

Moldable Development Patterns

OSCAR NIERSTRASZ, feenk gmbh, Switzerland

TUDOR GÎRBA, feenk gmbh, Switzerland

Moldable development supports decision-making by making software systems *explainable*. This is done by making it cheap to add numerous custom tools to your software, turning it into a live, explorable domain model. Based on several years of experience of applying moldable development to both open-source and industrial systems, we have identified several mutually supporting patterns to explain how moldable development works in practice. This paper targets (i) readers curious to learn about moldable development, (ii) current users of the *Glamorous Toolkit* moldable IDE wanting to learn best practices, and (iii) developers interested in applying moldable development using other platforms and technology.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Software development, software modeling and analysis, software testing, explainable systems.

1 INTRODUCTION: MOLDABLE DEVELOPMENT IN A NUTSHELL

Software systems are rich sources of knowledge for both developers and non-technical stakeholders. But it can be difficult to extract that knowledge. The usual artifacts to evaluate software systems are (i) the source code, and (ii) the running system. But neither of these lends itself well to answering questions about the system. In addition there may exist documentation and other related artifacts, but these are typically incomplete, or out-of-sync with the actual system. Software analysis tools can help to some extent, but since every system and every problem is different, *it is rare for generic analysis tools to be effective for arbitrary systems*.

When we think of software development, we typically think about the active part. Of constructing. Of building new worlds that never existed. It's an empowering view. Yet, developers spend most of their time figuring systems out [22]. They do that because they want to learn enough about the system to make a decision. This is the single largest development expense we have. So, we should optimize software engineering for decision making.

Moldable development is an approach to constructing software systems that are *explainable*, that is to say, systems that can answer questions about themselves. This is achieved by making it inexpensive to create dozens, hundreds or even thousands of custom tools to answers questions about a software system *as these questions arise*. These custom tools consist of small extensions to the *moldable* tools of the integrated development environment (IDE), such as the object inspector, the code editor, the debugger and the notebook.

Every part of a software system deals with a particular *domain*, whether this be the *business domain* of the overall application, or a more *technical domain* of the underlying application. The net effect of moldable development is to *expose* the underlying models of these diverse domains (*i.e.*, the “domain models”) so that they become explainable, and support decision making.

Glamorous Toolkit (GT) [9] is an example of a *moldable development environment* in which the development tools are continuously molded to make the software under development explainable. The examples we use to illustrate moldable development in this paper are all drawn from GT.¹

¹GT is open source, and runs on Mac, Linux and Windows. You can download GT from <https://gtoolkit.com>. There you will find alternative descriptions of these patterns in the “Glamorous Toolkit Book”, a live notebook containing the examples shown here.

As a simple example, consider the inspector views of a Ludo game implementation in Figure 1. With a conventional implementation, we can either try to play the game interactively, or we can stare at the source code. We can also run the tests, but if these are all green, they do not help us to understand the system. By applying moldable development, we turn questions we have about the game into custom views.

The figure shows three connected custom inspector views of a running game in GT. In the leftmost pane we see the game GUI as the Board view. We can also interact programmatically with the game, evaluating “self autoPlay: 1000” in a contextual playground (a kind of interactive shell) below the view. In the second pane we can explore the moves of the completed game, and in the third pane we can explore individual moves. The Move view visualizes the actual move performed in the context of the current game state at that point in time. Each of these views is achieved with just a few lines of code, and leads to the Ludo game becoming an explainable system that can be explored in ways that are far richer and more intuitive than by trying to read source code.




Fig. 1. Custom views of a Ludo game.

In a nutshell, moldable development is a way to make systems explainable by making the *inside* of a software system visible and explorable through custom tools. Of course, this begs the question how to actually apply moldable development in practice. In our experience applying moldable development to many industrial and open source systems, we have encountered a number of repeating patterns, which we document below.

2 MOLDABLE DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS

Moldable development can be understood in terms of a collection of mutually supporting patterns, in other words, a *pattern language*, summarized in Figure 2. These patterns have emerged over several years of experience in developing GT following moldable development, and applying it to numerous projects.

The diagram illustrates some of the ways in which the patterns support each other: the arrows indicate that one pattern “uses” or “leads to” another. The patterns that are concerned with *Tooling* are tagged with “(T)”, with *Modeling* “(M)”, and with the development *Process* “(P)”.




Fig. 2. A map of moldable development patterns.

There are two distinct roles involved in moldable development: (i) the *Facilitator* is responsible for the technical realization of custom tools, and (ii) the *Stakeholder* is responsible for the domain model and questions about the domain that should be answered by the custom tools. In a purely technical domain, these two roles can often be played by the same person (*i.e.*, a developer), but in general they may be distinct people.

At the top of the map we have “Explainable System,” which is not a pattern per se, but rather the goal of moldable development. An explainable system is a software system whose domain models have been exposed with the help of numerous custom tools [17].

Some domains require a preliminary phase of *Tooling Buildup*, for example, to create dedicated parsers for programming languages, DSLs or specialized data formats, or bridges to other execution platforms. Each custom tool can be seen as an extension of an existing *Moldable Tool*, which can be inexpensively customized. A *Project Diary* is a notebook that serves as a starting point for development tasks and recording explanations. An explanation generally takes the form of a *Composed Narrative*, a story built up with the help of live objects. A *Blind Spot* is a problematic part of the target system that is hard to understand and work with, and may be a promising starting point for moldable development to initially engage Stakeholders. A *Throwaway Analysis Tool* can be a quick way to solve an urgent problem in a focused way.

At the center of the diagram we see *Moldable Object*, which is also the most central pattern in terms of methodology. Moldable development itself starts with a moldable object, a live instance of a domain entity that is explored and molded with custom tools that package the results of exploration tasks. An interesting instance can be encapsulated as an *Example Object*, essentially a unit test that returns a tested object. An example can be embedded in a project diary notebook page, and can also be used as a moldable object itself for further development tasks. In case the domain includes already existing data entities, each of these can be wrapped in a *Moldable Data Wrapper* to produce a moldable object.

A moldable object can be explored with the help of its *Contextual Playground*, a live programming environment bound to the state of a live instance. Working code can be extracted from such a playground to create custom tools. The most common of these tools are: (i) a *Custom View*, a dedicated view of an object within a moldable tool such as an object inspector or a code browser, to display or visualize domain-specific information, (ii) a *Custom Action* that encapsulates a useful domain action, and (iii) a *Custom Search*, to perform an ad hoc query over objects reachable from a given moldable object. A custom view is frequently a *Simple View* that can be quickly prototyped, and later extended. A custom search often benefits from a *Moldable Collection Wrapper*, to allow the results of a query to be also molded with custom tools.

