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## Overview

- Definition and categories
- Clone detection
- Clone removal refactoring


## Code Clones

- Code clone is a code fragment in source files that is identical or similar to another
- Code clones are either within a program or across different programs
- Clone pair: two clones
- Clone class: a set of fragments which are clones to each other


## Code Clone Categorization

- Type-1 clones
- Identical code fragments but may have some variations in whitespace, layout, and comments
- Type-2 clones
- Syntactically equivalent fragments with some variations in identifiers, literals, types, whitespace, layout and comments


## Code Clone Categorization

- Type-3 clones
- Syntactically similar code with inserted, deleted, or updated statements
- Type-4 clones
- Semantically equivalent, but syntactically different code
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## Key Points of Code Clones

- Pros
- Increase performance
- Code inlining vs. function call
- Increase program readability
- Cons
- Increase maintenance cos $\dagger$
- If one code fragment contains a bug and gets fixed, all its clone peers should be always fixed in similar ways.
- Increase code size


## Clone Detection Strategies

- Text matching
- Token sequence matching
- Graph matching


## Text Matching

- Older, studied extensively
- Less complex, and most widely used
- No program structure is taken into consideration
- Type-1 clones \& some Type-2 clones
- Two types of text matching
- Exact string match
- Diff (cvs, svn, git) is based on exact text matching
- Ambiguous match


## Ambiguous Match

- Longest Common Subsequence match
- N-grams match


## Token Sequence Matching

- A little more complex, less widely used
- No program structure is taken into account, either
- Type-1 and Type-2 clones
- CCFinder[2]
- CP-Miner[3]


## CCFinder

- Step 1: Convert a program with multiple files to a single long token sequence
- Step 2: Find longest common subsequence of tokens
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## Step 1: Tokenization



## Step 1: Tokenization



## Step 1: Tokenization

```
int main (){
int i= 0;
int j = 5;
while (i<20){
i = i + j;
cout << "Hello World" <<I << endl;
return 0;
}
```


## Step 1: Tokenization

```
$p $p(){
$p $p = $p;
$p $p = $p;
while($p < $p ){
$p = $p + $p;
}
$p << $p << $p << $p;
return $p;
}
```


## Step 2: Find Clones



## Detected Clone Pair Example[2]

```
1. static void foo() throws RESyntaxException \{
2. String a[] = new String [] \{ "123,400", "abc", "orange 100" \};
3. org.apache.regexp.RE pat = new org.apache.regexp.RE("[0-9,]+");
4. int sum = 0;
5. for (int \(\mathrm{i}=0 ; \mathrm{i}\) < a.length; +i )
6. if (pat.match(a[i]))
7. sum += Sample.parseNumber(pat.getParen(0));
8. System.out.println("sum = " + sum);
9. \(\}\)
10. static void goo(String [] a) throws RESyntaxException \{
11. RE exp = new RE("[0-9,]+");
12. int sum \(=0\);
13. for (int \(\mathrm{i}=0 ; \mathrm{i}\) < a.length; ++i)
14. if (exp.match(a[i]))
15. sum += parseNumber(exp.getParen(0));
16. System.out.println("sum = " + sum);
17. \(\}\)
```


## Limitations of CCFinder

- All files are converted into a long token sequence
- When the program contains millions of lines of code, the tool cannot perform efficiently
- Do not take into account the natural boundary between functions and classes


## CP-Miner[3]

- Cut the token sequences by considering basic blocks as cutting units
- Calculate a hashcode for each subsequence
- Compare hashcode sequences instead of the original token sequences


## Graph Matching

- Newer, bleeding edge
- More complex
- Type-1, Type-2, and Type-3 clones
- Syntactic and semantic understanding
- AST matching (ChangeDistiller)
- CFG matching (Jdiff[4])
- PDG matching ([5])


## CFG-based Clone Detection[4]

- A Differencing Algorithm for ObjectOriented Programs
- Match declarations of classes, fields, and methods by name
- Match content in methods by hammock graphs
- A hammock is a single entry, single exit subgraph of a CFG


## Example: Enhanced CFG comparison for $P$ and $P^{\prime}$


(a)

(b)

## Hammock Graph Creation


(a)


## Algorithm

- Input: hammock node $n, n^{\prime}$, look-ahead threshold LH
- Output: set of matched pairs $N$
- Algorithm

1. expand $n$ and $n^{\prime}$ one level to graph $G$ and $G^{\prime}$
2. Push start node pair $\left\langle s, s^{\prime}\right\rangle$ to stack ST
3. while ST is not empty
4. pop 〈c, $\left.c^{\prime}\right\rangle$ from $S T$
5. if $c$ or $c^{\prime}$ is already matched then
6. continue:
7. if $\left\langle c, c^{\prime}\right\rangle$ does not match then
8. compare $c$ with LH successors of $c^{\prime}$ or compare $c^{\prime}$ with LH successors of $c$ until find match
9. if a match is found then
10. $N=N \cup\left\{c, c^{\prime}\right.$, "unchanged" $\}$
11. else
12. $\mathrm{N}=\mathrm{N} \cup\left\{c, c^{\prime},{ }^{\prime}\right.$ "modified" $\}$
13. push the pair's sink node pair on stack

## Observations

- The look-ahead process is like bounded LCS algorithm
- It can tolerate statement insertions at the same level
- The algorithm starts from the outmost Hammock, so it is similar to top-down treedifferencing algorithm
- When statements are inserted at the higher level, the algorithm does not work well
- <c, c', "modified">


## PDG-based Clone Detection [5]

- Using Slicing to Identify Duplication in Source Code
- Step 1: Partition PDG nodes into equivalence classes based on the syntactic structure, such as while-loops
- Step 2: For each pair of matching nodes ( $r 1, r 2$ ), find two isomorphic subgraphs containing r1 and r2


## Algorithm to Find Isomorphic Subgraphs

1. Start from $r 1$ and $r 2$, use backward slicing in lock step to add predecessors iff predecessors also match
2. If two matching nodes are loops or ifstatements, forward slicing is also used to find control dependence successors (statements contained in the structure)

## Example

Fragment 1:


Fragment 2:
while (isdigit(c)) \{
if ( $p==$ token_buffer + maxtoken)
$\mathrm{p}=$ grow_token_buffer $(\mathrm{p})$; numval $=$ numval $* 20+c-{ }^{\prime} 0$;
*p++ = c;
$\mathrm{c}=\operatorname{getc}($ finput $)$;
\}
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## Observations

- Pros
- Tolerate statement reordering and some program structure changes
- Cons
- Expensive
- Points-to analysis
- Do not allow ambiguous match


## Summary

- Clone detection flexibility
- PDG > CFG|AST > Token > Tex $\dagger$
- Cost
- Text < Token < CFG|AST < PDG


## Clone Removal Refactoring

- Extract method
- Extract the common code from different methods and create a method for it
- Pull up method
- Pull up the duplicated method to the super class, and declare a new super class if there is none
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## Pull Up Method
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