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1. INTRODUCTION
Program comprehension plays an important role when performing software engineering activities on large bodies of source code. Both industry and research therefore have aimed to integrate various tools into modern integrated development environments (IDEs) to support software engineers in understanding a software system during their daily development and maintenance tasks.

Especially for novice developers, mastering all the powerful features that are delivered by an IDE, such as Eclipse or Visual Studio, requires a great deal of learning effort. When solving a program comprehension task, developers usually have particular questions in mind, such as “Where is this method called?” or “What fields are declared as being of this type?” [33, 34]. Unfortunately, such questions often cannot be answered directly using existing functionality offered by IDEs. Instead, as explained by De Alwis and Murphy in [9], developers first need to map these conceptual queries to one or several concrete queries. Even if a particular conceptual query is directly supported, novice programmers are often not yet aware of the capabilities of their IDE. For example, although experienced developers can easily answer “Where is this method called?” with Eclipse, newcomers still need to be aware that the “Find references...” feature, hidden in a context menu, is what they are looking for.

Existing approaches to enable the integration of different information sources often do not allow developers to formulate ad-hoc queries. Instead, they need to be explicitly configured to enable new queries. On the other hand, query languages, such as CodeQuest [17] or JQuery [23], allow developers to formulate queries about software engineering artifacts. These languages are usually based on a SQL- or Prolog-like syntax and effectively using them requires learning effort. According to Chowdhury, however, “the most comfortable way for a user to express an information need is as a natural language statement.” [6]. Henninger even suggests that constructing effective natural language queries is as important or more important than the retrieval algorithm used [20].

In this paper, we present a framework that allows software engineers to use guided-input natural language strongly resembling plain English to query for information about a software system. For that, we combine software evolution data provided by EVOLIZER, our platform for software evolution analysis, with Semantic Web technologies for knowledge processing. We focus on queries concerning static source code information, such as “How often is this field accessed?” or “What are the subclasses of this class?”, to demonstrate the potential of our approach; but including more data from various software repositories and tools is straightforward, as we will explain in detail in this paper.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: In Section 2 we give an introduction to the Semantic Web and discuss
the knowledge processing technologies that we use throughout the paper. We present our framework to query static source code information with (quasi) natural language in Section 3. Section 4 provides a case study evaluation of our approach. Section 5 discusses existing work related to our approach and Section 6 concludes the paper.

2. BACKGROUND

The technologies originally developed for the Semantic Web have been proven useful whenever knowledge has to be processed by machines. In this paper, we exploit them to bridge the gap between more classical software analysis tools and natural language query interfaces.

Tim Berners-Lee et al. [2] define the Semantic Web as “an extension of the Web, in which information is given well-defined meaning, better enabling computers and people to work in cooperation.” Following this definition, this semantic extension enriches the Web with meta-data describing the semantics of the webpages in a computer-processable way. Before the webpages can be described with meta-data accordingly, an ontology has to be defined for the domain of discourse. An ontology formally describes the concepts (classes) found in the domain, the relationships between these concepts and the properties used to describe them [15]. For example, in the domain of an online record shop, we define concepts, such as Composer, Album, and Track; the relationships composed by and has track; and the properties has play-time and has title. The meta-data description of a CD is then able to give the data a well-defined meaning, using the concepts, relationships, and properties defined in the ontology. In the software engineering domain, we define concepts, such as User, Developer, Bug, Module; relationships, such as reports bug, fixes bug, and is assigned to bug. Since the Semantic Web describes this information based on formal semantics, data can be exchanged among two applications that support the same ontology, even if they were not meant to interoperate in the first place.

To bring the vision of the Semantic Web into being, the research community came up with a number of standards, W3C recommendations, development frameworks, APIs, and databases. The Resource Description Framework (RDF) [26] is the data-model for representing meta-data in the Semantic Web. The RDF data-model formalizes meta-data based on subject–predicate–object triples, so called RDF statements. RDF triples are used to make a statement about a resource of the real world. A resource can be almost anything: a bug report, a person, a Web page, a CD, a track on a CD, etc. Every resource in RDF is identified by a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) [1].

In an RDF statement the subject is the thing (the resource) we want to make a statement about. The predicate defines the kind of information we want to express about the subject. The object defines the value of the predicate. In the RDF data-model information is represented as a graph with the statements as nodes (subject, object) connected by labeled, directed arcs (predicate). The query language SPARQL [32] can be used to query such RDF graphs.

RDF is domain-independent in that no assumptions about a particular domain of discourse are made. It is up to the users to define specific ontologies in an ontology definition language, such as the Web Ontology Language (OWL) [10].

