Deep Learning Based Feature Envy Detection Boosted by Real-World Examples

ABSTRACT
Feature envy is one of the well-recognized code smells that should be removed by software refactoring. A major challenge in feature envy detection is that traditional approaches are less accurate whereas deep learning-based approaches are suffering from the lack of high-quality large-scale training data. Although existing refactoring detection tools could be employed to discover real-world feature envy examples, the noise (i.e., non-feature envy) within the resulting data could significantly influence the quality of the training data as well as the performance of the models trained on the data. To this end, in this paper, we propose a sequence of heuristic rules and a decision tree-based classifier to filter out non-feature envy reported by state-of-the-art refactoring detection tools. The data after filtering serve as the positive items in the requested training data. From the same subject projects, we randomly select methods that are different from positive items as negative items. With the real-world examples (both positive and negative examples), we design and train a deep learning-based binary model to predict whether a given method should be moved to a potential target class. Different from existing models, it leverages additional features, i.e., coupling between methods and classes (CBMC) and the message passing coupling between methods and classes (MCMC) that have not yet been exploited by existing approaches. Our evaluation results on real-world open-source projects suggest that the proposed approach substantially outperforms the state of art in feature envy detection, improving precision and recall by 38.5% and 20.8%, respectively.

1 INTRODUCTION
The term code smells was coined by Beck and Fowler [23] to represent bad designs in source code that may reduce the readability and maintainability of software projects. Different categories of code smell, e.g., duplicated code, lazy class, and long method have been proposed and intensively studied in both industry and academic community [15, 20]. Considering the prevalence and impact of code smells, hundreds of automated or semi-automated approaches have been proposed to identify and resolve such code smells [3, 18]. Code smells also widely serve as a useful indicator of software quality [70] and pilot lamps for software refactorings [69].

Feature envy is one of the most well-known and well-studied code smells [17, 49]. Methods associated with feature envy smells are often called feature envy methods or misplaced methods [4, 10]. Such methods are more interested in (features of) other classes than their enclosing classes, and thus they should be moved from their enclosing classes to those classes that they are interested in. The movement is known as move method refactorings [46]. Feature envy methods often result in unnecessary coupling between classes, increasing the difficulty of maintenance [62]. To this end, researchers have proposed dozens of approaches/tools to detect feature envy methods automatically [50, 52] and to recommend solutions (i.e., move method refactorings) [5, 66].
The most simple and intuitive way to identify feature envy methods is to manually design a sequence of heuristic rules and to detect feature envy methods with such predefined rules. Well-known examples include JDeodorant [17] and JMove [64]. Although such heuristics-based approaches are simple and intuitive, it is difficult to define comprehensive and accurate heuristics and it is also difficult to find the optimal setting of the thresholds that are often indispensable for heuristic rules [25]. To this end, researchers leverage traditional machine learning techniques, like SVM [32] and decision trees [2], to automatically learn rules for feature envy detection. Although such traditional machine learning techniques have the ability to learn simple rules from small labeled datasets, complex mappings (especially nonlinear mappings) from complex features of source code to the prediction are often beyond the reach of such techniques [13, 53]. To learn such complex mappings (rules), more advanced deep learning techniques have been applied to the detection of feature envy smells [41]. Although deep learning techniques have the potential to learn complex mappings, they often request a large number of labeled high-quality training data that are difficult to obtain [58]. The size and quality of the training data can significantly influence the performance of the resulting models [33]. To this end, Liu et al. [41] collected negative items (i.e., methods not associated with feature envy smells) by randomly sampling methods in high-quality open-source projects, assuming that all such methods are well-placed and are not associated with feature envy smells. Based on the same assumption, Liu et al. [41] generated positive items (i.e., feature envy methods) by randomly moving methods within high-quality open-source projects, and the resulting methods (after move method refactorings) envy their original enclosing classes (where they were placed before move method refactorings), and thus they could be taken as feature envy methods. Although this novel approach to generating training data has successfully increased the size of training datasets, it also raises serious concerns about the quality of the generated data: The arbitrarily and intentionally created feature envy smells could be essentially different from those in real-world projects that are created organically by developers. As a conclusion, the challenge in feature envy detection is that traditional approaches are less accurate whereas deep learning-based approaches are suffering from the lack of high-quality large-scale training data.

In this paper, we boost deep learning-based feature envy detection by real-world examples. Although existing refactoring detection tools, e.g., RefactoringMiner [67], could be employed to discover real-world move method refactoring examples, the noise (i.e., non-feature envy) within the resulting data could significantly influence the quality of the training data as well as the performance of the models trained on the data. The evaluation results in Section 4 confirm that directly employing the output of RefactoringMiner as training data would result in a substantial reduction in performance. To this end, we propose a sequence of heuristic rules and a decision tree-based classifier to filter out potential move method refactorings that are not associated with feature envy smells.

Another contribution of the paper is that we design a new deep learning-based model by leveraging features, i.e., coupling between methods and classes (CBMC) and message passing coupling between methods and classes (MCMC) that have not yet been exploited by existing approaches for feature envy detection. The third contribution is that we design and leverage a sequence of heuristics rules besides the deep learning-based classifier to make the final decisions in feature envy detection. We evaluate the proposed approach on five real-world open-source projects. Our evaluation results suggest that the proposed approach substantially improves the state of the art, improving precision and recall by 38.5% and 20.8%, respectively.

The paper makes the following contributions:

- An automated approach to collecting real-world feature envy examples, and a publicly available large-scale high-quality dataset of real-world feature envy methods.
- A deep learning-based approach (called feTruth) to detecting and resolving feature envy smells, leveraging new features not yet employed for this task.
- An initial evaluation of the proposed approach.

