

# Probing Pre-trained Language Models on Code Changes: Insights from ReDef, a High-Confidence Just-in-Time Defect Prediction Dataset

DOHA NAM, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology(KAIST), South Korea

TAEHYOUN KIM, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology(KAIST), South Korea

DUKSAN RYU, Jeonbuk National University, South Korea

JONGMOON BAIK, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology(KAIST), South Korea

Just-in-Time software defect prediction (JIT-SDP) plays a critical role in prioritizing risky code changes during code review and continuous integration. However, existing datasets often suffer from noisy labels and low precision in identifying bug-inducing commits. To address this, we present ReDef (**R**evert-based **D**efect dataset), a high-confidence benchmark of function-level modifications curated from 22 large-scale C/C++ projects. Defective cases are anchored by revert commits, while clean cases are validated through post-hoc history checks. Ambiguous instances are conservatively filtered out via a GPT-assisted triage process involving multiple votes and audits. This pipeline yields 3,164 defective and 10,268 clean modifications, offering substantially more reliable labels than prior existing resources. Beyond dataset construction, we provide the first systematic evaluation of how pre-trained language models (PLMs) reason about code modifications—specifically, which input encodings most effectively expose change information, and whether models genuinely capture edit semantics. We fine-tune CodeBERT, CodeT5+, and UniXcoder under five encoding strategies, and further probe their sensitivity through counterfactual perturbations that swap added/deleted blocks, invert diff polarity, or inject spurious markers. Our results show that compact diff-style encodings consistently outperform whole-function formats across all PLMs, with statistical tests confirming large, model-independent effects. However, under counterfactual tests, performance degrades little or not at all—revealing that what appears to be robustness in fact reflects reliance on superficial cues rather than true semantic understanding. These findings indicate that, unlike in snapshot-based tasks, current PLMs remain limited in their ability to genuinely comprehend code modifications.

CCS Concepts: • **Software and its engineering** → **Software defect analysis**; • **Computing methodologies** → *Natural language processing*.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Just-in-Time Software Defect Prediction, Pre-trained Language Models, Code Change Analysis, Software Defect Prediction

## 1 Introduction

Software defect prediction (SDP) aims to estimate whether a given piece of code is likely to contain defects so that limited engineering resources—testing, review time, and Continuous Integration (CI) capacity—can be prioritized where they matter most [37]. Unlike defect detection or localization, which seeks to identify concrete bug instances, SDP is a risk estimation problem used to triage changes and guide quality assurance activities. Effective SDP reduces downstream failures and lowers maintenance costs by surfacing risky code early enough for developers to take action within their normal workflow—for example, during code review or before a merge in CI.

Classical SDP typically models static snapshots of code or aggregates hand-crafted process metrics—such as churn, complexity, ownership, and past defects—at the file, module, or function level [53]. While such predictors can correlate with risk, they fail to capture how the code is evolving at the moment of change. Just-in-Time (JIT) SDP addresses this limitation by reasoning over code modifications at commit time, aligning closely with practical review and CI

---

Authors' Contact Information: Doha Nam, waroad@kaist.ac.kr, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology(KAIST), Daejeon, South Korea; Taehyoun Kim, tae\_hyoun@kaist.ac.kr, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology(KAIST), Daejeon, South Korea; Duktan Ryu, duksan.ryu@jbnu.ac.kr, Jeonbuk National University, Jeonju, South Korea; Jongmoon Baik, jbaik@kaist.ac.kr, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology(KAIST), Daejeon, South Korea.

processes that scrutinize the changed lines [25, 29]. However, most existing JIT-SDP datasets rely on SZZ(Śliwerski–Zimmermann–Zeller)-style linkages from bug-fixing commits back to bug-introducing commits [48]. SZZ attributes the introduction of a defect to the last modifier of the lines changed by a later fix—an assumption that is often violated by routine edits such as renaming or refactoring. This approach introduces substantial noise: it can misidentify the true introduction points, propagate commit-level label errors, and mismatch the actual defective lines, ultimately obscuring evaluation quality [17, 36]. To mitigate the noise inherent in SZZ-based labeling, we turn to a more explicit and high-confidence signal: revert commits.

