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ABSTRACT. This paper addresses the problem of software defect detection, an important problem which helps to improve the software systems’ maintainability and evolution. In order to detect defective entities within a software system, a self-organizing feature map is proposed. The trained map will be able to identify, using unsupervised learning, if a software module is defective or not. We experimentally evaluate our approach on three open-source case studies, also providing a comparison with similar existing approaches. The obtained results emphasize the effectiveness of using self-organizing maps for software defect detection and confirm the potential of our proposal.

1. INTRODUCTION

In order to increase the efficiency of quality assurance, defect detection tries to identify those modules of a software where errors are present. In many cases there is no time to thoroughly test each module of the software system, and in these cases defect detection methods can help by suggesting which modules should be focused on during testing.

We are proposing in this paper an unsupervised machine learning method based on self-organizing maps for detecting defective entities within software systems. The self-organizing map architecture was previously applied in the literature for defect detection, but using a kind of hybrid approach, where different threshold values for some software metrics were also used [1]. To our knowledge, there is no approach in the search-based software engineering literature similar to ours. The unsupervised model introduced in this paper proved to outperform most of the similar existing approaches, considering the datasets used for evaluation.
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The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the fundamentals of self-organizing maps as well as existing similar approaches for software defect detection. Our proposal for identifying software defects using self-organizing feature maps is introduced in Section 3. Section 4 provides an experimental evaluation of our approach, while an analysis of the obtained results and comparison with existing similar work is given in Section 5. Section 6 contains some conclusions of our paper and indicates directions for further improvement.

2. Background

In this section we aim at presenting the main characteristics of self-organizing maps as well as similar approaches for software defect detection.

2.1. Self-organizing maps. A self-organizing map (SOM) [15] is a type of artificial neural network that is trained using unsupervised learning to produce a low-dimensional (usually two-dimensional) representation of the training samples, called a map [5]. Self-organizing maps use a neighborhood function to preserve the topological relationships in the input space and are related to the category of competitive learning networks. Self-organizing maps are considered in the neural networks literature as the most innovative form of unsupervised learning.

The SOM provides a topology preserving mapping from the multi-dimensional input space to the map neurons (units). Each neuron from the input layer of a SOM is connected to each neuron from the output layer and each connection has an associated weight. The topology preservation property means that a SOM groups similar input instances on neurons that are close on the SOM [9]. The map is usually trained using the Kohonen algorithm [15].

The trained self-organizing map is able to provide clusters of similar data items [12]. This particular characteristic of SOMs makes them appropriate for data mining tasks that involve classification and clustering of data items [12]. The SOM can be used as an effective tool for clustering as well as a tool for visualizing high-dimensional data.

2.2. Literature review. A review on unsupervised learning-based approaches existing in the defect prediction literature will be provided in the following.

Abaei et al. proposed in [1] a fault prediction method by utilizing self-organizing maps and thresholds. Two experiments are conducted in this paper: the first one considers the removal of the modules’ labels and re-computing them afterwards by taking threshold values into account for some selected attributes (the ones for which threshold values are known). In the second experiment, a SOM is used for both clustering and evaluating the input data.
Threshold values are used as well for labeling the units from the trained SOM. For this second experiment they report a good Overall Error, and in most cases their proposed solution improves classification of unlabeled program modules in terms of FPR (False Positive Rate) and FNR (False Negative Rate). One drawback to their approach is that they do not obtain good results when the dataset is very small.

Another approach is presented in [2] that predicts software fault using a Quad Tree-based K-Means algorithm. The difference to the original K-Means algorithm is that the cluster centers are found by using Quad Trees. They evaluate their approach on various datasets, and compute the FPR, FNR and Overall Error for them. These values indicate that their approach is slightly better than other cluster center initialization techniques and they achieve slightly better results from fewer number of iterations.

The method presented in [18] uses the K-Means clustering algorithm as well, but it uses Hyper Quad Trees for determining the cluster centers. They present that Hyper Quad Trees are more efficient than simple Quad Trees because they produce more accurate centroids. After the K-Means algorithm is run, a threshold value is used to determine which cluster represents the defective and which represents the non-defective entities. The results for some public datasets confirm obtaining better outcomes in terms of FPR and Overall Error when comparing this approach to simple Quad Tree approach.

Tosun et al. used in [17] network measures to identify defective modules in software systems. Their approach uses the Naive Bayes classifier, together with a Call Graph Based Ranking (CGBR) framework. The experimental evaluation was performed on both small and large datasets and for three cases: complexity metrics only, network metrics only and a combination between them. The results show a great performance of applying network metrics for large datasets, but they do not provide significant improvement for small projects.