## 2 RELATED WORK

### 2.1 Heuristics-Based Approaches

Structural information of source code, especially dependencies, is widely used in heuristics-based detection of feature envy smells. For example, Tsantalis and Chatzigeorgiou [66] proposed a distance-based approach to identify move method refactoring opportunities and integrated the approach into the well-known refactoring tool JDeodorant [17]. They redefined the Jaccard distance [61] to measure the distance between methods and classes. If a method is closer to a class than its enclosing class, and it satisfies a set of preconditions that enable a legal move method refactoring, the method should be moved. Sales et al. [56, 64] proposed a similarity-based approach JMove to suggest move method refactorings. They computed the average similarity between a method and a class according to the distances of such techniques [13, 53]. To learn such complex mappings (rules), more advanced deep learning techniques have been applied to the detection of feature envy smells [41]. Although deep learning techniques have the potential to learn complex mappings, they often request a large number of labeled high-quality training data that are difficult to obtain [58]. The size and quality of the training data can significantly influence the performance of the resulting models [33]. To this end, Liu et al. [41] collected negative items (i.e., methods not associated with feature envy smells) by randomly sampling methods in high-quality open-source projects, assuming that all such methods are well-placed and are not associated with feature envy smells. Based on the same assumption, Liu et al. [41] generated positive items (i.e., feature envy methods) by randomly moving methods within high-quality open-source projects, and the resulting methods (after move method refactorings) envy their original enclosing classes (where they were placed before move method refactorings), and thus they could be taken as feature envy methods. Although this novel approach to generating training data has successfully increased the size of training datasets, it also raises serious concerns about the quality of the generated data: The arbitrarily and intentionally created feature envy smells could be essentially different from those in real-world projects that are created organically by developers. As a conclusion, the challenge in feature envy detection is that traditional approaches are less accurate whereas deep learning-based approaches are suffering from the lack of high-quality large-scale training data.

In this paper, we boost deep learning-based feature envy detection by real-world examples. Although existing refactoring detection tools, e.g., RefactoringMiner [67], could be employed to discover real-world move method refactoring examples, the noise (i.e., non-feature envy) within the resulting data could significantly influence the quality of the training data as well as the performance of the models trained on the data. The evaluation results in Section 4 confirm that directly employing the output of RefactoringMiner as training data would result in a substantial reduction in performance. To this end, we propose a sequence of heuristic rules and a decision tree-based classifier to filter out potential move method refactorings that are not associated with feature envy smells.

Another contribution of the paper is that we design a new deep learning-based model by leveraging features, i.e., coupling between methods and classes (CBMC) and message passing coupling between methods and classes (MCMC) that have not yet been exploited by existing approaches for feature envy detection. The third contribution is that we design and leverage a sequence of heuristics rules besides the deep learning-based classifier to make the final decisions in feature envy detection. We evaluate the proposed approach on five real-world open-source projects. Our evaluation results suggest that the proposed approach substantially improves the state of the art, improving precision and recall by 38.5% and 20.8%, respectively.

The paper makes the following contributions:

- An automated approach to collecting real-world feature envy examples, and a publicly available large-scale high-quality dataset of real-world feature envy methods.
- A deep learning-based approach (called feTruth) to detecting and resolving feature envy smells, leveraging new features not yet employed for this task.
- An initial evaluation of the proposed approach.
al. [50, 51] exploited change histories to detect feature envy smells. They assumed that a method affected by feature envy smells should change more frequently together with the envied class than with the class where it is actually placed. Consequently, if a method changes more frequently together with a class than with its enclosing class, the method is a feature envy method. Liu et al. [42] proposed an approach to identify move method refactoring opportunities based on refactoring histories. Once developers move method m out of class C, the approach recommends moving such methods in C that have the strongest relationship and greatest similarity with m.

2.2 Machine Learning-Based Approaches

Kreimer [36] employed decision tree-based classification to detect design flaws (including feature envy smells). Fontana et al. [19, 21, 22] conducted an empirical study comparing the performance of different machine learning techniques in detecting code smells. Their evaluation results suggest that machine learning techniques can significantly improve the performance of code smell detection. Similarly, Amorim et al. [2] evaluated the performance of decision tree-based detection of code smells. Their experiment results suggest that decision trees result in the best performance.

Nucci et al. [13] replicated the study by Fontana et al. [19] with a more realistic dataset. However, their evaluation results revealed that the high performance achieved in the previous study [19] was due to the specific characteristics (e.g., unrealistically balanced dataset and biased validation methods) of the selected limited dataset. In contrast, the effect of traditional machine learning techniques in code smell detection is limited.

2.3 Deep Learning-Based Approaches

Liu et al. [41, 43] are the first to apply deep learning techniques (more specifically, CNN and fully connected networks) to the detection and resolution of feature envy smells. They exploited textual information and code metrics (i.e., the distance between methods and classes [66]) as input to a neural network-based classifier whose output indicates whether a given method should be moved from its enclosing class to another given class. They realized that existing datasets are too small for deep learning-based techniques, and thus they proposed a novel approach to create large-scale labeled datasets automatically by randomly moving methods in high-quality open-source projects. Their evaluation results suggest that the deep learning-based approach significantly outperforms the state of the art in detecting feature envy smells and in recommending solutions for feature envy methods. Barbez et al. [4] applied multi-layer perceptions (i.e., fully connected feed forward neural networks) to the detection of feature envy smells. Besides CNN and fully connected networks, other deep-learning techniques have also been applied to the detection and resolution of feature envy smells. Hadj-Kacem and Bouassida [27] adopted coding criterion [54] and a variational autoencoder to extract the semantic features hidden in the source code, which are fed to a logistic regression classifier to detect feature envy smells. Kurbatova et al. [37] exploited code2vec [1] to compute the similarity between software entities, which improves the performance of feature envy detection.