Reverts are a routine part of disciplined software development. Developers may revert commits for various reasons—such as regressions, incompatibilities, performance degradations, policy or formatting violations, or simply because another change has superseded the patch [62]. A revert creates an explicit, time-stamped link to the earlier change. When the revert message cites a failure or fix, it provides strong evidence that the prior modification was defective. We therefore use revert commits as anchors to harvest high-confidence positive examples, and subsequently filter out cases unrelated to defective modifications.

With a more reliable labeling strategy in place, the next question is how modern models can be effectively leveraged. Existing JIT-SDP research has largely depended on compact engineered features with classical machine learning (ML) and, more recently, deep learning (DL) models. However, these approaches primarily capture surface-level correlations—such as churn, ownership, and developer activity—rather than the true semantics of code changes [18, 25, 26]. In other words, they estimate probabilities from shallow cues instead of reasoning about what the code actually does.

By contrast, recent code-focused pre-trained language models (PLMs) and large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated strong performance across diverse SE tasks—such as code search, summarization, repair, and vulnerability detection—precisely because they are designed to capture the meaning of code itself, not merely its statistical correlates [15, 41, 60]. This raises a natural question for JIT-SDP: if PLMs can effectively understand static code snapshots, can they also reason about code modifications, i.e., the relationship between the before and after states? Given that PLMs have consistently shown strong effectiveness for code understanding tasks, we therefore focus our study on PLMs as the primary models for systematic evaluation [49, 65, 66].

To answer this question, we first construct a high-confidence, change-centric benchmark. Next, in Stage 1, we compare alternative ways of presenting modification information to PLMs, asking which input encodings yield the most effective performance. For this, we fine-tune three widely used code PLMs—CodeBERT [12], CodeT5+ [57], and UniXcoder [15]—as backbones. However, strong results under these encodings alone do not guarantee genuine semantic reasoning, as models may still rely on superficial cues. Therefore, in Stage 2, we deliberately perturb the representation of code changes—e.g., by swapping added and deleted code blocks, inverting edit polarity, or injecting spurious markers—to test whether PLMs degrade when true semantic information is distorted. By probing how models behave under such distortions, our protocol not only measures raw accuracy but also uncovers a blind spot in current PLM research: apparent robustness may simply reflect reliance on shallow cues rather than genuine semantic reasoning about code changes.

Our key contributions are as follows:

- **High-Confidence JIT-SDP Dataset (ReDef):** We curate ReDef (**R**evert-based **D**efect dataset), a corpus of single-function changes harvested via revert anchors and refined through GPT-assisted filtering. The dataset is further validated through manual sampling to ensure benchmark reliability, and its 10K+ (3,164 defective, 10,268 clean) scale makes it well-suited for fine-tuning PLMs.

- **Encoding Strategies for PLMs:** We conduct the first systematic comparative study of five encoding strategies for representing code modifications as PLM inputs, providing clear empirical evidence of how input representations affect change-centric defect prediction.
- **Counterfactual Robustness Analysis:** We design counterfactual perturbation tests to probe whether PLMs truly reason about code changes beyond surface cues, revealing limitations of current models and offering guidance for future research.

Together, these contributions provide both a reliable benchmark and empirical insights into how PLMs handle code changes, informing future defect prediction research and practice. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews background and related work. Section 3 describes our dataset construction and PLM input strategies. Section 4 outlines the experimental setup, and Section 5 reports results. Section 6 discusses threats to validity, and Section 7 concludes.

## 2 Background and Related Work

This section reviews prior research on software defect prediction from three perspectives. Section 2.1 outlines classical *Software Defect Prediction (SDP)*, which predicts defect-prone modules from static snapshots using either hand-crafted metrics or learned representations. Section 2.2 covers *Just-in-Time software defect prediction (JIT-SDP)*, which shifts the unit of analysis to commits or patches and incorporates both engineered features and recent neural approaches. It also summarizes the limitations of existing JIT-SDP datasets, such as noise introduced by SZZ-based labeling. Finally, Section 2.3 discusses advances in applying *Pre-trained Language Models (PLMs)* across software engineering (SE) tasks, motivating their use for change-level defect prediction.