How to read the patterns. The patterns below are listed in three sections, starting with *Tooling Patterns*, and proceeding through *Modeling Patterns* and *Process Patterns*. This order reflects the diagram in *Figure 2*, and provides a complete picture of all the patterns. The hasty reader might prefer to start directly with *Moldable Object* at center of the diagram, and from there follow the arrows to the other patterns, the most fundamental being *Example Object*, *Contextual Playground*, and *Custom View*. This will provide a quick introduction to the most central and essential of the moldable development patterns.

3 TOOLING PATTERNS

We start by presenting the patterns that enable the cheap creation of custom tools.

Moldable Tool

Context. You are developing a software system, and find that the existing development tools fall short in supporting domain-specific questions about the software.

Problem. How can you cheaply and effectively extend the development environment with custom tools that address questions about your application domain?

Forces.

- Generic software tools are fine for answering generic questions, but they do not work well when addressing domain-specific questions.
- A plugin architecture can open up an IDE to new tools, but plugins can be complex and expensive to implement, and they often do not compose nicely with existing tools or with each other.

Solution. Make the development tools moldable to the dynamic context of the artifacts they are intended to work with [3], by associating custom behavior to the artifacts themselves.

Examples. A moldable tool makes its core functionality configurable by means of lightweight mechanisms. For example, a Test Runner in a modern IDE recognizes the presence of test cases by means of various programming conventions, *i.e.*, a test case is a method with a standard annotation, or it's a method whose name starts with "test" and belongs to a class that inherits from a TestCase class or implements a Test interface.

By the same token an inspector can be made moldable by recognizing that an object it is inspecting has one or more custom views defined as annotated methods. For example, in *Figure 3* we see that inspecting an instance of a GtLudoRecordingGame yields a custom Moves view listing the moves played thus far, as the inspector detects a `gtMovesFor:` method defined in the object with a `<gtView>` pragma (*i.e.*, annotation).²

²All the examples are written in Pharo Smalltalk, the platform upon which GT is built. See <https://pharo.org>

The precise mechanism used to mold a tool is not as important as is the fact that the customizations should be cheap, *i.e.*, few lines of code, and *dynamic*, *i.e.*, detected at run time.




Fig. 3. Defining a custom view in a just a few lines of code.

Other examples include: (i) a moldable code browser offering alternative views of packages, classes or methods to show dependencies, tests, or other more domain-specific features, such as custom visualizations, (ii) a moldable debugger to adapt the stepping behavior for diverse domains such as event-driven applications or parsing rules, or (iii) a moldable notebook, supporting domain-specific snippets or annotations.

Consequences. A moldable tool requires no up-front configuration, since it will be dynamically molded by the artifacts it encounters.

Conversely, since custom tools are an intrinsic part of software systems rather than the IDE, molding happens when needed.

Some tooling effort is required to open up the existing IDE tools to make them moldable, *i.e.*, dynamically customizable.

Known Uses. Unit testing tools such as JUnit [2] rely either on inheritance or annotations to automatically detect which methods in a package are tests, and adapt the IDE to enable test runners, however the tool adaptation is fixed, and cannot be further customized without writing a new plugin. The JetBrains IDE allows you to customize the views of objects within a debugging session, though the custom views are specified in the configuration of the tool itself, not in the context of the object.³ The Glamorous Toolkit includes several moldable tools. The Moldable Inspector [4] installs custom views, actions (*i.e.*, buttons), and search interfaces whenever an object is inspected that defines such custom tools as annotated methods. The Moldable Coder [20] (*i.e.*, code editor) also can add custom views, highlighters, actions and searches when editing the source of a class with annotated methods. The Moldable Debugger [5] provides custom views, actions and searches installed as methods in the class of a caught exception.

Related patterns. A Moldable Tool reacts to a *Moldable Object*, which triggers custom tools such as *Custom View*, *Custom Search* or *Custom Action*. A Moldable Tool should provide a *Contextual*

³<https://www.jetbrains.com/help/idea/customizing-views.html#renderers>

Playground to enable a live programming interface to the entities it works with (*i.e.*, objects, classes, exceptions).

Contextual Playground

Context. You are using a *Moldable Tool*, and you are ready to start exploring your software system.

Problem. Where do you start exploring?

Forces.

- An editor for coding new methods typically provides no facilities for testing the code.
- When we code new behavior as methods, we must repeatedly change our context to incrementally develop the logic.
- Testing the code requires a separate setup.
- Setting up code to prototype and test logic can be cumbersome.
- Writing tests first for parts of the logic of a complex method can be overkill.

Solution. Use a contextual playground of the tool to programmatically explore the entities of interest, and prototype new behavior.

Steps. A contextual playground provides a live programming interface to programmatically interact with the software entity managed by a *Moldable Tool*. The playground will be bound to the context of the object, so self and all slots (*i.e.*, instance variables) can be accessed exactly as they would in a running method.

Use the contextual playground to write code snippets to extract data, test hypotheses, navigate to parts or other related objects, to explore the API, or to prototype new behavior. Evaluating the code will typically open a new instance of another moldable tool on the result returned by the code, with a new contextual playground. Code snippets that turn out to be useful or interesting can then be copy-pasted to existing methods, or extracted to new methods using an *Extract method* refactoring [10]. The same process can be used whether the extracted code consists of accessors, assertions, examples, or new behavior.

Examples. In [Figure 4](#) we see an inspector view of an instance of a Python *MovieCollection* class. In the leftmost pane we see a notebook page with live code snippets, which function as contextual playgrounds within the context of the notebook page. From there we navigate to a moldable object inspector, a moldable tool for exploring live instances. In this case we are exploring a live Python instance of a *MovieCollection* object, with several custom views showing the *Directors*, *Years* and *Movies* of the collection. At the bottom of the inspector we see a contextual playground bound to the context of the Python object.

In this contextual playground, we experiment with Python code to perform a query over the collection and navigate to a particular *Movie* instance. Note that self in the code snippet is bound to the context of the *MovieCollection* instance. Once we have identified some useful code, we can extract it as a new method of the object. Similarly, if we identify an interesting instance, we can use the code to define an *Example Object*.