OWL enables the use of description logic (DL) expressions to further describe the relationships between classes and to restrict the use of properties [28]. For example, two classes can be declared to be disjoint, new classes can be built as the union/intersection of others, or the cardinality of a property can be restricted to define how often a property can be applied to an instance of a class.

In addition to the W3C recommendations, the Semantic Web community developed tools to process RDF meta-data. Jena1 emerged from the HP Labs Semantic Web Program and is a Java framework for building applications for the Semantic Web. It provides a programmable environment for RDF and OWL.

In this paper, we do not contribute directly to the Semantic Web, but we exploit the technologies introduced above to describe and process data. In short, we model software evolution data with an OWL ontology. Then we take, for example, the static source code information that was extracted with our Evolizer toolset, and represent it as an RDF graph that is based on this ontology. RDF graphs, in contrast to relations in a relational model, consist of {subject, predicate, object}-triples which are close to the natural English sentence structure. This enables the transformation from natural English queries into SPARQL queries which can be issued on the RDF graph. In the remainder of the paper, we describe in detail how the RDF graph is generated and how this knowledge representation is exploited to support software developers.

3. APPROACH

Our vision is to provide a convenient and intuitive interface that allows software engineers – and especially newcomers, who are not yet virtuous with their IDE or command line tools, such as grep and awk – to leverage information sources about various aspects of a software system under development. In particular we want to overcome some of the limitations that existing approaches suffer from: We do not want to restrict developers to a set of predefined queries and we do not want them to learn a specific query language for that limited purpose. Instead, we want developers to be able to use a query language that they are already very familiar with: natural language. A natural language interface to an IDE relieves especially novice programmers from the cognitive burden of translating a conceptual query to a concrete one, which might involve navigating through nested or multi-level menus.

In the following, we briefly introduce Evolizer, our platform for software evolution analysis. For the sake of this paper, we focus on the infrastructure that is needed to give developers the possibility to query static source code information from within Eclipse. However, we want to emphasize again that our approach can be generalized to many other domains in the software evolution context.

3.1 Evolizer

Evolizer2 basically stems from the idea of having a Release History Database (RHDB) [12] that integrates information originating from various repositories, such as CVS and Bugzilla, in a single database. It facilitates many common preprocessing steps [38] that are necessary when mining such software archives and, in that context, is comparable with Renyon of Bevan et al. [5] or eROSE of Zimmermann et al. [39].

Over the years Evolizer has advanced from a set of data importers and preprocessors to a platform for various tools that aid developers during their daily maintenance and development tasks. Realized as Eclipse plug-ins, the functionality of Evolizer is available at developers’ fingertips in a state-of-the-art IDE and incorporates applications that emerged from ideas of the software evolution research community, as well as more classical approaches to support, for example, program understanding. Some of the tools that are built upon Evolizer, such as Changedistiller [13, 14], follow the original idea of leveraging historical data. Others do not

1http://jena.sourceforge.net/
2http://www.evolizer.org/
make use of any evolutionary data at all. Instead, for example in case of DA4JJava [31], they analyze source code that is currently under development within the IDE.

Figure 1 gives an overview on the four layers of EVOLIZER that are relevant for this paper. The persistency layer gives access to facts about a system in a convenient way and provides application support for other EVOLIZER plug-ins to persist settings, query results and so on. In the following, we provide detailed insight into the other three layers: In Section 3.2 we describe the data layer consisting of a set of data models and data importers. Section 3.3 describes the ontology layer that enhances the data layer with formally described data semantics. In Section 3.4 we show how existing Semantic Web query technology can be used to query an ontology-based knowledge base with quasi-natural language. Section 3.5 sums up how the three layers play together to allow a developer to access facts about her source code in a convenient and intuitive way.

3.2 EVOLIZER Data Layer

EVOLIZER provides a set of data models to represent software evolution data along with adequate importer tools to obtain this data from software project repositories. Extending existing data models and data importers, or adding new ones, is straightforward. For the approach that we present in this paper, we use a tool that was implemented on top of our platform to perform static source code analysis and store the result in our EVOLIZER RHDB.

To add new data, we first identify the key concepts that we want to analyze (in case of analyzing source code: packages, classes, methods, accesses, invocations, etc.) and create a data model accordingly. We use the plug-in extension facilities of Eclipse to make EVOLIZER aware of its data models, so that they can later be accessed by other EVOLIZER plug-ins. For the approach presented in this paper, we plug in a custom-tailored implementation of the FAMIX model [35] to represent facts about source code. Eventually, we need a data importer to extract and store information into the data model that we have registered. In case of our example, this is a parser that extracts the relevant facts from source code under analysis. The FAMIX source code meta-model and the fact extractor that we use are covered in more detail in the next section.