### 2.1 Software Defect Prediction (SDP)

Classical SDP focuses on artifact-level prediction from static snapshots, typically at the file, class, or module granularity. Early approaches rely on hand-crafted product metrics (e.g., size, complexity, coupling) and process/organization metrics (e.g., churn, revisions, developer ownership, past defects) [5, 21, 37]. These features are commonly fed into traditional learners such as logistic regression, random forests, and Support Vector Machines (SVMs). For example, Elish et al. showed that SVMs perform competitively on NASA datasets compared to logistic regression [10], while ensemble methods based on random forests also address class imbalance [4]. Decision tree-based models have similarly achieved strong performance [28, 54]. More recent work replaces hand-crafted metrics with learned representations, leveraging topic models [39], deep generative models [55], or transformer-based encoders [44]. Evaluation often considers effort-aware measures (e.g., recall at top-x% LOC) and cross-project transferability [5, 45, 51, 52]. Despite this progress, snapshot-based prediction cannot capture the semantics of specific changes, and file- or module-level labels blur defective regions—complicating causal interpretation and limiting actionable insights for change-level prediction.

### 2.2 Just-in-Time Software Defect Prediction (JIT-SDP) and Datasets

JIT-SDP shifts the focus from static artifacts to change-time risk estimation, scoring each commit or patch so that reviewers and CI gates can provide immediate feedback. The concept originates from Kim et al., who first classified individual changes as clean or buggy [29]. Subsequent work engineered compact commit-level features—such as churn, diffusion, prior defect density, developer experience, recency, and message cues—and applied machine learning techniques [25, 26, 47]. Later studies incorporated commit messages and patch text, while neural models began encoding diffs directly. For example, Yang et al. proposed Deeper, a Deep Belief Network (DBN)-based model that outperformed logistic regression [63], and Hoang et al. introduced DeepJIT, which integrates

commit messages and code metrics [18]. CC2Vec further embedded code changes hierarchically to capture structural and sequential information [19].

More recently, researchers have applied PLMs to JIT-SDP. Guo et al. systematically compared six transformer-based backbones (RoBERTa, CodeBERT, BART, PLBART, GPT2, and CodeGPT) and showed that PLM-based variants consistently outperform traditional baselines such as DeepJIT and CC2Vec [16]. Building on this, Abu Talib et al. demonstrated that parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) techniques such as LoRA can further boost JIT-SDP performance on ApacheJIT [1], while Lin et al. introduced CCT5—a CodeT5-initialized model pre-trained on CodeChangeNet—that achieves state-of-the-art results on code-change tasks including JIT-SDP [33]. Jiang et al. extended CodeBERT with a Replaced Message Identification objective, resulting in BiCC-BERT and JIT-BiCC, which improved F1-scores by over 10% [23]. Together, these studies highlight the promise of PLMs for JIT-SDP, yet it remains unclear whether current gains reflect genuine modeling of code-change semantics or incidental signals from existing datasets—underscoring the need for both more reliable benchmarks and systematic evaluation of model behavior.

Despite these advances, a critical limitation of existing JIT-SDP datasets lies in label reliability. Afric et al. reported that even with RoBERTa-based issue classification, file-level datasets contained on average 14.3% mislabeled instances [2]. Herbold et al. showed that SZZ-based labeling is particularly error-prone, with only about half of the commits identified as bug-inducing being correct [17]. Several variants of SZZ attempt to mitigate this noise—for example, by excluding refactoring edits that standard SZZ mistakenly flags as defect-inducing or by tracing commit chains more accurately to recover missed bug-introducing links [36, 43]. However, even with such refinements, existing datasets still fall short in reliability, underscoring the need for explicit validation of defect labels, which we address in RQ1.

### 2.3 Pre-trained Language Models (PLMs) in Other Software Engineering Tasks

Pre-trained language models (PLMs) trained on large code corpora—such as CodeBERT, GraphCodeBERT, UniXCoder, and CodeT5—have been increasingly applied to diverse SE tasks, often achieving state-of-the-art results.

In code review, Li et al. proposed CodeReviewer, a Transformer-based encoder–decoder PLM tailored for diff review, improving both comment generation and code refinement quality [32]. Similarly, Kartal et al. demonstrated that transformer-based similarity measures outperform prior baselines in automated comment recommendation [27].

