A Preliminary Mapping Study of Software Metrics Thresholds

Elisabetta Ronchieri and Marco Canaparo INFN, CNAF, Viale Berti Pichat 6/2, 40126, Bologna, Italy

Keywords: Software Metrics, Thresholds, Mapping Study.

Abstract: Many papers deal with the topic of thresholds in software metrics to determine the quality level of a software project. This paper aims to identify the status of influential software metrics thresholds papers. We use search facilities in the SCOPUS Web tool to establish the cited papers published from 1970 to 2015. We classified the selected papers according to different factors, such as the main topic and the general type. The cited papers were more frequently on journals than conference proceedings. We observed three main problems: an unclear explanation of the method for selecting the technique that calculates thresholds; a direct application of the metric threshold values to different code context; a lack of objective analysis for the calculated thresholds. To our knowledge, this paper is the only one that performs this kind of study. It can provide baselines to assist new research and development efforts. Due to the page limit, this paper contains a summary of the results.

1 INTRODUCTION

Different organizations have proposed software metrics to measure code characteristics. For instance, the IEEE defines software metrics as *the quantitative measure of the degree to which a system, component or process possesses a given software attribute* 1 .

Metrics have been used successfully for quantification, whereas they have generally failed to support subsequent decision-making (Fenton and Neil, 2000). The use of metrics entails thresholds to determine if a certain value is normal or anomalous. Thresholds give semantics to metrics enabling them to become a decision-making tool (Lorentz and Kidd, 1994). However, the determination of suitable threshold values is arduous as detailed in the following studies: Nagappan et al. (Nagappan et al., 2006) have shown that thresholds obtained by performing a correlation analysis are only valid for a limited set of similar software systems; Zhang et al. (Zhang et al., 2013) have claimed that thresholds cannot be generalized and depend on specific domains (such as aerospace and student exercises) and programming language characteristics.

Organizations and computer scientists have given many definitions of software quality over time: the IEEE defines quality as *the degree to which a system*, *component, or process meets specified requirements*

or customer or user needs or expectations². However, a good definition must lead us to measure quality meaningfully. According to Fenton and Bieman (Fenton and Bieman, 2014), measurement is the process by which numbers or symbols are assigned to attributes of entities in the real world in such a way as to describe them according to clearly defined rules. In our study, we found many papers that talk about the topic of thresholds, but none of them is able to provide objective rules to use them effectively: they usually use threshold directly without explaining clearly the techniques used to calculate them nor the context in which they are derived. Therefore, this paper aims at identifying the influential software metrics thresholds papers with the purpose of leading developers and scientists to improve their knowledge in this field. Our methodology leverages the evidence-based software engineering (Kitchenham et al., 2004), which (Kitchenham and Charters, 2007): relies on empirical software engineering research; suggests collecting best available evidence on specific topic; uses secondary studies such as systematic literature reviews and mapping studies. This paper introduces a preliminary mapping study of software metrics thresholds research. It intends to identify and categorize influential software metrics thresholds research. Thus, it addresses two research questions: 1. What papers are currently most important in the software met-

232

Ronchieri, E. and Canaparo, M.

In Proceedings of the 11th International Joint Conference on Software Technologies (ICSOFT 2016) - Volume 1: ICSOFT-EA, pages 232-240 ISBN: 978-989-758-194-6

¹IEEE Standard Glossary of Software Engineering Terminology. IEEE Std 610.12-1990.

²IEEE Standard Glossary of Software Engineering Terminology. IEEE Std 610.12-1990.

A Preliminary Mapping Study of Software Metrics Thresholds. DOI: 10.5220/0005988402320240

Copyright © 2016 by SCITEPRESS - Science and Technology Publications, Lda. All rights reserved

Table 1: Search queries.