Data models in EVOLIZER are implemented using Java classes annotated with object-relational mapping meta-data according to the Enterprise JavaBeans 3.0 (EJB3.0) specification. Persistence is provided through Hibernate, a well-known high performance object/relational persistence and query service. As denoted earlier, EVOLIZER maintains a list of all registered data models and provides means to other EVOLIZER plug-ins to access the evolutionary information of a system via a convenient API.

3.2.1 EVOLIZER FAMIX

The FAMIX meta-model provides a language-independent representation of object-oriented source code [35] and we use it in EVOLIZER whenever an analysis requires static source code information. An overview of the core model is given in Figure 2. It specifies the entities that can be extracted directly from source code.

The model defines important object-oriented relations as classes. For example, Invocation is explicitly modeled as a class instead of using a self-aggregation for Method (which would be implemented in Java as a collection of Methods as an Attribute of the class Method). This yields several benefits for us; the most important one is that we can map Invocations directly to the EVOLIZER RHDB and query them explicitly later. For example, we can retrieve all Invocations that fulfill certain properties, such as that they point to a particular method we are interested in, using HQL – the Hibernate Query Language:

```java
from Invocation as invocation
join invocation.callee as callee
where callee.name='addChart';
```

The results of such a query can then be used to, e.g., provide a dependency analysis or visualization. EVOLIZER therefore already provides basic SQL-like query access, with features comparable to existing query languages for software analysis, to those that are familiar with both, HQL and the data available in the RHDB. On the other hand, the deficiencies of existing query languages also apply here; for developers that have no deeper knowledge of HQL and the underlying data structures, the information is hardly accessible through the data layer. In Section 3.3, we therefore describe how we add another layer to EVOLIZER to enable natural language interfaces.

We rely on a custom implementation of the FAMIX model, realized according to the procedure that we have outlined in Section 3.2. To populate an instance of the model with concrete data, we use ZBINDER by Pinzger et al. [30]. ZBINDER builds upon the Java Development Tools (JDT)\(^3\)

\(^3\)http://java.sun.com/products/ejb/

\(^4\)http://www.hibernate.org/

\(^5\)http://www.eclipse.org/jdt/
of Eclipse. The JDT parser alone fails in resolving cross references, such as method calls and attribute accesses of statements that contain a compile error – which is often the case when the code is incomplete or referenced libraries are missing. ZBINDER overcomes this limitation in most instances by gathering additional information stored in the abstract syntax tree and using sophisticated heuristics to reconstruct unresolvable method calls.

Static source code information for a software system can either be extracted from past releases that are stored within the EVOLIZER RHDB, or directly from a project that is currently under development in the workspace of Eclipse. ZBINDER can even be registered as a builder for a project, so that it gets notified every time a change is made to the source code.

The data layer of EVOLIZER provides a strong foundation for most of the classical software evolution and engineering analyses, especially when they depend on database performance, e.g., interactive software visualizations. Knowledge processing tasks and tool integration, on the other hand, would benefit from formally defined data semantics that the data layer alone cannot provide.

In the next section, we demonstrate by example how we overcome this limitation by adding an ontology layer to our platform.

3.3 Evolizer Ontology Layer

The EVOLIZER Java implementation of the FAMIX meta-model does not explicitly describe the formal semantics that is needed for automatic knowledge processing tasks such as query answering. For example, we cannot make use of the fact that there is an inverse relation between the property declares Method of a Class and the property is declared in Class of Method. If we are able to explicitly state the formal semantics then, every time we make a statement, such as A declares B, a semantic reasoner would be able to automatically infer that also B is declared in A. The Web Ontology Language OWL allows us to use description logic expressions to describe such relationships and to reason about them.

To take advantage of Semantic Web technologies, we added an additional layer on top of the EVOLIZER data layer by defining an OWL ontology that represents the FAMIX meta-model in terms of OWL classes, relationships and properties. This source code ontology is a subset of our software evolution ontology called SEON. Instance data is represented by RDF graphs. This way we get a knowledge base whose formal semantics enables automated processing. An overview of the ontology is shown in Table 1. The full ontology covers many more concepts, such as interfaces, local variables, type casts and usages of the instanceof-operator, as well as exceptions, but for the sake of this paper, we only focus on key concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class: Class</th>
<th>Class: Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>→ hasMethod Method</td>
<td>→ accessesAttribute Attribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ hasAttribute Attribute</td>
<td>→ hasParameter Parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ isReturnTypeOf Method</td>
<td>→ invokesMethod Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ isSubClassOf Class</td>
<td>→ hasReturnType Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ isSuperClassOf Class</td>
<td>→ isInvokedByMethod Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ hasName String</td>
<td>→ isMethodOf Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ hasName String</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class: Attribute</th>
<th>Class: Parameter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>→ isAttributeOf Class</td>
<td>→ isParameterOf Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ isAccessedByMethod Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ hasName String</td>
<td>→ hasName String</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 1: Simplified Version of the Evolizer Ontology for Source Code Analysis. |