Cui et al. [9] proposed an approach to recommend move method refactoring opportunities named RMove by exploiting structural and semantic representations of code snippets. They investigated the performance of various code embedding and graph embedding techniques and different machine/deep learning classifiers in recommending move method refactorings. Sharma et al. [58] conducted an empirical study on deep learning-based detection of code smells. They found that CNN, RNN, and Autoencoder have been widely used in this field, and thus compared the performance of these deep learning techniques in detecting feature envy smells.

The proposed approach differs from such approaches introduced in the preceding paragraphs in that it automatically collects large-scale real-world examples as training data to boost the detection and resolution of feature envy smells. Besides that, it also exploits new features, i.e., CBMC and MCMC, that have not yet been exploited by existing approaches.

2.4 Discovering Applied Software Refactorings

Automated discovery of software refactorings is to uncover refactorings applied by developers in real-world projects. The benefits of discovering such refactorings are twofold. First, it facilitates the understanding of software evolution, i.e., what kind of changes have been made and the rationale for the changes. Second, the discovered refactorings may serve as a benchmark for the evaluation of approaches in refactoring recommendations. To this end, Dig et al. [14] proposed the first approach (called RefactoringCrawler) to discover software refactorings. It exploits Shingles encoding [7] to match software entities between two successive versions of the same project and identifies moved/deleted/added/modified/untouched software entities. It then leverages pre-defined heuristic rules to identify refactorings based on the matched software entities. For example, if a method m in the older version matches method m’ in the later version but their enclosing classes (noted as classes A and B) do not match, RefactoringCrawler would report that there is a move method refactoring moving method m from its enclosing class A to class B.

Prete et al. [35, 55] proposed a logic programming-based approach, called Ref-Finder, to discover software refactorings. Ref-Finder encodes refactoring types into template logic rules and extracts logic facts concerning two successive versions into a logic database. A logic programming engine [11] is then employed to identify refactorings by converting the logic rules into logic queries and executing the queries on the logic database. ReDiff proposed by Silva et al. [59, 60] is a similarity-based approach to discovering software refactorings. It differs from other approaches in that it computes the similarity between software entities (i.e., two successive versions) with a variation of the TF-IDF weighting scheme [57] and a weighted Jaccard coefficient [8].

RefactoringMiner, proposed by Tsantalis et al. [67, 68], is a state-of-the-art approach to discovering refactorings. The key to this approach is an AST-based statement matching algorithm that does not request any user-defined thresholds. The algorithm accurately and automatically matches software entities between two successive versions. Based on the matched entities, RefactoringMiner exploits pre-defined rules (similar to those used by RefactoringCrawler [14]) to detect refactorings. Their evaluation results suggest that RefactoringMiner can significantly improve the state of the art in refactoring detection.
3 APPROACH

3.1 Overview

An overview of the proposed approach is presented in Fig. 1. For convenience, we call the proposed approach feTruth where “fe” is the abbreviation of “feature envy” and “Truth” suggests that the approach is boosted by the truth (i.e., real-world examples) and it could tell you the truth of feature envy.

feTruth takes as input the evolution histories of open-source projects stored in version control systems (e.g., GitHub), extracts real-world feature envy examples, and trains a deep learning-based prediction model with the extracted examples. In the testing phase, feTruth takes as input the source code of a software project and generates a list of feature envy smells associated with methods in the project, as well as suggested refactoring solutions to resolve the feature envy smells. The overall process of feTruth is as follows:

- feTruth mines for potential move method refactorings by applying RefactoringMiner [67] to the evolution histories of open-source projects.
- feTruth removes non-feature envy from the potential refactorings by heuristics-based filtering and learning-based filtering. The methods moved by the remaining move method refactorings are taken as positive samples.
- Methods not involved in any potential move method refactorings are taken as negative samples.
- With such positive and negative samples collected in the preceding steps, feTruth trains a neural network-based classifier to predict whether a given method should be moved to another class.
- feTruth leverages the trained classifier as well as a sequence of heuristic rules to predict whether a given method in the testing project is associated with feature envy smells. If yes, feTruth also suggests which class the method should be moved to.

Details of the key steps are presented in the following sections.

3.2 Mining for Move Method Refactorings

Feature envy smells are often resolved by move method refactorings [17]. Consequently, it is practical to discover methods associated with feature envy smells by mining for move method refactorings in open-source projects. To this end, we employ RefactoringMiner [67] to discover potential move method refactorings. RefactoringMiner is selected because it is well-known, widely-used, and representing the state of the art in automated discovery (mining) of software refactorings. It takes as input two versions (i.e., a commit and its parent in the commit history) of the same project, compares and matches software entities between the two versions, and generates a list of potential move method refactorings (as well as other categories of refactorings that are ignored by feTruth) by a sequence of pre-defined detection rules.

Although RefactoringMiner represents the state of the art, not all of the identified move method refactorings are associated with feature envy smells, and it also results in some false positives (i.e., the actual changes made are not move method refactorings). According to our empirical study in Section 4.5, up to 43.8% of the reported potential move method refactorings are not associated with feature envy smells or are false positives. For convenience, we call such potential refactorings as non-feature envy smells. To guarantee the quality of collected real-world examples, feTruth leverages heuristics-based filtering and classification-based filtering to identify and remove such non-feature envy smells. Details of the filtering are presented in Section 3.3 and Section 3.4, respectively.

