

# Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Background . . . . .	1
1.2. The Problem . . . . .	2
1.3. Motivation . . . . .	3
1.4. Objectives . . . . .	3
1.5. Developed Solutions . . . . .	4
1.5.1. Dependency Rules Solution . . . . .	4
1.5.2. Application Specific Rules Solution . . . . .	4
1.6. Validation . . . . .	5
1.6.1. Dependency Rules Solution Validation . . . . .	5
1.6.2. Application Specific Rules Solution Validation . . . . .	6
<b>2. State of the Art</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1. Android Studio . . . . .	7
2.1.1. Projects & Structure . . . . .	7
2.1.2. Builds & Gradle . . . . .	10
2.2. ProGuard . . . . .	12
2.2.1. How Does ProGuard Work? . . . . .	13
2.2.2. ProGuard Configuration Files . . . . .	15
2.2.3. Warning Rules . . . . .	19
2.2.4. Benefits & Usage of ProGuard . . . . .	20
2.3. Related Work . . . . .	21
<b>3. Problem</b>	<b>22</b>
3.1. Inherent Conflicts with Common Practices . . . . .	22
3.2. Warnings . . . . .	24
3.3. The User's Responsibility and Libraries . . . . .	25
3.4. Removing the Bottleneck . . . . .	25
<b>4. Solution</b>	<b>27</b>
4.1. Modeling and Studying the F-Droid Repository . . . . .	27
4.1.1. Scrapping F-Droid . . . . .	28
4.1.2. Python Meta-Model . . . . .	28
4.1.3. Results of the Study . . . . .	37
4.2. MySQL Database . . . . .	40
4.2.1. Database Tables . . . . .	41
4.2.2. DBConnect Class . . . . .	42
4.3. Dependency Rules Solution . . . . .	43

4.3.1. Data Loading . . . . .	44
4.3.2. Dependency Rules Generation . . . . .	46
4.3.3. Packaging the Solution . . . . .	51
4.4. Application Specific Rules Solution . . . . .	51
4.4.1. Resource Loading from the APK . . . . .	52
4.4.2. Java Code Called from the Native Side . . . . .	52
4.4.3. Data Classes . . . . .	53
4.4.4. Redacting Rules . . . . .	54
4.4.5. Packaging the Solution . . . . .	55
<b>5. Validation</b>	<b>56</b>
5.1. Replicating Existing Rules . . . . .	56
5.2. The Tester Class . . . . .	57
5.3. Validation Results For Dependency Rules Solution . . . . .	59
5.4. Cleaning Up The Generated Rules . . . . .	60
5.5. Effect of Generated Dependency Rules on Final APK Size . . . . .	61
5.6. Overprotective Rules . . . . .	62
5.6.1. Overprotective Rule Detection Algorithm . . . . .	63
5.6.2. Overprotective Class Reference Detection Algorithm . . . . .	64
5.6.3. Prevalence of Overprotective Rules in Generated Dependency Rules..	66
5.7. Validation Results For Application Specific Rule Solution . . . . .	66
<b>6. Conclusions</b>	<b>68</b>
6.1. Summary of Work Done . . . . .	68
6.2. Objectives & Accomplishments . . . . .	70
6.3. Relevance of the Developed Solutions . . . . .	73
6.3.1. Dependency Rules Solution . . . . .	73
6.3.2. Application Specific Rule Solution . . . . .	73
6.4. Lessons Learnt . . . . .	74
6.4.1. Learning From Reality . . . . .	74
6.4.2. Good Design is a Valuable Tool . . . . .	75
6.4.3. Work Ethic During Isolation . . . . .	75
6.5. Future Works . . . . .	76
6.5.1. Further Validation of App Specific Rules Solution . . . . .	76
6.5.2. Further Testing with Real Cases . . . . .	76
6.5.3. Growing Nurturing & Cleaning our Pool of Knowledge . . . . .	77
6.5.4. Perfecting and Expanding Conflict Detection on Source-Code . . . . .	77
6.5.5. Paring with Reflection Detectors . . . . .	77
<b>Appendix A. Complete UML Diagrams</b>	<b>81</b>
A.1. Application Class . . . . .	82
A.2. Tester Class . . . . .	83
<b>Appendix B. Code</b>	<b>84</b>
B.1. Overprotective Rule Detection Algorithm . . . . .	84
B.2. Class Reference Sub-Group Detection Algorithm . . . . .	85