To populate the knowledge base, we need to map our Java implementation of the FAMIX meta-model to the OWL ontology. This mapping is done via a custom Java annotation @rdf. We add an annotation with the URI of the according OWL class to the signature of each Java class that has a counterpart in the ontology. Similarly, we annotate each Java method that should be mapped to a corresponding OWL relation or property name. We use Java reflection to automatically generate RDF statements from Java instances. This approach is similar to – and partially inspired by – the sommer-project,7 an Object-to-RDF mapping layer that uses annotations in the spirit of Hibernate. In Listing 1 we show an example of an annotated Java class. We have omitted the EJB3.0 annotations for persistency that are used by the data layer of EVOLIZER.

```java
@rdf("http://evolizer.org/ont/java#Class")
public class FAMIXClass {
    @rdf("http://evolizer.org/ont/java#hasName")
    public String getName() {
        // ...
    }

    @rdf("http://evolizer.org/ont/java#hasMethod")
    public Set<FAMIXMethod> getMethods() {
        // ...
    }

    /* attributes, setter methods, and additional behaviour */
}
```

Listing 1: Java class annotated with @rdf.

For the following discussion, we introduce the namespace prefix evo: as shortcut for http://evolizer.org/ont/java#. In the example, the Java class FAMIXClass is annotated with the URI evo:Class and therefore, for every instance of the FAMIX-Class, an instance of the OWL class evo:Class is generated in the RDF graph. This is done by creating a resource in the graph and adding a rdf:type property with evo:Class as value. The URI that represents the resource is generated using the unique database id maintained by the data layer of EVOLIZER.

In addition, for each annotated method in the Java class, a property is added to the resource. The return value of the annotated method is used as value of the property in the graph. Since the getName()-method has the return type String, the value is added as a literal. For the getMethods()-method the return type is a set of instances of FAMIXMethod. Since the return type is a Set, we add a property for each element in the set. The elements in the set are instances of the FAMIXMethod class (which is also annotated with @rdf annotations). Therefore, we trigger the generation of the RDF statements for the FAMIXMethod class as well, repeating the process described above.

An excerpt of the generated RDF graph is shown in Figure 3. Ellipses represent resources in the graph. The labels in the ellipses are the URIs that uniquely identify the resources. The labeled arcs represent the properties that relate the subject and the object of a RDF statement. Finally, literals are depicted as rectangles. In addition to the example that we have outlined above, we list also additional subgraphs that belong to the version control and issue tracking ontologies in Figure 3. This gives an impression on how we integrate different kinds of data sources, although we focus solely on knowledge covered by our code ontology in this paper.

In our Java-to-OWL mapping, we have to take a special case into account. Not all Java classes have counterparts among OWL

---

6SEON is available for download at http://www.evolizer.org/

7https://sommer.dev.java.net/
classes. Java classes that explicitly model relationships are usually modeled as properties or relations in the ontology. In the RDF graph, they are represented as predicates. For example, the Invocation-class in the FAMIX model is modeled as invokesMethod-property in our ontology. We overcome this clash of paradigms by making it possible to mark a Java class explicitly to model a property by setting the flag isPredicate to true. In addition, we introduce two additional Java annotations @subject and @object to specify that, for example, in case of Invocation, the method getCaller() returns the subject and getCallee() the object of the RDF statement. The value of the @rdf-annotation is then considered to be the URI of an OWL-property, rather than of an OWL-class. This renders our mapping approach much more flexible, especially when the underlying Java class models were influenced by a relational view. An example of a class that models a property is given in Listing 2.

```java
@rdf(
    isPredicate=true,
    value="http://evolizer.org/ont/invokesMethod"
)
public class Invocation {

    @subject
    public FAMIXMethod getCaller() {
        // ...
    }

    @object
    public FAMIXMethod getCallee() {
        // ...
    }

    /* attributes, setter methods, and additional behaviour */
}
```

Listing 2: Java class that models a property.

### 3.4 Evolizer Query Layer: Natural Language Querying with Ginseng

So far, we have discussed how we import static source code information (and facts about the evolution of a system in general) into our EVOLIZER RHDB. We also showed how we use ontology information to augment this data. We explained that we rely on the established industry standard OWL/RDF which enables us to leverage the potential of EVOLIZER with a plentitude of existing tools and frameworks for knowledge processing from academia, as well as from industry.