3.3 Heuristics-Based Filtering

The proposed approach is to identify feature envy methods that should be moved from their enclosing classes to other classes.
that they envy. Consequently, for a given feature envy method, it should explicitly have its enclosing class (where it is) and its target class (where it should be moved) in the same version. However, RefactoringMiner often reports potential move method refactoring where the target class of the movement does not exist in the old version (i.e., $V_n$) or the source class does not exist in the new version (i.e., $V_{n+1}$). A typical example is when a class is moved to a different package. RefactoringMiner may report methods within the class as moved methods where the class in the old version is noted as the source class and the same class in the new version is noted as the target class. In this case, the target class does not exist in the old version. Consequently, it is unlikely for feature envy detection algorithms (including the proposed approach) to identify them as feature envy methods because the algorithms cannot recommend moving a method to a nonexistent class. Another typical example is that when a class (noted as $A$) is merged into another class (noted as $B$), RefactoringMiner may report that the methods within $A$ have been moved to the merged class (i.e., class $B$). In this case, the source class (i.e., class $A$) of the move method refactorings do not exist in the new version ($V_{n+1}$). Such detection is not appropriate as feature envy examples because it is a merge class refactoring or inline class refactoring, instead of a sequence of move method refactorings. Therefore, these potential move method refactorings should not be part of the training data because they are not associated with feature envy smells.

To exclude such potential refactorings, we exclude a potential move method refactoring if:

1. The source class of the potential refactoring does not exist in the new version (we note this heuristic rule as $H_1$) or
2. The target class of the potential refactoring does not exist in the old version (we note this heuristic rule as $H_2$).

Besides the heuristic filtering rules proposed in the preceding paragraph, we also leverage another rule (noted as $H_3$) to exclude testing methods, constructors, overriding methods, and overridden methods: If the method is moved by a potential move method refactoring is a testing method, a constructor, an overriding method or an overridden method, the method should not be taken as a feature envy method. Testing methods are excluded because the proposed approach is specially designed for production code. Notably, testing methods are often substantially different from methods in production code. A testing method, located in a testing class, frequently calls methods and accesses fields from the class (noted as ProductClass) it is testing. As a result, it inherently envies the ProductClass, and it may be misclassified by feature envy detection tools as a feature envy method. To this end, the proposed approach, as well as other existing approaches (e.g., FeDeep proposed by Liu et al. [41]), excludes testing methods. Constructors are excluded because they cannot be moved at all. Overriding and overridden methods are excluded because they cannot be moved across inheritance hierarchies, and moving between ancestors and descendants are often taken as pull up (or push down) method refactorings instead of move method refactorings. Pull up (and push down) method refactorings are designed to share (or conceal) functionality and interfaces among sibling classes, instead of removing feature envy smells. Consequently, the involved methods are often not associated with feature envy smells.

### 3.4 Learning-Based Filtering

Besides the heuristics introduced in the previous section, we also leverage a learning-based approach to further filter out non-feature envy. More specifically, we leverage a decision tree-based classifier to distinguish false positives from true positives according to a sequence of features of the potential move method refactorings.

A potential move method refactoring is represented as:

$$pMTr =< m, m', sc, tc >$$

where $m$ and $m'$ refer to the method before and after refactoring whereas $sc$ and $tc$ represent the source class and the target class of the movement. Methods calling $m$ and $m'$ are noted as $Caller(m)$ and $Caller(m')$, respectively.

The exploited features of a potential move method refactoring are explained as follows:

1. $rsc$: The ratio of callers to the original method that survived the movement, i.e.,

$$rsc = \frac{|Caller(m) \cap Caller(m')|}{|Caller(m)|}$$

2. A caller to the original method $m$ survives the movement if and only if it calls $m'$ after the movement.

3. $rsc'$: The number of survived callers divided by the number of callers to $m'$, i.e.,

$$rsc' = \frac{|Caller(m) \cap Caller(m')|}{|Caller(m')|}$$

4. $cst$: The number of common statements (matched statements according to RefactoringMiner) appearing in both $m$ and $m'$, i.e.,

$$cst = |Statements(m) \cap Statements(m')|$$

5. $rcst$: The number of common statements divided by the total number of statements in $m$, i.e.,

$$rcst = \frac{cst}{|Statements(m)|}$$

6. $rcst'$: The number of common statements divided by the total number of statements in $m'$, i.e.,

$$rcst' = \frac{cst}{|Statements(m')|}$$

Features $rsc$ and $rsc'$ concern to what extent $m$ and $m'$ share the same callers whereas features $cst$, $rcst$, and $rcst'$ concern the similarity between the method bodies of $m$ and $m'$. Such outside features (concerning the callers to the methods) and inside features (concerning the method bodies) together may help identify whether $m'$ is an evolved version of $m$. Notably, most of the false positives reported by RefactoringMiner are caused by incorrect matching between $m$ and $m'$: $m'$ is somewhat similar to $m$ (which results in incorrect matching), but $m'$ is not an evolved version of $m$, and thus they do not form a move method refactoring.

With the extracted features, we train a decision tree to learn how to classify potential refactorings into false positives and true positives. It takes $< rsc, rsc', cst, rcst, rcst' >$ as input, and generates a binary output that suggests whether the given potential move method refactoring is associated with feature envy smells. Decision trees [6] are one of the most popular and commonly used machine learning algorithms. They are known for their ability to handle large datasets and provide easily interpretable models.
learning techniques for classification [63]. Compared to other machine learning techniques, decision trees are intuitive, interpretable, and adjustable (via manual pruning to optimize classification). We do not employ more powerful deep learning techniques because they request a large number of labeled training data that we do not have. In contrast, decision trees work well on small datasets.

3.5 Collecting Negative Samples

In the previous sections, we collect real-world samples of feature envy methods with RefactoringMiner and a sequence of filters as introduced in Sections 3.3–3.4. In this section, we explain how we collect negative samples, i.e., methods not associated with feature envy smells. Such negative examples together with the positive samples constitute the complete labeled training data for feature envy detection.

