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Abstract—Software Entropy Metrics for bug prediction have been validated on various software systems by different researchers. In our previous research, we have validated that Software Entropy Metrics calculated for Mozilla subsystem’s predict the future bugs reasonably well. In this study, the Software Entropy metrics are calculated for a subsystem of Android and it is noticed that these metrics are not suitable for bug prediction. The results are compared with a subsystem of Mozilla and a comparison is made between the two software systems to determine the reasons why Software Entropy metrics are not applicable for Android.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Bug prediction involves using the past characteristics of the software systems to determine the future bugs in the software system. Software Entropy Metrics proposed by Hassan [1] are used to quantify the complexity of source code changes. A change is made to the software for (i) bug correction, (ii) enhancement, and (iii) maintenance purposes. The most complex of these are the enhancement related changes. A change is made to the software for (i) bug correction, (ii) enhancement, and (iii) maintenance purposes. The most complex of these are the enhancement related changes which contribute to the complexity of code change process. This complexity is quantified in terms of Software Entropy given by (1):

\[ S.E. (P) = - \sum_{j=1}^{n} (P_i \times \log_2 P_i) \]  

where, \( P \) is the probability of changes in the \( i \)th file defined as the number of changes in \( i \)th file divided by the total number of changes in all files of the software system/subsystem.

Hassan [1] validated the applicability of Software Entropy metrics using Simple Linear Regression (SLR) on six open source software systems including NetBSD, FreeBSD, OpenBSD, Postgre, KDE and KOffice.


II. SOFTWARE ENTROPY METRICS

The Software Entropy for a particular period is calculated by using the formula given in (1). The Software Entropy \( S.E. \) is normalized by using (2), such that \( 0 \leq S.E. \leq 1 \). The normalized Software Entropy makes it possible to compare the Software Entropy for subsystems containing different number of files.

\[ S.E. (P) = \frac{1}{\text{Maximum Entropy}} * S.E. (P) = \frac{1}{\log_2 n} * \sum_{j=1}^{n} (P_i \times \log_2 P_i) \]

where \( P_i \geq 0, \forall i \in 1, 2, ..., n \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_i = 1 \)

After calculating the normalized Software Entropy, each file is assigned a complexity value. In general, greater the complexity value, more buggy is the file. History Complexity Metric (HCM) is calculated for each file in the software system.

For a period \( k \), with entropy \( S.E. \) where a set of files, \( F_k \) are modified with a probability \( P_j \) for each file \( j \in F_k \), (3) defines the History Complexity Period Factor (HCPF) for a file \( j \) during period \( k \).

\[ HCPF_k(j) = C_{kj} * S.E. \quad j \in F_k \]
where, $C_{kj}$ is the contribution of Software Entropy for period $k$ ($S.E.k$) that is assigned to file $j$. By varying the value of $C_{kj}$, three variants of $HCPF$ are obtained to calculate $HCM$. Fig. 1 defines the different variants of $HCM$.

### Variants of $HCM$

**HCM1**: $C_{kj}=1$, Equal weightage of complexity is assigned to each file that is modified in the $k$th period.

**HCM2**: $C_{kj}=P_j$, where $P_j$ is the probability of change for file $j$ compared to all changes in $k$th period.

**HCM3**: $C_{kj}=1/F_k$, where $F_k$ is the total number of files changed in the $k$th period.

HCM value for a file $j$ over the evolution period $\{x, y\}$ is calculated using (4):

$$HCM_{(x,y)}(j) = \sum_{k=x}^{y} HCPF_k(j)$$

The value of $HCM$ and so the complexity increases with time. $HCM$ value for a software subsystem $(S)$ over the evolution periods $\{m, \ldots, n\}$ is the sum of $HCM$s for each file in the subsystem as defined in (5).

$$HCM_{(x,y)}(S) = \sum_{j \in S} HCM_{(x,y)}(j)$$

$HCM$ metrics, Normalized Software Entropy and number of changes and faults per year for the subsystems of Android and Mozilla are listed in Tables I and II, respectively.

