

Modeling the Relationship between Software Effort and Size Using Deming Regression

STAINS

STAtistics in INformation Systems Group

Nikolaos Mittas
Makrina Viola Kosti
Basiliki Argyropoulou
Lefteris Angelis



*Programming Languages & Software Engineering Lab
Department of Informatics
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece
{nmittas, mkosti, vargyrop, lef}@csd.auth.gr*

Presentation Outline

- Motivation and Objectives
 - Research questions
- Definitions and Description
- Methodology of Experimentation
 - Dataset
 - Evaluation method
- Results and Conclusions
- Directions of Future Research

The Research Problem in Software Cost Estimation (SCE)

- ❑ Accurate prediction of software cost needed
- ❑ Plethora of prediction methods
 - Expert judgment to statistical models and machine learning techniques
- ❑ The General Research problem
 - Identification of the “best” prediction technique for a certain dataset
- ❑ Findings from literature contradictory - no global answer
 - Lack of standardization in SCE methodologies, measurement, reporting techniques, terminology, etc
 - Accuracy depends on dataset

Motivation

- *Regression Analysis* (RA) (especially *Ordinary Least Squares* OLS) → Well-known modeling technique:
 - Various forms of regression for modeling the relationship between effort and size
- Despite the popularity of OLS in SCE → Several restrictions:
 - OLS it is assumed that the values of the independent variable (i.e. *size*) are measured without errors
- The assumption of error-free measurement is not so realistic in SCE:
 - Software size is the result of a counting and estimating process derived from a tool or an expert (*Source Lines of Code* (SLOC) or *Function Points* (FP))

Related Work

- Literature Regression forms
 - Miyazaki et al.(1991)
 - Regression based on relative errors
 - Chen & Stromberg (1997)
 - Heteroscedasticity (LMS, Least Median of Squares – LTS, Least Trimmed Squares)
 - Pickard et al. (1999)
 - RR, Robust Regression – LAD, Least Absolute Deviation
- Inaccuracy of measurement
 - Miyazaki et al.(1994)
 - Foss et al. (2001)

Proposed Model

- Deming regression → Improvement of the process for modeling the relationship between *effort* and *size*
- Deming regression → General class of *errors-in-variables* models:
 - Appropriate in situations where random errors exist in the measurements of both the independent and the dependent variable

Modeling the SCE Procedure

- SCE is the procedure of predicting the cost of a new project
- Let:
 - $Y \rightarrow$ Real random dependent variable representing the **cost** of projects
 - $X \rightarrow$ Real random variable representing the **size** of projects
- Goal to find a regression function
$$y_j = f(x_j) + \varepsilon_j \quad (j = 1, \dots, n)$$
 - $\varepsilon_j \rightarrow$ Real random error

Parametric Estimation Technique

- *Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) Regression*

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i + \varepsilon_i$$

- Objective:

- Minimization of the overall *Sum of Squared Residuals* (SSR)

$$SSR = \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \beta_0 - \beta_1 x_i)^2$$

- Final estimation of *constant* (β_0) and *slope* (β_1)

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{n \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i - (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i)}{n \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^2}$$

$$\hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{y} - \beta_1 \bar{x}$$

where

$$\bar{y} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$$

$$\bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$$

Proposed Model

- Deming Regression:
 - A form of *errors-in-variables* model
 - Takes into account:
 - The error arising from the **dependent** variable (*effort*) (similarly OLS)
 - The error in measurement of the **independent** variable (*size*)

Theoretical Model (1/2)

□ Notation

- (X_i, Y_i) → True **unknown** observations
- (x_i, y_i) → Erroneously measured observations
- $(\varepsilon_i, \delta_i)$ → Error terms

□ Constant ratio λ of error variances

$$\lambda = \frac{\sigma_{e_x}^2}{\sigma_{\delta_y}^2}$$

□ Deming Regression Model

$$x_i = X_i + \varepsilon_i$$

$$y_i = Y_i + \delta_i$$

Theoretical Model (2/2)

Deming Regression


$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_i$$

Objective:

- Minimization of the over-weighted *Sum of Square Residuals (SSR)*

$$SSR = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\varepsilon_i^2}{S_{\varepsilon_x}^2} + \frac{\delta_i^2}{S_{\delta_y}^2} \right) =$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n ((y_i - \beta_0 - \beta_1 x_i)^2 + \lambda(x_i - X_i)^2)$$



Estimation of Coefficients

- Final estimation of *constant* (β_0), *slope* (β_1) and X

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{s_{yy} - \lambda s_{xx} + \sqrt{(s_{yy} - \lambda s_{xx})^2 + 4\lambda s_{xy}^2}}{2s_{xy}} \quad \hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x}$$

$$X_i = x_i + \frac{\hat{\beta}_1}{\hat{\beta}_1^2 + \lambda} (y_i - \hat{\beta}_0 - \hat{\beta}_1 x_i)$$


where

$$s_{xx} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 \quad s_{yy} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2$$

$$s_{xy} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})$$

Methodology (Datasets)

- Desharnais
 - 77 completed software projects from a Canadian Software house
 - The project size measured with *FPS*
- COCOMO81
 - COCOMO81 → Public domain database
 - The project size is measured with *SLOCs*
- Maxwell
 - 62 projects from a commercial Finnish bank
 - The project size measured with *FPS*
- Nasa93
 - 93 projects from different centers
 - The project size measured with *SLOCs*

 For better fitting, size and effort were logarithmically transformed

Methodology (Accuracy measures)

- The predictive accuracy of the cost model is usually based on local measures of error

