

# Follow Your Nose - Which Code Smells are Worth Chasing?

Idan Amit<sup>1,2,\*</sup>    Nili Ben Ezra<sup>1</sup>    Dror G. Feitelson<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Dept. Computer Science, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel

<sup>2</sup>Acumen Labs, Tel-Aviv, Israel

**Abstract**—The common use case of code smells assumes causality: Identify a smell, remove it, and by doing so improve the code. We empirically investigate their fitness to this use. We present a list of properties that code smells should have if they indeed cause lower quality. We evaluated the smells in 31,687 Java files from 677 GitHub repositories, all the repositories with 200+ commits in 2019. We measured the influence of smells on four metrics for quality, productivity, and bug detection efficiency. Out of 151 code smells computed by the CheckStyle smell detector, less than 20% were found to be potentially causal, and only a handful are rather robust. The strongest smells deal with simplicity, defensive programming, and abstraction. Files without the potentially causal smells are 50% more likely to be of high quality. Unfortunately, most smells are not removed, and developers tend to remove the easy ones and not the effective ones.

## I. INTRODUCTION

High quality is desirable in software development. A common method to improve quality is to identify low-quality code and improve it. Code smells are often advocated as indicators of low-quality code. They encapsulate software engineering knowledge and facilitate large-scale scanning of source code to identify potential problems [6], [53], [73]. Once found, removing the smell is believed to improve the quality of the code. However, it seems that this approach suffers from many drawbacks. Code smells have been criticized for not representing problems of interest [11] and for having low predictive power [67], [69], [46]. As a result they are not widely used by developers [9], [40], [24], [67], [38].

The common method to assess causality is controlled experiments. Choose a smell, find instances where it occurs, remove them, and observe the results. However, CheckStyle alone provides 151 smells and assessing all of them will require tremendous effort. We use the data on the smells behaviour ‘in nature’ in order to identify the most promising smells. After that, it is much easier to follow up and validate the causality.

We use a set of metrics in order to measure the influence of smells: The corrective commit probability, commit size, commit duration, and time to find bugs. The corrective commit probability (CCP) estimates the fraction of development effort that is invested in fixing bugs [3]. Commit size measures coupling using the average of the number of files appearing in commit [80], [2], [3]. Commit duration, the gross time to complete a commit, computed as the average time from the

previous commit of the same author, for commits on the same date. Time to find a bug is the difference from the previous modification of the file, a process metric lower bound to the time from the bug introduction.

Note that all our target metrics are process metrics, unlike smells which are based on code, making dependency less likely.

One could measure correlation of the smells and the metrics, but correlation is not causation. In a world of noisy observations, it is not easy to show causality. On the other hand, it is possible to specify properties that are expected to hold if causality actually exists. We suggest the following properties:

- **Predictive power**: the ability to use smells to detect low-quality files.
- **Monotonicity**: the smell should be more common in low-quality files than in high-quality files.
- **Co-change**: an improvement in quality once a smell is removed.
- **Predictive power when the developer is controlled**, comparing the quality of files of the same developer differing by a smell.
- **Predictive power when the length is controlled**, to avoid smells that are merely indications of large code volume.

### A. Novelty and Contribution

We suggest a novel method to evaluate if a smell might be causal. We checked these properties for all CheckStyle’s smells, on a large data set. The results were that less than 20% of the smells were found to have all the desired properties with respect to a target metric.

We did this evaluation on four target metrics, representing quality, productivity, and bug detection efficiency. We also used a random metric as a negative control. Our results agree with prior work on the importance of simplicity, abstraction, and defensive programming, as well as infamous smells like ‘IllegalToken’ (go to) and ‘InnerAssignment’ (e.g., assignment in if statement).

We analyzed the smells that developers currently remove and show that they focus on easy smells and not in causal smells.

We identify a small set of smells that might be causal and therefore their removal might improve the desired metric. We show that files lacking them indeed have higher quality,

\* idan.amit@mail.huji.ac.il

promising results for developers that will remove them, if these smells are indeed causal.

## II. RELATED WORK

### A. Code quality

Metrics are essential for quantitative research and therefore there is a long history of code-quality metrics research. The need has motivated the development of several software quality models (e.g. [16], [25]) and standards.

For some, this term refers to the quality of the software product as perceived by its users [68]. Capers Jones defined software quality as the combination of low defect rate and high user satisfaction [41], [42]. Such a definition is not suitable for our needs since we don't have data about the users' satisfaction.

A different approach is using industry standards. A typical example is the ISO/IEC 25010:2011 standard [39]. It includes metrics like fitness for purpose, satisfaction, freedom from risk, etc. These metrics might be subjective, hard to measure, which makes them less suitable to our research goals. Indeed, studies of the ISO/IEC 9126 standard [36] (the precursor of ISO/IEC 25010) found it to be ineffective in identifying design problems [1].

Code smells themselves were suggested as code quality metrics [26], [73]. Yet, it is debatable whether they indeed reflect real quality problems [1], [11]. One could treat each code smell as a labeling function and evaluate them using their relations [4], [65]. Yet, this direction is not trivial and simpler smell-based methods might be circular.

### B. Code Smells

A common method to improve code quality is by refactoring [26]. Code smells [26], [73] identify code artifacts that are of low quality, potential for improvement by refactoring.

Smells, as their name indicates, are not necessarily problems but a warning. Smells are de facto defined by the developers implementing them. While they capture knowledge, they are not always validated, a gap that we would like to fill.

Static analysis [56] is analysis that is based on the source code, as opposed to dynamic analysis in which the code is being run. Static analysis is a common way to implement code smells identification. `CheckStyle`, the code smell identification tool that we used, is also based on static analysis.

It seems that developers lost faith in code smells and don't tend to use static analysis tools [40], choose refactoring targets based on smells, consider them in pull request approval [47], or remove the smells [11], [18].

Defect prediction is the attempt to predict if a file will contain bugs [22], [30], [31], [56], [61], [82], [57], [51]. The common features used for defect prediction are code metrics and code smells.

There are two main differences between our work and the common defect prediction. Our work is an easier task since we don't try to predict a bug but focus on quality groups. On the other hand, it is harder since we measure differences in quality levels, requiring the ability to identify differences.

Our work resembles that of Basili et al. [10] who validated the K&C metrics [19] as predictors of fault-prone classes. The difference is that we validate the smells as potential causes and not as predictors. Couto et al. [21] used Granger causality tests, showing additional predictive power in time series for future events [29], in order to predict defects using code metrics. Our work is also close in spirit to the work of Trautsch et al. that investigated the evolution of PMD static analyzer alerts and code quality, operationalized as defect density (defects per LOC) [72].

## III. OUR TARGET METRICS

We aim to measure the influence of the smells with respect to quality (smells common use), productivity, and bug detection efficiency. The target metrics that we use are the corrective commit probability (CCP) and coupling for quality [3], commit duration for productivity, and time to detect bugs for detection efficiency. Our main metric of interest is CCP since many smells are used to alert on possible bugs. We use the other metrics in order to understand if smells serve other goals too and as comparison.

The corrective commit probability (CCP) [3] uses the intuition that bugs are bad and measures the ratio of the commits dedicated to bug fixes. Self-admitted technical-debt [64], developers referring to low-quality, and even swearing agree with CCP. Other than the code quality, CCP is also influenced by detection efficiency. For example, as predicted by Linus's law [66], popular projects with more eyeballs detect bugs better and have higher CCP. Bigger projects with more developers also tend to have higher CCP. In the co-change property we compare a file to itself, so these variables are being controlled. It is also important to note that CCP, like the other metrics that we use, are process metrics, and not source code metrics. If we used the same data source that might lead to dependency between the smells and the metrics (as we show for `length`) which might invalidate the results. Assuming conditional-independence given the concept [15], [48] between the source code and process metrics, an increase in the CCP is due to an increase of problems in the source code.

