Evaluating Software Clustering
What is a good software decomposition?

The problem

- How do we know that a particular decomposition of a software system is good?

- What does "good" mean anyway?

- We can compare against a
  - Mental model
  - Benchmark standard

- Can be done either manually or automatically

Manual evaluation

- Have experts evaluate automatic decompositions

- Very time-consuming, impractical

- Also quite subjective

- Need an automatic, objective way of doing it

Automatic evaluation

- Usually measures the similarity of an automatic decomposition A to an authoritative decomposition B (prepared manually)

- Major drawback: Assumes there exists one "correct" decomposition

- Other evaluation approaches are possible, such as measuring the stability or the extremity distribution of a clustering algorithm

Precision/Recall

- Standard Information Retrieval measures

- Were applied in a software clustering context by Anquetil

- Definitions:
  - Intra pair: A pair of software entities in the same cluster
  - Inter pair: A pair of entities in different clusters

Precision/Recall

- Precision: Percentage of intra pairs in A which are also intra in B

- Recall: Percentage of intra pairs in B also found in A

- A good algorithm should exhibit high values in both measures

Precision / Recall example

Decomposition A	Decomposition B

Pair 1-5: Intra pair in A but not in B
Precision: 16/20 = 80% Recall: 16/21 = 76.2%

Problems with Precision / Recall

- Sensitive to the size and number of clusters
  - Differences are exaggerated if you have small/many clusters
- Two values makes comparison harder
- The two values are interchangeable if there is no authoritative decomposition

Koschke - Eisenbarth measure (KE)

- Loosely based on Precision/Recall
- Attempts to be less strict
- Definitions:
  - GOOD match: Two clusters (one in A, one in B) with both precision and recall larger than a threshold p (typical value 70%)
  - OK match: Two clusters with only one of the measures larger than p

Koschke - Eisenbarth metric

$$\frac{\sum_{(a,b)\in\text{GOOD}} \text{overlap}(a,b) + \sum_{(a,b)\in\text{OK}} \text{overlap}(a,b)}{|\text{GOOD}| + |\text{OK}| + |\text{true negatives}|}$$

Koschke - Eisenbarth metric

- Does not take edges into account
- In extreme situations (each cluster contains only one element) may provide strange results (similarity of 100%)
- No penalty for joining clusters

Assignment tool: ke

- Takes two .kos files containing different decompositions of the same set of entities
- Example:
  `ke -cand dec1.kos -ref dec2.kos`
- Produces lots of output. We're interested in the recall rate
- Transform an RSF file with contain facts to the KE format with
  `unitrans input.rsf output.kos`

MoJo distance

- The distance between two different partitions of the same software system is defined as the minimum number of Move and Join operations to transform one to the other
  - Move: Remove an object from a cluster and put it in a different cluster
  - Join: Merge two clusters into one
  - Split: Has to be simulated by Move operations

MoJo example

Decomposition A   Decomposition B

MoJo(A,B) = 2
MoJo(B,A) = 3

Why only Move and Join?

- Two clusters can be joined in only one way. One cluster can be split in two in an exponential number of ways
- Joining two clusters only means that we performed more detailed clustering than required
- Splitting is effectively assigned a weight equal to the cardinality of the smaller of the two resulting clusters

Computing MoJo distance

- MoJo distance can be computed in polynomial time
- Worst case complexity is $O(n^3)$ but with real data it is no worse than $O(n\log n)$

Assignment tool: mojo

- Takes two .rsf files containing different decompositions of the same set of entities
- Example: `mojo dec1.rsf dec2.rsf`
- Output: `383`
- If the two decompositions do not refer to the same set of entities, only the intersection of the two sets is considered.

MoJoFM Effectiveness Metric

$$MoJoFM(A) = (1 - \frac{MoJo(A, B)}{max_{\forall c}(MoJo(C, B))}) \times 100\%$$

- The denominator is the maximum possible MoJo distance to decomposition B
 - Can be computed by construction

EdgeSim

- Other measures do not consider edges

- Edges might convey important information

- EdgeSim penalizes clustering algorithms for changing the edge types

EdgeSim

Inter-edge: Edge between clusters
Intra-edge: Edge within a cluster
Y: set of edges that are of the same type in both A and B

EdgeSim example

$\text{EdgeSim}(A,B) = \frac{weight(Y)}{weight(E)}$ x 100%
In this example, EdgeSim(A,B) = 52.6%

EdgeSim counterexample


EdgeMoJo philosophy

- A similarity measure cannot make assumptions as to what cluster a particular object should belong to

- Dissimilarity between decompositions should increase if the misplacement of an object results in the misplacement of a large number of edges

EdgeMoJo calculation

- Apply MoJo and obtain a series of Move and Join operations

- Perform all Join operations

- The cost of each Move operations increases from 1 to

$$m(o) = 1 + \frac{|(W(o, A_{new}) - W(o, A_{old})|}{W(o, A_{new}) + W(o, A_{old})}$$

EdgeMoJo example

Decomposition A Decomposition B

$$m(5) = 1 + \frac{|4-1|}{4+1} = 1.6$$

EdgeMoJo in practice

- Experiments with real and synthetic data indicated that EdgeMoJo distance is usually MoJo distance multiplied by a constant factor

- The usefulness of edges in measuring similarity between partitions is still an open question

What about nested decompositions?

- All measures we discussed so far assume a flat decomposition
  - No nested clusters

- Clustering algorithms typically create nested decompositions

- One needs to flatten decompositions to use these measures

Creating compact flat decompositions

- All objects are re-assigned to the first level cluster they are transitively contained in

Decomposition A

A_1 A_2

A_3 A_4 6 7 8 9

1 2 3 4 5

Decomposition C

C_1 C_2

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Creating detailed flat decompositions

- All clusters are re-assigned to the root

Decomposition A

A_1 A_2

A_3 A_4 7 8

1 2 3 4 A_5

5 6

Decomposition D

D_1 D_2 D_3 D_4

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

The END framework

- Each decomposition is transformed into a sequence of decompositions

- One for each level in the containment tree

- Compute the value of a flat evaluation measure M at each level

- Obtain a vector of values S_{M_i}

The END framework

- Compute the combined similarity/distance S as

$$\sqrt{\sum(w_i S_{M_i}{}^2)}$$

  where $\sum w_i = 1$

- Weights need to be assigned to each level

A different solution: UpMoJo

- An extension of MoJo distance that includes an Up operation as well
  - Moves an object one level higher in the containment tree

- A series of Up operations ensures that the top level of the containment tree contains the same set of objects

- MoJo rearranges the top level

- The process repeats for each subtree of the top level