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This project was accomplished as part of the U.S. Army's Manufacturing Methods and Technology Program. The primary objective of this program is to develop, on a timely basis, manufacturing processes, techniques, and equipment for use in production of Army material.

The complexity measure limits the number of independent paths in a program at the design and coding stages so that testing will be manageable during the later stages. This allows for structured testing, avoiding the problems arising from software which is inherently untestable. This testing technique can be applied during all stages of testing (i.e., unit, integration, and qualification testing).

Applied during software development, the complexity measure limits the number of independent paths in a program that testing will be manageable during the later stages. This allows for structured testing, avoiding the problems arising from software which is inherently untestable. This testing technique can be applied during all stages of testing (i.e., unit, integration, and qualification testing). (cont)

**ABSTRACT (CONTINUE ON REVERSE IF NECESSARY AND IDENTIFY BY BLOCK NUMBER)**

This report presents an overview of the complexity analysis tool (CAT), an automated tool which will analyze mission critical computer resources (MCCR) software. CAT is based on the cyclomatic complexity metric, which is used to measure, quantify, or evaluate a software module's complexity. Software which is less complex is easier to maintain and is less likely to have embedded errors. The metric suggests the minimum number of paths which must be tested in order to assure software reliability. The ideal limit of complexity is 10 for any software module. A module of complexity greater than 10 would need to be modified or redesigned.
CAT automates the metric for BASIC (HP-71), ATLAS (EQUATE), Ada (subset of DOD-STD-1815A), Ada PDL, and PDL (Caine, Farber, Gordon). It operates on both an IBM PC-AT (running MS DOS) and on DEC VAXs (750/780 running AT&T UNIX 5.2). CAT analyzes source code and computes complexity on a module basis. CAT also generates graphic representations of the logic flow paths and test paths, as well as other textual output.
INTRODUCTION

Approximately 85% of today's weapon systems employ embedded computers, and there is a trend towards more complex systems. In these mission critical computer resources (MCCR), a software error can have a drastic effect upon system performance.

There are several problems facing MCCR development. First, there is the ever increasing hardware dependency upon the software to successfully carry out its mission. At the same time, software development is a relatively new and unproven technology compared to hardware. Software development is often performed in a sloppy fashion and is improperly documented. Use of off-the-self software is often force fitted to the application at hand. This approach to software design leads to errors, and if detected late in the development cycle can drive up costs substantially.

The major problem with DoD software development projects today relates to the verification and validation of requirements in the software program. Statistics have shown that approximately 46% to 64% of software errors are traced back to inadequate requirements and design. Of these errors, 70% of them are not caught early in the life cycle and propagate into production and deployment (ref 1). The problem stems from the fact that many software implementations of functional requirements remain untested, and consequently errors are found during use when an untested path in the software is executed. The surprises will cost the government both time and money when extensive debugging and reverification efforts are required to fix these problems. The cost of correcting these errors can be as much as 300 times the cost to correct it during unit testing.

Software assessments for the most part are subjective in nature. The difference between hardware and software quality assessments is the lack of measurable parameters for software. For this reason there is an increasing drive to develop and apply techniques which provide a quantitative means of measuring or assessing software quality.

The primary means of performing software quality assessments is through independent verification and validation (IV&V). This includes verifying that requirements are met, through qualitative specification reviews, having adequate documentation, and testing. Testing in support of software quality assurance (SQA) is very labor intensive. In fact, the norm for software testing is about 50% of the total software development effort (ref 1). In order to meet program deadlines and cost constraints, the testing effort is often cut short, leaving doubt as to the quality of the software.
The problems mentioned above were addressed by the Software Quality Assurance/Math Branch of the U.S. Army Armament Munition and Chemical Command (AMCCOM). A technique was devised that would help verify the quality of the software through the use of quantitative measures. The assessment technique in the form of an automated tool would increase productivity and efficiency of available manpower, reduce subjectivity, reduce fielded system failures, and consequently would reduce development and maintenance costs. The result of this effort was the automation of the cyclomatic complexity metric.

THE CYCLOMATIC COMPLEXITY METRIC

The cyclomatic complexity metric is documented in the U.S. Department of Commerce National Bureau of Standards (NBS) Special Publication 500-99, "Software Testing. A Software Testing Methodology Using the Cyclomatic Complexity Metric" (ref 2). It is based upon structured programming conventions and graph theory. The idea behind the metric is to measure, quantify or evaluate the complexity of a software module. Software which is less complex can be comprehended, is easier to maintain, can be tested thoroughly, and is less likely to have embedded errors. The ideal limit of complexity is 10 for any software module. A module of complexity greater than 10 would need to be broken down into smaller submodules.