**TABLE I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsystem</th>
<th>Android/platforms_frameworkbase/location</th>
<th>Android/platforms_frameworkbase/keystore</th>
<th>Android/platforms_frameworkbase/obex</th>
<th>Android/platforms_frameworkbase/native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>Faults</td>
<td>Normalized Entropy</td>
<td>Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsystem</th>
<th>Mozilla/layout/forms</th>
<th>Mozilla/layout/generic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>Faults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subsystems “Mozilla/layout/forms” and “Mozilla/layout/generic” of Mozilla, and “Android/platform_frameworks_base/location”, “Android/platform_frameworks_base/keystore”, “Android/platform_frameworks_base/obex” and “Android/platform_frameworks_base/native” of Android are used to validate the Software Entropy metrics for bug prediction. The data are collected from Mozilla-central [5] and GitHub [6] for Mozilla and Android respectively.

Regression analysis is done to determine the performance of calculated metrics for bug prediction. The tool used to perform regression is Weka 3.6 [7], which is a popular tool for data mining and machine learning. The results are compared based on the values of Correlation Coefficient, Mean Absolute Error (M.A.E.) and Root Mean Square Error (R.M.S.E.). These measures as defined in [8] are:

- **Correlation Coefficient**: measures the statistical correlation between the $a$’s and the $p$’s given by (6):

$$\text{Correlation Coefficient} = \frac{s_{pa}}{s_p s_a}$$

where $s_{pa} = \frac{\sum (p_i - \bar{p})(a_i - \bar{a})}{n-1}$, $s_p = \frac{\sum (p_i - \bar{p})^2}{n-1}$ and $s_a = \frac{\sum (a_i - \bar{a})^2}{n-1}$.

- **Mean Absolute Error (M.A.E.)**: as in (7) averages the magnitude of individual errors. The sign of error is not considered.
\[ M.A.E. = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)^2} \]  

- **Root Mean Square Error (R.M.S.E.):** measures the differences between the predicted and actual values of the samples as given in (8).

\[ \sqrt{\frac{(a_1 - a_n)^2 + \ldots + (a_n - a_n)^2}{n}} \]  

The regression results for these subsystems are listed in Tables III-VIII.

### TABLE III

**REGRESSION RESULTS FOR “MOZILLA/LAYOUT/FORMS/”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Metrics Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>M.A.E</th>
<th>R.M.S.E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Vector Regression (SVR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>104.144</td>
<td>125.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>92.497</td>
<td>119.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>92.496</td>
<td>119.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locally Weighted Regression (LWR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>0.7233</td>
<td>109.149</td>
<td>127.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>0.7237</td>
<td>109.367</td>
<td>128.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>0.7238</td>
<td>109.367</td>
<td>128.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multilayer Perceptron</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>100.15</td>
<td>128.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>92.114</td>
<td>123.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>92.115</td>
<td>123.627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE IV

**REGRESSION RESULTS FOR “MOZILLA/LAYOUT/GENERIC/”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Metrics Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>M.A.E</th>
<th>R.M.S.E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Vector Regression (SVR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>125.089</td>
<td>173.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>186.815</td>
<td>199.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>186.709</td>
<td>199.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locally Weighted Regression (LWR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>135.910</td>
<td>177.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>136.631</td>
<td>171.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>136.623</td>
<td>171.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multilayer Perceptron</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>118.841</td>
<td>140.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>154.611</td>
<td>174.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>154.636</td>
<td>174.367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE V

**REGRESSION RESULTS FOR “ANDROID/PLATFORM_FRAMEWORKS_BASE/LOCATION/”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Metrics Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>M.A.E</th>
<th>R.M.S.E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Vector Regression (SVR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>17.711</td>
<td>22.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>16.749</td>
<td>21.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>16.750</td>
<td>21.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locally Weighted Regression (LWR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>-0.663</td>
<td>26.745</td>
<td>31.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>-0.591</td>
<td>25.181</td>
<td>29.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>-0.591</td>
<td>25.181</td>
<td>29.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multilayer Perceptron</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>-0.832</td>
<td>19.841</td>
<td>25.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>-0.911</td>
<td>20.602</td>
<td>25.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>-0.910</td>
<td>20.601</td>
<td>25.395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is seen that the correlation coefficients for three out of four subsystems of Android are negative, whereas those for subsystem of Mozilla are positive. This indicates that as the Software Entropy; i.e., the complexity of code changes increases the number of bugs in the subsystem decreases for Android system. But, as we know that the number of bugs increases with the code change complexity [1], we try to understand the differences between Mozilla and Android. The goal of this study is to analyze why the Software Entropy metrics are not useful for predicting bugs in Android.