Evaluating this snippet opens another Python object inspector on the resulting *Movie*, seen in the third pane. The third pane also has a contextual playground, which can be opened by dragging up the handle at the bottom of the pane.

Consequences. By prototyping new behavior in a contextual playground, you obtain immediate feedback for experimental code.

You may need to evaluate multiple snippets in multiple playgrounds to get to interesting information.




Fig. 4. Exploring Python objects within a contextual playground (bottom of middle pane).

Known Uses. A REPL (Read-eval-print loop) or language shell is essentially a contextual playground for a programming language or an operating system.

The JavaScript console of a modern web browser also functions as a contextual playground: while inspecting a live web page, you can explore and programmatically interact with the live objects in the run-time environment of the page.

The moldable tools within GT all provide contextual playgrounds: notebook pages, object inspectors, code editors, and the debugger, in particular.

Related patterns. Use a *Project Diary* to start live coding. You can use a contextual playground to prototype custom tools (see *Custom View*, *Custom Action* and *Custom Search*) for a *Moldable Object* within a moldable inspector. A snippet within a contextual playground that yields an interesting object can be extracted as an *Example Object*. A contextual playground for an *Example Object* can also be used to explore and prototype assertions for that example.

Custom View

Context. You are exploring a live domain model and find some interesting information.

Problem. How do you make it easy to find interesting information?

Forces.

- To obtain an interesting view of data, you are generally forced to activate a dedicated tool.
- Navigating to the data you want to reach may entail a sequence of operations, either clicking in views, or evaluating code snippets, to reach the answer you seek.
- The sequence of steps may be cumbersome to follow repeatedly.
- The default view you obtain may not highlight the interesting bits of information.

Solution. Turn interesting data into a custom view. Extract the navigation steps into a new custom view for the moldable object you start navigating from.

Examples. As an example, consider the views of a partially played Ludo game in Figure 5. We would like to understand which moves have been played up to now. In the leftmost pane we are exploring a “raw view” — a generic view of the state of the object. With this view we can navigate to the individual moves and explore them, but it is a clumsy way to explore the object. In the second pane we see a custom Moves view that lists the moves in order, with columns showing each roll of the




Fig. 5. A raw view and two custom views.

die, the player who rolled the die, and any token that may have moved. From this custom view we can then dive directly into the `Move` object, which in turn has a custom view visualizing the change in state.

Consequences. A custom view exposes information about a domain that can otherwise be hard to find.

Custom views become an intrinsic part of a software system, thus turning it into an *explainable system*.

By augmenting an object with a custom view, you can navigate directly to interesting information about that object, without having to fire up a separate tool.

You first need a *Moldable Tool* into which you can dynamically plug custom views.

Known Uses. Clerk [13] is an open-source programming assistant for the Clojure language, which offers moldable, custom views within notebook pages. Custom views are pervasive in GT. In a standard image from August 2024, there exist over 1800 classes with a total of over 3600 view methods, averaging under 12 lines of code. It is also worthwhile to note that if we take inheritance into account, then the views affect 12000 classes. The treemap from Figure 6 offers an overview of the GT classes organized in packages. A class appears colored with blue if it or its superclass defines a custom view, and in green if it defines an example method (see *Example Object*).

Related patterns. A custom view is closely related to a given *Moldable Object*. Interconnected objects with custom views can form a *Composed Narrative*. A *Moldable Tool* is a prerequisite for a custom view to be automatically installed when the relevant artifact (an object, a class, an exception, etc.) is seen by the tool. A *Custom View* should be cheap to implement. Start with a *Simple View*, and only elaborate it when it is needed.




Fig. 6. A treemap of all classes in GT grouped in packages, highlighting in blue those that define at least a Custom View.

Custom Search

Context. You have a complex domain model consisting of various kinds of entities related to each other.

Problem. How can you effectively navigate between domain entities by name, content or other criteria?

Forces.

- It can be hard to anticipate which domain entities you will need to navigate to.
- Designing a good query interface can be a difficult task.

Solution. Add a custom search for every kind of domain entity you want to navigate to.

Steps. Simply search by substring against various attributes of the domain objects. Add a separate search for each attribute type or domain object.

Examples. In Figure 7 we see custom searches for people and addresses within an address book. As with other custom tools, one way to implement a custom search is as a method of the domain object from which the search is initiated, with a dedicated annotation. In GT, custom searches are annotated with `<gtSearch>`, and triggered within multiple moldable tools, such as the inspector, the code editor, and also the notebook.

Consequences. You need a *Moldable Tool* into which you can dynamically plug custom searches. The same search interface can accommodate multiple custom searches to query different attributes of multiple domain entities.

Known Uses. A form of custom searches are supported by the JetBrains IDE⁴ to support configurable help services. Within GT, each knowledge base of notebook pages supports custom searches by title or contents. Within the moldable inspector, any object can define multiple custom searches over related collections of objects, for example, a movie database could search for matching titles, directors, or countries of origin.

⁴https://www.jetbrains.com/help/writerside/custom-search-service.html#request_format




Fig. 7. Custom substring searches.

Related patterns. You need a *Moldable Tool* to automatically plug in a custom search. In order for the result of a search to also be a *Moldable Object*, you should consider wrapping it as a *Moldable Collection Wrapper*.

Custom Action

Context. You are developing an explorable domain model of your application and find yourself repeatedly evaluating the same code snippets to perform a certain action or navigate to another object.

Problem. How can you streamline execution of repeated actions?

Forces.

- Repeated tasks are annoying, time-consuming, and error-prone.
- Remembering how to perform common tasks increases cognitive overload.
- Storing code to perform common actions as methods or as snippets in class comments doesn't guarantee that the code will be easily found when you need it.

Solution. Add a custom action button to the moldable tool for the object involved in a repeated task, encapsulating the boilerplate code to perform it.

Steps. Be sure to pick an evocative button icon and tooltip text to make the intent of the button clear. Only add buttons for the most important actions to avoid cluttering the interface of a moldable tool.

Examples. As an example, consider the inspector view in Figure 8 of a notebook page in the GT Book [11], the live documentation system of GT. Common actions are to navigate to the notebook database, to view the file in which the state of the notebook page is stored, or to export an HTML version of the page. Each of these actions can easily be packaged as an inspector button, so that the action can be performed with a single click, opening a new inspector view of the result. In the example we navigate to the database holding all related notebook pages for the given project.




Fig. 8. Custom actions for Lepiter pages.

Consequences. Custom actions appear as buttons in moldable tools only in the context of the objects to which they can be applied.