We first collect all methods in subject projects where positive samples are collected. From such methods, we exclude the following methods:

- Methods that cannot be moved across inheritance hierarchies, e.g., constructors, overriding methods, and overridden methods;
- Testing methods that are out of the scope of the proposed approach;
- Methods that violate move method refactoring preconditions provided by Eclipse JDT [28, 29] (e.g., the target class should not inherit a method having the same signature of the moved method);
- Methods that have been moved by potential move method refactorings according to the detection results of RefactoringMiner.

The remaining methods are noted as candidate negative samples. Considering that in most high-quality projects negative samples are often significantly more popular than positive samples (feature envy methods), we conduct undersampling [44] so that the total number of negative examples equals the number of positive samples. To maximize the diversity of the negative examples, we sample no more than a single method from each class and keep the same sample rate on all subject projects.

3.6 Detection and Resolution of Feature Envy

First, the following methods are automatically predicted as negative (i.e., methods not associated with feature envy smells): Constructors, overriding methods, and overridden methods. These methods are predicted as negative because they cannot be moved across inheritance hierarchies. For other methods, we leverage a neural network-based classifier for automated prediction. An overview of the classifier is presented in Fig. 2 and its details are discussed as followings.

3.6.1 Input of the Classifier. The classifier takes as input a method (noted as \( m \)) and a potential target class (noted as \( C_t \)) to which the method could be legally moved. It generates a binary prediction to suggest whether \( m \) should be moved to \( C_t \). Notably, existing tools, like Eclipse JDT, can automatically and accurately validate whether \( m \) could be legally moved to target class \( C_t \). Consequently, we reuse Eclipse JDT to collect all potential target classes for a given method \( m \) and leverage the classifier to predict whether \( m \) should be moved to any of the potential target classes.

![Figure 2: Neural Network Based Classifier](image)

The input of the classifier consists of both textual features and structural features (code metrics):

\[
\text{input} = \langle \text{names}, \text{metrics} \rangle
\]

where \( \text{names} \) consist of three identifiers:

\[
\text{names} = \langle \text{name}(m), \text{name}(C_s), \text{name}(C_t) \rangle
\]

where \( \text{name}(m) \), \( \text{name}(C_s) \), \( \text{name}(C_t) \) represent the name of the method to be tested, the name of its enclosing class, and the name of the potential target class. Structural features \( \text{metrics} \) consist of a sequence of code metrics:

\[
\text{metrics} = \langle \text{dist}(m, C_s), \text{dist}(m, C_t), \text{cbmc}(m, C_s), \text{cbmc}(m, C_t), \text{mcmc}(m, C_s), \text{mcmc}(m, C_t) \rangle
\]

where \( \text{dist}(m, C) \) is the Jaccard distance between method \( m \) and class \( C \) [61, 66]. Let \( S_m \) be the entity set of method \( m \) and \( S_C \) be the entity set of class \( C \), the distance between \( m \) and \( C \) is defined as follows:

\[
\text{dist}(m, C) = 1 - \frac{\left| S_m \cap S_C \right|}{\left| S_m \cup S_C \right|}
\]

Notably, the entity set of a software entity (e.g., a method or a class) includes all methods and fields accessed directly by the entity. Besides the distance (as defined by Equation 9) that has been exploited by existing deep learning-based approaches [41, 43], our approach also exploits CBMC and MCMC. \( \text{cbmc}(m, C) \) is the number of methods from class \( C \) that are called directly by \( m \) divided by the total number of methods directly called by \( m \):

\[
\text{cbmc}(m, C) = \frac{|\text{methods called by } m \cap \text{ methods of } C|}{|\text{methods called by } m|}
\]

\( \text{mcmc}(m, C) \) is the frequency of invocations from method \( m \) to class \( C \) divided by the total frequency of invocations from \( m \):

\[
\text{mcmc}(m, C) = \frac{|\text{method invocations from } m \text{ to } C|}{|\text{method invocations from } m|}
\]
3.6.2 Architecture of the Classifier. The architecture of the classifier is presented in Fig. 2. The textual features are first fed into an embedding layer to convert them into numerical vectors. We leverage the well-known and widely-used word2vec [47, 48] as the embedding layer, and reuse the publicly available pre-trained word2vec model [40]. The outputs of the embedding layer, together with other structural features, are fed into convolutional neural networks (CNN). The outputs of the CNN layers are transformed into one-dimensional vectors by the following flatten layers. Such vectors are merged into a single one-dimensional vector by the following merge layer, and the resulting vector is fed into a dense layer. The output layer generates the binary prediction, i.e., whether \( m \) should be moved from its enclosing class to the target class \( C_t \).

3.6.3 Classifier-Based Prediction. For each method to be tested (noted as \( m \), \( \text{feTruth} \) first leverages Eclipse JDT [28, 29] to collect potential target classes to which the method could be legally moved. Notably, from the potential target classes, we remove all data classes that do not contain any methods or contain getter/setter methods and constructors only (we note this heuristic rule as \( H_4 \)). Such classes are specially designed to store data (variables) only, and moving methods to such classes may break the principle. Besides, if \( m \) is an instance method (i.e., a non-static method) and its a target class is composed of only static members, we remove this class from the target classes (we note this heuristic rule as \( H_5 \)). Consequently, we exclude them from potential target classes.

If a method does not have any potential target class, the method is deemed negative, not associated with feature envy smells (we note this heuristic rule as \( H_6 \)). Otherwise, \( \text{feTruth} \) leverages the neural network-based classifier presented in Fig. 2 to predict whether the method should be moved to the given potential target class. The prediction is often interpreted as positive (and the potential target class is called candidate target class) if the output is greater than 0.95 [34]. Otherwise, it is interpreted as negative. If the prediction is negative for all potential target classes, the method is not associated with feature envy smells. Otherwise, it is a feature envy method.