### TABLE VI

**REGRESSION RESULTS FOR “ANDROID/PLATFORM_FRAMEWORKS_BASE/KEYSTORE/”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Metrics Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>M.A.E</th>
<th>R.M.S.E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Vector Regression (SVR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>6.787</td>
<td>7.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>4.881</td>
<td>5.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>4.881</td>
<td>5.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locally Weighted Regression (LWR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>8.855</td>
<td>10.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>8.884</td>
<td>10.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>8.884</td>
<td>10.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multilayer Perceptron</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>9.931</td>
<td>11.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>9.931</td>
<td>11.066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE VII

**REGRESSION RESULTS FOR “ANDROID/PLATFORM_FRAMEWORKS_BASE/OBEX/”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Metrics Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>M.A.E</th>
<th>R.M.S.E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Vector Regression (SVR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>-0.574</td>
<td>3.136</td>
<td>3.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>-0.639</td>
<td>3.042</td>
<td>3.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>-0.638</td>
<td>3.042</td>
<td>3.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locally Weighted Regression (LWR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>-0.337</td>
<td>2.926</td>
<td>3.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>-0.459</td>
<td>3.234</td>
<td>3.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>-0.459</td>
<td>3.234</td>
<td>3.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multilayer Perceptron</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>-0.828</td>
<td>2.683</td>
<td>3.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>-0.828</td>
<td>2.683</td>
<td>3.191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE VIII

**REGRESSION RESULTS FOR “ANDROID/PLATFORM_FRAMEWORKS_BASE/NATIVE/”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Metrics Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>M.A.E</th>
<th>R.M.S.E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Vector Regression (SVR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>-0.605</td>
<td>2.812</td>
<td>3.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>-0.619</td>
<td>2.524</td>
<td>3.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>-0.619</td>
<td>2.524</td>
<td>3.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locally Weighted Regression (LWR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>-0.694</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>-0.695</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>-0.695</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multilayer Perceptron</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM1</td>
<td>-0.879</td>
<td>3.303</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM2</td>
<td>-0.854</td>
<td>3.384</td>
<td>3.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM3</td>
<td>-0.853</td>
<td>3.384</td>
<td>3.838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE IX

**COMPARISON PARAMETERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes per year</td>
<td>The number of feature introducing changes that take place in the software system/subsystem per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugs per year</td>
<td>The number of bugs that are repaired in the software system/subsystem per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Entropy</td>
<td>The value of normalized Software Entropy as given in (2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software type Development Approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source code management system</td>
<td>The repository/tool used for managing the source code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bug tracking</td>
<td>How are bugs reported and managed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. COMPARISON OF MOZILLA AND ANDROID

In this section, we compare the two software: Mozilla and Android in order to understand the differences that make Software Entropy metrics non-applicable to Android systems. The two subsystems are compared on the parameters listed in Table IX. The subsections of this section compare the two systems based on these parameters in detail and the descriptive statistics for some of these parameters are listed in Table X.

A. Changes per Year

The number of changes per year, particularly feature introducing changes, are compared for the subsystems of Mozilla and Android. The mean numbers of changes per year for the subsystems of Mozilla (54.86,265.86) are higher than those for the subsystems of Android (19,7,8,6,10,75). The mean number of changes is higher in Mozilla, and also the variance for number of changes per year is very high in Mozilla in comparison to Android (see Table X). Thus, a low variance in the number of changes per year may be a factor contributing to the non-applicability of Software Entropy metrics for subsystems of Android.

B. Bugs per Year

The number of bugs per year for the subsystems of Mozilla and Android are compared. The number of bugs per year in Mozilla is large (in hundreds or thousands), while those for Android subsystems are less (see Table X). Thus, a low number of bugs repaired per year may be another factor contributing to the non-applicability of Software Entropy metrics for the subsystem of Android.