You need a *Moldable Tool* into which you can dynamically plug custom actions.

Known Uses. In the GT image of August, 2024, there are over 200 classes that define a total of over 300 actions, ranging from checking HTTP links within web pages to pushing commits to a remote repository.

Related patterns. A *Custom Action* can also be used to spawn a particular *Custom View* of the same object or a related one.

Composed Narrative

Context. You want to explain a particular aspect of a software system. It could be an explanation of how to use the system, or a problem or bug that needs to be resolved.

Problem. How can you explain an issue with a software system in an intuitive way that is easy for a reader to follow?

Forces.

- Pure textual narratives can be hard to follow and visualize.
- A picture is worth a thousand words.
- An individual screenshot without context can be misleading.

Solution. Create a narrative composed of views of various objects or tools, where each view leads to the next by performing a particular action or step. Share the narrative as a static screenshot, record it as a video, or perform it live with an audience.

Steps. Choose a starting point within a given tool, such as a notebook page, an inspector view of an object, a debugger window, or a source code editor on a class or package. Navigate to a new state by performing a step, such as clicking on an element of a view, performing a custom action, initiating a custom search, evaluating a code snippet in a contextual playground, or any other GUI action. String together these states and steps into a narrative. Capture the narrative as a screenshot or a video, or a live, scripted GUI entity, and share it. Be sure to capture the entire view of each tool or object to provide the necessary context. If necessary, edit or decorate the narrative to highlight certain aspects or steps performed.

Examples. In [Figure 9](#) we see a composed narrative answering the question of how to locate the implementation of a shortcut of an editor. The narrative starts with a visual scene for which we see the rendering tree (similar to an HTML DOM). A paragraph object from the editor is selected and reveals its list of shortcuts. A shortcut object presents its defining source code and concludes the answer.




Fig. 9. An composed narrative showing how to explore the shortcuts available in an editor.

Most of the figures in this paper are illustrations of Composed Narrative. For example, [Figure 3](#) shows how a given Custom View is implemented in a few lines of code. [Figure 5](#) shows how a raw view differs from a Custom View. [Figure 12](#) illustrates how examples can be composed to create new examples.

Consequences. A Composed Narrative tells a story of how one can get to an interesting state. You may need to carefully adjust the individual views to highlight what is interesting. Composed Narratives consisting of more than three views may be unwieldy when shared as static screenshots.

Known Uses. Narrative art works,⁵ from the Bronze Age through to modern graphic novels, tell stories by juxtaposing images. Montage Theory, dating from the early days of cinema [8], creates narratives in film by creatively juxtaposing individual shots.

Related patterns. The first view of a composed narrative is often a *Project Diary* notebook page, or a *Custom View* of an *Example Object*. The steps performed may be a *Custom Action*, a *Custom Search* or evaluating a snippet in a *Contextual Playground*. A scripted Composed Narrative can itself be turned into an *Example Object*.

4 MODELING PATTERNS

Next we present the patterns related specifically to modeling domain entities in a way that facilitates querying and exploration of an explainable system.

⁵https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Narrative_art

Moldable Object

Context. You are ready to start the process of creating an explainable system, either from scratch, or based on some existing software or data, to answer specific questions you have.

Problem. *Where do you start coding an explainable system?*

Forces.

- As a programmer, you want to quickly get feedback about the code you are writing.
- When you write code in a conventional code editor, you are several steps away from seeing the consequences of your coding.
- To write unit tests, you must already know what behavior you want to test and what the results should be.

Solution. *Start coding by inspecting a live instance of the class you are coding, not in a conventional source code editor.*

Steps. Incrementally pose domain-specific questions, find the answers by exploring and interacting with the object, and then turn the way you reach those answers into custom tools, behaviors and tests.

Examples. Moldable development is about making systems explainable with the help of custom tools, which means that you need to start the process by asking questions that you want to answer. In most cases you can't immediately start building the custom tools, but rather you need to explore the domain objects to understand how to answer the question. Once you know how to get the answer, you can turn the exploration steps into a custom tool. Starting with a live object means that you can immediately start the exploration process. Turning the exploration of an object into a custom tool is the process of molding it, hence we call it a "moldable object."

In [Figure 10](#) we see an Inspector on an instance of a `GtLudoRecordingGame` with a *Contextual Playground* where we can write experimental code that we later extract as methods. In this case we are prototyping the *autoplay* feature. In the second pane we see the *History* view of the object, showing the details of all the moves of the game.

With the moldable object at hand, we can ask questions like *What is the current state of the Ludo game?*, or *What happened in the last few moves that we autoplaid?* As we answer questions we can create small custom tools, such as a *Custom View* or a *Custom Action*. The model of the history emerged from the need to answer questions about the evolution of an instance of the game, while the history view was created as a *Custom View* to enable exploration of a game's history. Whenever we identify an interesting state of our moldable object, we can extract it as an *Example Object* that we can use as a test case, or as a starting point for further moldable development.

A moldable object can encapsulate entities at different levels of abstractions. When viewed with a *Custom View* and connected with other moldable objects we can form various kinds of *Composed Narrative*. For example, in [Figure 11](#) we see three related objects. On the left we see a `CircularMemoryLogger` object that shows multiple signals logged for an asynchronous execution. In the middle we have an instance of `BrTextStyleAsyncStylingStarted`. The signal contains the stack and presents it in a *Custom View*. Selecting an item in the stack shows the related `Context` object that displays a view with the `Source`. Essentially, we have obtained a postmortem debugger connected to a logger. There are many such combinations possible.

Consequences. Instead of writing code in a text editor in the context of the source code of a class, you are always working in the context of a live object, whose behavior can be immediately explored.




Fig. 10. A moldable Ludo game instance.




Fig. 11. Three interconnected moldable objects playing the role of a logger linked to a debugger.

Instead of writing hypothetical code that you must afterward test, you start by prototyping code, and then extracting new behavior.

Instead of trying to program custom tools in a vacuum, you first explore and prototype answers to questions, and then extract the code you need to create a custom tool.

Known Uses. The core idea of a Moldable Object is to incrementally mold a live object to obtain immediate feedback into code changes. Interactive, or “live” programming has a long history [18]. One could argue that any live programming task starts with a “moldable object”, however the key

difference is the focus on molding objects to create an explainable system consisting of custom tools, rather than just live programming in general.

Related patterns. You can obtain a moldable object in various ways.

