Last week

- Assignment 6
  - Deadline: Today
- Assignment 7
  - Have you looked at it?
  - How to implement evolution
    - Last week: evolution strategies and decision making
    - Today: refactoring
- Next week: No class (Whit Monday)

Problem: changing code is difficult

- Correct code can be far from perfect:
  - Bad structure
  - Code duplication
  - Bad coding practices
  - ...
- We need to change it
  - Undisciplined code modification may introduce bugs
  - ... and does not guarantee that the code will actually be improved!
  - Manual work, not clear how to support it beyond “copy/paste” and “replace all”

Refactoring

- Refactoring – a disciplined technique for restructuring code, altering its internal structure without changing its external behavior.
- External behavior not changed
  - New bugs are not introduced
  - Old ones are not resolved!
- Aims at improving
  - maintainability, performance

Examples of refactorings

- Extract method
  - If similar series or steps are repeatedly executed, create a separate method
- Rename method
  - If the method’s name no longer corresponds to its purpose/behaviour, rename the method
- Pull up
  - Move the functionality common to all subclasses to the/a superclass
- Push down
  - If the functionality is needed only in some subclasses move it to the subclass
We will discuss some of the refactorings in more detail.

### Categories of refactorings [Fowler]
- Composing methods (extract method, inline temp)
- Moving features between objects (move field, remove middleman)
- Organizing data (change value to reference)
- Simplifying conditional expressions
- Making method calls simpler (rename method)
- Dealing with generalization (pull up field)
- Big refactorings (separate domain from presentation)

### Refactoring catalogue [Fowler]: Example
- **Name:** Inline Temp
- **Applicability:**
  - A temp is assigned to once with a simple expression, and it is getting in the way of other refactorings.
  - Replace all references with the expression
- **Motivation:** simplifies other refactorings, e.g., Extract Method
- **Steps (Java):**
  - Declare the temp as final, and compile
  - Find references to the temp and replace them
  - Compile and test after each change
  - Remove the declaration and the assignment of the temp
  - Compile and test

Why would you declare the temp as final?

### How many refactorings are there?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Java</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson et al. website</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Haskell</td>
<td>20 * 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrido</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serebrenik, Schriijers, Demoen</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Prolog</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields et al.</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>&gt;70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- One has to organize refactorings by categories
- We will discuss some of the refactorings in more detail!

### Closer look: Pull Up Field / Push Down Field

- **Pull Up**
  - When would you use each one of the refactorings?
  - Pull Up: field is common to all subclasses
  - Push Down: field is used only in some subclasses

### Pull Up: Seems simple...
- Inspect all uses of the candidate fields
- Ensure they are used in the same way.
- If the fields do not have the same name, rename
  - The candidate fields should have the name you want to use for the superclass field.
- Compile and test.
  - Create a new field in the superclass.
  - If the fields are private, protect the superclass field
  - The subclasses should be able to refer to it.
  - Delete the subclass fields.
  - Compile and test.
  - Consider using Self Encapsulate Field on the new field.

### Another example: Extract method: Without parameters

```java
static Order order;  
static char name[];
void printOwing() {
  Enumeration e = elements (order);  
  double outst = 0.0;
  printBanner();
  while (hasMoreElements (e)) {
    Order each = nextElement (e);
    outst += getAmount (each);
  }
  printDetails('name %s

print ("name %s in
print ("amount %s

// calculate outstanding
while (hasMoreElements (e)) {
  Order each = nextElement (e);
  outst += getAmount (each);
}
// print details
print ("name %s

print ("amount %s

// pull up field:
static Order order;
static char name[];
void printBanner() {
  print (" Customer Owes

print ("Customer Owes

// push down field:
static Order order;
static char name[];
void printBanner() {
  print (" Customer Owes

print ("Customer Owes
```
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Assume that we want to improve maintainability.

Software metrics

Select the maintainability metrics

Changes (based on version control)

Refactoring loop

Recalculate the maintainability metrics

But is the new program really better than the old one?

• Assume that we want to improve maintainability

How to identify bad smells?