C. Software Entropy

The value of Normalized Software Entropy is for the subsystems of Android and Mozilla are plotted in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3. The Software Entropy for Mozilla subsystem is nearly constant for some time before it increases or decreases, while for Android subsystem the Software Entropy is rapidly changing. This rapidly changing Software Entropy may be a factor that renders Software Entropy inapplicable for predicting bugs in Android.

D. Software Type

Mozilla is a web browser, while Android is an Operating system (O.S.). A web browser is an application software used for accessing, fetching and presenting the information available on the internet. On the other hand, an O.S. is a system software that is responsible for managing and coordinating hardware and software resources. Android is a...
system software that manages other application software, hence it is a more complex software system than Mozilla. The types of bugs in an O.S. are also a bit different from those in other software systems. An O.S. has more concurrency bugs than memory-based or semantic bugs as compared to other software systems [9]. This difference between the two software systems can be another factor that leads to non-applicability of Software Entropy Metrics for Android and not for Mozilla.

![Software Entropy for subsystems of Android](image1)

**Fig. 2 Software Entropy for subsystems of Android**

![Software Entropy for subsystems of Mozilla](image2)

**Fig. 3 Software Entropy for subsystems of Mozilla**

**E. Development Approach**

Mozilla is developed by Open Source Community initiated by Netscape members in 1998. First major version was released in 2002, and the Mozilla Foundation supported by open source developers and various companies was created in 2003. It follows a community based development approach. On the other hand, Android was initially developed by Android Inc. and later taken over by Google in 2005. It was unveiled in 2007 along with the formation of Open Handset Alliance. The Android source code is released under the open source license by Google, but the fact remains that Android is developed privately by Google and after the latest changes and updates are made, the source code is released publically.

It can be said that since Android is developed privately by one of the best companies in the world i.e. Google, the complexity of code changes is not the same as for other open source software systems. Hence, Software Entropy metrics are not applicable for Android.

**F. Source Code Management System**

Mozilla uses a Mercurial repository for managing its source code, keeping track of changes and sharing changes with others. Mozilla-central is a Mercurial repository that keeps track to changes made in the main development tree, whereas Android uses Git as its open source version control system. Repo is a repository management tool that is built over Git to handle multiple Git repositories at once. Thus, Mozilla has its own Mercurial repository for managing the source code, whereas Android uses the services of Git which is an open source version control system. This is another difference that might have a slight impact on the non-applicability of Software Entropy metrics.

**G. Bug Tracking**

Mozilla uses Bugzilla for maintaining its bug database and keeping track of the reported bugs. This is a web-based tool that was initially developed and used by the Mozilla Foundation. Bugzilla was later released as an open source software and many organizations have adopted it for using as a bug tracking system for open source as well as proprietary software. On the other hand, Android Open Source Project uses a public issue tracker for reporting bugs and requesting updates.

In Bugzilla, the sole purpose is to report and track bugs while providing complete details for reproducing a bug; however, with the Android issue tracker, you can also make request for features and updates. Hence, the fact that Android does not use different systems for handling bug reports and feature requests might affect the applicability of Software Entropy Metrics for bug prediction in Android.

**IV. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK**

In this study, we calculated Software Entropy Metrics for two subsystems of Mozilla and four subsystems of Android. We noticed negative correlation coefficients in all of the regression techniques for three out of four subsystems of Android, indicating that the complexity of code changes is not able to predict bugs in Android subsystem effectively. Therefore, in order to analyze the reason why Software Entropy metrics cannot be used for predicting bugs in Android, we compared the two software systems: Mozilla and Android.

On the basis of the comparison, we concluded that the factors contributing to non-applicability of Software Entropy Metrics for Android include: (i) low variance in the number of changes per year, (ii) low number of bugs repaired per year, (iii) rapidly changing Software Entropy, (iv) types and complexity of bugs in an O.S. are different from the ones in other application software, (v) private development approach rather than a community based development approach, (vi) use of an open source code management repository service and (vii) same system for handling both bug reports and feature requests.

We plan to enhance the study, by identifying the differences in types of changes/bugs in the software systems that may affect the applicability of Software Entropy metrics. Also, there is a need to replicate this study for other subsystems of Android.
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