- *You already have a class:* create a *Project Diary* notebook page containing a code snippet to create an instance of the class, and start from there.
- *You don't have a class:* within a *Project Diary* page, start instead with a code snippet that instantiates an empty class, and then prototype the behavior.
- *You have a test case:* turn the test case into an *Example Object* and start from there.
- *You have some data (in memory, in a file, in a database, in the cloud ...):* wrap the data as a *Moldable Data Wrapper*.

Example Object

Context. You want to explore questions about domain objects that are in particular execution states.

Problem. How do you create an object in a particular state to start a moldable development task?

Forces.

- Concrete examples are needed for many purposes, such as documentation, testing, and exploration.
- Examples can be complex to set up.
- Unit tests consume examples, but they are only accessible if a test fails.

Solution. Wrap examples as (instance) methods that optionally evaluate some tests (assertions), and return the example instance.

Steps. Each example may also use one or more existing examples as the initial setup to arrive at the new execution state. To start, you need a modified unit testing framework in which tests return the exercised fixture, namely, an example.

Examples. In GT, you create an example by defining a parameterless method that has a `<gtExample>` pragma and returns an object. Here is a simple example method that creates a fresh instance of the `gtLudoGame` class, asserts a few basic facts (*i.e.*, that the game is not yet over, no one has won yet, and so on). It resembles a classical unit test in all respects except one: it returns the instance of the unit under test, *i.e.*, the game instance.

```
GtLudoGameExamples>>#emptyGame
<gtExample>
| game |
game := self gameClass new.
self assert: game isOver not.
self assert: game winner equals: 'No one'.
self assert: game currentPlayer name equals: 'A'.
self assert: game playerToRoll.
self assert: game playerToMove not.
↑ game "return the game instance"
```

Unlike normal test methods, examples are designed to be *composed*. In [Figure 12](#) we see a second example, `playerARolls6`, that starts from the `emptyGame` example, rolls a 6, asserts a few facts, and returns the modified game instance.




Fig. 12. Composing examples.

Examples such as these can be embedded into notebook pages and used as moldable objects for further development tasks, or as documentation, as seen in Figure 13.

Consequences. Examples can be run just like classical unit tests.

When an example fails, its dependent examples do not need to be run.

When an example succeeds, it can be inspected, used as a moldable object to start coding, or embedded as a live example snippet within a notebook page to illustrate some point.

When you are searching for usages of an API, not only do you find examples that illustrate the usage, but by running the example you obtain a live instance that you can explore.

Known Uses. Subtext [7] supports *example-centric programming* by placing live examples at the focus of the development process. JExample [14] is a Java-based testing framework in which tests return examples.

Related patterns. An example can be used as a *Moldable Object* to start a new exploration activity. Examples can also be embedded within a *Project Diary* notebook page to illustrate a particular documentation point.

Moldable Data Wrapper

Context. You are working in a domain with existing data that you want to turn into an explainable system.

Problem. How do you develop custom tools for existing data?

Forces.

- When we explore data, we represent them using suitable low-level data structures.
- Data structures (lists, dictionaries) reflect the representation of data, not their interpretation.
- To analyze and explore data, we need higher-level views that reflect our understanding of the data.

Solution. Wrap each kind of data using a dedicated class reflecting the problem domain entity.

Steps. As you explore the data, introduce custom tools (views etc.) to the domain class that reflect answers to questions you ask about the data.

Examples. First extract the data of interest. This might be data sitting in your file system (for example, a CSV file), or data retrieved from a website. For example, here we retrieve a Dictionary representation of JSON data about the feenk GitHub organization:




Fig. 13. Documenting the Ludo game with live example objects.

```
url := 'https://api.github.com/orgs/feenkcom'.
json := ZnClient new get: url.
dictionary := STON fromString: json.
```

The dictionary representation, however, is not well-suited for exploring the GitHub organization domain. If we explore the resulting object (see Figure 14) we just see the keys and values of the raw downloaded data. From this view, of course we can explore the data by navigating the Dictionary views, or by programmatically exploring other paths, but we cannot add or tailor views to specifically support the GitHub Organization domain.

We address these problems by wrapping the raw data as a dedicated GhOrganization object, as follows:

```
GhOrganization new rawData: dictionary.
```




Fig. 14. Raw (not moldable) GitHub data.

Now we can add custom views specific to this domain, for example, listing the repositories of an organization, or the most recent GitHub events. For each new domain concept, we introduce a dedicated wrapper object, so we can navigate the entire model via the domain concepts. We see the result after some moldable development steps in Figure 15.




Fig. 15. Wrapped (moldable) GitHub data.

Consequences. By wrapping the raw domain data, you obtain a moldable object that can be customized to form part of an explainable system.

Each time you navigate to other data representing further domain entities, wrap them as well, to build an explorable domain model.

In case custom tools of the underlying data objects are useful, you can always recycle them and make them available to the wrapped objects as well.

Known Uses. Lifeware⁶ uses Moldable Data Wrappers extensively to wrap SQL data in the insurance domain to be able to create custom views for these data. Within GT (August, 2024) there are over 40 classes that wrap a rawData slot and provide custom views. These classes wrap diverse data

⁶<https://www.lifeware.ch>

ranging from Jupyter notebooks to social media records. EGAD [21] is a research prototype to explore GitHub actions by wrapping the raw data obtained from GitHub as moldable objects.

Related patterns. A *Moldable Collection Wrapper* serves a similar purpose, but solves a different problem, which is to allow the results of queries to be moldable.

Moldable Collection Wrapper

Context. Within your application domain, you not only have to deal with individual domain objects, but also composite entities (e.g., a book of notebook pages, a website of web pages), and collections of entities (e.g., the result of query).

Problem. How can you effectively provide custom tools for various kinds of collections of domain entities?

Forces.

- Collections are generic data structures with generic views that are not necessarily informative for your domain.
- Collections of domain entities may occur in various forms and contexts, such as the state of a composite object, or the result of a query.
- Providing custom views for each of these can be tedious and lead to much duplicated code.

Solution. Wrap a collection of domain objects in a dedicated collection wrapper, and give it dedicated views, actions and searches.

Steps. In case there are multiple composite entities or collections that should share the same custom tools, factor these out into a common abstract superclass or trait [6].

Examples. In Figure 16 we see that when we navigate to the Pages of a website, we obtain not a raw collection, but a `WebPageGroup` wrapping the collection, and providing custom tools, such as a map of reachable and unreachable pages. Similarly, a query for pages matching a particular string will also return a wrapped group with dedicated tools.