For methods predicted as positive, \( \text{feTruth} \) also suggests solutions, i.e., where they should be moved. If method \( m \) has only a single candidate target class, \( \text{feTruth} \) suggests moving the method to this class. If it has multiple candidate target classes, \( \text{feTruth} \) suggests moving \( m \) to the candidate target class that results in the largest output of the classifier.

4 EVALUATION

4.1 Research Questions

The evaluation was designed to answer the following research questions:

RQ1. Can \( \text{feTruth} \) improve the state of the art in feature envy detection?

RQ2. Are the filters proposed in Sections 3.3–3.4 accurate in excluding non-feature envy in potential move method refactorings reported by RefactoringMiner?

RQ3. To what extent can data filtering improve the performance of \( \text{feTruth} \)?

RQ4. To what extent can real-world examples outperform randomly generated training data in boosting \( \text{feTruth} \)?

RQ5. How does the size of training data influence the performance of \( \text{feTruth} \)?

Research question RQ1 concerns whether \( \text{feTruth} \) can substantially outperform existing approaches in feature envy detection. To answer this question, we compare \( \text{feTruth} \) against the approach proposed by Liu et al. [41], JDeodorant [17] and JMove [64]. Since Liu et al. [41] did not explicitly name their approach, we call it \( \text{feDeep} \) for convenience in the rest of this paper. Such baseline approaches are selected for comparison because they represent the state of the art. Research question RQ2 concerns the accuracy of the filtering introduced in Sections 3.3–3.4 whereas RQ3 concerns its influence on the performance of the proposed approach. RQ4 concerns the benefits of replacing randomly generated training data with real-world examples whereas RQ5 concerns the impact of the size of the training data.

4.2 Subject Projects

The subject projects are divided into two parts. The first part (noted as Part1), consisting of 500 Java projects, was used to discover real-world feature envy examples (i.e., collection of training data). The second part (noted as Part2), consisting of 5 open-source Java projects, was used to evaluate the proposed approach and the selected baseline approaches. The 500 projects in the first part were selected from GitHub: We selected the top 500 most popular Java projects (with the largest numbers of stars) to constitute the first part of the subject projects. The 5 projects in the second part were selected from Defects4J [31]. These projects were selected because they are from different domains and are developed/maintained by different teams, which may help to reduce the potential bias in the evaluation. Besides, all of them are well-known and widely-used open-source projects. Table 1 presents an overview of the 5 Java projects in the second part where the snapshot specifies the version of the selected projects, NOC and NOM represent the number of classes and the number of methods within the projects. LOC represents the number of source code lines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Snapshot</th>
<th>NOC</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jsoup</td>
<td>9b40b7b</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>9,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csv</td>
<td>989c495</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compress</td>
<td>231a466</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>8,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cli</td>
<td>7d1363e</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>4,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>b9a83fb</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>9,290</td>
<td>79,036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Process

First, we applied RefactoringMiner to the 500 selected subject projects (in Part1), and it reported 30,599 potential move method refactorings. From them, we randomly sampled 600 potential move method refactorings, and requested three experienced developers who were familiar with move method refactorings and feature envy smells to independently and manually marked them as true positives (i.e., move method refactorings associated with feature envy smells) or non-feature envy. All of the participants were required...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>#Reported</th>
<th>#Accepted</th>
<th>#Accepted targets</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Accuracy (destination)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feTruth</td>
<td>Jsoup</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>91.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Csv</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compress</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70.73%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feDeep</td>
<td>Jsoup</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52.63%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Csv</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compress</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.06%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDeodorant</td>
<td>Jsoup</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Csv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compress</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43.48%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMove</td>
<td>Jsoup</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Csv</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cli</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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to have Java background. They had a median of 6 years of programming experience and 3.5 years experience with software refactoring. In case of inconsistent labeling, the potential refactorings were discussed together by the participants to reach an agreement, which resulted in 600 consistently labeled samples. Notably, the three developers achieved high consistency with a Fleiss’ kappa coefficient [16] of 0.81. The size of the sample (600) guaranteed a confidence level of over 95% and a margin of error of 5% [30].

Second, we trained the decision tree-based filter (as presented in Section 3.4) with the 600 manually labeled samples. After that, we leveraged the resulting decision tree-based filter and heuristics-based filter (as presented in Section 3.3) to identify all positive examples reported by RefactoringMiner, which resulted in 14,209 real-world feature envy methods. We also collected 14,209 negative examples as introduced in Section 3.5 to make up a balanced training dataset (called rw-Dataset).

Third, we trained the proposed approach (feTruth) with the training data collected in the preceding paragraph. We trained the baseline approach (feDeep) with equally sized training data (called rg-Dataset), where positive examples were randomly generated by feDeep [41] on the same subject projects, and negative examples were consistent with those in rw-Dataset. After that, we applied the resulting models and other selected baseline approaches, i.e., JDeodorant [17] and JMove [64] to the five projects in Part 2 and requested three experienced developers to independently and manually validate all of the reported feature envy smells. To reduce the threats to validity, the participants did not know which of the feature envy smells were reported by the proposed approach or the baseline approaches. In case of inconsistency, they were requested to discuss together, and they reached an agreement on all items. Based on the manual validation, we computed the performance of the evaluated approaches.