One such tool is Ginseng, a guided input natural language search engine, that was presented by Bernstein et al. in [3]. Ginseng benefits from the fact that ontologies are described in terms of triples of subject, predicate, and object. This structure strongly resembles the way how humans talk about things. It can be exploited to use quasi-natural language queries for accessing any OWL/RDF knowledge base. Ginseng is lightweight compared to classical full natural language interfaces since it uses no predefined vocabulary and queries are not interpreted logically or syntactically. Instead, the vocabulary is derived from the OWL knowledge base itself, i.e., from labels of the instance data and from the identifiers that were used to define the ontologies. Optionally it is possible to add synonyms by annotating the ontology with Ginseng tags.

Ginseng uses a multi-level grammar consisting of a static part that defines basic sentence structures and phrases for English questions, and a dynamic part that is generated when an ontology is loaded. The static part additionally contains information on how to translate query sentences from quasi natural language to SPARQL. To generate the dynamic part of the grammar, the ontology is loaded into a Jena inferencing model and for each OWL class, individual (instance), object property, and data type property, a grammar rule is generated. The full grammar is then used by Ginseng to guide its users by offering an auto-completion feature, i.e., it presents a popup box with suggestions on how to complete the word that the developer is currently typing into the free-form input field. This limits the questions a developer can ask to a certain extent but prevents her from entering queries that are grammatically incorrect. Once the com-
plete query is entered and concluded by a question mark, it is translated by Ginseng into SPARQL statements and executed against the knowledge base maintained by Jena. The results of the query are then presented to the developer.

Consider again the example graph given in Figure 3. If we want to query for all the Methods that are declared in the class DefaultTitleEditor, we could ask:

```
SELECT ?methods
WHERE {
  ?class <evo:hasMethod> ?methods .
  ?class <rdf:type> <evo:Class> .
  ?class <evo:hasName> "DefaultTitleEditor" .
}
```

When the query above is executed, the graph pattern consisting of the four triple patterns in the WHERE-clause is matched against the triples in the RDF graph, and returns the bindings for the variables in the SELECT-clause. In SPARQL, variables are indicated by the prefix “?”.

The predicate and the object of the first triple are fixed values, so the pattern is going to match only triples with those values. Within a graph pattern a variable must have the same value no matter where it is used, so the query above only returns a binding for ?methods if the variables called ?method in the first and second triple have the same value; as well as the variables called ?class in the second, third, and fourth triple.

For more details on Ginseng and its underlying technology, we refer to [3].

### 3.5 Wrapping up: The Integration of the three Layers of Evolizer

When we want to query for facts about source code, we tell the data layer of Evolizer to parse the currently selected project in the Eclipse workspace (alternatively it is possible to process the code of a past release stored within the RHDB). The most convenient way to trigger this process is to add a Evolizer Nature to an Eclipse project. Along with the nature, a builder is then assigned to the project that automatically re-builds the FAMIX-model every time a change to the source code is made. Re-building the FAMIX model means that the source code is parsed by ZBinder which creates instances of FamixClass, FamixMethod, Invocations, and so on, according to the facts that it finds within the source code. Then it stores these instances into the RHDB.

The data is then passed to the ontology layer which translates it according to the @rdf-annotations and the OWL description of the Evolizer Ontology for Source Code Analysis into a Jena Ontology model.

This model is then analyzed by Ginseng and, subsequently, available to the developer for querying in natural language. The results are presented to the developer in an Eclipse view, similar to that provided by Eclipse itself for displaying Java search results. Since we also keep track of source code locations in our model, the developer can easily navigate from the results view directly to the corresponding source code.

Next, we provide a case study to demonstrate how our prototype implementation of the framework described above can be used by a developer to answer common questions during daily program comprehension tasks.

### 4. CASE STUDY

In our case study, we demonstrate by the example of the open-source library JFreeChart\(^3\) that our framework can be used to answer the most common program comprehension questions that arise during software evolution tasks [9]. We do not focus on evaluating the quality of the query results – as we have explained throughout the preceding sections, the data importers are not the key contribution of this paper and can be exchanged easily thanks to Evolizer’s plug-in architecture. Instead, we show that, compared to existing tools, developers are given more flexibility when composing queries with our approach: they can formulate queries conveniently using different variations of natural language sentences.

