
Abstract
XH: Experience and/or Heuristic
Studies reported here of <reuse> supported by <a small controlled experiment> generate a number of findings concerning <usefulness of reuse>, including <evidence that reused does indeed increase code quality and programmer productivity>. They indicate that <utility> is met by <traditional reuse practices>.

Why XH?
The authors are reporting on an experiment where a few programming teams tried out some commonly accepted reuse strategies on a small project. They conclude that reuse does indeed improve the bug rate, rework rate, and productivity of the programmers.

Question - [Generalization / characterization]
Is it true that reuse improves the quality and speed of programmers’ work?

Results - [Empirical model]
The authors do indeed claim to find statistical evidence that reuse can do all manner of wonderful things, short only of curing gunshot wounds. Specifically, they find a strong negative relationship between reuse and both defect rate and development effort, as well as a positive relationship between reuse and productivity. They conclude that it is indeed true that reuse is a very good thing.

Validation – [Experience]
The authors have a lot to say about the statistical techniques that they use, in order to assess whether the data are really saying what they appear to be saying. They also correctly assess qualitative threats to internal validity, principally the fact that they could not control the amount of reuse practiced by each team (which means that there could be an indirect flow of covariance from some independent variable through the team into the observed dependent variables). The authors also correctly realize that their experiment (involving only 8 student teams in an artificial setting) has limited generalizability, and they call for further work to continue this line of research. Overall, the study is believable, in part because of the authors’ hand-wrining about validation, and partly because it agrees with our intuitions.