Search _{Id}	Goal	Search String
Search ₁	papers 2015	(TITLE-ABS-KEY (software) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (metrics) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (thresholds))
		AND SUBJAREA (mult OR ceng OR CHEM OR comp OR eart OR ener OR engi OR envi OR mate OR math
		OR phys) AND PUBYEAR = 2015
$Search_2$	papers 2015	(TITLE-ABS-KEY (metrics) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (for) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (object-oriented)) AND
		SUBJAREA (mult OR ceng OR CHEM OR comp OR eart OR ener OR engi OR envi OR mate OR math OR
		phys) AND PUBYEAR = 2015
$Search_3$	papers 1970-2014	(TITLE-ABS-KEY (software) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (metrics) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (thresholds))
		AND SUBJAREA (mult OR ceng OR CHEM OR comp OR eart OR ener OR engi OR envi OR mate OR math
		OR phys) AND PUBYEAR > 1969 AND PUBYEAR < 2015
$Search_4$	papers 1970-2014	(TITLE-ABS-KEY (metrics) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (for) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (object-oriented) AND
		TITLE-ABS-KEY (software)) AND SUBJAREA (mult OR ceng OR CHEM OR comp OR eart OR ener OR
		engi OR envi OR mate OR math OR phys) AND PUBYEAR > 1969 AND PUBYEAR < 2015

rics thresholds research community? 2. Can software metrics thresholds papers be meaningfully aggregated? We refer to this as a preliminary study, because we make no claim for completeness. We have focused on the years 1970-2015: to the best of our knowledge, there are no surveys in the thresholds' field. We have used the SCOPUS tool ³ to search for relevant peer-reviewed papers and the AlmaDL service ⁴ of the University of Bologna to download their complete text. So far we have decided to leave other tools (such as ACM, IEEE and CiteSeer digital libraries) for further studies.

2 BACKGROUND

Software metrics thresholds represent a way to determine the quality of code through a quantitative criterion. Metrics can measure some features of the code such as the size of the final program, the complexity of the software design, the modularity of a class and the quality characteristics of the software. Size metrics quantify code size. They are estimators of software cost and effort. Complexity metrics measure the relative simplicity of the system design. Object-oriented metrics (Chidamber and Kamerer, 1994) measure complexity, cohesion, coupling and inheritance (Brito e Abreu and Carapuca, 1994). Quality metrics also compute the length of time between occurrences of defects (mean time between failures) or defects density (e.g., defects per size). Let us start illustrating criteria for thresholds identification. We briefly summarize the various approaches to determine metrics thresholds (Alves et al., 2010). Personal experience of software quality experts is very common. Many authors (McCabe,

1976) (Nejmeh, 1988) have defined thresholds according to their know-how. This complicates the reproduction or generalization of their results and leads to arguments about their values. **Descriptive statistics**, such as average and standard deviation, provide reasonable thresholds when the data distribution is Gaussian. **Other techniques**, such as error information and cluster analysis, are recently exploited by researchers.

3 RESEARCH METHODS

For the preliminary mapping study we defined all the steps that compose the methodology we decided to adopt.

Let us start detailing how we have identified relevant papers. We used SCOPUS to search for software metrics thresholds papers published from 1970 up to 2015. SCOPUS is a general indexing system that includes publishers, such as IEEE, ACM, Elsevier, Wiley and Springer Lecture Notes publications. The search process has been split in two phases ended in January 2016: the first one considered studies up to 2014; the second one only regarded year 2015. The papers were separated in two categories because we included number of citations only amongst the filtering criteria of the first group. Table 1 shows the search queries whose identifier is $Search_{Id}$ with Id = 1, ..., 4. Due to the high number of papers found by the different searches, we decided to filter them according to various criteria, as explained in the following paragraphs.