A clustering-based approach is presented in [3], where the Xmeans algorithm is used, an algorithm which is similar to K-means, but it can automatically determine the optimal number of clusters. The authors use the implementation of this algorithm from WEKA [7], and when the clusters are created, software metric threshold values are applied to the mean vector of each cluster in order to decide whether it represents the defective or the non-defective entities. They claim that this method proved better results than a simple threshold-based approach, fuzzy c-means and k-means.

Another unsupervised software fault prediction model is given by Park and Hong in [14] where clustering algorithms that determine the number of clusters automatically are used. They have a pre-processing step, where attribute selection is performed, using the CfsSubsetEval method from WEKA.
Results achieved with the Xmeans and EM models from WEKA (which can automatically determined the optimal number of clusters) were compared to other results produced with Xmeans (in [3]) and Quad Tree based K-Means algorithm. They conclude that both Xmeans and EM have good results if attribute selection is not performed, results that are better than the existing ones in most of the considered cases.

3. Methodology

In this section we introduce our unsupervised neural network model for defect identification in software systems.

The main idea of this approach is to represent an entity (class, module, method, function) of a software system as a multidimensional vector, whose elements are the values of different software metrics applied to the given entity. We consider that a software system \( S \) is a set of components (called entities) \( S = \{s_1, s_2, ..., s_n\} \). We are considering a feature set of software metrics \( SM = \{sm_1, sm_2, ..., sm_k\} \) and thus each entity \( s_i \in S \) from the software system can be represented as a \( k \)-dimensional vector, having as components the values of the software metrics from \( SM \), \( s_i = (s_{i1}, s_{i2}, ..., s_{ik}) \) (\( s_{ij} \) represents the value of the software metric \( sm_j \) applied to the software entity \( s_i \)).

For each software entity, the label of the instance (defect or non-defect) is known. We mention that the labels will be used only in the pre-processing step and for evaluating the performance of the model.

3.1. Data pre-processing. The first step before applying the SOM approach is the data pre-processing step. During this step, the input data is scaled to [0,1] using the Min-Max normalization method, and then a feature selection step will be applied. Details about the feature selection step will be given in the experimental part of the paper (Section 4). After applying the feature selection step, \( m \) software metrics (features) are selected to be further used for building the SOM.

Regarding the normalization method, we have to mention that in our approach the minimum and maximum values for the software metrics (features) from the training data are used for the Min-Max normalization step. We have focused in this paper only on the unsupervised scenario of grouping the existing entities from a software system into defective or non-defective. In a supervised learning scenario, in which new testing data is used, it is not useful to use for normalization the minimum and maximum values for the features from the training data. Instead, it would be a good idea to use, for each software metric, the minimum and maximum values for that software metric. Further extensions of our approach will investigate this situation.
3.2. **The SOM model.** Before designing the SOM model, the input dataset is pre-processed. For the training step of the SOM, a distance function between the input instances is required. We are considering the *distance* between the high-dimensional representation of two software entities $s_i$ and $s_j$ as the *Euclidean Distance* between their corresponding vectors of software metrics values. We have chosen the *Euclidean distance* because it is the most often used distance measure for SOM-based approaches and because, intuitively, considering the $m$-dimensional instances (preprocessed as mentioned in Section 3.1), the *Euclidean distance* will assign low distances to similar entities that are very likely to have the same output class (defect or not). Nevertheless, in the future we intend to extend our approach to use other distance measures as well.

The set of pre-processed software entities from the dataset $S$ are grouped into clusters using a SOM. For the self-organizing map, the *torus* topology is used (Figure 1). In geometry, a torus is a surface of revolution generated by revolving a circle in the three dimensional space about an axis coplanar with the circle. It is shown in the literature that this topology provides better neighborhood than the conventional one [11].

Figure 1. A torus

The goal of this step is to obtain two clusters corresponding to the two classes of instances: *defects* and *non-defects*. For grouping the software entities the following steps are performed.

- **Map Construction.** For a given number of *epochs* (training episodes), perform the following. Each $m$-dimensional training instance (software entity) is fed to the map. For each instance $s_i$ the following steps are performed:
  1. **Matching.** The neuron having its weight vector closest (considering the *Euclidean distance*) to instance $s_i$ is declared the “winning” neuron. This is a competition phase, in which the output units from the map compete to match the input instance.
  2. **Updating.** After the “winning neuron” was identified, the connection weights of the winning unit and its neighbors are updated,
such that are moved in the direction of the input instance by a factor determined by a learning rate.

- **Visualization.** After the training phase (the steps described above) was completed, in order to visualize the obtained map, the U-Matrix method [8] is used. The U-Matrix value of a particular node from the map is computed as the average Euclidean distance between the node and its closest 4 or 8 neighbors. These distances can be then be viewed as heights giving a U-Matrix landscape. The U-Matrix may be interpreted as follows [8]: high places on the U-Matrix encode data that are dissimilar while the data falling in the same valleys represent input instances that are similar. Thus, instances within the same valley can be grouped together to represent a cluster. Each cluster visualized on the map identifies a class of instances.

