

Chapter 2.26

Decision Rule for Investment in Frameworks of Reuse

Roy Gelbard
Bar-Ilan University, Israel

ABSTRACT

Reuse helps to decrease development time, code errors, and code units. Therefore, it serves to improve quality and productivity frameworks in software development. The question is not HOW to make the code reusable, but WHICH amount of software components would be most beneficial, that is, cost-effective in terms of reuse, and WHAT method should be used to decide whether to make a component reusable or not. If we had unlimited time and resources, we could write any code unit in a reusable way. In other words, its reusability would be 100%. However, in real life, resources are limited and there are clear deadlines to be met. Given these constraints, decisions regarding reusability are not always straightforward. The current research focuses on decision-making rules for investing in reuse frameworks. It attempts to determine the parameters, which should be taken into account in decisions relating to degrees of reusability. Two new models are presented for decision-making relating to reusability: (i) a

restricted model and (ii) a non-restricted model. Decisions made by using these models are then analyzed and discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Reuse helps decrease development time, code errors, and code units, thereby improving quality and productivity frameworks in software development. Reuse is based on the premise that educating a solution from the statement of a problem involves more effort (labor, computation, etc.) than inducing a solution from a similar problem for which such efforts have already been expended. Therefore, reuse challenges are structural, organizational, and managerial, as well as technical.

Economic considerations and cost-benefit analyses in general, must be at the center of any discussion of software reuse; hence, the cost-benefit issue is not HOW to make the code reusable, but WHICH amount of software components would be most beneficial, that is, cost-effective

for reuse, and WHAT method should be used when deciding whether to make a component reusable or not.

If we had unlimited time and resources, we could write any code unit in a reusable way. In other words, its reusability would be 100% (reusability refers to the degree to which a code unit can be reused). However, in real life, resources are limited and there are clear deadlines to be met. Given these constraints, reusability decisions are not always straightforward.

A review of the relevant literature shows that there are a variety of models used for calculating-evaluating reuse effectiveness, but none apparently focus on the issue of the degree to which a code is reusable. Thus, the real question is how to make reusability pragmatic and efficient, that is, a decision rule for investment in reuse frameworks. The current study focuses on the parameters, which should be taken into account when making reusability degree decisions. Two new models are presented here for reusability decision-making:

- A non-restricted model, which does not take into account time, resources, or investment restrictions.
- A restricted model, which takes the above-mentioned restrictions into account.

The models are compared, using the same data, to test whether they lead to the same conclusions or whether a contingency approach is preferable.

BACKGROUND

Notwithstanding differences between reuse approaches, it is useful to think of software reuse research in terms of attempts to minimize the average cost of a reuse occurrence (Mili, Mili, & Mili, 1995).

$$[Search + (1-p) * (ApproxSearch + q * Adaptation_{old} + (1-q) * Development_{new})]$$

Where:

- **Search** (**ApproxSearch**) is the average cost of formulating a search statement of a library of reusable components and either finding one that matches the requirements exactly (appreciatively), or being convinced that none exists.
- **Adaptation** old is the average cost of adapting a component returned by approximate retrieval.
- **Development** new is the average cost of developing a component that has no match, exact or approximate, in the library.

For reuse to be cost-effective, the above must be smaller than:

$$p * Development_{exact} + (1-p) * q * Development_{approx} + (1-p) * (1-q) * Development_{new}$$

Where:

- **Development** exact and **development** new represent the average cost of developing custom-tailored versions of components in the library that could be used as is, or adapted, respectively. Note that all these averages are time averages, and not averages of individual components, that is, a reusable component is counted as many times as it is used.

Developing reusable software aims at maximizing P (probability of finding an exact match) and Q (probability of finding an approximate match), that is, maximizing the coverage of the application domain and minimizing adaptation for a set of common mismatches, that is, packaging components in such a way that the most common old mismatches are handled easily. Increasing P

7 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/decision-rule-investment-frameworks-reuse/29432

Related Content

Evolution of Blockchain Technology: Principles, Research Trends and Challenges, Applications, and Future Directions

Oluwaleke Umar Yusuf and Maki K. Habib (2023). *Perspectives and Considerations on the Evolution of Smart Systems* (pp. 67-104).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/evolution-of-blockchain-technology/327527

Comparative Analysis of Intelligent Driving and Safety Assistance Systems Using YOLO and SSD Model of Deep Learning

Nidhi Sindhwani, Shekhar Verma, Tushar Bajaj and Rohit Anand (2021). *International Journal of Information System Modeling and Design* (pp. 131-146).

www.irma-international.org/article/comparative-analysis-of-intelligent-driving-and-safety-assistance-systems-using-yolo-and-ssd-model-of-deep-learning/273230

Agile Coaches and Champions: Two Hidden Facilitators of Agile Transition

Taghi Javdani Gandomani and Mina Ziaei Nafchi (2016). *Emerging Innovations in Agile Software Development* (pp. 24-36).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/agile-coaches-and-champions/145032

Concepts and Strategies for Quality of Modeling

Patrick van Bommel, Stijn Hoppenbrouwers, Erik Proper and Jeroen Roelofs (2009). *Innovations in Information Systems Modeling: Methods and Best Practices* (pp. 167-189).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/concepts-strategies-quality-modeling/23789

Secure Key Generation for Static Visual Watermarking by Machine Learning in Intelligent Systems and Services

Kensuke Naoe, Hideyasu Sasaki and Yoshiyasu Takefuji (2010). *International Journal of Systems and Service-Oriented Engineering* (pp. 46-61).

www.irma-international.org/article/secure-key-generation-static-visual/39098