

 **ISWC 2008**

4th International Workshop
on Semantic Web Enabled Software Engineering



UNIVERSITÉ
Concordia
UNIVERSITY

Enriching SE Ontologies with Bug Report Quality

Philipp Schügerl, Juergen Rilling, Philippe Charland*

Ambient Software Evolution Group,
Concordia University, Montreal
aseg.cs.concordia.ca

*System of Systems Section
Defence R&D Canada Valcartier
Quebec, Canada

SE-ADVISOR Project

- Goal:

Improve software engineering processes by integrating originally disconnected software artifacts within a KB

→ **Make the life of Software Engineers easier**



- Methodology:

Create advices based on the current context by analyzing a SE ontology


SE-ADVISOR System

Context

SE Ontology



SE-ADVISOR Ontology



- Unified representation of resources
 - Sourcecode, versioning, bugtracking,... sub-ontologies
 - “The following documents, source code parts and wiki pages are affected by a change in this class”
- Formal representation of domain specific knowledge
 - For example: define concept “bad programmer”
 - “This class has a higher chance of containing a bug because a bad programmer has originally written it [and it hasn’t been modified]”

Back to...

ENRICHING SE ONTOLOGIES WITH BUG REPORT QUALITY

Contribution

- Defining bug report quality attributes
- Automatic quality assessment for bug reports
- Adding quality to the bugtracker sub-ontology
(Formulating new advices based on quality)

Bug Quality – General Guidelines

- Be precise
- Explain it so others can reproduce it
- One bug per report
- Clearly separate fact from speculation
- No abuse or whining about decisions

[Bettenburg 2008]

[Tatham 2008]

Bug Quality Guidelines 1/2

- **Certainty.** There should be no speculation in a bug description.

To Me it seems not to be possible to create a class within a diagram from a different package?

(ArgoUML Bug# 378)

- **Focus.** There should be no off-topic discussions, complaints or personal statements. Only one bug should be described per report.

Hi, I'm a very new user to ArgoUML. I found it exciting.....Direct to the point.....

(ArgoUML Bug# 236)

Bug Quality Guidelines 2/2

- **Reproducibility.** There should be a clear way to reproduce the bug (context in which the bug occurred).

After adding a diagram (class/state), I couldn't delete it from the project...

(ArgoUML Bug# 269)

- **Observability.** The observed negative behavior should be described.

*GUI **hangs** when attempting to bold text...*


(ArgoUML Bug# 364)

Bug Quality Classification

Predicted	Observed					<i>Precision</i>
	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	
Very good	15	4	2	0	1	86%
Good	29	36	7	5	2	91%
Average	1	6	2	0	1	80%
Poor	0	6	3	3	3	60%
Very poor	1	2	5	1	3	33%
<i>Recall</i>	96%	85%	63%	44%	60%	

Accuracy: 81%

Automatic Quality Assessment



ArgoUML bugtracker

Enriching the SE Ontology

- Introducing new concepts for quality in the bug-tracker sub-ontology
 - Define concept “bad reporter”
- Trust (disambiguation)

Ambient Software Evolution Group

aseg.cs.concordia.ca



UNIVERSITÉ

Concordia

UNIVERSITY

www.concordia.ca