We chose to divide the metrics into groups of the 25% 'low-quality', 25% 'high-quality' and the 'other' 50% in the middle. This way the groups' quality is different and we avoid problems due to imbalanced data sets [74], [45], [60]. In the case of CCP, low quality files are in the spirit of hot spots, files with many bugs, [71], [77], [52], [43] and high quality resemble files of reduced-risk [59]. Note that the high-quality group for CCP translates to no bugs, in at least 10 commits in the given year.

We use the commit size as a coupling metric, the target of few smells. A commit is a unit of work ideally reflecting the completion of a task. It should contain only the files relevant to that task. Many files needed for a task means coupling. Therefore, the average number of files in a commit can be used as a metric for coupling [80], [2], [3]. This metric agrees with the way developers think about coupling, being higher

when “coupled” or “coupling” is mentioned by the developer [3].

We measure productivity using the average gross duration of file’s commits. Smelly code is assumed to be harder to understand and modify, hurting productivity. We compute the gross duration as the time between a commit to the previous commit of the developer, on the same day. The requirement for the same day overcomes large gaps of inactivity of open source developers that could be misinterpreted as long tasks. We manually labeled 50 such cases to validate that they fit the duration needed for the code change. The same-day duration is highly stable with 0.87 adjacent-years Pearson correlation, and co-changes with commits per developer and pull requests per developer. In turn, commits per developer is correlated with self-rated productivity[55] and team lead perception of productivity [62]. Commit duration can be applied to a file by analyzing its commits and therefore we choose it.

One could measure bug detection efficiency by the duration between the bug inducing commit and the bug fixing commit. Unreadable code, edge cases, and unexpected behaviour can lead to hard to detect bugs. In order to identify the bug inducing commit, one should use a method like the SZZ algorithm [70] which is not a process metric and requires a considerable computational effort on our data set. Instead we use the last time the file was touched before the bug-fixing commit. This is a lower bound on the time to fix the bug since the bug inducing commit is this one or an earlier one. The adjacent-year repository Pearson correlation is 0.52. In order to validate the “Time from Previous Update” metric, we observe the influence of behaviours that should change the time needed to identify bugs. Projects that hardly have tests (less than 1% test files in commits, allowing few false positives) fix a bug after 72 day on average, 33% more than the rest. Similarly to Linus’s law influence on CCP analysis [3], the extremely popular projects identify bugs in 51 days on average, compared to 78 days for the others from the same organizations (53% higher).

The target metrics implementation has many small details, listed in the supplementary materials.

As a negative control, a metric with which causality is not expected, we used a variable uniformly distributed between 1 and 100. Table I shows that random has 4 potentially causal smells, all with hit rate 0.00 (rounded) and no robust smells. Using this negative control, we can estimate the expected noise.

Most smells are designed to alert on potential bugs, hence most are expected to be aligned with CCP. We observed good alignment with productivity too, as many smells alert on aspects like readability (e.g. ‘BooleanExpressionComplexity’, ‘OneStatementPerLine’), which influence productivity. The alignment with coupling and detection efficiency is rather low, as with random. Hence their related smells might be accidental, as further discussed later.

## IV. DATA SET CREATION

Our data set starts with all [BigQuery GitHub schema](#) non-redundant<sup>1</sup> Java repositories with 200+ commits during 2019, taken from the CCP paper [3]. There are 909 such repositories. From these we extract all non-test files with at least 10 commits during 2019 that we could analyze with the [CheckStyle](#) tool. This led to 31,687 files from 677 repositories.

For the predictive power analysis, we used commits of 2019 and the code version of January 1st 2019. For temporal analysis (stability, co-change, smell removal), we used the commits of 2017, 2018, and 2019 the code versions of January 1st of the relevant year.

The data set mere computation is long. Source code tends to deviate from language specifications, and static analyzers might fail due to such deviations [14]. Therefore running CheckStyle requires a lot of tuning and monitoring. This was the main technical constraint in extending the data set into the past.

We used CheckStyle to analyze the code and identify smells. This tool currently recognizes 174 smells, 151 appeared 200+ times and are relevant to us. We chose CheckStyle since it is popular [12], open-source, with many diverse smells. In addition, its smells tend to be general and not specific low-level erroneous patterns. Due to the data set creation effort we couldn’t use more than one static analyzer. We list in the threats to validity other static analyzers that could be used for similar research.

We excluded test files since their behaviour is different from that of functional code. We identified test files by looking for the string ‘test’ in the file path. Berger et al. reported 100% precision of this classifier, based on a sample of 100 files [13].

## V. DESIRED PROPERTIES OF CODE SMELLS

Though smells might be valuable due to their predictive power alone, the implicit assumption is of causality. The common use is “once you find a smell, remove it, in order to avoid the problems it causes”.

A common approach in causality studies is to build models of possible relations among all variables [63]. However, smells usage assumes that a smell occurrence is important on its own, regardless of other smells. We do the same and treat each smell separately, aiming for finding a smell-concept relation and not relations between smells. This allows us to use properties that examine each smell on its own and show the expected temporal behaviour. However, the separate analysis poses a threat of identifying a non causal smell as causal since it is very related to a causal smell.

The direction of causality, if it exists, is known. Given concept  $C$  and smell  $S$ , one could build models for  $S \rightarrow C$  and for  $C \rightarrow S$ , and see which is better supported. However, we know that a smell in the source code might lead to a bug, but the bugs won’t modify the source code, invalidating  $C \rightarrow S$ . Due to these assumptions we are left with a simple model for smells and concepts causality.

<sup>1</sup>Excluding forks and other related repositories.

We suggest a set of properties that should hold given causality. The properties are [predictive power](#), [monotonicity](#), [co-change of smell and target metric](#), [influence when the developer is controlled](#), and [influence when the length is controlled](#).

By removing smells that don't have these properties, we remain with a group of less than 20% of the 151 original smells that can be further investigated for causality. The rest of the smells should be treated with more suspicion.

Note that these properties are not meant to be descriptive of the developers actual activity, discussed in Section VII. These properties are derived from the required causality and justified due to mathematical reasons.

### A. Predictive Power

We start with requiring predictive power. Precision, defined as  $P(\text{positive}|\text{hit})$ , measures a classifier's tendency to avoid false positives. In a software development context, this measures the probability of actually finding a low-quality file when checking a smell alert.

Precision might be high simply since the positive rate is high. Precision lift, defined as  $\text{Precision}/P(\text{positive}) - 1 = \frac{P(\text{positive}|\text{hit}) - P(\text{positive})}{P(\text{positive})}$ , copes with this difficulty and measures the additional probability of having a true positive relative to the base positive rate. For example, a useless random classifier will have precision equal to the positive rate, but a precision lift of 0.

There are additional supervised learning metrics [that we discuss below](#). However, the precision lift best captures the usage of smells and therefore it is a metric of high interest. When a developer looks for low-quality code to improve, the precision lift measures the value of using the smell as a guide rather than going over the source code randomly. High precision and precision lift make the use of smells effective.

We define the predictive power property to be the conjunction of three terms:

- We require a positive precision lift in order to claim that observing the hits of a smell is better than observing random files. This is deliberately the minimal threshold of improvement.
- We also require that the target metric average given a smell will be higher than the metric average. Note that this measures *how bad* the code is, and not only whether it is bad.
- We required that the smell appears in 200+ files since a small number of cases might make the evaluation inaccurate. Other than that, a rare smell provides less opportunities for quality improvement.

### B. Monotonicity

In case that a smell causes more problems, we expect it to appear more in problematic files. Hence the smell hit rate in 'high-quality' files will be lower than in 'other' files, which in its turn will be lower than in 'low-quality' files.

Here is the justification. Let  $L$  be 'low-quality' and let  $S$  be smell. If  $S$  causes  $L$ , then  $P(L|S) > P(L) > P(L|\neg S)$ .