In [24], Kaufmann et al. presented a usability study with 48 users, evenly distributed over a wide range of backgrounds and professions, including software development. The study incorporated four query interfaces (including Ginseng) featuring four different query languages that demonstrated the usefulness of natural language interfaces for casual end-users. Their experiment was based on geographical data encoded in an OWL knowledge base. Kaufmann et al. found that:

> “(1) With full-sentence questions, users can communicate their information need in a familiar and natural way without having to think of appropriate key-words in order to find what they are looking for. (2) People can express more semantics when they use full sentences and not just keywords.” [24]

Although we did not yet conduct an extensive user study in the software engineering domain, we claim that the results of this study are, to some extent, applicable to our setting. It is reasonable to assume that the domain of the knowledge that we query can be neglected, compared to the influence of the professional background of the users and, as a consequence, their familiarity with more formal languages. The study of Kaufmann et al., however, showed that the findings above apply to both categories of users likewise – to those without any prior knowledge of query languages, as well as to those with a background in software engineering and familiar with at least SQL.

### 4.1 Using Evolizer to answer common Program Comprehension Questions

In [9], De Alwis and Murphy have listed 36 common program comprehension questions that their tool Ferret implements. The questions fall into five categories: inter-class, intra-class, inheritance, declarations, and evolution. The questions are further assigned to one or several contexts, or what they call contributing spheres: The static-sphere relies on static program analysis, the dynamic-sphere uses profiling information, the evolution-sphere relies on software repository mining, and the plug-in-sphere contains declarative information specified in Eclipse plug-in manifests.

Evolizer supports all of their static queries out of the box, without having them predefined or hard-coded explicitly. Conceptually, we can also answer all the questions from the evolution-sphere.

---

\(^3\)http://www.jfree.org/jfreechart/
The structure of the original question is too complex for the simple grammar rules of Ginseng but can be reformulated to: “What fields have the type <type>?”. For example, we can search for attributes of type JTextField to identify classes of JFreeChart that contribute to the user interface in general and, in particular, process user input. Entering the question:

What attributes have the type JTextField?

returns seven results; three in DefaultAxisEditor, two each in DefaultNumberAxisEditor and DefaultTitleEditor.

This time significantly more user interaction is necessary to come up with the same results using the Java Search of Eclipse. Besides entering the search string, we have to choose Search for type and configure the “Limit To” option to only match for field types. Especially newcomers to Eclipse are often not aware of these features.

Questions concerning Intra-Class Dependencies

During maintenance tasks, developers often face god-classes several thousand lines of code in size. Changing, e.g., the type of one of their attributes is a tedious task, involving careful code investigation and a lot of scrolling to answer questions, such as “What methods access this field?” Often, the task is further complicated when information hiding principles were violated. Using our framework, we are able to significantly narrow down the amount of code that has to be inspected. Coming back to one of the examples in the last section, we can ask what methods access the field labelFontField in DefaultAxisEditor. Again, the user is guided during query composition. When she starts typing “What method accesses...”, Ginseng automatically suggests attribute (as well as field, as a synonym) and method as the next possible words. By choosing attribute, the set of suggested candidates for the concluding word is reduced to the names of particular fields, i.e., names of methods are faded out. The full query is:

What method accesses the attribute labelFontField?

Executing the query yields two results: the constructor of DefaultAxisEditor and the method attemptLabelFontSelection(). Manual inspection confirms these results to be correct.

Questions concerning Inheritance

Generalization and specialization are among the most powerful features in Object-Orientation. The other side of the coin is that inheritance increases the gap between the static program and the dynamic process and therefore complicates program understanding in some cases, especially if used too extensively (e.g., deep inheritance hierarchies over more than seven levels), or incorrectly (e.g., to simply reuse code, rather than backed by the idea of specialization). Supporting the developer with tools to understand inheritance hierarchies more easily is therefore desirable. Browsing through code and navigating upwards the inheritance hierarchy is already well-supported by modern IDEs. Navigating downwards, on the other side, usually involves tedious searching. However, literally speaking, it could be as easy as asking “What are the subclasses of this class?”, if our approach were used.

The class DefaultAxisEditor in JFreeChart is implemented as a subclass of JPanel. Querying the static source code information in FAMIX, we can quickly locate similar classes, i.e., classes that extend JPanel: DefaultTitleEditor, DefaultAxisEditor, and FontChooserPanel, among others. If the underlying ontology provides meaningful synonyms, each of the following queries would return the information that we are interested in:
• What are the classes that extend JPanel?
• What are the subclasses of JPanel?
• What classes inherit from JPanel?

Questions concerning Declarations

We have chosen “What are all the fields declared by this type?” among the 36 conceptional queries that De Alwis and Murphy have listed in their paper to conclude our case study on how developers can benefit from our framework. The question has been identified by De Alwis and Murphy to be the most commonly asked one concerning declarations. In the last example, we have identified a few classes that are subclasses of JPanel. If we want to confirm the initial impression that DefaultTitleEditor and DefaultAxisEditor implement similar concepts according to their naming scheme, we can do that in terms of comparing their states, i.e., fields. Investigating the answers to the queries:

What attributes are defined in DefaultAxisEditor?

and:

What are the attributes of DefaultTitleEditor?

confirms that they, in fact, have similar states: For example, both of them seem to have associated a font (labelFont and titleFont, respectively), a checkbox (showTickLabelsCheckBox and showTitleCheckBox, respectively), and so on. The next steps would probably be to investigate further the types of the fields and the behavior that operates on them or to have a look at the documentation of the two classes, e.g., by entering the following query:

Give me the Javadoc of DefaultAxisEditor!