Papers 2015 - *Search*¹ found 24 articles many of which were irrelevant, for example papers that reported in the title the following words: *biodiversity, watermaking, MOSFET, dielettric, FFT, routing, spectrum, dosimetry, reverberation, MPSoCs, MIC and analog.* We removed all the papers with the words above in the title and one paper with no au-

³Scopus, https://www.elsevier.com/solutions/scopus

⁴Libraries, digital resources and study rooms, http://www.unibo.it/en/services-and-opportunities/ libraries-digital-resources-and-study-rooms/

	Main Topic of thresholds
Category	Meaning
Development	The paper is about a specification of a new tech-
	nique for calculating thresholds.
Assessment	The paper is about the assessment of existing
	thresholds or techniques.
Analysis	The papers discuss and or illustrate methods for
	analyzing software metrics thresholds.
Framework	The paper is about general or automated process
	by which thresholds are defined, extracted and
	analyzed.
Literature survey	The paper summarizes the literature on some as-
	pect of thresholds.
Application	The paper is only an application of existing or
	calculated values of thresholds.
	General type of paper
Category	Meaning
Empirical	The paper assesses existing thresholds or a tech-
	nique for calculating them.
Theoretical	The paper discusses some issues about software
	engineering and may consider some theoretical
	aspects of software metrics thresholds.
Both	The paper is a mixed theoretical and empirical
	paper.

Table 2: Main topic of thresholds and general type of paper.

thors: as a consequence, there were 10 records left with no citations that we call $Search_{1_1}$. $Search_2$ found 77 articles many of which were relevant. We removed one paper with the *mobile* word and 3 papers with no authors: as a consequence, there were 73 records left (only one contains a citation) that we call $Search_{2_1}$.

After the filtering operations, we found that $Search_{1_1}$ and $Search_{2_1}$ have two relevant papers in common. We identify this set with $Search_{1_2}$ and we decided to exclude them from the set of $Search_{1_1}$ and $Search_{2_1}$ that we call $Search_{1_2}$ and $Search_{2_2}$ respectively. A more detailed review of the abstract and text in the papers belonging to $Search_{1_2}$ found 4 papers no relevant to the topic of this paper. Therefore, there are 4 papers left named $Search_{2_3}$. For what concerns $Search_{2_2}$, 44 papers are not relevant, therefore 27 records left named $Search_{2_3}$. The total number of relevant papers are 33 obtained adding together $Search_{1_3} + Search_{2_3} + Search_{1_2}$. Among them there are 9 papers requested to their authors.

Papers 1970-2014 - *Search*³ found 213 articles that becomes 128 after having removed those with no citations. Many left papers were irrelevant, for example those reported in the title the following words: *forest, vehicle, voting, landscape, healths, social, UMLS, neuronal, organs, PAM, genes, clinical, cloud anomalies, breast, LC-MS/MS, proteomic, ECG, gyrokinetic, tensor, mammography, satellite, macro-invertebrates, water-making, hue, car hood, routing, network, circuit, cellular, MOSFET, ionospheric, cortical, ur-*

	Table 3: Citat	tions per pu	ublication	type for ye	ear 1970-2014
--	----------------	--------------	------------	-------------	---------------

Set	#Citations	#Books	#Journals	#Proceedings	Total
	< 10	0	5	4	9
	10-19	0	1	0	1
Search ₃₄	20-29	0	2	0	2
	30-39	0	0	0	0
	40-49	0	1	0	1
	50+	0	0	0	0
	Total	0	9	4	13
Set	#Citations	#Books	#Journals	#Proceedings	Total
	< 10	0	15	16	31
	10-19	0	2	3	5
Search ₃₃	20-29	0	2	1	3
2	30-39	0	0	0	0
	40-49	0	0	1	1
	50+	0	1	1	2
	Total	0	20	22	42
Set	#Citations	#Books	#Journals	#Proceedings	Total
	< 10	2	78	77	157
	10-19	1	21	17	39
$Search_{4_3}$	20-29	0	12	4	16
2	30-39	0	10	1	11
	40-49	0	3	3	6
	50+	0	24	7	31
	Total	3	148	109	260

Table 4: Topic per paper type.