In program repair, PLMs have achieved significant progress. For instance, Mashhadi and Hemmati applied CodeBERT to repair Java bugs, achieving 19–72% fix accuracy on ManySStuBs4J datasets [38]. Retrieval-augmented methods like RAP-Gen combine CodeT5 with external bug-fix retrieval, showing marked improvements over previous approaches—repairing 15 more bugs on the Defects4J benchmark [56]. Additionally, AlphaRepair uses CodeBERT in a zero-shot, infilling-style repair setup and achieves state-of-the-art results without task-specific retraining [60].

In vulnerability detection, PLMs have shown strong effectiveness across diverse settings. For example, one study fused multi-modal knowledge (structural, semantic, and syntactic features) with PLM encoders to achieve state-of-the-art function-level vulnerability detection [41]. Atiq et al. fine-tuned PLMs on the multi-language CVEFixes dataset (JavaScript, Java, Python, PHP, Go, C/C++), reporting substantial variation across languages and finding that UniXcoder outperformed other models [3]. More recently, a comprehensive benchmark demonstrated that PLMs can surpass much larger code LLMs in accuracy and F1-scores, underscoring their superior inductive bias and efficiency for vulnerability detection tasks [66].

Taken together, PLMs have shown impressive capabilities across diverse SE tasks. Importantly, many of these tasks—such as program repair and vulnerability detection—require reasoning about

the semantics of code edits or risky patterns, which parallels the demands of defect prediction. Their strong performance in such semantics-sensitive settings suggests that PLMs are particularly promising for change-aware defect prediction, motivating our systematic investigation in this paper.

### 3 Methodology

Our methodology comprises two main pillars. (A) ReDef Construction: We curate defective and clean code modifications from large-scale C/C++ projects, leveraging revert signals, post-hoc history screening, and expert audits to ensure high label reliability. (B) PLM Evaluation Protocol: We design a two-stage framework to assess how models interpret code modifications. Figure 1 summarizes the overall approach.




Fig. 1. Overall approach of ReDef construction and PLM evaluation.

#### 3.1 ReDef Construction

We curated ReDef, a high-confidence JIT-SDP corpus from 22 long-lived, high-activity C/C++ repositories. Projects were selected for sustained commit volume, explicit revert workflows, and domain diversity to reduce project-specific bias. The curation yielded 3,164 defective and 10,268 clean modifications. Figure 2 reports per-project counts.

**Defective Modification.** We extracted commits that touched exactly one file and whose modified lines were confined to a single function. This design ensures reliable causal attribution to a specific function—a choice also adopted in recent datasets such as PrimeVul [9]. From this single-function pool, we identified defective modifications by collecting revert commits whose messages (i) contained the keyword “revert” and (ii) explicitly referenced the hash of an earlier commit. Since such reverts typically indicate that the referenced commit introduced a problem, the targeted




Fig. 2. Number of defective and clean modifications per project in the ReDef corpus.

commits are highly likely to represent defective modification. For each referenced hash, we retrieved its associated commit (the target of the revert) and collected four artifacts for analysis: the reverted commit message, the `function_before` and `function_after` from that commit, and the revert commit message itself. Together these formed an evidence bundle and were submitted to GPT-4o three independent times under a fixed rubric to remove ambiguous or non-defect reverts (e.g., formatting changes, policy reversions, or hash-only messages without rationale). The rubric distinguished each revert as: (A) Failed/incomplete fix (Defective→Defective), (B) Bug introduction (Clean→Defective), or (C) Other (non-defect). Categories (A) and (B) were merged into the defective class, while (C) served as a filter to discard non-defect cases. To ensure high precision, a candidate was retained only if *all three GPT-4o votes unanimously fell in {A,B}* (e.g., A/A/A or A/B/B). Any sample with one or more (C) votes (e.g., A/A/C) was conservatively discarded.

**Clean Modification.** To assemble the clean stratum, we first identified all defective modifications and then targeted clean modification commits from a similar time period in the same repository, thereby mitigating both project-specific and period-specific bias. As with the defective side, we extracted commits that touched exactly one file and whose modified lines were confined to a single function. For each candidate commit, we inspected up to five subsequent commits that touched the same function. If any of these later messages contained problematic keywords (e.g., “revert,” “rollback,” “fix bug,” “regression”), the candidate was discarded to avoid false-clean labels—since such signals in subsequent edits suggest that the earlier commit may have introduced issues—an idea conceptually similar to SZZ methodology. Surviving candidates were further required to be modified at least once after their introduction, which excluded dead or unused code. We then formed an evidence bundle—commit message, `function_before`, and `function_after`—and queried GPT-4o three independent times under a dedicated clean-label rubric. The rubric classified each commit as: (A) Bug fix (Defective→Clean), (B) Improvement/optimization/feature change (Clean→Clean), or (C) Ambiguous/irrelevant commits. Categories (A) and (B) were retained as clean modifications, while any case with a (C) vote was filtered out. The sample was kept only when all three votes unanimously fell in {A,B} (e.g., A/A/A or A/B/B).