Using Bayes rule  $P(L|S) = \frac{P(S|L) \cdot P(L)}{P(S)}$ , the inequality  $P(L|S) > P(L)$  can be rewritten  $\frac{P(S|L) \cdot P(L)}{P(S)} > P(L)$ , which implies  $P(S|L) > P(S)$  as desired. The same derivation for no smell leads to  $P(\neg S|L) < P(\neg S)$ .

Extending to three groups, if we compare the smell appearance probability in 'high-quality', 'other', and 'low-quality' files we expect it to be strictly monotonically increasing.

### C. Co-Change with Target Metric

In co-change analysis we compare the change of two metrics on the same entity in two consecutive periods. As with correlation, co-change of two metrics does not necessarily imply causality. However, causal relations do imply co-change, since a change in the causing metric should lead to a change in the affected metric. Co-change analysis was used in software engineering to show that coupling improvement co-changes with CCP improvement [3].

In short, denote the event that metric  $i$  improved from one year to the next by  $m_i\uparrow$ . The probability  $P(m_j\uparrow | m_i\uparrow)$  (the equivalent to precision in supervised learning) indicates how likely we are to observe an improvement in metric  $j$  knowing of an improvement in metric  $i$ . Smell improvement is defined as a reduction in the smell occurrences relative to the same file the year before. Target metric improvement is a reduction in its value between the years. It might be that we will observe high precision but it will be simply since  $P(m_j\uparrow)$  is high. In order to exclude this possibility, we also observe the precision lift,  $\frac{P(m_j\uparrow | m_i\uparrow)}{P(m_j\uparrow)} - 1$ . Note that these are the same precision and precision lift used in the predictive power, this time applied on temporal data.

### D. Influence when Controlling the Developer

The developer writing the code influences it in many ways. Consider a smell that has no influence from a software engineering point of view, yet due to sociological reasons it divides the developer community into two groups. If one of the groups tends to produce code of higher quality, it will look as if this smell influences the quality.

The statistical method to avoid this is to control the relevant variables: Investigate  $P(Q|S, C)$  instead of  $P(Q|S)$ , where  $Q$  is quality,  $S$  is smell, and  $C$  is community. Note that in case that we condition on a community that has no influence then  $P(Q|S, C) = P(Q|S)$ , and this property will not be influential.

However, we do not have information about the community or any other confounding variables. A popular solution in psychology is "twin experiments". Identical twins have the same biological background, so a difference in their behaviour is attributed to another difference (e.g., being raised differently). This idea was used to profile malware of the same developer [5], and to investigate the project influence on coupling [3]. For example, if project A is more coupled than project B, a developer's coupling in A also is usually higher than in B [3].

Twin experiments thus help to factor out personal style, biases, and skill, and can neutralize differences in the developer community and other influencing factors.



In this paper we consider files written by the same developer in the same repository as twins.

### E. Influence when Controlling File Length

The influence of length on error-proneness is one of the most established results of software engineering [49], [27]. As Figure 1 shows, file of at most 104 lines, the first 3 deciles, have average CCP less than 0.1, which is enough to enter the top 20% of projects [3].

Doing a co-change analysis of line count and CCP, an improvement in line count has a 5% precision lift predicting CCP improvement, and 6% precision lift predicting a significant CCP improvement of 10 percentage points.




Figure 1. Corrective Commit Probability by Line Count Deciles.

Hence, the appearance of a smell might seem indicative of low quality simply since the smell is indicative of length, which in turn is indicative of lower quality [27]. In order to avoid that, we divide files into length groups, and require the property of predictive power when the length group is controlled. Specifically, we require precision lift in the short (first 25%, up to 83 lines), medium (25% to 75%), and long (highest 25%, at least 407 lines) length groups.

Also, we filter out smells whose Pearson correlation with line count is higher than 0.5, which is **considered to indicate high correlation**. This should have been a relatively easy requirement since the **'JavaNCSS'** smell (number of Java statements above a threshold) has Pearson correlation of 0.45 and the **'FileLength'** smell (length higher than a threshold) has a Pearson correlation of 0.44 with the line count. These smells are basically step functions on length and have lower than 0.5 correlation. Hence, 0.5 correlation is a strong correlation also in our specific case. Indeed, 127 smells have lower than 0.5 Pearson with length.

Table I summaries how many smells have each property with respect to each target metric. 'Robust' and 'Almost' are used for sensitivity analysis, either slightly higher or lower requirements. In the 'Robust' we require a precision lift of 10% in predictive power, twins, length and cochange. In 'Almost' we allow a small decrease of -10% precision lift.

## VI. RESULTS

We present statistics on smells that appeared in 200+ non-test files. The potentially causal smells with respect to CCP are presented in Table II, for commit duration in Table III, for detection efficiency in Table IV, and for coupling in Table V. We analyze 31,687 files that had at least 10 commits during 2019, from 677 repositories.

Smells are extremely stable year to year, even when counting smell occurrences in a file and not just existence. The average Pearson correlation of the smells year to year is 0.93.

### A. Potentially Causal Smells Investigation

In this section we investigate the resulting potentially causal smells, and some smells surprisingly not considered as such. The descriptions are based on the **CheckStyle tutorial**.

CheckStyle groups the smells by type, which allows to analyze the findings with respect to these groups. For CCP, Table II (Section VI-B) shows that many of the smells are 'coding' checks, typically alerting on a local specific case. The 'metrics' smells are more general, representing simplicity and abstraction. The 'size' group also represents simplicity while its member 'AnonInnerLength' also checks abstraction. The 'class-design' smell 'VisibilityModifier' checks abstraction too. The 'import' and the 'illegal' groups (subsets of the coding group) check that a too wide action is not used.

The 'whitespace', 'JavaDoc comments', and 'misc' represent smells that the compiler is indifferent to. Despite that, refactoring of the same spirit were shown to be useful [2]. It might be due to their influence on the developer, like in improving the readability. Note that since we use twin experiments, it is possible that part of their predictive power is due to indication about the developer's behaviour, yet more influence exists.

It is interesting that entire groups are not represented at all, questioning their utility: 'naming conventions', 'annotations', 'unnecessary', 'block', 'header', 'modifiers', and 'regex' groups.

Duration potentially causal smells (Table III) come mainly from 'coding', 'metrics', 'naming conventions' and 'size violation'. Yet it is more diverse than the CCP groups and the indirect groups are more represented.

The results for coupling and detection (Tables IV and V) are suspicious. Note that they both have a very small number of potentially causal smells. Each smell comes from a different group, undermining the hypothesis that a group represents a more general reason to the influence. The coupling related smells do not seem to have anything to do with coupling. Note that the hit rate of most of them is very small, making them very sensitive to noise.

Detection efficiency is represented by 'MutableException' from 'class design' group and 'TypecastParenPad' from 'whitespace' group. While 'MutableException' seems like a source of bugs that are hard to detect, 'TypecastParenPad' alerts on the use of white space in casting and seems accidental. In both cases the hit rate is small and rounded to 0.00.