The concept behind the metric is simple; one counts the number of control tokens which exist in the software module to determine complexity. Complexity can be calculated as:

\[
\text{Complexity} = \text{The number of control tokens} + 1
\]

Control tokens are programming language statements which in some way provide provision points which modify the top-down flow of the program. In other words, statements such as IF-THEN-ELSE, CASE, GOTOs, are considered to be control tokens since they base program flow upon a logical decision, thereby creating alternate paths which program execution may follow. Thus, at the same time, the technique also identifies the critical paths needed to exercise every line of code in the module. A module of complexity five would have five critical or basis paths. These paths can then be used to adequately test software modules while minimizing the extent of testing required.

The metric can be used throughout the entire software life cycle. Applying a limited complexity as a contractual requirement will force structured programming techniques. Applied during software development, the metric will limit the number of basis paths in a
program at the design and coding stages. It can be used during software testing to identify the basis paths and to minimize the testing effort. During the maintenance phase, a proposed change should not be allowed to substantially drive up the complexity, whereby increasing the testing effort.

The cyclomatic complexity metric allows you to quantitatively assess the software. As discussed earlier, having this metric incorporated in the form of an automated tool would have substantial benefits as well.

**COMPLEXITY ANALYSIS TOOL**

The complexity analysis tool (CAT) is an automated tool which is based upon the cyclomatic complexity metric. It is designed to run on an IBM PC AT under a MS DOS operating system, as well as on a DEC VAX under a UNIX (AT&T 5.2) operating system. CAT will analyze an ASCII source code file and will identify the various control tokens. It will then generate a graphic representation of the logic flow paths, called a data flow diagram (DFD), similar to a flow chart. The basis paths can also be displayed. CAT’s interface consists of a series of user-friendly menus which guide the user through execution of the tool.

The first thing CAT will ask for is the language being analyzed. CAT currently has the ability to analyze programs written in BASIC (HP-71), PDL (Caine, Farber, Gordon), Equate ATLAS, Ada (DOD-STD-1815A), and Ada PDL. After selecting an appropriate file, the tool will pass the file through the appropriate language parser and perform the metrics analysis. CAT operates under the assumption that the file can be compiled successfully. If not, an appropriate error message will be raised. Upon successful completion of the parser and metrics analysis, CAT is ready to display its output. The user, through the use of menus, selects how the information is to be displayed (i.e., to the screen printer, plotter, or disk file). Examples are shown in figures 1 through 5.

CAT’s output consists of several tables and diagrams, including the source listing, data flow diagram, and test paths. This output will provide the developer or assessor a pictorial and quantitative representation of the software logic. The first output consists of a source listing of the entire file. This listing contains two major sections. The first is the module directory (fig. 1). It lists the modules found in this file and presents the vital statistics for each of the modules. Modules are listed in the order they were found in the source file, i.e., by ascending line number. The directory shows the name of each module, the starting line, the number of lines in the module, and cyclomatic complexity. At the far left of each line in the directory, a letter is given to the module. This letter is used in the body of the listing to identify code belonging to the module.
The second section is the listing itself (fig. 2). The leftmost columns of each line are used to show the correspondence between the source code and the DFD. First is the line number, which is the count of lines from the top of the file. Next is the module letter which identifies the module containing this line of code. Following the module letter is the list of nodes that are represented, wholly or partially, by this line. Each module may be examined individually if desired.

In looking at the DFD (fig. 3), there is a summary of information at the top of the DFD. Listed are the source filename, the module within the source file being analyzed, the module’s complexity, the number of lines of code in that module, and the date and time of the analysis. Also included is a color scheme for the DFD to indicate program flow direction.

The numbers on the DFD represent nodes, a block of statements where the program flow is sequential. Edges represent the program’s branches taken between blocks. Edges that cause loops are shown in one color. These edges always flow from the bottom to the top of the page. Edges that perform a structured exit of a loop (such as a WHILE or FOR statement) are shown in another color. These edges flow from the top to the bottom of the page. All remaining edges are drawn in a third color. These edges also go from the top to the bottom of the page. Another indication of the direction and function of an edge is its shape. Loops or loop exits are always drawn as curved lines. Other edges are drawn as straight lines unless they must be curved to avoid colliding with another node.

If a file analyzed contained several modules, and one of these modules has a complexity greater than 10, or one of these modules has been changed, these modules would be candidates for further review. By going through the menu interface, a specific module can be selected for individual review. The module’s corresponding source listing, DFD, and basis paths can be examined. CAT can automatically determine the basis paths and display them in two fashions. The first is by a series of numbered nodes, such as 0-1-2-3-5-6-7-14-7-8-9-10-13-3-4-16-17, corresponding to the DFD (fig. 4). The second means is by graphing the test paths individually (fig. 5).