Fig. 16. A moldable collection wrapper for web pages.

Furthermore, if the wrapped collection or composite object should also behave like a collection, use a trait to forward collection API requests to the underlying collection. In this example, `WebPageGroup` uses the trait `TGtGroupWithItems` that forwards all collection requests to the items slot of the wrapper that holds the raw collection.

Consequences. Composite domain objects and collections of domain objects can be molded to support custom tools. Query results can be similarly molded.

Wrapped collections can be made plug-compatible with raw collections.

Known Uses. Lifeware⁷ uses Moldable Collection Wrappers to wrap SQL query results so the query results can be molded. There are about two dozen usages with GT, wrapping collections of notebook pages, web pages, logging events, and various other kinds of domain entities.

Related patterns. Whenever you develop a *Custom Search* that returns a collection, consider wrapping it as a Moldable Collection Wrapper.

5 PROCESS PATTERNS

We conclude with the process patterns that provide guidance in organizing and steering moldable development tasks.

Project Diary

Context. You are working on a software project and need to track your progress.

Problem. How can you keep track of decisions, experiments and progress in a moldable development project?

Forces.

- It’s boring to write documentation after the fact.
- Documentation is not part of the running system, so it distracts you from coding.
- Tools for tracking your progress are separate from the code base, so they are commonly out of sync with reality.

Solution. Use a live notebook as the starting point for all tasks.

Steps. Create a dedicated notebook page for each project, or even each project task, to summarize the goals, and provide pointers to related material. Use the notebook to keep a diary of your progress. As the project matures, use the notebook as a draft for the documentation.

Examples. In [Figure 17](#) we see a live Lepiter page in the GT Book documenting the task of adding some list views to the Ludo game. This page started as a Project Diary page, and was later rewritten as documentation.

If needed, add code snippets for any setup tasks (e.g., cloning repositories or loading databases). Also add code snippets to the notebook pages to serve as moldable objects to start coding from. Extract interesting code snippets as example objects to document interesting use cases, or to serve as tests.

As the project grows, organize the notebook into a main page with an overview, and separate notebook pages for different tasks or groups of related tasks.

Consider using notebook tags to organize your pages implicitly. For example, use a dedicated project tag for all the project pages, and additional tags to indicate their status (“todo”, “completed”, “urgent” etc.). For example, the “DRAFT” tag is used to track pages of the GT Book that require further editing.

At the end of a project, consider recycling and rewriting the project pages to create documentation. In this way the diary can serve as a rough draft.

⁷<https://www.lifeware.ch>




Fig. 17. Documenting your progress in a live notebook.

Consequences. A live notebook is an integral part of the project, and evolves together with other software artifacts.

Notebook pages can express tasks in various stages of completion, so can be used as starting points for further development tasks.

Notebooks can serve not only to track progress, but also as documentation for both technical and non-technical stakeholders.

Known Uses. A Zettelkasten⁸ [16] is a traditional form of note-taking, where notes are cross-indexed in card files using various metadata, to be used as a knowledge base for research and writing. Jupyter⁹ notebooks are commonly used as both activity logs and as project documentation. Personal knowledge management systems like RoamResearch¹⁰ are regularly used for diaries for software projects.

Related patterns. A Project Diary page can embed numerous live *Example Object* instances to document specific points.

⁸<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zettelkasten>

⁹<https://docs.jupyter.org/>

¹⁰<https://roamresearch.com>

Tooling Buildup

Context. You want to start moldable development but lack the basic infrastructure to start exploring the domain. You may be missing a parser for a data format or a DSL, a language bridge to an execution platform, or implementations of key analysis algorithms.

Problem. How do you start moldable development if you are missing core infrastructure?

Forces.

- When you are building on top of an existing project, you may be missing key tools to allow you to start exploring the domain.
- You might not know where to find existing implementations to directly use, or to port or adapt to your development platform.
- You might lack the expertise to build the tools yourself.

Solution. To start a moldable development activity, first obtain the basic tools you need to start exploring.

Examples. In this phase you *do not focus* on specific domain questions you want to explore, but rather on acquiring the tools you need to start exploring: (i) building a parser for YAML configuration files so that you can extract useful data from them and apply the *Moldable Data Wrapper* pattern, (ii) building an island parser [15] to extract interesting bits of information from source files in software languages for which a full parser may not be readily available, (iii) building a bridge to a foreign execution platform, such as for Python, AWS, or a database system, so that you can observe and interact with run-time entities in the target platform, or (iv) implementing graph-traversal algorithms to detect dependencies, deadlocks *etc.*

Consequences. Tooling Buildup will slow you down.

Once you have the right tools in place, you can move fast.

Known Uses. Tooling Buildup is arguably a common pattern within just about any kind of project. We mention it explicitly here to emphasize the point that moldable development does not necessarily work out-of-the-box, but may require some up-front investment.

Related patterns. A *Moldable Tool* is part of the moldable development environment, whereas Tooling Buildup is about the additional, specific tools you need before you can start moldable development.

Blind Spot

Context. You are starting to work with an existing team and code base, and you need to engage the key stakeholders.

Problem. How do you pick the first moldable development task to focus on?

Forces.

- The stakeholders are already heavily committed to their current development tasks, and have little time to spare for you.
- They are almost certainly skeptical that moldable development will make them more productive. You need to demonstrate early success to get the customer to commit long-term to further collaboration.
- It can be difficult to pick a task that is both feasible in a short amount of time, and also brings value to the stakeholders.

Solution. Find the parts of the system that are creating problems for the stakeholders and make them explainable.

Steps. The “blind spots” are the aspects that are difficult to understand, to monitor, or to debug. Pick one of these blind spots as a target. The task should be feasible in reasonable time (*i.e.*, hours or days, but not weeks or months) but non-trivial. There should be a clear value for the stakeholder, that is, do something that the stakeholder has difficulty with.

Examples. Some typical examples are (i) exposing hidden dependencies between features, (ii) visualizing performance costs of test runs on a cluster, or (iii) providing views to gain insights into scheduling deadlocks.

Consequences. Since the stakeholder has little time to spare to guide you, you may have to work in the dark at times. Be sure to always have something to show when you come back with questions. By quickly developing a solution to an ongoing problem, you will engage the stakeholder. It does not matter if the custom tools you develop do not perfectly match the stakeholder’s needs, as the only goal is to convince the stakeholders to commit to closer and longer-term collaboration.

