. Anderson, R. C. Ball, Murphy's law, the fitness of evolving species, and the limits of software reliability, Cambridge Technical Report UCAM-CL-TR-471 (1999)
6. Software Reliability Engineering Handbook, M. R. Lyu ed, McGraw-Hill Education (1995)
7. http://irb.cs.uni-magdeburg.de/sw-eng/us/bibliography/bib_main.shtml
8. R. Botting, Some Stochastic Models of Software Evolution, paper presented at Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics'2002, SCI 1, Orlando, USA, July 2002
9. Free Software Foundation www.fsf.org
10. Linux www.kernel.org
11. Apache www.apache.org
12. E. S. Raymond, *The Cathedral & the Bazaar*, O'Reilly (2001), (available at catb.org/esr/writings/cathedral-bazaar)
13. RedHat www.redhat.com/about/corporate/milestones.html
14. M. W. Godfrey and Q. Tu, Evolution in Open Source Software: A Case Study, Proc. of the 2000 Intl. Conference on Software Maintenance (ICSM-00), San Jose, California, October 2000
15. Mozilla www.mozilla.org
16. S. Valverde, R. Ferrer, R. V. Sole, Scale free networks from optimal design, Europhysics Letters **60**, 512-17 (2002)
17. D. Challet and A. Lombardoni, Bug propagation and debugging in asymmetric software structures, Phys. Rev. E **70**, 046109 (2004).
18. J. T. Duane, Learning curve approach to reliability, monitoring, IEEE Transactions on Aerospace, AS-2, **2**, 563-566 (1964).
19. D. Challet, Open-source software development: the role of contributors, unpublished (2003), material available on request