

# Chapter X

## 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 educing 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 and Q does not necessarily mean putting more components in the library; it could also mean adding components that are more frequently needed, because adding components not only has its direct expenses (adaptation costs), but also increases search costs.

6 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/21067](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/decision-rule-investment-frameworks-reuse/21067)

## Related Content

---

### Ranking and Risk Factor Scheme for Malicious applications detection and Classifications

Kiran Khatter and Sapna Malik (2018). *International Journal of Information System Modeling and Design* (pp. 67-84).

[www.irma-international.org/article/ranking-and-risk-factor-scheme-for-malicious-applications-detection-and-classifications/218172](http://www.irma-international.org/article/ranking-and-risk-factor-scheme-for-malicious-applications-detection-and-classifications/218172)

### Atomicity and Semantic Normalization

Andy Carver and Terry Halpin (2010). *International Journal of Information System Modeling and Design* (pp. 23-39).

[www.irma-international.org/article/atomicity-semantic-normalization/43607](http://www.irma-international.org/article/atomicity-semantic-normalization/43607)

### User Interface Generation from the Data Schema

Akhilesh Bajaj and Jason Knight (2009). *Systems Analysis and Design for Advanced Modeling Methods: Best Practices* (pp. 145-153).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/user-interface-generation-data-schema/30020](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/user-interface-generation-data-schema/30020)

### Techniques and Trends Towards Various Dimensions of Robust Security Testing in Global Software Engineering

Muhammad Sulleman Memon, Mairaj Nabi Bhatti, Manzoor Ahmed Hashmani, Muhammad Shafique Malik and Naveed Murad Dahri (2022). *Research Anthology on Agile Software, Software Development, and Testing* (pp. 1245-1271).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/techniques-and-trends-towards-various-dimensions-of-robust-security-testing-in-global-software-engineering/294518](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/techniques-and-trends-towards-various-dimensions-of-robust-security-testing-in-global-software-engineering/294518)

### Software Development for Information System - Achieving Optimum Quality with Security

Syeda Umama Hani and Abu Turab Alam (2017). *International Journal of Information System Modeling and Design* (pp. 1-20).

[www.irma-international.org/article/software-development-for-information-system---achieving-optimum-quality-with-security/205593](http://www.irma-international.org/article/software-development-for-information-system---achieving-optimum-quality-with-security/205593)