Table 1. Filtering outcomes for defective (revert-anchored) and clean (history-screened) candidates.

Category	Before GPT Filtering	After GPT Filtering
Defective total	6,257	<b>3,164</b>
Defective→Defective	–	1,270
Clean→Defective	–	1,795
Clean total	11,807	<b>10,268</b>
Defective→Clean	–	6,524
Clean→Clean	–	3,744

Table 1 summarizes the filtering outcomes. The defective pool was reduced from 6,257 to 3,164—about half of revert-anchored commits were discarded, mostly because the reasons for the reverts were not sufficiently specified. Among the retained cases, 1,270 were classified as Defective→Defective and 1,795 as Clean→Defective. By contrast, the clean pool was only modestly reduced (11,807 to 10,268), with 6,524 Defective→Clean and 3,744 Clean→Clean cases retained, all meeting the unanimous voting criterion. The exact GPT prompts and rubric are available in the provided artifact.

Clean selection was intentionally conservative: a function had to be revised at least once after the candidate commit, and no problematic keywords could appear in the next five commits touching that function. Unlike prior JIT corpora (e.g., SZZ-derived [26, 29]) or static snapshot datasets (e.g., Devign [67], Big-Vul [11], Defects4J [24]) that define “clean” at a snapshot or immediate post-fix state, our per-function, post-hoc history check aimed to reduce false-clean labels arising from late-emerging faults or follow-up fixes.

After assembling the labels, each repository was split time-respectively (80%/10%/10% into train/validation/test by commit timestamp) to avoid temporal leakage—training on commits occurring after the test set would otherwise expose future information. Class balance (defective/clean) was preserved within each split, and splitting was performed per repository to ensure that every project was represented across partitions, preventing cases where a project might be entirely absent from validation or test. The per-project partitions were then concatenated to form the final splits.

To characterize input length, we tokenized `function_after` using each of the PLMs employed in our experiments (CodeBERT, UniXcoder, CodeT5+). As shown in Figure 3, the cumulative distribution indicates that although the exact counts vary slightly by model, around 55–65% of functions exceed the 512-token limit, meaning the entire function cannot be fed to the model without truncation. With UniXcoder’s 1,024-token limit, roughly 70% of functions fit in full. This distribution motivates a comparison between encoding strategies that provide only the edited lines versus those that supplying the full function at the risk of truncation. Although the dataset is derived from commit history, the intended inference unit is a function-level modification, which can be evaluated pre-commit (e.g., in an Integrated Development Environment (IDE) or local CI hooks) as well as at review/merge time. To assess label reliability, two authors independently audited a stratified sample of 100 defective commits under a shared rubric and adjudicated disagreements.

### 3.2 PLM Evaluation Protocol

Our goal is to assess whether pre-trained language models (PLMs) can effectively leverage code-change information for defect prediction. To this end, we designed a two-stage evaluation. **Stage 1** compares alternative input encodings that vary in how much context and change signal are provided. **Stage 2** introduces counterfactual perturbations that deliberately distort change signals, checking whether models degrade as expected when edit semantics are disrupted. Together, these stages provide a structured protocol for evaluating whether PLMs rely on genuine semantic cues rather than superficial patterns.




Fig. 3. Cumulative distribution of function lengths (tokens) across PLM tokenizers

In **Stage 1**, we compared five alternative input encodings, each tokenized using the model’s native tokenizer before being fed into the PLM encoder.