Table I  
SMELLS WITH EACH OF THE PROPERTIES

Concept	Description	Potential	Robust	Almost	Predictive	Cochange	Twins	Monotonicity	Length
Random	Negative control	4	0	41	48	62	73	30	32
Duration	Avg. commit duration	20	1	62	119	97	114	86	52
Detection	Avg. time from modification	2	0	7	19	63	28	15	46
Coupling	Avg. # files in commit	4	0	10	15	112	122	14	28
CCP	Fix commit probability	27	5	62	105	111	113	89	53

Table II  
POTENTIAL CODE SMELLS FOR CCP

Smell	Group	Precision	Mean	Hit Rate	Recall	Jaccard	Co-change	Twins	Removal Probability
NestedTryDepth	Coding	0.39	0.32	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.24	0.07
FallThrough	Coding	0.39	0.29	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.16	0.54	0.11
EmptyForIteratorPad	Whitespace	0.39	0.31	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.05	0.43	0.09
InnerAssignment	Coding	0.35	0.28	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.01	0.34	0.05
IllegalThrows	Coding	0.34	0.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.93	0.09
ParameterAssignment	Coding	0.34	0.28	0.11	0.14	0.11	0.13	0.32	0.05
NPathComplexity	Metrics	0.34	0.27	0.17	0.22	0.16	0.18	0.27	0.05
MethodParamPad	Whitespace	0.34	0.26	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.30	0.28	0.14
AnonInnerLength	Size Violation	0.33	0.27	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.31	0.48	0.09
UnnecessaryParentheses	Coding	0.33	0.26	0.13	0.16	0.12	0.21	0.34	0.08
NestedIfDepth	Coding	0.33	0.27	0.20	0.25	0.17	0.24	0.31	0.04
IllegalCatch	Coding	0.32	0.25	0.20	0.25	0.16	0.15	0.37	0.04
JavaNCSS	Metrics	0.32	0.27	0.15	0.19	0.13	0.23	0.26	0.05
AvoidStaticImport	Import	0.32	0.26	0.21	0.26	0.17	0.16	0.31	0.04
RequireThis	Coding	0.32	0.32	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.28	0.13
ClassDataAbstractionCoupling	Metrics	0.32	0.26	0.19	0.23	0.16	0.12	0.36	0.04
ExecutableStatementCount	Size Violation	0.32	0.26	0.20	0.25	0.16	0.20	0.25	0.04
JavadocParagraph	Javadoc Comments	0.32	0.25	0.19	0.23	0.16	0.09	0.37	0.10
TrailingComment	Misc	0.32	0.26	0.22	0.26	0.17	0.30	0.33	0.05
VisibilityModifier	Class Design	0.31	0.25	0.23	0.27	0.17	0.14	0.12	0.05
VariableDeclarationUsageDistance	Coding	0.31	0.26	0.10	0.12	0.09	0.21	0.19	0.09
IllegalToken	Coding	0.31	0.27	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.98	0.43	0.03
ExplicitInitialization	Coding	0.30	0.24	0.13	0.15	0.11	0.18	0.21	0.05
HiddenField	Coding	0.30	0.23	0.46	0.52	0.23	0.18	0.32	0.03
EqualsHashCode	Coding	0.29	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.02	0.33	0.37
AvoidStarImport	Import	0.29	0.24	0.15	0.17	0.12	0.06	0.27	0.08
WhitespaceAround	Whitespace	0.28	0.24	0.24	0.26	0.16	0.09	0.20	0.13

Table III  
POTENTIAL CODE SMELLS FOR DURATION

Smell	Group	Precision	Mean	Hit Rate	Recall	Jaccard	Co-change	Twins	Removal Probability
InterfaceTypeParameterName	Naming Conventions	0.48	146.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.60	0.04
AvoidEscapedUnicodeCharacters	Misc	0.46	137.42	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.24	0.26	0.05
ArrayTypeStyle	Misc	0.40	132.44	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.08	0.28	0.10
FileLength	Size Violation	0.40	134.45	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.11	0.14	0.02
MethodTypeParameterName	Naming Conventions	0.37	152.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.13	0.04
BooleanExpressionComplexity	Metrics	0.36	126.56	0.05	0.07	0.06	0.12	0.12	0.06
EmptyForInitializerPad	Whitespace	0.36	136.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.10	0.43
EmptyCatchBlock	Block	0.35	118.11	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.19	0.21	0.11
FallThrough	Coding	0.35	120.35	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.09	0.26	0.11
UnnecessarySemicolonInEnumeration	Coding	0.33	133.25	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.27	0.09	0.08
IllegalImport	Import	0.33	121.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.72	0.25	0.33
NestedForDepth	Coding	0.33	119.86	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.12	0.13	0.08
NPathComplexity	Metrics	0.32	118.79	0.17	0.23	0.15	0.01	0.10	0.05
OneStatementPerLine	Coding	0.32	122.85	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.16	0.06	0.11
ParameterNumber	Size Violation	0.32	116.64	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.11	0.22	0.05
JavadocParagraph	Javadoc Comments	0.31	113.84	0.19	0.24	0.16	0.05	0.15	0.08
TrailingComment	Misc	0.31	117.03	0.22	0.27	0.17	0.06	0.06	0.05
ClassTypeParameterName	Naming Conventions	0.31	120.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.64	0.02
NoFinalizer	Coding	0.29	109.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.49	0.13
WriteTag	Javadoc Comments	0.27	104.99	0.55	0.60	0.23	0.01	0.18	0.02

Table IV  
POTENTIAL CODE SMELLS FOR DETECTION

Smell	Group	Precision	Mean	Hit Rate	Recall	Jaccard	Co-change	Twins	Removal Probability
MutableException	Class Design	0.43	81,505.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.24	0.01	0.07
TypecastParenPad	Whitespace	0.29	37,117.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.48	0.11	0.21

Table V  
POTENTIAL CODE SMELLS FOR COUPLING

Smell	Group	Precision	Mean	Hit Rate	Recall	Jaccard	Co-change	Twins	Removal Probability
LambdaParameterName	Naming Conventions	0.34	20.24	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.14	1.05	0.06
IllegalImport	Import	0.29	19.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.79	0.33
AnnotationUseStyle	Annotation	0.26	19.95	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.05	1.06	0.08
LeftCurly	Block	0.24	19.77	0.15	0.15	0.10	0.24	0.52	0.08

Few smells are potential for more than one target metric, indicating extra validation of their usefulness.

**NPathComplexity** [58] was designed based on cyclomatic complexity [50], checking the number of execution paths, is potential for CCP and duration. So is **'FallThrough'**, dropping in switch statement options without a break.

**'JavadocParagraph'**, a JavaDoc formatting smell, and **'TrailingComment'**, a comment in a code line, are also potential for CCP and commit duration. They seem not harmful on their own but indicative of deviation from a standard.

**'IllegalImport'** is potential for duration and coupling. It alerts on wide imports like `'import sun.*'`, which can lead to collisions, unintended use of the wrong package and readability problems.

More smells of special interest are the robust ones, which have higher lift. The robust smells for CCP are **'AvoidStaticImport'**, **'IllegalCatch'**, **'ParameterAssignment'**, **'UnnecessaryParentheses'**, and the already discussed **'NPathComplexity'** [58].

Defensive programming [79] is programming in a way that is robust to *future programming mistakes*, and not avoiding only incorrectness in the current implementation. **'AvoidStaticImport'** allows hiding the relation between a static method and its source (e.g., `'import static java.lang.Math.pow'`; and calling `pow` instead of `Math.pow`), which is a source of confusion. **'ParameterAssignment'** disallows assignment of parameters. **'IllegalCatch'** alerts on the use of a too general class in catch (e.g., `Error`, `Exception`). Besides the robust defensive smells, pay attention to **'IllegalToken'**, a structured variant of `'go to'`, the most notorious construct in software engineering [23]. Also, **'InnerAssignment'** "Checks for assignments in subexpressions, such as in `String s = Integer.toString(i = 2);`", is causing bugs since the early days of C. **'UnnecessaryParentheses'** is harmless on its own but might indicate misunderstanding of the developer.

The only robust smell with respect to duration is **'AvoidEscapedUnicodeCharacters'**, which advocates a readable representation of Unicode. That might hurt understanding the text.

Another interesting aspect is that some of the smells con-

sider abstraction: **'ClassDataAbstractionCoupling'**, **'VisibilityModifier'**, and **'AnonInnerLength'**.

Coupling and detection had no robust smells, making our suspicion in the result stronger.

There were smells that we were surprised by their failure to be potentially causal for CCP. In the easier to understand cases, some smells didn't have a positive precision lift when conditioned on a certain length group value. These are **'TodoComment'** (whose removal was shown beneficial [2]), the classic **'CyclomaticComplexity'** [50] (ancestor of **NPathComplexity**) and **'MagicNumber'**. This might be accidental since we conducted many experiments and some smells have a low hit rate. It is also possible that a smell is indeed beneficial but only on a certain length group.