**BENEFITS**

The significant benefits derived from a quality design are realized throughout the full life-cycle of the program (i.e., development, production, post-deployment), as opposed to benefits derived from an instantaneous assessment. CAT provides an overall improvement in design by enforcing structured programming techniques upon the software programmer, thus designing quality into the software. Imposition of the metric would also allow early inspection and diagnosis of the problem areas in the software logic. For example, during initial design, CAT can be used to assure a low complexity in the PDL. By using the PDL, DFDs, source listing and test paths, one can perform a
walk-through to check for logic or function errors before coding takes place. When identified problems are resolved, proceed to the coding phase. The developed code can then be passed through CAT again, coming up with another set of output. These two sets of output, one from the PDL and one from the code, can then be compared against one another. There should not be significant differences between the two. For example, if a PDL module had a complexity of five, the code implementing that module should not have a corresponding complexity of 25. The complexities are likely to increase implementing the PDL into code, but they should not be significant differences. If there are differences such as these, you know that the requirements in the PDL are not correctly implemented into the code. This is another way errors could be uncovered early in the life cycle before they propagate to unmanageable portions.

A major benefit derived from the use of the metric would be an improvement in the ease and efficiency of testing. By concentrating on the basis paths, the testing effort is prioritized and minimized. The test paths as a whole can be used for unit testing of the module and can be part of its unit development folder. The tool can also be used in conjunction with acceptance testing as a means of verifying the performance of the software.

From a post deployment perspective, the metric is a means of obtaining a measure of software supportability. Suppose you would like to know the effects of a proposed change in the software. In looking at figure 2 you could locate the lines of source code you intend to change. By looking at the corresponding node letters on the left-hand side, you could then go to figure 3 and note its corresponding effect upon the other nodes. If the area in question is highly structured, a change would probably have little impact. However, if the area was highly unstructured, a change would probably have a drastic impact. The diagrams could also be used in a reverse fashion. For example, if you notice that a particular area of the DFD was cluttered and you wanted to clean it up, you could note which nodes were involved. You could then go to figure 2 and find the corresponding source code you would have to change.

CAT, because of its data flow analysis, not only detects a modification but relates the modification to a particular flow area in the program. To fully characterize a program change, CAT can flag changes in the program flow paths. Thus the complexity metric will provide an efficient means of identifying regression test cases to verify those portions of the software program which are changed.

CAT as an automated tool can eliminate manual computation errors, eliminate subjectivity, and significantly reduce the number of manhours required for manual computations of the metric. Preliminary forecasts estimate that the effort required to apply the metric manually to a software development process is approximately 3% to 7% of the overall development effort (assuming no learning curve is required). This estimate is based on our own in-house experience with MCCR software using manual calculations of complexity. We project that with the automated tool the effort would drop
by about one or two orders of magnitude. In either case, taking the extra effort to use
the metric provides a vehicle for detecting and correcting bugs earlier in the life cycle.
This in turn could amount to significant benefits and savings in terms of development
and testing costs, productivity gains, and software quality and reliability.

CONCLUSIONS

The use of CAT as a quality assurance tool provides a quantitative measure of
software quality, structure, robustness, testability, and maintainability. Imposition of the
cyclical complexity metric on the developer during the early phases of the life cycle
will result in a quality design. Benefits will then be realized throughout the life cycle of
the program.

The complexity metric has been incorporated as a requirement in several mission
critical computer resources programs currently underway. A follow-on study will be
performed which will quantify these benefits in terms of time, labor, and cost savings, as
well as correlations between complexity and reliability, error rate, modifiability, etc. The
study will be performed using data gathered from users of the metric and tool. The
complexity analysis tool can be obtained by contacting:

U.S. Army AMCCOM
AMSMC-QAH-A(D)
Bldg 62
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
(201) 724-4849, Autovon 880-4849
Complexity Analysis Tool
Listing from source file xsample.ada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module letter</th>
<th>Module name</th>
<th>Cyclomatic complexity</th>
<th>Starting line</th>
<th>Number of lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>SAMPLE_ADA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Module directory

Page 1 CAT listing Source file:xsample.ada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Module/Node</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>procedure SAMPLE_ADA is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>FIRST: INTEGER;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEXT: INTEGER;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>C: CHARACTER;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>if FIRST = 0 then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>put line(&quot; First equal to zero &quot;):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEXT := FIRST;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>while (NEXT = 0) loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>put line(&quot; Next not equal to zero &quot;);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>for I in 1..20 loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>C := C + 1;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>put(C):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>end loop:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>case C is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>when 1 = - ADD;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>when 2 = - DELETE;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>when others = - PRINT OUT;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>end case:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>end loop:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>end if:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>end SAMPLE_ADA:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Module listing
Figure 3. Data flow diagram
Module Name: SAMPLE_ADA
Complexity 6
Language: Ada

Baseline: 0 1 15 16 17
Test Path 1: 0 1 2 3 4 16 17
Test Path 2: 0 1 2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 13 3 4 16 17
Test Path 3: 0 1 2 3 5 6 7 14 7 8 9 10 13 3 4 16 17
Test Path 4: 0 1 2 3 5 6 7 8 9 12 13 3 4 16 17
Test Path 5: 0 1 2 3 5 6 7 8 9 11 13 3 4 16 17

Figure 4. Test path listing
Figure 5. Test path graph
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