From here, gaining a deeper understanding of JFreeChart is just a matter of asking the right questions.

4.2 Discussion and Limitations

We conducted a validation of our approach by addressing the questions that De Alwis and Murphy listed in their paper about Ferret. The two approaches share many similarities in terms of their goals. Furthermore, those questions were identified in two empirical studies [34, 33] to be the most frequently asked questions by programmers during software evolution tasks and therefore provide a suitable benchmark for our framework.

Our approach, in contrast to Ferret, can draw from the full power of the semantic web technologies and is therefore not limited to a set of predefined queries, with the need to have any additional ones implemented by some provider, such as a tools-support group. Instead, the querying capabilities of our framework are much more flexible and only limited by a subset of the English grammar and by the knowledge base that is available. Therefore the developer queries that we have chosen in our case study are only a subset of the ones that can be formulated and answered out of the box. Many more are possible and they can be formulated in different variations, e.g., as a questions or using the imperative form.

IDE vendors need to provide an interface to the information offered by tools comparable to Ferret (often menu-items in deeply nested context-menus). This becomes more and more of a problem as the information need of developers may become more diverse with the increase in complexity of modern software systems. Our framework, in contrast, provides a single access point for most of the information needs: using natural language, a developer can just ask what is on her mind, without having to worry where the desired functionality is hidden in the deeply nested menus of her favorite IDE.

Existing query languages for software evolution artifacts potentially also provide such an access point and give the developer the freedom to formulate queries without being bound to a set of predefined ones. On the other hand, they usually rely on custom-tailored, verbose languages. Therefore, they are hardly used in practice. A simple question, such as “What methods call addChart?”, which our tool answers right away, has to be reformulated by a developer into a SQL-like statement in order to be answerable with a tool, such as Semmle. A Semmle query would look like this:

```java
from Method caller, Method callee
where caller.calls(callee)
and caller != callee
select caller.getName().matches("addChart")
```

Moreover, extending existing query languages with new vocabulary involves manual editing of the language definition files, whereas in our framework, additional vocabulary is available as soon as new data is loaded into EVOLIZER. This is possible because Ginseng generates dynamic grammar rules from the loaded OWL ontologies, but it also implies that we have to rely on meaningful identifiers in the ontologies that we query. If this is not the case, we also have to fall back to manual definitions of synonyms. This is straightforward and can be done either in advance by a tool-vendor or later by the end-users, i.e., developers – even if they are unfamiliar with the Semantic Web – in case that they are more comfortable with another vocabulary than the one that is already provided by the ontology.

Query languages are less ambiguous than natural language in general and therefore better in expressing, e.g., complex restrictions and in formulating composed queries. However, supported by the empirical studies mentioned above, we claim that the most common program comprehension questions have a simple structure. In rare cases where more expressive power is needed, one can always fall back to SPARQL or to the SQL-like Hibernate Query Language (HQL).

The performance of our prototype on a common laptop computer is acceptable for a project of the size of JFreeChart (~250kLOC, the response time for the queries presented in our case study was usually around a couple of seconds).

5. RELATED WORK

Our work is highly related to the approach of De Alwis and Murphy presented in [9]. Just like them, we offer a framework to support the composition and integration of different sources of data about software artifacts in a single queryable knowledge base. In contrast to our approach, they define their own sphere model, whereas we rely on standardized technologies that are already established in the research community, as well as in industry. Moreover, while Ferret restricts developers to a set of predefined, hard-coded questions, we give them the freedom to formulate their own questions by exploiting existing natural language query tools.

Natural Language in Program Comprehension

LaSSIE, presented by Devanbu et al. in [11], integrated multiple views on a software system at AT&T in a frame-based knowledge base and also provided semantic retrieval through a natural language interface. LaSSIE and our framework share many common-
alties, especially since the Semantic Web emerged from frame-
based knowledge representation techniques. Hill et al. presented
an algorithm to extract noun, verb, and prepositional phrases from
method and field signatures in source code to enable contextual
searching [21]. The queries they support are closer to keyword
search on identifiers found in source code than to full natural lan-
guage questions and they do not cover structural information, such
as caller-callee or inheritance relationships among source code en-
tities.