		Year 2015						
Торіс	Empirical	Theoretical	Both	Total				
Development	0	0	1	1				
Assessment	2	1	3	6				
Analysis	0	0	In the second					
Framework	0	0	0	0				
Application	2	0	0	2				
Literature	0	0	0	0				
Survey								
Total	4	1	5	10				
	Years 1970-2014							
	Ye	ars 1970-2014						
Торіс	Ye Empirical	ars 1970-2014 Theoretical	Both	Total				
Topic Development	Ye Empirical	ars 1970-2014 Theoretical 20	Both 49	Total 99				
Topic Development Assessment	Ye Empirical 30 20	ars 1970-2014 Theoretical 20 13	Both 49 3	Total 99 36				
Topic Development Assessment Analysis	Ye Empirical 30 20 10	ars 1970-2014 Theoretical 20 13 0	Both 49 3 1	Total 99 36 11				
Topic Development Assessment Analysis Framework	Ye Empirical 30 20 10 11	ars 1970-2014 Theoretical 20 13 0 23	Both 49 3 1 34	Total 99 36 11 68				
Topic Development Assessment Analysis Framework Application	Ye Empirical 30 20 10 11 2	ars 1970-2014 Theoretical 20 13 0 23 6	Both 49 3 1 34 0	Total 99 36 11 68 8				
Topic Development Assessment Analysis Framework Application Literature	Ye Empirical 30 20 10 11 2 1	ars 1970-2014 Theoretical 20 13 0 23 6 1	Both 49 3 1 34 0 0	Total 99 36 11 68 8 2				
Topic Development Assessment Analysis Framework Application Literature Survey	Ye Empirical 30 20 10 11 2 1	ars 1970-2014 Theoretical 20 13 0 23 6 1	Both 49 3 1 34 0 0	Total 99 36 11 68 8 2				

ban, multi antenna, wireless, MLSDA, diagnostically, DIBL, agriculture, vestibular, radio, history sensitive, laser optics, fog events, SIFT, WLAN, WAAS, ultrasound, traffic, spatial vision, flood attack, portfolio and filtering. We removed all the papers with the words above in the title; as a consequence, there were 72 records left that we call $Search_{31}$. $Search_4$ found 1403 articles that becomes 832 after having removed those with no citations. We removed one paper with



Figure 1: The number of publications per year: books, proceedings and journals.

Table 5:	Source of	f conference	and journal	papers for	year 2015.
			5	1 1	

Conferences	#papers	Journals	#papers
ACM Symposium on Applied Computing	1	Expert Systems	1
ACM International Conference Proceeding Series	3	Advances in Computers	1
Ibero-American Conference on Software Engineering, CIbSE 2015	1	Procedia Computer Science	1
International Conference on Knowledge and Smart Technology, KST 2015	1	Software and Systems Modeling	1
International Workshop on Software Architecture and Metrics, SAM 2015	1	Journal of Systems and Software	4
IEEE International Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation Workshops, ICSTW 2015	1	Information and Software Technology	1
International Conference on Advances in Computing, Commu- nications and Informatics, ICACCI 2015		Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering	3
IEEE International Conference on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation, ETFA	1	Journal of Software: Evolution and Process	1
IEEE International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Communication Technology, CICT 2015	1	Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing	2
		Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications	1
		International Journal of Applied Engineering Research	2
		International Journal of Software Engineering and its Applica- tions	3
		International Journal of Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering	1
Total	11	Total	22

the *satellite* word in the title; as a consequence, there were 831 records left that we call $Search_{4_1}$.

After the filtering operations, we found that $Search_{3_1}$ and $Search_{4_1}$ have 15 papers in common, two of which are not relevant being out of topic. We identify this set with $Search_{3_4}$ and we decided to exclude them from the set of $Search_{3_1}$ and $Search_{4_1}$ that we call $Search_{3_2}$ and $Search_{4_2}$ respectively. A more detailed review of the abstract and text in the papers belonging to $Search_{3_2}$ found 14 papers no relevant to the topic of this paper. In addition, we removed 1 paper that we were unable to find. Therefore, there are 42 papers left named $Search_{3_3}$. For what con-

cerns *Search*₄₂, 556 papers are not relevant, therefore 260 records left named *Search*₄₃. The total number of relevant papers are 314 obtained adding together *Search*₃₃ + *Search*₄₃ + *Search*₃₄. Among them there are 60 papers requested to their authors.