- (1) **After-only**: The function\_after, without any explicit indication of where edits occurred. Serves as a classical SDP-style baseline.
- (2) **After+Change markers**: The function\_after, augmented with <CHG> tags on each modified line so the model can directly identify edited regions.
- (3) **Before+After**: Both pre- and post-modification functions concatenated, prefixed with markers (“[Before]: ... [After]: ...”). To balance length, half of the token budget was allocated to each side, ensuring that the after-code was not entirely truncated by a long before-code.
- (4) **Diff with tags**: Only the changed lines and their local context, with <ADD> and <DEL> tags prepended to additions and deletions respectively, following the representation of DeepJIT [18].
- (5) **Added→Deleted blocks**: Inspired by JiT-Fine [40], we supplied added lines first, then deleted lines, each under explicit headers (“[ADDED LINES]: ... [DELETED LINES]: ...”). Unlike JiT-Fine, commit messages were excluded for fairness.

The first three variants serve as heuristic baselines, representing straightforward ways of exposing code modifications to PLMs without relying on prior proposals. These five encodings let us quantify the trade-off between context and change signal under realistic token budgets and identify the most effective representation for defect prediction.

In **Stage 2**, we applied controlled perturbations to test whether models behave consistently when change signals are deliberately altered. Each perturbation targeted the representation of change information while leaving the overall code form largely intact [22, 46].

- (1) **Spurious change markers**: In the **After+Change markers** format, the number of modified lines is first computed, then the same number of <CHG> tags are randomly inserted at arbitrary locations, injecting meaningless signals during both training and testing.

- (2) **Swapped snapshots:** Under the **Before+After** format, models are trained identically, but at test time the positions of `function_before` and `function_after` are swapped with 50% probability (e.g., “[Before]: `function_after` [After]: `function_before`”).
- (3) **Reversed diff tags:** Under the **Diff with tags** format, models are trained identically, but tested with the `<ADD>` and `<DEL>` tags inverted.
- (4) **Swapped added/deleted blocks:** In the **Added→Deleted blocks** format, the two sections are randomly swapped with 50% probability, so that “[ADDED LINES]” contains deletions and “[DELETED LINES]” contains additions during both training and testing.

These counterfactual variants are designed to reduce model performance: if a PLM truly understands the relationship between code before and after—that is, the semantics of the modification—then disrupting this information should lead to a drop in performance compared to the corresponding Stage 1 results. Conversely, if performance remains largely unchanged, it suggests that the model has not learned meaningful change semantics and is instead relying on superficial cues from the overall code context.

## 4 Experimental Setup

### 4.1 Research Questions

We try to answer following research questions:

**RQ1:** *How accurate are the labels in the ReDef JIT-SDP dataset?*

**RQ2:** *Which input encodings yield the best PLM performance?*

**RQ3:** *Does PLM performance degrade under counterfactual perturbations of change representations?*

### 4.2 Models and Baselines

To evaluate how PLMs capture the semantics of code changes, we experimented with the following pre-trained models. CodeT5+ and CodeBERT were used with their default maximum input limit of 512 tokens. UniXcoder uniquely supports longer contexts, so we evaluated it under both 512- and 1,024-token limit settings to test performance under constrained and full-capacity conditions.

*Pre-trained Language Models.*

- (1) **CodeBERT.** [12] We included CodeBERT, a 125M parameter RoBERTa-based encoder pre-trained for code understanding. Despite being one of the earlier PLMs, it has consistently shown strong and robust performance in defect prediction and classification tasks, making it an essential baseline for fair comparison [8, 61].
- (2) **CodeT5+.** [57] We used the 220M encoder-only variant, as detection tasks do not require generation capabilities. CodeT5+ has achieved state-of-the-art results across a wide range of software engineering tasks [13, 42], making it a competitive and modern baseline.
- (3) **UniXcoder.** [15] We used the base-nine version (220M parameters, released in 2023), which has demonstrated strong performance across diverse SE tasks [9, 58].

In addition to these PLMs, we implemented input encodings inspired by DEEPJIT (diff with `<ADD>/<DEL>` tags) and JIT-FINE (added→deleted block format). These were not used as standalone baselines, but rather as representation strategies integrated into our Stage 1 evaluation protocol.

### 4.3 Evaluation Metrics

We evaluate model performance using five standard classification metrics: Accuracy, Precision, Recall, F1 (F1-score), and PR-AUC. Among these, F1 is adopted as the primary metric, as it balances precision and recall and is widely used for imbalanced datasets such as JIT-SDP [18, 19, 25].