Query Languages for Software Artifacts

Many approaches have been proposed that use specific languages to
query software artifacts. They are either based on standard database
languages, such as SQL or Datalog (e.g., CodeQuest [17] and Sem-
ble), customized Prolog implementations (e.g., Jquery [23], AST-
Log [8], GraphLog [7]), or a custom language (e.g., SCA [29]).
All of them aim to help developers to effectively explore and better un-
derstand code, uncovering information that would be impossible or
extremely hard to find with standard tools. However, most of them
require the user to master syntax and vocabulary of a specific query
language limited to that single purpose. Our approach guides devel-
opers in vocabulary, as well as in syntax, to construct well-formed
and coherent questions about static source code information. Nev-
evertheless, we consider most of these query languages complementary
to our approach, as they are more expressive in terms of that it
is possible to compose more complex queries than with the subset
of English grammar rules that we rely on. In general, as argued in
Section 4, the most common questions that arise during software
evolution tasks are of simple structure and are therefore predesti-
nated to be answered with natural language using EOLIZER.

Semantic Web in Software Engineering

Our framework relies heavily on Semantic Web technologies. Be-
sides the Web, these technologies have proven to be useful in many
domains, for example to enable the interoperability of software sys-
tems, and when technologies are needed to express knowledge with
formal semantics to enable machine processing. Software Engi-
eering is one of these domains. An overview of applications of
ontologies in software engineering has been given in [19, 16, 36].
All of these publications promote the theoretical benefits offered
by different characteristics of ontologies, such as explicit semantic
ics and taxonomy, lack of polysemy, ease of communication and
automatic data exchange between distinct tools, and computational
inference. On the other hand, only few approaches put those ideas
into real practice. Hyland-Yood et al. [22] propose an OWL on-
tology of software engineering concepts (SEC), including classes,
tests, metrics, and requirements. Bertoa et al. [4] follow a sim-
ilar approach but focus more on software measurement. Happel
et al. [18] propose various ontologies to foster software reuse. In
their KOntoR approach, they provide therefore background knowl-
dge about software artifacts, such as the programming language
and licensing models. Kiefer et al. developed EvoOnt, a software
repository data exchange format based on OWL [25]. Their soft-
ware ontology model (SOM) was influenced by FAMIX. Their ver-
sion ontology model (VOM) and their bug ontology model (BOM)
are based on EOLIZER’s data models for CVS and bug tracking
information, respectively. The authors use iSPARQL, their exten-
sion to the RDF query language SPARQL, for effectively querying
their ontologies to detect code smells. Witte et al. [37] use text
mining and static code analysis to map documentation to source
code for software maintenance purposes. These mappings are rep-
resented in RDF. The MOST project [27] aims to facilitate soft-
ware engineering by leveraging ontology and reasoning technolo-
gies. It integrates ontologies into model-driven software develop-
ment (MDSD), resulting in ontology driven software development
(O DDS). All of the approaches mentioned above acknowledge the
potential of ontologies and the Semantic Web applied to software
engineering. They often define custom ontologies that can be inte-
grated in the ontology layer of EOLIZER.

6. CONCLUSIONS

As software systems get more complex, efficient tools to sup-
port software engineers during their development and maintenance
tasks are becoming more important. Modern IDEs already made
a great leap forward in providing a variety of features to, for ex-
ample, facilitate program comprehension. The complexity of the
user interface is putting a significant cognitive burden on a devel-
oper. Often it is easier to solve a task manually than to master a
tool. Although experienced developers usually know exactly what
information they are looking for, they often do not know how to get
it. They simply do not know how to turn conceptual queries into
something their IDE understands.

In this paper, we presented a framework that overcomes this gap
and showed an application of Semantic Web technologies that goes
beyond merely data exchange for the sake of tool interoperability.
We combined industrial-strength technologies with ideas and tools
from the Semantic Web to enable developers to query software en-
engineering artifacts in a way that is familiar to them: using (quasi)
natural language strongly resembling plain English. For that, we
use the Web Ontology Language OWL to describe static source
code information extracted by our EOLIZER. The resulting ontol-
ogy then serves as input for the guided-input natural language inter-
face Ginseng. We demonstrated in a case study that our approach
makes it possible to answer the most common program comprehen-
sion questions identified in the literature.

We do not restrict developers to a set of predefined questions
but advance the state-of-the-art in that our approach is only de-
pendent on what data is available as input. With our framework,
it is straight-forward to integrate almost any kind of evolutionary
information, for example, from version control or issue tracking
systems – solely by exploiting existing and well-established stan-
dards for resource description. We encourage other researchers to
download and try out our EOLIZER toolset or to incorporate our
SEON ontology into their own tools.
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