Let us explain how we have extracted data. Starting from the relevant papers, we collected some standard information about all papers, such as the authors, the full reference, whether the paper was related to a conference or a journal, the total number of citations. So far we have not observed for the selected papers changes in the number of citations. We aim to classify all the papers according to the following criteria:

#papers		68
Conferences	 International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement. ESEM 2009 International Correlense on Signal Processing System, ICSRS 2000 International Correlense on Research Challenges in Information Science, RCIS 2010 International Correlense on Species Theory in Software Metrics, WETSM 2012 International Correlense on Species Theory information Science, RCIS 2010 International Correlense on Software Development International Correlense on Software and Data Technologies, ICSOFT 2010 International Conference on Aspect-Oriented Software Development Conference on Software Management and Telecommunications, ComMarTel 2013 International Conference on Aspect-Oriented Software Development International Conference on Aspecta Computer Science and Software Manipulation, SCAM 2010 IEEE International Conference on Antomation Science and Manipulation, SCAM 2010 IEEE International Conference on Antomation Science and Software Engineering, ICCS 2005 IEEE International Conference on Computer Science and Software Engineering, ICCS 2013 IEEE International Software Manipulation, SSBE 2009 IEEE International Software Manipulation, SSBE 2009 IEEE International Software Manipulation, SSBE 2009 IEEE International Conference on Computer Science and Software Engineering, ICCS 2013 IEEE International Conference on Computer Science Conference Software Engineering, ICCS 2013 IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering, SSBE 2009 IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering, ICCS 2013 IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering, ICCS 2013 IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering, ICCS 2013 IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering, ICCS 2016 IEEE Interna	Total
#papers		67
Conferences	 International Conference and Exhibition on Technology of Object-Oriented Languages and Systems, TOOLS 39 Contral and Eastern European Software Engineering. MASEE 2009 Wold Congresson Software Engineering, MASEE 2009 Wold Songesson Software Engineering, MASEE 2011 Malaysian Conference on Engineering, MASEE 2011 Malaysian Conference on Software Engineering, and Reverse Engineering. CSMR-WCRE 2014 Malaysian Conference on Software Engineering, and Reverse Engineering. CSMR-WCRE 2014 Malaysian Conference on Software Maintenance. Recignmering, and Reverse Engineering. CSMR-WCRE 2014 Malaysian Conference on Software Maintenance. Recignmering and Applications. 2005 Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference on Computer Engineering. Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference on Computer Systems. MASE EllE International Conference on Neural Networks EllEE International Conference on Software Fisting and Analysis. ISSTA 08 IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering. ASE 2004 International Symposium on Software Engineering. ASE 2004 International Conference on Maine Software Engineering. ASE 2004 International Conference on Quanty Software. SND 2010 IEEE International Conference on Quanty Software. SNEC International Conference on Quanty Softw	Total

Table 6: Source of conference papers for years 1970-2014.

ICSOFT-EA 2016 - 11th International Conference on Software Engineering and Applications