Harder cases are smells that don't have the predictive or co-change property. This is more disturbing since these properties are the basic assumptions in smells usage. We were surprised that the smells **'BooleanExpressionComplexity'** and **'ConstantName'** didn't have a positive co-change precision lift, and **'SimplifyBooleanExpression'** had a negative predictive precision lift.

It was also surprising to notice that some smells designed for coupling are not potentially causal for it. These are **'ClassDataAbstractionCoupling'** [8] with -35% predictive precision lift, and **'ClassFanOutComplexity'** [33] with -27% predictive precision lift.

In order to evaluate the sensitivity of the properties, we present in Table I smells that are **'Robust'** and **'Almost'** smells. Even with the generous **'Almost'** setting, about two thirds of the smells are not included. Requiring robust properties leads to only a handful of smells.

Another way to perform sensitivity analysis is to count the number of properties they have. The CCP potentially causal smells, 27 of them, have all 5 properties. 49 smells have 4 properties, 31 smells have 3 properties, 31 smells have 2 properties, 13 smells have 1 property and 2 have none.

Out of the smells having 4 properties, 73% lack the length property, 12% lack the co-change property, 10% lack the twins, 4% lack the monotonicity, and none lack predictive power.

## B. Smells Influence

Supervised learning metrics shed light on the common behaviour of a classifier and a concept. However, a metric should be used with respect to a need. We explain to which software engineering needs each metric that we use here corresponds.

The cases in which the concept is true are called ‘positives’ and the positives rate is denoted  $P(\text{positive})$ . Cases in which the classifier is true are called ‘hits’ and the hit rate is  $P(\text{hit})$ . A high hit rate of a smell means that the developer will have to examine many files.

Ideally, hits correspond to positives but usually they differ. Precision, discussed above, is one example of a metric for such differences.

Recall, defined as  $P(\text{hit}|\text{positive})$ , measures how many of the positives are also hits; in our case, this is how many of the low quality files a smell identifies. Recall is of high importance to developers who aim to remove all low quality.

Accuracy,  $P(\text{positive} = \text{hit})$  is probably the most common supervised learning metric. However, it is misleading when there is a large group of null records, samples that are neither hits nor positives. For example, the vast majority of programs are benign, so always predicting benign will have high accuracy but detect no malware [60]. True Positives (TP, correct hits), False Positives (FP, wrong hits), and False Negatives (FN, unidentified positives) are the cases in which either the concept or the classifier are true—without the null records. The Jaccard index copes with the problem of null records by omitting them, computing  $\frac{TP}{TP+FP+FN}$ .

Tables II, III, V, and IV presents the above statistics for the robust smells, ordered by precision. The concept is being low-quality, and the precision, recall, and Jaccard are computed with respect to this concept. The mean (of the target metric) is not a supervised learning metric. It doesn’t measure if the quality is bad but how bad it is (the higher, the worse in our target metrics). Co-change and Twins present the precision lift in these properties. Removal probability is the probability of a smell existing in a file in one year to be removed in the year after it, further discussed in section VII.

The strongest result observed is the poor performance of even the potentially causal smells. The highest precision is less than 50%, implying at least 1 mistake per successful identification, and the common results are around 30%, not much more than the 25% expected from a random guess. Such performance quickly leads to mistrust.

The hit rate of most smells is low, possibly since developers already consider them to be a bad practice and avoid them in the first place.

The recall and the Jaccard index, aggregating the precision and recall, is also very low for all potentially causal smells. Thus, these smells are of limited value either for developers looking for easy wins (precision oriented) or those aiming to win the war (recall oriented).

## VII. ACTED UPON SMELLS

Smells are usually not translated into action, due to reasons like low predictive power, lack of trust, or just not being aware of them. Identifying actionable alerts adds value to the developer. On the other hand, a developer taking action upon an alert is implicitly approving it [78], [32], [67].

We used the developers “wisdom of the crowd” to check which smells are acted upon. We did this by checking the probability of a smell type existing in a file in one year to be removed in the next year. According to Imtiaz et al. the median time required for acting on an alert is 96 days [37]. We require that all the smells of this type be removed as indication of intent. On the other hand, if an entire method was removed (e.g., due to deprecation), we will consider its smells as being removed too.

In prior properties we evaluated smells with respect to code quality. In this experiment, we evaluate the importance attributed to the smells by the developers and the code quality is not used.

Table VI, presenting most removed smells with 200+ removal opportunities, agree with prior work that smells are generally not acted upon [37], [44], [72]. The leading smell is ‘UnusedImports’, which is a common best-practice, with 42% removal probability.

Removal probability continues to decrease rapidly, and the vast majority of smells are unlikely to be removed. The potentially causal smells with the highest removal probability on 200+ cases are ‘EqualsHashCode’ with 37% and ‘Method-ParamPad’ with 14%.

The lack of effort to remove smells is an indication of disbelief in the value of investing in this activity. Most acted upon smells are usually supported by IDEs and even automatic source code formatting utilities. Hence, not only that developers don’t tend to act up on smells, smells that are acted upon are the easy ones, not the ones likely to provide benefit.

## VIII. MODELING

We checked if the combined power of the smells is higher than each of them alone. For each metric, we checked the probability of being either high-quality or low-quality, given that none of the potentially causal smells appear in the file (see Table VII). Note that in this section we no longer investigate causality but modeling, as we observe the smells existence. If the smells are causal, their removal is expected to lead to what we observe.

For CCP the gap is very high, and the probability of being high-quality is 44%, with a lift of 50%. Note that the high-quality CCP means no bugs (at least in 10 commits, real probability might be somewhat higher), making the result outstanding. When we control for length the precision lift is only 1% for the already good short files, 32% for medium, and 59% for long.

In order to know the relative power of the CCP result, we compared it to a machine learning model for high quality using all smells. First, we reach over-fitting deliberately when



Table VI  
ACTED UPON SMELLS INFLUENCE (200+ REMOVAL OPPORTUNITIES, AT LEAST 0.15)

Smell	Group	Precision	Mean	Hit Rate	Recall	Jaccard	Co-change	Twins	Removal Probability
UnusedImports	Import	0.26	0.22	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.23	0.33	0.42
EqualsHashCode	Coding	0.29	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.02	0.33	0.37
AtclauseOrder	JavaDoc Comments	0.22	0.17	0.05	0.04	0.04	-0.17	-0.48	0.29
GenericWhitespace	Whitespace	0.29	0.22	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.17	0.64	0.25
NoWhitespaceBefore	Whitespace	0.29	0.23	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.32	0.07	0.23
EmptyStatement	Coding	0.26	0.22	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.05	-0.01	0.21
MissingDeprecated	Annotation	0.26	0.23	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.40	0.21	0.17
ParenPad	Whitespace	0.30	0.24	0.08	0.09	0.08	-0.04	0.19	0.16
ArrayTrailingComma	Coding	0.29	0.23	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.67	0.17	0.15
CommentsIndentation	Misc	0.31	0.25	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.15	0.18	0.15
InvalidJavadocPosition	JavaDoc Comments	0.33	0.24	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.13	-0.06	0.15
SingleSpaceSeparator	Whitespace	0.29	0.24	0.12	0.13	0.10	0.08	0.22	0.15

training and evaluating on the same data set in order to evaluate the model representation power of the data [7]. It reached accuracy of 98%, a good representation. When training and evaluating on different sets, it reached accuracy of 74% and precision (equivalent of high-quality probability) of 71%. Hence the descriptive model has precision 75% higher than the group, basing on indicative smells that might not be causal. When we built a model with only the potentially causal smells, we reached over-fitting accuracy of just 71%, and test set precision of 54%, 22% higher than using the entire set.