Known Uses. Finding and understanding legacy feature toggles in the Open edX Proposals project is a public example of a Blind Spot tackled with GT during a hackathon [12].

Related patterns. A Blind Spot will manifest itself as one or more instances of a *Moldable Object*.

Simple View

Context. You have found some useful domain information to expose and have decided to implement a *Custom View*.

Problem. How should you design a custom view to effectively communicate the information of interest?

Forces.

- There are many different ways to design a view.
- It is hard to anticipate what information another Stakeholder would be interested in seeing.
- You can spend an arbitrary amount of time and effort implementing a rich, interactive visualization as a view.

Solution. Always start with the simplest kind of view that you can implement quickly to convey just the information you are interested in for your current task.

Steps. Enhance the simple view, or replace it by a richer view only when there is a clear need to do so.

This pattern follows exactly the same reasoning as the *Goal/Question/Metric* (GQM) approach [1] for designing software metrics. A view, like a metric, only exists because it helps you to answer a question that supports you in achieving some goal. Views or metrics that do not support a specific goal or answer a concrete question have no reason to exist. It follows, then, that a view should be designed to answer a specific question you have in a development task. The simplest design that achieves this is the one you want. If new goals and questions arise, you will then either design new views, or extend or replace the existing views by richer ones.

Examples. GT supports a wide range of different kinds of views, ranging from simple textual lists and trees, to arbitrary visualizations. However, the most widely used view in the default environment is the forward view, which allows an object to reuse a view of a component or a collaborator. We can see this in [Figure 18](#), where a webpage object leverages the existing `gtContentsFor:` view of the underlying file to display the file’s contents. This is also the simplest view to implement, since it only requires, at a minimum, the specification of the target object (`self webpageFile`) and the view method to reuse (`#gtContentsFor:`).




Fig. 18. A webpage contents view forwarding to its file's contents view.

The next most popular view is a `columnedList`, which presents a collection of data in a format resembling a spreadsheet with column headers. The Moves view in the middle pane of Figure 5 is an example. A common flow is to start with a forward view to an existing `columnedList` view of another object, then replace it by a custom `columnedList` when a need is identified to rename, replace or add columns.

NB: A *raw view* (leftmost pane of Figure 5) is *not* a simple view. Although it is “simple” in the sense that it requires no effort to implement, it does not succeed in focusing your attention to the information of interest. With a raw view, it is almost always necessary to navigate through the view to find what you want. Although the Raw view and the Moves view are showing us the same information in Figure 5, only the (simple) Moves view highlights this information in a clear and accessible way.

Similarly, the Board view of the Ludo game (leftmost pane of Figure 1) is *not* a simple view, as it requires some effort to build up the interactive GUI view of the board. On the other hand, once we have such a view, it can be reused and repurposed, as we can see in the Move view of the Ludo Move object in the same figure.

Other kinds of simple views exist to display plain text, simple lists without columns, and trees of hierarchical data.

Consequences. A simple view requires little effort to implement and can be quickly deployed and tested.

Simple views are easy to understand and extend or replace.

Known Uses. Notebooks like Jupyter make it easy to generate simple views as interactive visualizations.¹¹ Within GT there exist nearly 1000 forward views that simply reuse an existing view of another object. Over 800 views are simple `columnedList` views, in contrast to just under 500 explicit views that explicitly construct more complex graphical views.

Related patterns. When you introduce a *Custom View*, you want to start with a Simple View.

¹¹<https://jupyterbook.org/en/stable/interactive/interactive.html>

Throwaway Analysis Tool

Context. You are assessing a problem such as a bug, a performance problem, or a security issue, and you are facing a problem that is very difficult to understand.

Problem. How can you advance the assessment effectively?

Forces.

- The goal of an assessment is to find answers as quickly as possible.
- Custom tools help make analyses faster, while generic, “reusable” tools can make it more difficult to find the answers you need.
- Throwaway tools aren’t.

Solution. Build a dedicated, throwaway tool just for your problem.

Steps. Use a *Contextual Playground* to prototype a visualization or to explore the result of a quick query.

The focus should be on finding an answer. Reusability should only later become a concern. Some tools can indeed become reusable as a *Custom View*, *Custom Search*, or *Custom Action*, but that should not be the driving force. When you start with reusability in mind, you tend to favor generic tools. However, assessment benefits from *contextual tools*. Focusing on the context first speeds up the overall effort. To make this economically feasible, the cost of the tool should be amortized on the first use. You can make this possible through a *Moldable Tool*.




Fig. 19. A throwaway analysis to find candidate examples.

Examples. A throwaway analysis tool should be cheap to implement. In Figure 19 we see an *ad hoc* query to find Lepiter *Project Diary* pages that match the string “Ludo” and also contain *Example Object* snippets, to illustrate the use of example objects in documentation.

Throwaway analysis tools may appear to be wasteful: they cost development effort that you do not get to reuse. However, the goal is to optimize the overall development speed. The alternative to custom tools is manual exploration. Building a tool, even for just one usage, can outcompete manual exploration by a large margin. That budget difference can more than make up for the cost of the tool development.

Consequences. By making it cheap to build analysis tools, tool-building becomes an essential part of the development process, rather than a side activity, just as writing tests has become an integral development activity rather than an add-on.

Known Uses. There are numerous examples of *ad hoc* analyses implemented as Throwing Tools in the GT book, for example the page on *Optimizing the links in the book for first time readers* shows a script (Figure 20) to generate a visualization of the pages in the book itself that are reachable by following links contrasted with standalone pages.

Related patterns. Use a *Contextual Playground* to prototype the tools.




Fig. 20. A throwaway tool to visualize reachable and unreachable knowledge base pages.

6 CONCLUSION

The pattern language described here has been mined from several years of experience in applying moldable development to both open- and closed-source projects, using the GT moldable development platform. Moldable development makes software systems explainable by making it cheap to add custom tools that support decision making. In practice, however, this requires a paradigm shift since it leverages live programming to explore domain objects and incrementally mold them.

Although the examples given here have all been drawn from GT, we believe that they can be applied in any programming environment that offers a minimal level of support for live programming. The key to supporting moldable development is the pattern *Moldable Tool*. The tools of the environment need to be open to small, custom changes that support decision-making by answering questions about the underlying system under development. An example of another system that supports such changes is Emacs [19], though it was not designed to support moldable development as we describe it. Once the development environment has been opened up to make its core tools moldable, then moldable development can truly start.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Ralf Barkow, Ward Cunningham, Konrad Hinsens, Timo Kehrer and Edward Ocampo-Gooding for their detailed reviews of drafts of this paper. Thanks are due as well to Petr Picha, Cesare Pautasso, and Daniel Pinho for their written comments, and the EuroPLOP workshop participants for their spoken feedback.