Journals	#papers	Journals	#papers
ACM Computing Surveys	1	ACM SIGPLAN Notices	1
Computer Journal	1	IBM Systems Journal	1
IET Software	4	Informatica (Ljubljana)	1
Information Sciences	2	Journal of Software	2
SpringerPlus	1	Neurocomputing	1
Pattern Recognition	1	Procedia Computer Science	1
Software Quality Journal	3	The Scientific World Journal	1
Ruan Jian Xue Bao/Journal of Software	3	Software - Practice and Experience	3
Software Process Improvement and Practice	1	Journal of Systems Architecture	1
Tien Tzu Hsueh Pao/Acta Electronica Sinica	1	Software Testing Verification and Reliability	1
Wuhan University Journal of Natural Sciences	1	Information Processing Letters	2
Empirical Software Engineering	9	Expert Systems With Applications	2
Applied Artificial Intelligence	1	IEEE Transactions on Reliability	1
Journal of Electronic Imaging	1	Journal of Object Technology	5
Journal of Software Maintenance	1	Conference on Software Maintenance	4
Journal of Systems and Software	18	Lecture Notes in Computer Science	13
Information and Software Technology	18	Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering	1
European Journal of Operational Research	1	Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing	1
ACM International Conference Proceeding Series	1	IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering	19
IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems	4	Innovations in Systems and Software Engineering	2
International Review on Computers and Software	3	JOOP - Journal of Object-Oriented Programming	2
Journal of Zhejiang University: Science C	1	Journal of software: Evolution and Process	1
Journal of Computer Science and Technology	1	Journal of Information Processing Systems	1
Journal of Object-Oriented Programming	1	Journal of Software Maintenance and Evolution	6
Journal of Integrated Design and Process Science	1	Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing	1
Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society	1	Communications in Computer and Information Science	2
IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems	1	International Journal of Computers and Applications	1
World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology	1	International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics	1
ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Method-	3	International Journal on Artificial Intelligence Tools	1
ology			
International Journal of Computer Applications in Technol-	3	Journal of Computational Methods in Sciences and Engi-	1
ogy		neering	
WSEAS Transactions on Information Science and Applica-	HIND	International Journal of Digital Content Technology and its	
tions		Applications	
International Journal of Software Engineering and Knowl-	7		
edge Engineering			
Total	97	Total	81

Table 7: Source of journal papers for years 1970-2014.

1. the main topic (see Table 2); 2. the type of paper (i.e., empirical, theoretical or both (see Table 2); 3. the type of publication (i.e., proceedings, journal, book); 4. the software licence (i.e., open source or commercial software) of the analysed projects; 5. the considered dataset of metrics (i.e., name, public or private); 6. the programming languages of the analysed projects; 7. the type of metrics; 8. the type of presented technique (e.g., statistical or artificial intelligence based). Let us detail why we have aggregated data. The main hindrance to the adoption of thresholds is the lack of guidelines for their exploration and exploitation. As a consequence, one of the purposes of this paper is to define several classification criteria to acquire valid aggregations that can facilitate the way scientists and developers search information related to thresholds. Since they have been always calculated in specific applicability domain (characterized by, e.g., a particular software license or programming language), we established to track all the information about the environment where thresholds were determined and used.

4 **RESULTS**

In this section we present some tabulations of the results of categorizing the identified papers. They concern the following information: number of publications per year (see Figure 1); number of citations per publication type for year 1970-2014 (see Table 3); topic per paper type for year 2015 (see Table 4); topic per paper type for years 1970-2014 (see Table 4); source of conference papers for year 2015 (see Table 5); source of journal papers for years 1970-2014 (see Table 6); source of journal papers for years 1970-2014 (see Table 7); details of common (*Search*₁₂ and