4.4 RQ1: Improving the State of the Art

The evaluation results are presented in Table 2. #Reported presents the total number of potential feature envy smells reported by the evaluated approaches whereas #Accepted presents how many of them were confirmed according to the given ground truth. #Accepted targets presents how many of the target classes recommended by the approaches were confirmed. Precision presents the precision in smell detection. Accuracy (destination) presents the accuracy of the approaches in recommending target classes for the confirmed feature envy methods.

From Table 2 we make the following observations:

- feTruth was accurate in detecting feature envy smells. Among the 41 items reported by feTruth, 29 have been manually confirmed, resulting in a precision of 70.73%. feTruth was also accurate in suggesting target classes for feature envy methods. For 29 feature envy methods, it succeeded in recommending target classes for 27 of them, resulting in a precision of 93.1%.
- feTruth substantially outperformed the state of the art in feature envy detection. It resulted in the highest precision (70.73%),
The involved method JMove in open-source project SchedulerFactory populateProviderWithExtraProps. However, original developers refused to move the method.

operations on such fields. and there is no need to move the method. Be-
factor pattern C3p0PoolingConnectionProvider follows the widely-used C3p0PoolingConnectionProvider it suggested moving it to class C3p0PoolingConnectionProvider fields of the created object with data from providers (including the pattern [24] where the C3p0PoolingConnectionProvider is responsible for creating objects whereas providers are responsible for providing requested data. The involved method populateProviderWithExtraProps initializes fields of the created object with data from providers (including the target class C3p0PoolingConnectionProvider and other providers). Consequently, the current decision well follows the widely-used factory pattern and there is no need to move the method. Besides, the target class C3p0PoolingConnectionProvider is designed to provide static fields only, and it should not contain complex operations on such fields.

Our approach feTruth did not report the method in Listing 1 as a feature envy smell because its training data did not contain any real-world feature envy methods that should be moved from a factory class ("*Factory") to a provider class ("*Provider"). It may suggest that methods are rarely misplaced (by developers) between factories and providers. However, the training data automatically generated by feDeep did contain four artificial 'feature envy methods' that should be moved from factories to providers. Such unreal training data resulted in incorrect prediction on the method in Listing 1.

The example code in Listing 2 explains why feTruth succeeded in identifying some true positives missed by the baseline approaches. The method isEndOfFile is from the class Lexer in open-source project commons-csv [26]. feTruth reported the method in Listing 2 as a feature envy smell because its training data contained common patterns, i.e., a boolean method ("isEndOfFile") was moved to the class to which the field accessed in its conditional expression belongs [65]. However, the training data generated randomly by feDeep did not contain such patterns. Notably, the heuristic-based baseline approaches also missed the method presented in Listing 2.

4.5 RQ2: Accurate Filtering of Move Methods

To answer RQ2, we randomly sampled and validated 379 (out of 29,999) items that have been fed into the filters. The size of the sample guaranteed a confidence level of 95% and a margin of error of 5% [30]. The manual checking was conducted by three experienced developers in the same way as they labeled training data (as introduced in the first paragraph of Section 4.3). They achieved high consistency with a Fleiss’ kappa coefficient [16] of 0.87. Notably, while labeling the items, the participants did not know the rationale of the filters or the results of the filters, which might help to reduce potential bias. The manually created labels served as the ground truth for the evaluation of the accuracy of the filters.

The evaluation process and evaluation results are plotted in Fig. 3 where negative samples are those that were reported by RefactoringMiner as potential move method refactorings but were denied manually by the participants. Such negative samples
should be identified and filtered out by the proposed filters. In contrast, the positive samples are those that were reported by RefactoringMiner as potential move method refactorings and were confirmed manually by the participants. Ideally, all of the positive samples should pass the filters.

From Fig. 3 we make the following observations:

- First, a large percentage of the potential move method refactorings reported by RefactoringMiner was not associated with feature envy smells. The negative items account for 43.8% = 166/(166+213) of the reported samples.
- Second, the heuristics-based filter was effective and accurate. It successfully identified 121 out of the 166 negative items whereas none of the 213 positive items were filtered out by mistake.
- Third, the decision tree-based filter was accurate as well. It filtered out 42 out of the 45 negative items fed into the filter whereas only 12 out of the 213 positive items were misclassified.
- Finally, the two filters together filtered out 98.2% = (121+42)/166 of the negative samples whereas only 5.6% = (0+12)/213 of the positive examples were filtered out by mistake.

Based on the preceding analysis, we conclude that the filters proposed in this paper have the potential to filter out most of the negative samples accurately without significant loss in positive samples. Consequently, with RefactoringMiner and such filters, it is practical to construct a large-scale and high-quality dataset of feature envy smells, which in turn may boost learning-based approaches to detecting and resolving feature envy smells.

### 4.6 RQ3: Impact of Example Filtering

To evaluate the effect of example filtering, we disabled the filtering and repeated the evaluation (keeping the testing data unchanged). The evaluation results are presented in Table 3.

From Table 3 we make the following observations:

- The filtering had a substantial and positive impact on the performance in detecting feature envy smells. Enabling it improved the precision by 31.3% = (70.73% - 53.85%)/53.85%. The number of true positives (#Accepted) also increased slightly from 28 to 29.
- The filtering substantially reduced the number of false positives (i.e., #Reported - #Accepted) from 24 = 52 - 28 to 12 = 41 - 29, with a substantial reduction of 16% = (29-25)/25.
- The filtering also had a positive impact on the accuracy of the approach in suggesting destinations for feature envy methods. The accuracy was slightly improved from 92.86% to 93.1%.

We conclude from the preceding analysis that simply employing the refactoring histories from refactoring miners without essential filtering may result in a substantial reduction in the performance of feature envy detection. This reduction stems primarily from the failure to filter out move method refactorings that are not associated with feature envy smells and are false positives. Consequently, it becomes evident that the unfiltered move method refactorings not only introduce noise into the training dataset but also hamper the model’s ability to generalize accurately, thereby reducing the performance of feature envy detection.