• Software metrics
  • Size: Large class, large method, long parameter list
  • Dependencies: feature envy, inappropriate intimacy
  • % comments: comments

• Code duplication

• Changes (based on version control)
  • Divergent change (one class is changed in different ways for different reasons)
  • Shotgun surgery (many small changes)
  • Parallel inheritance hierarchies
How to identify bad smells?

- Structural problems: obsolete parameters, inappropriate interfaces, ...
- Parameter \( p \) of \( C.m \) is obsolete if
  - Neither \( C.m \) itself uses \( p \)
  - Nor any of the classes inheriting from \( C \) and reimplementing \( m \) uses \( p \)
- Naïve approach: check all parameters of all methods of all classes
  - Not feasible
  - Better ideas?

Querying the structure [Tourwe, Mens]

- Query (a la Datalog):
  
  ```
  obsolete(Class, Method, Parameter) :-
  classImplements(Class, Method),
  parameterOf(Class, Method, Parameter),
  forall(subclassImplements(Class, Method, Subclass),
    not(methodUsesParameter(Subclass, Method, Parameter)) )
  ```
- Advantage:
  - Once the DB is populated one can look for different smells

How to chose appropriate refactorings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bad smell</th>
<th>Refactoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Extract method, Introduce assertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicated code</td>
<td>Extract method, Extract class, Pull Up method, Form Template method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature envy</td>
<td>Move method, Extract method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long method</td>
<td>Extract method, Decompose conditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another example: Inappropriate interface

- AbstractTerm cannot be easily extended
  - not clear which subclass should implement terms
- Query
  
  ```
  commonSubcInt(Class, Int, Subcs) :-
  classInterface(Class, ClassInt),
  allSubclasses(Class, SubcList),
  sharedInterface(SubcList, commonInt, Subcs),
  difference(commonInt, ClassInt, Int)
  ```
Refactoring never comes alone

- Usually one can find many different bad smells
- And for each one many different refactorings...
- Guidelines when refactorings should be applied
- Still even with strict guidelines [DuBois 2004]
  - org.apache.tomcat.{core,startup}
  - 12 classes, 167 methods and 3797 lines of code
- Potential refactorings
  - Extract Method 5
  - Move Method 9
  - Replace Method with Method Object 1,
  - Replace Data Value with Object 3
  - Extract Class 3

Refactorings and metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refactoring</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Reducing</th>
<th>Extracting</th>
<th>Modify</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>WMC/McCabe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract methods</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design methods</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracting methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMC/McCabe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- CDE – class definition entropy
- N – number of strings in the class
- $f_i$ – frequency of the string i

\[
CDE = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} f_i \ln \left( \frac{f_i}{N} \right)
\]

Refactoring never comes alone

- Which one is “better”?
- The most beneficial for the maintainability metrics we want to improve
  - We can do this a posteriori but the effort will be lost!
  - So we would like to assess this a priori

- Extract method from multiple methods
  - decreases LOC
  - decreases #dependencies on other classes

Refactoring and metrics

- CDE – class definition entropy
- N – number of strings in the class
- $f_i$ – frequency of the string i

\[
CDE = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} f_i \ln \left( \frac{f_i}{N} \right)
\]

The refactoring process

- Select the quality metrics
  - maintainability, performance, ...
- Recall: Goal – Question – Metrics!

- Refactoring loop
  - Calculate the metrics value
  - Identify a problem: “bad smell”
  - Check that the refactoring is applicable
  - Refactor
    - Compile and test
      - Recall: “without changing its external behavior”
      - Recalculate the metrics value

Inconsistency

- Refactoring can introduce inconsistency
  - In tests by breaking the interfaces
  - In models by making them out-of-date

- We need to detect such inconsistencies
  - A priori: using classification of refactorings
    - We know when the things will go wrong
  - A posteriori:
    - Using a logic formalism
      - Inconsistency = unsatisfiability of a logic formula
    - Using change logs
      - EROSE

Interface preservation by refactorings

- Refactoring can violate the interface

- Classify refactorings [Moonen et al.]
  - Composite: series of small refactorings,
  - Compatible: interface is not changed
  - Backwards compatible: interface is extended
  - Make backwards compatible: interface can be modified to keep it backwards compatible
  - Incompatible: interface is broken, tests should be adapted
Refactoring and tests

Compatible
- Inline temp
- Extract class
- Decompose conditional

Backwards compatible
- Extract method
- Push down/Pull up field

Make backwards compatible
- Add/Remove parameter
- Rename/Move method

Incompatible
- Inline method
- Inline class

• To which group belong
  • Replace Exception with Test
  • Self Encapsulate Field

But tests are also code!