Threshold Values	McCabe <= 6 low risk,]6,8] moderate risk,]8,15] high risk, > 15 very high risk		Statements = 113 (class)	Table 5 reports data for 5 imagi- nary case studies		Different thresh- olds calculated by different applica- tion domain, soft- ware types, soft- ware size.	WMC > 31, TCC < 0.33, WOC < 0.95	Different thresh- olds for individ- ual datasets	CBO = 9, RFC = 40, WMC = 20	CBO = 13, RFC = 44 , WMC = 24 , CTM = 33 , NOC = 9 to identify low, medium and high risk	Used thresholds listed by Olague et al., 2006 and Rosenberg, 1998	Different thresh- olds for individ- ual datasets
Statistical/Artificia Intelli- gence/other	Statistical	Statistical	Statistical	Not used	Statistical Statistical	Statistical	Genetic Algo- rithm	Artificial intelli- gence	Statistical	Statistical, ROC analysis	Not used	Statistical
Type of Metrics	Size, Complexity	Size, coupling and cohesion	Statements	Size, Complexity, C& K	Size, C& K Size and some C& K	Size, C&K	Size and metrics derived from C&K	Size, Complexity, C&K	A subset of C&K metric suites	C&K, LK	McCabe Cyclo- matic Complex- ity, Size	C&K metrics
Programming Language	Java, C#	Java	Java	Not used	Java C++, Java	Java	Java, C++	C, C++, Java	Java	Java	No	Java, C++
Public Data Set	Not public	Not public	Not used	Not used	Not public Not public	Not public	Not public	Yes (Promise Repo)	Not used	Not public	Not used	Open DataSet, KC1
Open Source SW project	Proprietary and open source	Open source	Open source	Not used	Open source Industrial com- mercial and open source	Open source	Open source	Not used	Yes	Open source	Not used	All open source except NASA software
Number of SW projects	100 projects	6 projects: Art of illusion, Free- Mind, etc	5 projects: Jboss, Relaxer, etc	Not used	146 projects 3 systems	40 projects from sourceforge	7 projects	Not used	Mozilla and Rhino systems, Eclipse version 2.0 and 2.1	3 release of Eclipse	Not used	NASA software, Apace Ivy, JEdit
Empirical/Theoretical	Empirical	Empirical and Theo- retical	Empirical	Empirical and Theo- retical	Empirical Empirical and Theo- retical	Empirical	Empirical	Empirical	Empirical and Theo- retical	Empirical	Empirical and Theo- retical	Empirical
Main Topic	Development	Assessment	Development	Application	Assessment Application	Development	Development	Development	Development	Development	Application	Evaluation
Reference	(Alves et al., 2010)	(Al Dallal, 2012)	(Aman et al., 2005)	(Ampatzoglou et al., 2011)	(Barkmann et al., 2009) (El Emam et al., 2002)	(Ferreira et al., 2012)	(Mihancea and Marinescu, 2005)	(Rodriguez et al., 2013)	(Shatnawi, 2010)	(Shatnawi et al., 2009)	(Sodiya, 2012)	(Malhotra and Bansal, 2015)

Table 8: Common pubblications in detail.

Search₃₄) publications 1970-2015 (see Table 8). As regards this table we list here the meaning of the metrics' acronyms used in the "threshold values" column:

WMC (Weighted Method Count), TCC (Tight Class Cohesion), WOC (Weight of a Class), CBO (Class Between Objects), RFC (Response for Class), CTM

(Coupling Through Message passing), NOC (Number of Child classes), C&K (Chidamber and Kemerer), LK (Lorentz and Kidd).

For the years 1970-2014 we identified 3 books whose titles are: Model-Driven Software Development: Integrating Quality Assurance; Object-Oriented Design Knowledge: Principles, Heuristics and Best Practices; Theory and Practice of Object Systems. We have hitherto received 4 papers out of the 69 requested to the authors.

5 CONCLUSIONS

We believe this study is useful, in spite of its limitations, because it may act as the starting point for more detailed work. This paper: identifies the most influential papers, in terms of citations, published from 1970 to 2014; collects some standard information about all the papers in the range 1970-2015 in terms of whether the paper was related to a conference or journal, the total number of citations; establishes some criteria according to which papers can be classified (such as main topic, whether the paper is theoretical or empirical, the programming language of the software employed for thresholds extraction and validation, the type of software license, the type of metrics used, the type of the presented technique and some threshold values); starts a meaningful aggregation of all the material based on the established criteria, in order to facilitate the selection of papers;

We may extend this work by taking into consideration other criteria to provide further classification results. Furthermore, we could use other tools (such as ACM, IEEE and CiteSeer digital libraries) in order to have a comparison with the results obtained by SCOPUS.

To fully analyze the current status in the field of thresholds, we will firstly undertake the mapping study (Kitchenham & Charters, 2007) and secondly the systematic review (Cronin et al, 2008). The former allows identifying the set of primary works highlighting their gaps according to the established question. The latter provides a list as complete as possible of all the published and unpublished studies relating to a particular subject area.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was funded by INFN CNAF.