The gap for duration is quite moderate. For detection there is no gap and for coupling it is in the reverse direction, supporting the hypothesis that the smells are not influential with respect to them. Note that coupling and duration had very few potentially causal smells, which also contributes to the influence of their groups. 86% of the files have no coupling smells and almost none have detection smells.

Table VII  
SMELLS GROUPS INFLUENCE

Metric	Hit Rate	High Quality	Low Quality
CCP	0.15	0.44	0.24
Coupling	0.86	0.22	0.24
Detection	1.00	0.25	0.25
Duration	0.27	0.25	0.22

For the predictive analysis of the smells we used data from 2019. In order to avoid evaluation on the same data we used 2018 in this section. Yet, we alert on some data leakage. Some of it is due to co-change that uses prior years data. More leakage comes from the stability of the smells and the metrics. The file CCP has adjacent-year Pearson correlation of 0.45, and most smells are even more stable, with average Pearson correlation of 0.93. This stability means that the train and test samples are similar, very close to our over-fitting setting. Note that this leakage is common in defect prediction and might explain why cross-project defect-prediction is harder than within-project defect-prediction, resulting in lower predictive power [81].

## IX. THREATS TO VALIDITY

Our data set contains only Java projects, simplifying its construction and taking language differences out of the equation.

But this raises a question whether the results hold for other languages too.

We used a single code smell detector, [CheckStyle](#). Other tools (e.g., [FindBugs](#) [14], [SonarCube](#) [17], [Coverity](#) [14], [37], [PMD](#) [72], [Klocwork](#), and [DECOR](#) [54]) offer different smells, some of which might be causal.

A basic threat is that a smell might be useful, yet we might fail to identify it due to insensitivity of the target metric or computational limitations. Indeed, the concept of computational indistinguishably teach us of different constructs that cannot be differed in polynomial time [28]. However, for a practitioner such a smell is (indistinguishable from) a useless smell and there is no reason to invest time in its removal. On the other hand, we know that smells that alert on bugs do change metrics as those that we use so this threat is mainly theoretical.

Smell removals are not always small atomic actions. Commits might be tangled [35], [34] and serve more than one goal. Even when serving one goal, a smell might be removed as part of a large clean up, along with more influential smells. It is also possible that while one smell was removed, a different smell was introduced. In principle, this can be taken care off by controlling all other smells. However, controlling all other smells will be too restrictive in a small data set, leading to basing the statistics on very few cases. In the same spirit, while we controlled length and the developer, there might be other confounding variables influencing the results.

In the [acted upon smells](#), we know that a smell was not removed but we don't know why. The developer might not use [CheckStyle](#) and was not necessarily aware of the smell. It is also possible that developers consider smell removal as less important than their other tasks. Another threat might be when the smell is considered important yet the file itself is not considered important (e.g., code that is no longer run, or unimportant functionality). Since we require 10 commits in a year, the file might be unimportant, yet it is still maintained.

The data set contains only files on which we could run [CheckStyle](#). Using uncommon syntax can make static analyzers fail [14], so one shouldn't assume that the omitted files behave like those in our data set. We also restricted our files to be files with at least 10 commits. We did so since estimating

the quality based on less commits will be very noisy. While 812 projects had such files, these files are only 26% of the files. It is possible that in files in which the number of commits is small, the behaviour of smells is different.

One could use other target metrics or even aim for different software engineering goals, obtaining different results, and identifying different smells of interest. We used four metrics in order not to be governed by a single one.

We analyzed the source code on a specific date and used the commits done in an entire year in order to measure quality. It is possible that we identified a smell in January, and a developer removed it in February, making it irrelevant for the rest of the year. But we showed that smells are very stable, indicating that this scenario is rare.

Our classification of files into ‘low-quality’, ‘high-quality’ and ‘other’ are necessarily noisy. As an illustrative example of the implication of a small number of commits, consider a file with CCP of 0.1, a probability of 10% that a commit will be a bug fix. The file has probability of 35% to have no hit in 10 commits and it will be mis-classified as ‘high-quality’.

On top of that, the VC dimension theory [76], [75] warns us that given a fixed size data set, the more statistics we compute, the more likely that some of them will deviate from the true underlying probabilities. We started with 151 smells and for each one of them we computed five properties for four target metrics, relying on even more statistics. This might lead to missing robust smells or misidentifying a smell as robust. Note that a random smell has a low probability to achieve all properties. On the other hand, doing a lot of statistical tests, some will fail. Some causal smells that have the desired properties might accidentally fail on our data. Examining these properties on more files will help to further validate the results.

Another threat comes from the use of the linguistic model in order to identify corrective actions. The linguistic model accuracy is 93%, close to that of human annotators [3]. A misclassification of a commit as a bug fix might change a file quality group.

Projects differ in their quality properties and their reasons [3]. Popular projects have higher bug detection efficiency, as predicted by Linus’s law. However, we have relative properties like co-change and twins where the project properties are fixed.

The suitability of the properties to our needs pose a threat on the suitability of the results. Aiming for causality existence, we required positive influence and ignored the effect size. One can argue that a smell with high effect size is interesting even if it lacks other properties. We also examined overall precision, neglecting the possibility of conditional benefit. For example, defensive programming smells might be valuable if a mistake will be done in the future. However, if this mistake won’t be done, the value of the defensive act won’t be captured in our properties.

## X. FUTURE WORK

The smells that we examined represent a lot of knowledge regarding software engineering. It is possible that the concept that a smell attempts to capture is indeed indicative and

influential, yet its smells are not suitable. For example, many smells are parameterized. Cyclomatic Complexity [50] might be a causal smell, once the threshold of complexity is set to the right value. Our data set can help in finding the optimal value.

Low-quality files lacking important smells are hints for developing new smells, capturing hitherto unrecognized problems. Defect prediction is usually based on smells, and smells are usually hand-crafted by experts. Given the data set of high and low quality files, one can try an “end-to-end” approach and build models whose input is the source code itself. The “end-to-end” approach showed value in many fields of machine learning and also in the domain of software engineering [20].

We did a large step from mere correlation, yet we didn’t prove a causality relation between smells and the target metrics. Our data set provides intervention opportunities. One can choose a smell of interest and retrieve its occurrences. Then deliberately modify the code to remove the smell, either by a suggestion to the author or directly. Such experiments are the classical causality testbed and given our data they can be focused and easier to conduct. In such experiments we will know that the removal targets were not chosen due to a confounding variable that also influences the quality. Avoiding complex modifications will remove the threat that the smell removal was a by-product of a complex change, changing the quality due to different reasons.

## XI. CONCLUSIONS

Identification of causes for low quality is an important step in quality improvement. We showed that many code smells do not seem to cause low quality. That can explain why developers tend not to act upon smells.

We did identify smells that have properties expected from low quality causes. For researchers, we presented a methodology for identifying possibly causal variables. Out of 151 candidate smells, we found that less than 20% have our properties and may have a causal relationship with quality.

For developers, we first justify their mistrust of most smells. We also suggest a small set of interesting smells and basic software engineering guidelines: simplicity, defensive programming, and abstraction.

Files that have no potential CCP smells have 44% probability to have no bugs and show improvement even when the length is controlled. While we still didn’t prove causality, the results indicate a stronger relation between these smells and improved quality, making the decision to act upon them more justifiable.

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

The language models are available at <https://github.com/evidencebp/commit-classification> and the analysis utilities (e.g., co-change) are at [https://github.com/evidencebp/analysis\\_utils](https://github.com/evidencebp/analysis_utils), both from [3]. Database construction code is at <https://github.com/evidencebp/general>. All other supplementary materials can be found at <https://github.com/evidencebp/follow-your-nose>.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by the ISRAEL SCIENCE FOUNDATION (grant No. 832/18). We thank Udi Lavi, Daniel Shir, Yinnon Meshi, and Millo Avissar for their help, discussions and insights.