• Smells [Moonen et al.]
  • Mystery guest (dependency on an external resource)
  • Resource optimism (availability of resources)
  • Test run war (concurrent use of resources)
  • General fixture (too many things are set-up)
  • Eager test (several methods are tested together)
  • Lazy tests (the same method for the same fixture)
  • Assertions roulette (several assertions in the same test with no distinct explanation)
  • For testers only (production code used only for tests)
  • Sensitive equality (toString instead of equal)
  • Test code duplication

Smells are there, what about refactorings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refactoring</th>
<th>Bad smell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inline resource</td>
<td>Mystery guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setup External Resource</td>
<td>Resource optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make resource unique</td>
<td>Test run war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce data</td>
<td>General fixture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add assertion explanation</td>
<td>Assertions roulette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce equality method</td>
<td>Sensitive equality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternative: A posteriori inconsistency

• Sometimes we do not know what refactorings took place

• Van Der Straeten et al.: inconsistencies in UML models using encoding as logic formulas
  • Similar technique can be used for code/model
  • Syntax adapted:
    inconsistent(ClassDiagram,SeqDiagram,Class,Obj) :-
      class(Class),
      not(inNamespace(Class,ClassDiagram)),
      instanceOf(Class,Obj),
      inNamespace(Obj,SeqDiagram)

Putting it all together: refactoring browsers

• IntelliJ IDEA – first popular commercial refactoring browser for Java
  • Today: additional languages
  • A number of alternatives
    • Eclipse
    • MS Visual Studio
  • ...
Refactoring browsers have a lot of potential but are they used?

- Students [Murphy Hill and Black]
  - 16 used Eclipse, 2 used refactoring
  - 42 used Eclipse, 6 used refactoring

- Professionals
  - 112 agile programmers, 68% used refactoring
  - Traditional programmers are expected to be less enthusiastic

- Are refactoring browsers fit to what the developers want to do?

How do people refactor [Murphy Hill and Black]

- Floss refactorings: frequent, intertwined with usual development activities

- Root canal refactorings: concentrated refactoring effort, infrequent, no usual development activities take place
  - Regular flossing prevents root canal treatment
  - Programmers prefer to floss [Weißgerber, Diehl]

We need to focus on floss refactorings

1. Choose the desired refactoring quickly,
2. Switch seamlessly between program editing and refactoring,
3. View and navigate the program code while using the tool,
4. Avoid providing explicit configuration information, and
5. Access all the other tools normally available in the development environment while using the refactoring tool.

Eclipse revisited

Lengthy menus: refactoring selection is slow (Req. 1)

Configuration dialog (Req. 4) interrupts the regular development activities (Req. 2) and does not allow to view the code (Req. 3).
Fast access means limited choice

- Which refactorings are actually used?
  - Column – refactoring
  - Row – developer
  - Colour – times used

- Leaders
  - Rename, move
  - Extract method, pull up
  - ModifyParameters
  - ExtractLocalVariable
  - ExtractInterface
  - ExtractConstant

Proposed solution: Refactoring Cues

- Short menu (Req. 1)
- Switch is easy (Req. 2)
- Code is visible (Req. 3)
- Dialog is non-modal (Req. 5)
- Configuration (Req. 4) is an issue

No explicit configuration: X-Develop

- Up: Original source code
- Down: After the extract method refactoring
- Default method name: m
- The name is pre-selected: the rename method refactoring is intended

Conclusion

- Refactoring – a disciplined technique for restructuring code, altering its internal structure without changing its external behavior.
- Refactoring loop
  - Calculate maintainability metrics
  - Identify a problem: “bad smell”
  - Check that the refactoring is applicable
  - Refactor
  - Compile and test
  - Recalculate the maintainability metrics
  - Refactoring browsers should better support flossing