Once the map was built, it may also be used in a supervised learning scenario for classifying a new software entity. First, the “winning neuron” corresponding to this instance is determined (as indicated at the **Matching** step above). The cluster (class) to which the winning neuron belongs will indicate the class membership of the given entity.

3.2.1. **Testing.** For evaluating the performance of the SOM model, we are using several evaluation measures from the supervised classification literature. Since the training instances were labeled, the labels are used to compute the confusion matrix for the two possible outcomes (non-defect and defect). Considering the defective class as the positive one and the non-defective class as the negative one, the confusion matrix [16] for the defect detection task consists of: the number of true positives (TP), false positives (FP), true negatives (TN) and false negatives (FN).

Considering the values computed from the confusion matrix, the following evaluation measures will be used in this paper:

1. False Positive Rate (FPR), computed as $\frac{FP}{FP + TN}$.
2. False Negative Rate (FNR), computed as $\frac{FN}{FN + TP}$.
3. Overall Error (OE), computed as $\frac{FN + FP}{FN + FP + TN + TP}$.

We have decided to use these measures, because they are used in papers presenting similar approaches, so a direct comparison of the results is possible. But the datasets used for the experiments are imbalanced, so we have decided to compute the value of a fourth performance measure as well: the **Area Under the ROC Curve (AUC)** [6]. The ROC curve is a two-dimensional plot of sensitivity vs. (1-specificity), which in our case contains one single point, linked to the (0,0) and (1,1) points.
4. Experimental evaluation

In this section we provide an experimental evaluation of the SOM model (described in Section 3) on three case studies which were conducted on open source datasets. We mention that we have used our own implementation for SOM, without using any third party libraries.

4.1. Datasets. We have used three openly available datasets for the experimental evaluation of our model, called Ar3, Ar4 and Ar5, which can be downloaded from [4]. All three datasets come from a Turkish white-goods manufacturer embedded software implemented in C. They all contain the value of 29 different McCabe and Halstead software metrics, computed for the functions and methods from the software systems, and one class label, denoting whether the entity is defective or not. The Ar3 dataset contains metric values for 63 entities, out of which 8 are defective. The Ar4 dataset contains 107 entities, out of which 20 defective, while the Ar5 dataset has 36 entities, out of which 8 are defective.

For the SOM used in the experiments, the following parameter setting was used: the number of training epochs was set to 100000, the learning coefficient was set to 0.7, the radius was computed as half of the maximum distance between the neurons and the neighborhood function. We have tried out different parameter settings and we have achieved the best results with these values. However, we will perform in the future a thorough study to investigate the effect of different parameter settings.

4.2. Data pre-processing. In order to analyze the importance of the features, we are using the information gain measure. The information gain (IG) of a feature expresses the expected reduction in entropy determined by partitioning the instances according to the considered feature [13]. More exactly, the IG measure indicates the relevance of a feature in the defect classification task. Since the software metrics values (features values) are real numbers, in order to compute the information gain of the attributes we first discretize their values by dividing their interval of variation into ten sub-intervals.

For a better data analysis, we have computed the information gain of the features from the dataset obtained using all three datasets (Ar3, Ar4 and Ar5) together. The information gain values for the features are shown in Figure 2.

Starting from the IG values of the software metrics, we have chosen a threshold value $\tau$ and considered only the attributes whose IG was higher than this threshold. Out of these attributes, we selected those that measure different characteristics of the software system. For the threshold $\tau$ we have selected the value 0.163, because we have achieved the best results with this value. Out of the 18 software metrics whose value was higher than $\tau$, we have selected...
the following 9 metrics: halstead_vocabulary, total_operands, total_operators, executable_loc, halstead_length, total_loc, condition_count, branch_count, decision_count. These selected attributes were used in the experimental evaluation on all three considered datasets. We mention that a different, possibly automatic, attribute selection method can also be implemented considering the IG values and will be further investigated.

4.3. Results. We are presenting in this section the results we have obtained by applying the SOM model on the Ar3, Ar4 and Ar5 datasets. For each dataset considered for evaluation, the experiments are conducted as follows. First, the data pre-processing step is applied and then the methodology indicated in Section 3 is used for an unsupervised construction of a torus SOM. The U-Matrix corresponding to the trained SOM will be visualized (the red labels on the U-Matrix represent the defective entities and the yellow labels represent the non-defective ones). Then, the evaluation measures presented in Section 3.2.1 will be computed for evaluating the performance of the obtained results.

4.3.1. The Ar3 dataset. A torus SOM, consisting of 150x8 nodes, was trained on the set of software entities from the Ar3 dataset. Figure 3 depicts the U-Matrix visualization of the trained SOM.