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{TP + TN}{TP + TN + FP + FN} \quad (1)$$

Accuracy measures the overall proportion of correctly classified modifications, but can be misleading under severe class imbalance.

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}, \quad \text{Recall} = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \quad (2)$$

Precision quantifies the fraction of predicted defective modifications that are truly defective, while Recall measures the fraction of actual defective modifications that are successfully identified.

$$F1 = \frac{2 \cdot \text{Precision} \cdot \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}} \quad (3)$$

F1 is the harmonic mean of precision and recall, and is widely regarded as the most informative single measure in imbalanced classification settings.

$$\text{PR-AUC} = \int_0^1 \text{Precision}(r) dr \quad (4)$$

PR-AUC is the area under the Precision–Recall curve, which provides a threshold-independent view of the trade-off between precision and recall across all operating points.

#### 4.4 Implementation Details

For each PLM–encoding configuration, we fine-tuned the model ten times with different random seeds (12345–12354) and report the mean and standard deviation to reduce stochastic variance. All models were trained under consistent hyperparameters: a learning rate of 1e–5, batch size 8, and the AdamW optimizer with decoupled weight decay [35]. Gradient accumulation was applied to stabilize updates, and a linear learning-rate scheduler with a 10% warm-up ratio was used to avoid abrupt changes in the early stages. Each run lasted for 6 epochs.

The best checkpoint was selected based on validation F1 (our primary metric) and subsequently used for test reporting. To address class imbalance, we applied the standard weighting scheme, assigning the positive class a weight of  $N_{\text{neg}}/N_{\text{pos}}$  [30, 34].

All experiments were conducted on Tesla V100-PCIE-32GB GPUs in a shared academic cluster. Due to CPU bottlenecks and scheduling constraints, full GPU capacity was not always utilized. Training time was consistent across encoding strategies since only the input format varied; for reference, a single CodeBERT run at the 512-token limit required approximately 30 minutes on one GPU.

**Statistical Analysis.** For RQ2, we conducted a two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with within-subject factors *model* (4) and *encoding* (5), treating the 10 seeds as subjects. We report partial  $\eta^2$  and Cohen’s  $f$  as effect sizes [31]. Post-hoc comparisons used paired  $t$ -tests with Holm step-down correction [20] applied per family: Encoding main-effect pairs on subject-level marginal means (collapsed over models), and all encoding pairs within each model (simple effects).

For RQ3, each perturbation was paired with its corresponding original encoding and evaluated across the same 10 seeds. We tested the directional hypothesis that perturbations degrade performance using one-sided paired  $t$ -tests ( $H_1 : F1_{\text{orig}} > F1_{\text{pert}}$ ), complemented by Wilcoxon signed-rank tests [59]. We also report paired effect size as Cohen’s  $d_z$  and non-parametric percentile 95% bootstrap confidence intervals (CIs) for the mean difference  $\Delta = F1_{\text{orig}} - F1_{\text{pert}}$  using 10,000 resamples [50].  $p$ -values were adjusted for multiple comparisons using Holm’s method within each set of tests (e.g., across the five perturbations).

Table 2. Outcomes of the manual audit for 100 randomly sampled defective labels.

	Correct	Ambiguous	Wrong
Reviewer 1	94	5	1
Reviewer 2	83	14	3
Adjudicated	<b>92</b>	5	3

Following common conventions, we consider results statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Effect sizes are interpreted using standard thresholds: partial  $\eta^2 \approx 0.01$  (small), 0.06 (medium), 0.14 (large); Cohen’s  $d_z \approx 0.2$  (small), 0.5 (medium), 0.8 (large) [7].

## 5 Experimental results

**RQ1:** *How accurate are the labels in the ReDef JIT-SDP dataset?*

We manually audited 100 randomly sampled defective functions. Following recent practices in vulnerability dataset curation [6, 9], two authors independently inspected the commit evidence—reverted commit message, `function_before`, `function_after`, and `revert commit message`—and labeled each case as *Correct*, *Ambiguous*, or *Wrong*. After adjudication, 92 cases were classified as Correct, 5 as Ambiguous, and 3 as Wrong, yielding a positive-label precision of 0.92 as shown in Table 2. Compared to prior reports of 14–50% noise in SDP datasets [2, 17], our 8% mislabel rate is substantially lower.