## REFERENCES

- [1] H. Al-Kilidar, K. Cox, and B. Kitchenham. The use and usefulness of the ISO/IEC 9126 quality standard. In *Intl. Synp. Empirical Softw. Eng.*, pages 126–132, Nov 2005.
- [2] I. Amit and D. G. Feitelson. Which refactoring reduces bug rate? In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Conference on Predictive Models and Data Analytics in Software Engineering, PROMISE'19*, page 12–15, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [3] I. Amit and D. G. Feitelson. The corrective commit probability code quality metric. *ArXiv*, abs/2007.10912, 2020.
- [4] I. Amit, E. Firstenberg, and Y. Meshi. Framework for semi-supervised learning when no labeled data is given. U.S. patent application #US20190164086A1, 2017.
- [5] I. Amit, J. Matherly, W. Hewlett, Z. Xu, Y. Meshi, and Y. Weinberger. Machine learning in cyber-security - problems, challenges and data sets, 2019.
- [6] F. Arcelli Fontana, V. Ferme, A. Marino, B. Walter, and P. Martenka. Investigating the impact of code smells on system's quality: An empirical study on systems of different application domains. pages 260–269, 09 2013.
- [7] D. Arpit, S. Jastrzębski, N. Ballas, D. Krueger, E. Bengio, M. S. Kanwal, T. Maharaj, A. Fischer, A. Courville, Y. Bengio, et al. A closer look at memorization in deep networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.05394*, 2017.
- [8] A. Asad and I. Alsmadi. Design and code coupling assessment based on defects prediction. part 1. *Computer Science Journal of Moldova*, 62(2):204–224, 2013.
- [9] N. Ayewah, W. Pugh, D. Hovemeyer, J. D. Morgenthaler, and J. Penix. Using static analysis to find bugs. *IEEE Software*, 25(5):22–29, 2008.
- [10] V. R. Basili, L. C. Briand, and W. L. Melo. A validation of object-oriented design metrics as quality indicators. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 22(10):751–761, 1996.
- [11] G. Bavota, A. De Lucia, M. Di Penta, R. Oliveto, and F. Palomba. An experimental investigation on the innate relationship between quality and refactoring. *J. Syst. & Softw.*, 107:1–14, Sep 2015.
- [12] M. Beller, R. Bholanath, S. McIntosh, and A. Zaidman. Analyzing the state of static analysis: A large-scale evaluation in open source software. In *2016 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution, and Reengineering (SANER)*, volume 1, pages 470–481, 2016.
- [13] E. D. Berger, C. Hollenbeck, P. Maj, O. Vitek, and J. Vitek. On the impact of programming languages on code quality. *CoRR*, abs/1901.10220, 2019.
- [14] A. Bessey, K. Block, B. Chelf, A. Chou, B. Fulton, S. Hallem, C. Henri-Gros, A. Kamsky, S. McPeak, and D. Engler. A few billion lines of code later: Using static analysis to find bugs in the real world. *Commun. ACM*, 53(2):66–75, Feb 2010.
- [15] A. Blum and T. Mitchell. Combining labeled and unlabeled data with co-training. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory, COLT' 98*, pages 92–100, New York, NY, USA, 1998. ACM.
- [16] B. W. Boehm, J. R. Brown, and M. Lipow. Quantitative evaluation of software quality. In *Intl. Conf. Softw. Eng.*, number 2, pages 592–605, Oct 1976.
- [17] G. Campbell and P. P. Papapetrou. *SonarQube in action*. Manning Publications Co., 2013.
- [18] D. Cedrim, A. Garcia, M. Mongiovi, R. Gheyi, L. Sousa, R. de Mello, B. Fonseca, M. Ribeiro, and A. Chávez. Understanding the impact of refactoring on smells: A longitudinal study of 23 software projects. In *Proceedings of the 2017 11th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 465–475, 2017.
- [19] S. R. Chidamber and C. F. Kemerer. A metrics suite for object oriented design. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.*, 20(6):476–493, Jun 1994.
- [20] M. Choetkiertikul, H. K. Dam, T. Tran, T. Pham, A. Ghose, and T. Menzies. A deep learning model for estimating story points, 2016.
- [21] C. Couto, P. Pires, M. T. Valente, R. S. Bigonha, and N. Anquetil. Predicting software defects with causality tests. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 93:24–41, 2014.
- [22] M. D'Ambros, M. Lanza, and R. Robbes. An extensive comparison of bug prediction approaches. In *2010 7th IEEE Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR 2010)*, pages 31–41, May 2010.
- [23] E. W. Dijkstra. Letters to the editor: go to statement considered harmful. *Communications of the ACM*, 11(3):147–148, 1968.
- [24] L. N. Q. Do, J. Wright, and K. Ali. Why do software developers use static analysis tools? a user-centered study of developer needs and motivations. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.*, 2020.
- [25] G. Dromey. A model for software product quality. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.*, 21(2):146–162, Feb 1995.
- [26] M. Fowler. *Refactoring: Improving the Design of Existing Code*. Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., Boston, MA, USA, 1999.
- [27] Y. Gil and G. Lalouche. On the correlation between size and metric validity. *Empirical Softw. Eng.*, 22(5):2585–2611, Oct 2017.
- [28] O. Goldreich. A note on computational indistinguishability. *Information Processing Letters*, 34(6):277–281, 1990.
- [29] C. W. Granger. Investigating causal relations by econometric models and cross-spectral methods. *Econometrica: journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 424–438, 1969.
- [30] T. Hall, S. Beecham, D. Bowes, D. Gray, and S. Counsell. A systematic literature review on fault prediction performance in software engineering. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.*, 38(6):1276–1304, Nov 2012.
- [31] A. E. Hassan. Predicting faults using the complexity of code changes. In *2009 IEEE 31st International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 78–88, 2009.
- [32] S. Heckman and L. Williams. A systematic literature review of actionable alert identification techniques for automated static code analysis. *Information and Software Technology*, 53(4):363–387, 2011.
- [33] S. Henry and D. Kafura. Software structure metrics based on information flow. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.*, SE-7(5):510–518, Sep 1981.
- [34] S. Herbold, A. Trautsch, B. Ledel, A. Aghamohammadi, T. A. Ghaleb, K. K. Chahal, T. Bossenmaier, B. Nagaria, P. Makedonski, M. N. Ahmadabadi, K. Szabados, H. Spieker, M. Madeja, N. Hoy, V. Lenarduzzi, S. Wang, G. Rodríguez-Pérez, R. Colomo-Palacios, R. Verdecchia, P. Singh, Y. Qin, D. Chakraborti, W. Davis, V. Walunj, H. Wu, D. Marcilio, O. Alam, A. Aldaej, I. Amit, B. Turhan, S. Eismann, A.-K. Wickert, I. Malavolta, M. Sulir, F. Fard, A. Z. Henley, S. Kourtzanidis, E. Tuzun, C. Treude, S. M. Shamasbi, I. Pashchenko, M. Wyrich, J. Davis, A. Serebrenik, E. Albrecht, E. U. Aktas, D. Strüber, and J. Erbel. Large-scale manual validation of bug fixing commits: A fine-grained analysis of tangling. *arXiv:2011.06244 [cs.SE]*, 2020.
- [35] K. Herzig and A. Zeller. The impact of tangled code changes. In *2013 10th Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*, pages 121–130, 2013.
- [36] I. IEC. 9126-1 (2001). software engineering product quality-part 1: Quality model. *International Organization for Standardization*, page 16, 2001.
- [37] N. Imtiaz, B. Murphy, and L. Williams. How do developers act on static analysis alerts? an empirical study of coverage usage. In *2019 IEEE 30th International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering (ISSRE)*, pages 323–333. IEEE, 2019.
- [38] N. Imtiaz, A. Rahman, E. Farhana, and L. Williams. Challenges with responding to static analysis tool alerts. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 16th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*, pages 245–249, 2019.
- [39] International Organization for Standardization. Systems and software engineering – systems and software quality requirements and evaluation (square) – system and software quality models, 2011.
- [40] B. Johnson, Y. Song, E. Murphy-Hill, and R. Bowdidge. Why don't software developers use static analysis tools to find bugs? In *2013 35th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 672–681, 2013.
- [41] C. Jones. *Applied Software Measurement: Assuring Productivity and Quality*. McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1991.
- [42] C. Jones. Software quality in 2012: A survey of the state of the art, 2012. [Online; accessed 24-September-2018].
- [43] Y. Kamei, S. Matsumoto, A. Monden, K. i. Matsumoto, B. Adams, and A. E. Hassan. Revisiting common bug prediction findings using effort-aware models. In *2010 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance*, pages 1–10, Sept 2010.