REFERENCES

- [1] Victor R Basili, Gianluigi Caldiera, and H. Dieter Rombach. 1994. The goal question metric approach. In *Encyclopedia of software engineering*, John J. Marciniak (Ed.). John Wiley & Sons Inc., 528–532.
- [2] Kent Beck and Erich Gamma. 1998. Test Infected: Programmers Love Writing Tests. *Java Report* 3, 7 (1998), 51–56. <http://members.pingnet.ch/gamma/junit.htm>
- [3] Andrei Chiş, Tudor Gîrba, Juraj Kubelka, Oscar Nierstrasz, Stefan Reichhart, and Aliaksei Syrel. 2017. Moldable Tools for Object-Oriented Development. In *PAUSE: Present And Ulterior Software Engineering*, Bertrand Meyer Manuel Mazzara (Ed.). Springer, Cham, 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67425-4_6
- [4] Andrei Chiş, Tudor Gîrba, and Oscar Nierstrasz. 2014. The Moldable Inspector: a framework for domain-specific object inspection. In *Proceedings of International Workshop on Smalltalk Technologies (IWST 2014)* (Cambridge, England). <http://scg.unibe.ch/archive/papers/Chis14a-MoldableInspector.pdf>
- [5] Andrei Chiş, Oscar Nierstrasz, and Tudor Gîrba. 2024. Moldable Exceptions. In *Proceedings of Onward! 2024*. To appear.
- [6] Stéphane Ducasse, Oscar Nierstrasz, Nathanael Schärli, Roel Wuyts, and Andrew P. Black. 2006. Traits: A mechanism for fine-grained reuse. *TOPLAS: ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems* 28, 2 (March 2006), 331–388. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1119479.1119483>
- [7] Jonathan Edwards. 2004. Example centric programming. In *OOPSLA 04: Companion to the 19th annual ACM SIGPLAN conference on Object-oriented programming systems, languages, and applications* (Vancouver, BC, CANADA). ACM Press, 124–124. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1028664.1028713>
- [8] Sergei Eisenstein and Jay Leyda. 1949. *Film Form: Essays in Film Theory*. New York, Harcourt, Brace. https://monoskop.org/images/7/7c/Eisenstein_Sergei_Film_Form_Essays_in_Film_Theory_1977.pdf
- [9] feenk.com. 2023. *Glamorous Toolkit (version 1.0)*. <https://github.com/feenkcom/gtoolkit>
- [10] Martin Fowler, Kent Beck, John Brant, William Opdyke, and Don Roberts. 1999. *Refactoring: Improving the Design of Existing Code*. Addison Wesley.
- [11] Tudor Gîrba. 2021. Introducing Lepiter: Knowledge Management + Multi-language Notebooks + Moldable Development. <https://web.archive.org/web/20240525193125/https://lepiter.io/feenk/introducing-lepiter--knowledge-management--e2p6apqs5npq7m4xte0kkywn/>
- [12] Tudor Gîrba. 2021. Steering Agile Architecture by Example: the Feature Toggles From Open edX. Blog post. <https://web.archive.org/web/20231129023359/https://lepiter.io/feenk/steering-agile-architecture-by-example--th-e2p6aps2brbby94deek31xqxh/>
- [13] Martin Kavalár, Philippa Markovics, and Jack Rusher. 2023. Clerk: Moldable Live Programming for Clojure. In *Companion Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on the Art, Science, and Engineering of Programming* (Tokyo, Japan) (*Programming '23*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 22–31. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3594671.3594682>
- [14] Adrian Kuhn, Bart Van Rompaey, Lea Hänsenberger, Oscar Nierstrasz, Serge Demeyer, Markus Gaelli, and Koenraad Van Leemput. 2008. JExample: Exploiting Dependencies Between Tests to Improve Defect Localization. In *Extreme Programming and Agile Processes in Software Engineering, 9th International Conference, XP 2008 (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, P. Abrahamsson (Ed.). Springer, 73–82. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-68255-4_8
- [15] Jan Kurš, Mircea Lungu, and Oscar Nierstrasz. 2014. Bounded Seas: Island Parsing Without Shipwrecks. In *Software Language Engineering (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 8706)*, Benoît Combemale, David J. Pearce, Olivier Barais, and Jurgen J. Vinju (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, 62–81. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-11245-9_4
- [16] Niklas Luhmann. 1981. Kommunikation mit Zettelkästen: Ein Erfahrungsbericht. *Öffentliche Meinung und sozialer Wandel/Public Opinion and Social Change* (1981), 222–228. <https://ckrybus.com/static/papers/luhmann1981.pdf>
- [17] Oscar Nierstrasz and Tudor Gîrba. 2022. Making Systems Explainable. In *VISSOFT'22: Proceedings of the 10th IEEE Working Conference on Software Visualization*. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/VISSOFT55257.2022.00009>

- [18] Patrick Rein, Stefan Ramson, Jens Lincke, Robert Hirschfeld, and Tobias Pape. 2018. Exploratory and Live, Programming and Coding: A Literature Study Comparing Perspectives on Liveness. *The Art, Science, and Engineering of Programming* 3, 1 (July 2018). <https://doi.org/10.22152/programming-journal.org/2019/3/1>
- [19] Richard M. Stallman. 1981. EMACS the Extensible, Customizable Self-documenting Display Editor. *ACM SIGOA Newsletter* 2, 1-2 (April 1981), 147–156. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1159890.806466>
- [20] Aliaksei Syrel. 2017. Towards a live, moldable code editor. In *Companion Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on the Art, Science, and Engineering of Programming* (Brussels, Belgium) (*Programming '17*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 43, 3 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3079368.3079376>
- [21] Pablo Valenzuela-Toledo, Alexandre Bergel, Timo Kehrer, and Oscar Nierstrasz. 2023. EGAD: A moldable tool for GitHub Action analysis. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories* (Melbourne, Australia) (*MSR '23*). <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSR59073.2023.00044>
- [22] Xin Xia, Lingfeng Bao, David Lo, Zhenchang Xing, Ahmed E. Hassan, and Shanping Li. 2018. Measuring Program Comprehension: A Large-Scale Field Study with Professionals. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 44, 10 (2018), 951–976. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2017.2734091>