- Absolute Error (AE) $AE_i = |Y_{A_i} - Y_{E_i}|$

- The Magnitude of Relative Error (MRE)

$$MRE_i = \frac{|Y_{A_i} - Y_{E_i}|}{Y_{A_i}}$$


- The global accuracy measures are:

- Mean and Median Magnitude of Relative Error (MMRE, MdMRE)
- Mean and Median of Absolute Error (MAE, MdAE)
- Percentage of projects with $MRE \leq 25\%$ (pred25)

Methodology (Graphical Comparison)


- Graphical analysis through *Regression Error Characteristic* (REC) curves
- 2-dimensional plot:
 - x-axis → the error tolerance of a predefined accuracy measure
 - y-axis → the accuracy of a prediction model
- Trade-off between accuracy and tolerance:
 - The accuracy of a model increases as the error tolerance becomes higher
 - $e=0$ → only the predictions that are identical to actual values considered accurate

$$accuracy(e) = \frac{\#(\text{projects with error} \leq e)}{\#(\text{projects})}$$



Desharnais Dataset


OLS		Deming	
intercept	slope	intercept	slope
2.993	0.929	-2.212	1.868



Deming (solid line) vs. OLS (dashed line)

Accuracy Measures (Desharnais)

	OLS	Deming	Improvement (%)
MAE	2101.13	614.25	70.77%
MdAE	1107.46	335.59	69.70%
MMRE (%)	66.88	15.28	77.15%
MdMRE (%)	34.88	11.30	67.60%
pred25 (%)	35.06	87.01	148.17%




- Deming outperforms for all accuracy measures

- The improvement ranges from 67.60% (MdMRE) up to 148.17% (pred25)


- The Wilcoxon test statistically signifies the difference for AEs

- Error reduction achieved by Deming



COCOMO81 Dataset

OLS		Deming	
intercept	slope	intercept	slope
1.204	1.106	0.243	1.404





Deming (solid line) vs. OLS (dashed line)

Accuracy Measures (COCOMO81)


	OLS	Deming	Improvement (%)
MAE	455.37	222.22	51.20%
MdAE	63.90	22.47	64.84%
MMRE (%)	137.38	32.99	75.99%
MdMRE (%)	63.97	26.31	58.87%
pred25 (%)	19.05	49.21	158.32%

- Deming outperforms for all accuracy measures
- The improvement ranges from 51.20% (MAE) up to 158.32% (pred25)
- The Wilcoxon test statistically signifies the difference for AEs
- AE distribution of OLS → High variability
- REC curve for Deming dominates



Maxwell Dataset

OLS		Deming	
intercept	slope	intercept	slope
3.517	0.827	2.088	1.065





Deming (solid line) vs. OLS (dashed line)

Accuracy Measures (Maxwell)


	OLS	Deming	Improvement (%)
MAE	3766.83	1856.38	50.72%
MdAE	1997.54	1068.19	46.52%
MMRE (%)	55.33	25.46	53.99%
MdMRE (%)	45.22	22.67	49.87%
pred25 (%)	20.97	56.45	169.19%

- Deming outperforms for all accuracy measures
- The improvement ranges from 46.52% (MdAE) up to 169.19% (pred25)
- The Wilcoxon test statistically signifies the difference for AEs
- AE distribution of OLS → High variability with a long upper tail
- REC curve for Deming dominates → Solid line climbs rapidly to 1



NASA93 Dataset

OLS		Deming	
intercept	slope	intercept	slope
1.977	0.920	1.277	1.107





Deming (solid line) vs. OLS (dashed line)

Accuracy Measures (NASA93)

	OLS	Deming	Improvement (%)
MAE	346.51	198.94	42.59%
MdAE	70.34	34.21	51.36%
MMRE (%)	65.79	26.77	59.31%
MdMRE (%)	36.08	16.02	55.60%
pred25 (%)	33.33	64.52	93.58%

- Deming outperforms for all accuracy measures
- The improvement ranges from 42.59% (MdAE) up to 93.58% (pred25)
- The Wilcoxon test statistically signifies the difference for AEs
- AE distribution of OLS → Slightly higher variability
- REC curve for Deming dominates



Conclusions (1/2)

- Study of modeling the relationship between effort and size
- Main idea:
 - OLS is applied under the assumption that the observed values of the variables are measurements which coincide with the true values
 - Not realistic assumption in SCE → Heterogeneous projects with respect to:
 - Nature
 - The way they were measured

Conclusions (2/2)

- Goal of this paper:
 - Application of Deming regression
 - Alternative robust technique → Beneficial:
 - Counting process of the size is characterized by uncertainty due to:
 - Subjective decisions of the practitioners
 - Tools
- Significant improvement compared to OLS:
 - Several accuracy measures
 - Graphical inspection (REC curves, boxplots)
 - Statistical tests (Wilcoxon matched paired)

Future Work (1/2)

- Method deserves a deeper and thorough study
- Construction of *Prediction Intervals* (PI) → “optimistic” and “pessimistic” guess for the true magnitude of the cost:
 - Researchers suggest that PI → Realistic estimate accounting for both uncertainty and risk
 - Under the assumption of error in measurement → Point estimate is meaningless:
 - Expresses not the response to the true size value, but the response to the measured value

Future Work (2/2)

- Introduction of more explanatory (or independent) variables in the model → Increase the percent of variability of the effort that is explained by the cost function
- Examination of the performance of the comparative models to different situations:
 - Systematic treatment through simulation
 - Errors of the independent variable ranges from a small amount into a high source of variability



Thank You