- [44] S. Kim and M. D. Ernst. Which warnings should i fix first? In *Proceedings of the the 6th Joint Meeting of the European Software Engineering Conference and the ACM SIGSOFT Symposium on The Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC-FSE '07*, page 45–54, New York, NY, USA, 2007. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [45] B. Krawczyk. Learning from imbalanced data: open challenges and future directions. *Progress in Artificial Intelligence*, 5(4):221–232, 2016.
- [46] T. Kremenek and D. Engler. Z-ranking: Using statistical analysis to counter the impact of static analysis approximations. In *International Static Analysis Symposium*, pages 295–315. Springer, 2003.
- [47] V. Lenarduzzi, V. Nikkola, N. Saarimäki, and D. Taibi. Does code quality affect pull request acceptance? an empirical study, 2019.
- [48] D. D. Lewis. Naive (bayes) at forty: The independence assumption in information retrieval. In C. Nédellec and C. Rouveirol, editors, *Machine Learning: ECML-98*, pages 4–15, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1998. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [49] M. Lipow. Number of faults per line of code. *IEEE Transactions on software Engineering*, (4):437–439, 1982.
- [50] T. McCabe. A complexity measure. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.*, SE-2(4):308–320, Dec 1976.
- [51] T. Menzies, J. Greenwald, and A. Frank. Data mining static code attributes to learn defect predictors. *IEEE transactions on software engineering*, 33(1):2–13, 2006.
- [52] T. Menzies, Z. Milton, B. Turhan, B. Cukic, Y. Jiang, and A. Bener. Defect prediction from static code features: current results, limitations, new approaches. *Automated Software Engineering*, 17(4):375–407, 2010.
- [53] R. Mo, Y. Cai, R. Kazman, and L. Xiao. Hotspot patterns: The formal definition and automatic detection of architecture smells. In *2015 12th Working IEEE/IFIP Conference on Software Architecture*, pages 51–60, May 2015.
- [54] N. Moha, Y.-G. Gueheneuc, L. Duchien, and A.-F. Le Meur. Decor: A method for the specification and detection of code and design smells. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.*, 36(1):20–36, Jan 2010.
- [55] E. Murphy-Hill, C. Jaspan, C. Sadowski, D. C. Shepherd, M. Phillips, C. Winter, A. K. Dolan, E. K. Smith, and M. A. Jorde. What predicts software developers’ productivity? *Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2019.
- [56] N. Nagappan and T. Ball. Static analysis tools as early indicators of pre-release defect density. In *Proceedings. 27th International Conference on Software Engineering, 2005. ICSE 2005.*, pages 580–586, 2005.
- [57] N. Nagappan, T. Ball, and A. Zeller. Mining metrics to predict component failures. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE '06*, page 452–461, New York, NY, USA, 2006. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [58] B. A. Nejmeh. Npath: A measure of execution path complexity and its applications. *Commun. ACM*, 31(2):188–200, Feb 1988.
- [59] R. Niedermayr, T. Röhm, and S. Wagner. Too trivial to test? an inverse view on defect prediction to identify methods with low fault risk. 10 2018.
- [60] R. Oak, M. Du, D. Yan, H. Takawale, and I. Amit. Malware detection on highly imbalanced data through sequence modeling. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security, AISec'19*, page 37–48, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [61] N. Ohlsson and H. Alberg. Predicting fault-prone software modules in telephone switches. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 22(12):886–894, 1996.
- [62] E. Oliveira, E. Fernandes, I. Steinmacher, M. Cristo, T. Conte, and A. Garcia. Code and commit metrics of developer productivity: a study on team leaders perceptions. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 04 2020.
- [63] J. Pearl. *Causality*. Cambridge university press, 2009.
- [64] A. Potdar and E. Shihab. An exploratory study on self-admitted technical debt. In *2014 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution*, pages 91–100. IEEE, 2014.
- [65] A. Ratner, C. D. Sa, S. Wu, D. Selsam, and C. Ré. Data programming: Creating large training sets, quickly, 2016.
- [66] E. Raymond. The cathedral and the bazaar. *First Monday*, 3(3), 1998.
- [67] J. R. Ruthruff, J. Penix, J. D. Morgenthaler, S. Elbaum, and G. Rothermel. Predicting accurate and actionable static analysis warnings: An experimental approach. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE '08*, page 341–350, New York, NY, USA, 2008. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [68] N. F. Schneidewind. Body of knowledge for software quality measurement. *Computer*, 35(2):77–83, Feb 2002.
- [69] H. Shen, J. Fang, and J. Zhao. Efindbugs: Effective error ranking for findbugs. In *2011 Fourth IEEE International Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation*, pages 299–308, 2011.
- [70] J. Śliwerski, T. Zimmermann, and A. Zeller. When do changes induce fixes? *SIGSOFT Softw. Eng. Notes*, 30(4):1–5, May 2005.
- [71] A. Tosun, A. Bener, and R. Kale. Ai-based software defect predictors: Applications and benefits in a case study. *AI Magazine*, 32:57–68, 06 2011.
- [72] A. Trautsch, S. Herbold, and J. Grabowski. A longitudinal study of static analysis warning evolution and the effects of pmd on software quality in apache open source projects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02179*, 2019.
- [73] E. van Emden and L. Moonen. Java quality assurance by detecting code smells. In *Ninth Working Conference on Reverse Engineering, 2002. Proceedings.*, pages 97–106, Nov 2002.
- [74] J. Van Hulse, T. M. Khoshgoftaar, and A. Napolitano. Experimental perspectives on learning from imbalanced data. In *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 935–942, 2007.
- [75] V. Vapnik. *The nature of statistical learning theory*. Springer science & business media, 2013.
- [76] V. Vapnik and A. Chervonenkis. On the uniform convergence of relative frequencies of events to their probabilities. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 16(2):264–280, 1971.
- [77] N. Walkinshaw and L. Minku. Are 20% of files responsible for 80% of defects? In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement, ESEM '18*, pages 2:1–2:10, New York, NY, USA, 2018. ACM.
- [78] X. Yang, J. Chen, R. Yedida, Z. Yu, and T. Menzies. How to recognize actionable static code warnings (using linear svms), 2020.
- [79] M. Zaidman. Teaching defensive programming in java. *J. Comput. Sci. Coll.*, 19(3):33–43, Jan 2004.
- [80] T. Zimmermann, S. Diehl, and A. Zeller. How history justifies system architecture (or not). In *Sixth International Workshop on Principles of Software Evolution, 2003. Proceedings.*, pages 73–83, Sept 2003.
- [81] T. Zimmermann, N. Nagappan, H. Gall, E. Giger, and B. Murphy. Cross-project defect prediction: A large scale experiment on data vs. domain vs. process. In *Proceedings of the 7th Joint Meeting of the European Software Engineering Conference and the ACM SIGSOFT Symposium on The Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE '09*, page 91–100, New York, NY, USA, 2009. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [82] T. Zimmermann, R. Premraj, and A. Zeller. Predicting defects for eclipse. In *Proceedings of the Third International Workshop on Predictor Models in Software Engineering, PROMISE '07*, page 9, USA, 2007. IEEE Computer Society.