REFERENCES

- Al Dallal, J. (2012). Constructing models for predicting extract subclass refactoring opportunities using objectoriented quality metrics. *Information and Software Technology*, 54:1125–1141.
- Alves, T. L., Ypma, C., and Visser, J. (2010). Deriving metrics thresholds from benchmark data. In *The IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance*, pages 1–10.
- Aman, H., Mochiduki, N., Yamada, H., and Noda, M.-T. (2005). A simple predictive method for discriminating costly classes using class size metric. *IEICE Transaction on Information and Systems*, E88-D(6).
- Ampatzoglou, A., Frantzeskou, G., and Stamelos, I. (2011). A methodology to assess the impact of design patterns on software quality. *Information and Software Technology*, 54:331–346.
- Barkmann, H., Lincke, R., and Love, W. (2009). Quantitative evaluation of software quality metrics in opensource projects. In *International Conference on Advanced Information Networking and Applications Workshops*, pages 1067 – 1072. IEEE.
- Brito e Abreu, F. and Carapuca, R. (1994). Object-oriented software engineering: Measuring and controlling the development process. In *4th Int. Conf. on Software Quality QSIC*.
- Chidamber, S. R. and Kamerer, C. F. (1994). A metrics suite for object-oriented design. *IEEE Trans. Software Engineering*, SE-20(6):476–493.
- El Emam, K., Benlarbi, S., Goel, N., Melo, W., Lounis, H., and Rai, S. (2002). The optimal class size for objectoriented software. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 28.
- Fenton, N. and Bieman, J. (2014). Software Metrics: A Rigorous and Practical Approach, Third Edition. CRC Press.
- Fenton, N. E. and Neil, M. (2000). Software metrics: roadmap. ICSE - Future of SE Track, pages 357–370.
- Ferreira, K. A. M., Bigonha, M. A. S., Bigonha, R. S., Mendes, L. F. O., and Almeida, H. C. (2012). Identifying thresholds for object-oriented software metrics. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 85(2):244–257.
- Kitchenham, B. A. and Charters, S. M. (2007). Guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering. EBSE Technical Report EBSE-2007-01, Keele University and Durham University.
- Kitchenham, B. A., Dyba, T., and Jorgensen, M. (2004). Evidence-based software engineering. In *The 26th International Conference on Software Engineering* (*ICSE'04*).
- Lorentz, M. and Kidd, J. (1994). *Object-oriented software metrics:a practical guide*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Malhotra, R. and Bansal, A. J. (2015). Fault prediction considering threshold effects of object-oriented metrics. *Expert Systems*, 32(2):203–219.
- McCabe, T. J. (1976). A complexity measure. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, SE-2(4):308–320.
- Mihancea, P. and Marinescu, R. (2005). Towards the optimization of automatic detection of design flaws in

object-oriented software systems. In Ninth European Conference on Software Maintenance and Reengineering, pages 92 – 101. IEEE.

- Nagappan, N., Ball, T., and Zeller, A. (2006). Mining metrics to predict component failures. In *The 28th international conference on Software engineering (ICSE* '06), pages 452–461, New York, NY, USA,. ACM.
- Nejmeh, B. A. (1988). Npath: A measure of execution path complexity and its applications. *Communications of the ACM*, 31(2):188–200.
- Rodriguez, D., Ruiz, R., Riquelme, J., and Harrison, R. (2013). A study of subgroup discovery approach for defect prediction. *Information and Software Technol*ogy, 55:18101822.
- Shatnawi, R. (2010). A quantitative investigation of the acceptable risk levels of object-oriented metrics in opensource systems. *IEEE Transactions on Software En*gineering, 36:216–225.
- Shatnawi, R., Li, W., Swain, J., and Newman, T. (2009). Finding software metrics threshold values using roc curves. *Journal of Software Maintenance and Evolution: Research and Practice*, 22(1):1–16.
- Sodiya, A. S. (2012). A survability model for objectoriented software systems. In *Fourth International Conference on Computational Aspects of Social Networks (CASoN)*, pages 283 – 290. IEEE.
- Zhang, F., Mockus, A., Zou, Y., Khomh, F., and Hassan, A. E. (2013). How does context affect the distribution of software maintainability metrics? In *The 29th IEEE International Conference on Software Maintainability* (*ICSM'13*), pages 350–359, Eindhoven. IEEE.