Visualizing the U-Matrix for the resulting map, we have identified the two clusters, representing the defective and non-defective entities. The cluster with the defective entities contains 6 defective entities and 1 non-defective entity, thus we have 1 FP entity and 2 FN ones. All the other entities are placed...
in the correct cluster. The values of the performance measures from Section 3.2.1 are presented in the first three cells of the first row of Table 1.

4.3.2. The Ar3 dataset. A torus SOM, consisting of 150x8 nodes, was trained on the set of software entities from the Ar3 dataset. The U-Matrix visualization of the obtained SOM is illustrated in Figure 4.

Visualizing the U-matrix for the resulting map, we have identified the two clusters which represent the defective and non-defective entities. The cluster with the defective entities contains 10 defective entities and 2 non-defective entities. Consequently we have 10 FN entities and 2 FP ones. The values of the performance measures are presented in the middle three cells of the first row of Table 1.

4.3.3. The Ar5 dataset. A torus SOM, consisting of 150x8 nodes, was trained on the set of software entities from the Ar5 dataset. The U-Matrix visualization of the trained SOM is presented in Figure 5.

From Figure 5 we can observe that the obtained SOM indicates a good topological mapping of the input instances, and also identifies subclasses within the defective and non-defective classes. Most of the defective entities are grouped together (there is only one FN), but there is also one non-defective entity in this cluster, so we have 1 FP as well. The values of the performance measures for this dataset are presented in the last three cells of the first row of Table 1.
5. Discussion and comparison to related work

An analysis of the approach we have introduced in Section 3 for detecting the defective entities from software systems will be provided in the following. A discussion on the obtained experimental results, as well as a comparison of them with similar approaches from the literature is conducted.
As presented in the previous section, our approach was capable of separating the defective and non-defective entities in two clusters, obtaining a good topological mapping of the input instances. Even if the separation was not perfect, for all three datasets we had both false positive and false negative entities. A major advantage of the self-organizing map is that it does not require supervision and no assumption about the distribution of the input data is made. Thus, it may find unexpected hidden structures from the data being investigated. Moreover, as seen from our experiments (Section 4), it is interesting that the SOM is able to detect, within the defective/non-defective class, subclasses of instances. This would be very useful, from a data mining perspective, since it may provide useful knowledge for the software developers.

As the accuracy of the trained SOMs depends on the choice of some parameters (number of training epochs, learning coefficient, neighborhood function), we have to measure it. One method for evaluating the quality of the resulting map is to calculate the average quantization error over the input samples, defined as the Euclidean norm of the difference between the input vector and the best-matching model [10]. Figures 6, 7 and 8 give a graphical representation of the average quantization error during the training steps, for each case study considered for evaluation. It can be easily seen that while the error fluctuates at the beginning of the training phase, it decreases during it, and after the training is completed, a very small average quantization error of the trained maps is obtained (1.6 × 10^{-6} for Ar3, 1.7 × 10^{-4} for Ar4 and 6.7 × 10^{-13} for Ar5), which shows the accuracy of the trained maps.

Considering the subclasses identified within the clusters for the defective and non-defective entities as further work we propose to analyze these subclasses to identify the characteristics of the software entities placed in them.

Table 1 presents the values of the FPR, FNR and OE performance measures computed for the results of our approach, but it also contains values reported in the literature for some existing approaches, presented in Section 2.2. The Hyper Quad Tree-based approach presented in [18] does not report FNR values, this is marked with “NR” in the table.

From Table 1 we can see, that even if our approach does not provide the best results in each case, it has better results than most of the approaches. Out of 51 cases in total, our algorithm has a better or equal value for a performance measure in 43 cases, which represents 84.3% of the cases.

The first line of Table 2 presents the value of the AUC measure computed for our approach. As presented in Section 3.2.1, for computing the value of the AUC measure we need to compute the sensitivity and specificity of the classification. Since sensitivity is equal to 1 − FNR and (1 − specificity) is equal to FPR, we computed the value of the AUC measure for those approaches from the literature which report both of these values. They are presented in.
Table 2 as well, and for each dataset the best value is marked with bold. Our approach has the highest AUC value for the Ar5 dataset, the second highest
value for the Ar3 dataset and the fourth highest value for the Ar4 dataset. Interestingly, for the Ar3 and Ar4 datasets the best value is achieved by the other SOM-based approach presented in the literature, suggesting that SOMs are indeed suitable for this problem.

6. Conclusions and future work

We have introduced in this paper a self-organizing feature map which may be used for an unsupervised detection of software defects. The experimental results obtained on three open-source datasets reveal a good performance of
the proposed approach, it provides better results than many of the existing approaches report in the literature.

Future work will be done in order to extend the evaluation of the proposed machine learning based model on other open source case studies and real software systems. We will also investigate the applicability of fuzzy self-organizing maps for software defect detection, as well as to further consider techniques for data pre-processing and feature selection.
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