### 4.7 RQ4: Effect of Real-World Examples

To investigate the effect of real-world examples, we replaced such examples with randomly generated training data (i.e., rg-Dataset) and repeated the evaluation. Notably, in contrast to answering RQ1, we employ the same neural network architecture (i.e., feTruth) for this evaluation. Testing data were kept untouched as well. The evaluation results are presented in Table 4. From this table we make the following observations:

- Exploiting real-world examples substantially improved the precision of the proposed approach. The improvement in precision is 38.6% = (70.73% - 51.02%)/51.02%.
- Exploiting real-world examples improved the number of true positives (#Accepted) from 25 to 29, with a substantial improvement of 16% = (29-25)/25.
- Replacing random examples with real-world examples improved the performance in the recommendation of target classes. The accuracy was improved from 88% to 93.1%.

We conclude that real-world examples are more effective than randomly generated training data. This conclusion arises from the observation that applying models trained on randomly generated data to real-world examples results in a substantial reduction in performance. The reduction can be attributed to the fact that randomly generated data often do not align with real-world examples. Consequently, when these models, trained on such randomly generated data, are tested on real-world examples, they tend to identify fewer instances of feature envy methods and their suggested target classes are less accurate.

### 4.8 RQ5: Impact of Data Size

Fig. 4 presents how the size of the training data influences the performance of the proposed approach. From this figure we make the following observations:

- The precision of the approach in both detecting feature envy smells and recommending solutions (target classes) keeps increasing with the increase in training data. It may suggest that...
the performance of the proposed approach has the potential to be further improved with additional training data in future.

- The number of confirmed feature envy smells and the number of accepted target classes keeps increasing when the data size increases. However, when the size reaches 80% of the current size, the rate of increase in the number becomes relatively slow.

Based on the analysis we conclude that collecting additional training data may further improve the proposed approach. This conclusion aligns with the underlying principle that as the training data expands, the model’s performance progressively improves. This phenomenon underscores the fundamental nature of neural networks, which rely on large amounts of data for effective training.

4.9 Threats to Validity

The first threat to external validity is that only a limited number of subject projects were used for the evaluation. Only 500 subject projects were used for the mining of refactorings, and only five projects were used for testing. Note that manual validation of the detection results was tedious and time-consuming, which significantly limited the size of the testing data. To reduce the threat, we collected projects from different domains and different development teams. We also publish the implementation [38] of the proposed approach to facilitate further validation on additional subject projects.

The second threat to external validity is that the evaluation is confined to Java projects only. It is unclear how the proposed approach works on other programming languages although the proposed approach is expected to work with any object-oriented programming languages because it does not depend on any special characteristics of Java. The evaluation is confined to Java because 1) the prototype implementations of the proposed approach and the baseline approach feDeep are confined to Java projects only, and 2) RefactoringMiner is confined to Java projects.

A threat to construct validity is that the manual labeling of potential move method refactorings, the manual checking of reported feature envy smells, and the manual checking of suggested target classes could be inaccurate. It might in turn result in inaccurate calculation of the performance of the evaluated approaches. To reduce the threat, we requested multiple participants to label (check) the same items and computed the consistency among the participants. The resulting kappa coefficients suggest that they resulted in a high level of consistency. Besides, we did not tell them the rationale of the proposed approach, and they did not know which approaches had reported the potential smells or suggested the target classes. All of these might help reduce the bias.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Detection and resolution of feature envy smells have been well-studied, and dozens of such approaches have been proposed. Although deep learning techniques have been proven useful in automated detection and resolution of feature envy smells [41], the quality of the randomly generated training data is preventing them from reaching the maximal potential. To this end, in this paper, we boost deep learning-based feature envy detection approaches with real-world examples. We propose a heuristics-based filter and a learning-based filter to exclude false positives reported by refactoring miners, and manage to generate high-quality and large-scale training data for feature envy detection. We design a new deep learning-based classifier leveraging new features not yet exploited by existing approaches, and employ the resulting classifier as well as a sequence of heuristics rules to detect feature envy smells and to generate solutions for detected smells. Our evaluation results on real-world open-source projects suggest that the proposed approach substantially outperforms the state of the art in the detection and resolution of feature envy smells, improving the precision and recall in feature envy detection by 38.5% and 20.8%, respectively.

Similar to the state-of-the-art feature envy smell detection tools (e.g., feDeep, JDeodorant, and JMove), feTruth only detects misplaced methods that should be moved from their enclosing classes to other classes they envy. Although such feature envy methods are the key concern for current feature envy detection and resolution tools/algorithms, there is another category of feature envy: Only a small part of the method should be extracted and moved outside the enclosing class. We plan to generalize the proposed approach to deal with such feature envy smells in future.

feTruth was sponsored by Huawei, one of the leading IT companies in the world, and it has been successfully deployed in the company. Notably, we adopt a client-server architecture, putting all deep-learning related models on a server (deployed within the company) and integrating other models into a plug-in of the IDE, to avoid any deep learning computation on client sides (i.e., PCs of software developers). As a result, for the end users, feTruth is as simple as the traditional heuristics-based detection tools, and no deep learning libraries or devices are required. We would like to report detailed usage of the tool within the company (and potentially other companies) in the near future.

The large-scale high-quality dataset of real-world feature envy examples constructed in this paper is an important contribution of this paper. It may inspire and boost other learning-based approaches to feature envy detection in future. We also plan in future to further enlarge the dataset by mining additional evolution histories of high-quality open-source projects.

6 DATA AVAILABILITY

The replication package, including the tools and the data, is publicly available [38, 39].
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