Ambiguities initially accounted for 30% of cases, typically arising when revert messages cited only a hash without any rationale, forcing annotators to infer defect-relatedness. We revised the rubric to abstain unless defect links were explicit, which reduced ambiguous cases to 5% in the final adjudicated set. The three Wrong cases followed non-defect patterns (e.g., mistaken commit ordering, temporary mitigations, or structural refactoring).

Overall, these results suggest that our revert-anchored, history-screened pipeline yields comparatively reliable defect labels.

### Summary of RQ1

A manual audit of 100 defective functions found that 92% were correctly labeled, with only 8% identified as ambiguous or wrong. This demonstrates our revert-anchored, history-screened pipeline provides substantially more reliable labels than prior SDP datasets.

**RQ2:** *Which input encodings yield the best PLM performance?*

Table 3 summarizes the performance of all PLM–encoding combinations. Overall, **Diff w/ tags** and **Added→Deleted** consistently achieved the highest F1 across models, whereas **After+Markers** and **Before+After** performed worst. In contrast, these latter two encodings often ranked highest in terms of accuracy. This discrepancy is explained by class imbalance: ReDef contains over three times more clean (negative) than defective (positive) modifications, so encodings biased toward the majority class can appear more accurate while sacrificing F1. To compare models more rigorously beyond such raw patterns, we applied statistical tests as follows.

We conducted a two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with *model* (4 PLMs) and *encoding* (5 variants) as within-subject factors (Table 4). Results showed significant main effects of both model ( $F(3, 27) = 9.96, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.53, f = 1.05$ ) and encoding ( $F(4, 36) = 13.80, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.61, f = 1.24$ ), both indicating large effect sizes. No interaction was found ( $F(12, 108) = 0.82, p = .63$ ), suggesting that the relative ranking of encodings was consistent across PLMs. Post-hoc

Table 3. Stage 1 performance analysis of different encodings across models (mean  $\pm$  std over 10 runs).

Model	Encoding	F1	PR-AUC	Accuracy	Precision	Recall
CodeBERT	After-only	0.3731 $\pm$ 0.0191	0.3086 $\pm$ 0.0160	0.5751 $\pm$ 0.0536	0.2901 $\pm$ 0.0201	0.5401 $\pm$ 0.0999
	After+Markers	0.3524 $\pm$ 0.0238	0.3107 $\pm$ 0.0202	0.6152 $\pm$ 0.0577	0.2968 $\pm$ 0.0175	0.4489 $\pm$ 0.1046
	Before+After	0.3521 $\pm$ 0.0385	0.3161 $\pm$ 0.0101	<u>0.6161 <math>\pm</math> 0.0553</u>	0.2999 $\pm$ 0.0197	0.4536 $\pm$ 0.1236
	Diff w/ tags	0.3953 $\pm$ 0.0100	<u>0.3349 <math>\pm</math> 0.0076</u>	0.5987 $\pm$ 0.0346	0.3082 $\pm$ 0.0131	0.5571 $\pm$ 0.0602
	<b>Added<math>\rightarrow</math>Deleted</b>	<u>0.3971 <math>\pm</math> 0.0114</u>	0.3240 $\pm$ 0.0106	0.5988 $\pm$ 0.0350	<u>0.3093 <math>\pm</math> 0.0156</u>	<u>0.5609 <math>\pm</math> 0.0606</u>
CodeT5+	After-only	0.3630 $\pm$ 0.0173	<u>0.3144 <math>\pm</math> 0.0126</u>	0.6109 $\pm$ 0.0352	0.2977 $\pm$ 0.0150	0.4719 $\pm$ 0.0630
	After+Markers	0.3381 $\pm$ 0.0279	0.3032 $\pm$ 0.0123	0.6333 $\pm$ 0.0624	0.3010 $\pm$ 0.0191	0.4050 $\pm$ 0.1261
	Before+After	0.3119 $\pm$ 0.0370	0.3103 $\pm$ 0.0073	<u>0.6565 <math>\pm</math> 0.0429</u>	0.3023 $\pm$ 0.0166	0.3391 $\pm$ 0.1038
	Diff w/ tags	0.3764 $\pm$ 0.0223	0.3067 $\pm$ 0.0148	0.6073 $\pm$ 0.0332	0.3028 $\pm$ 0.0187	<u>0.5050 <math>\pm</math> 0.0733</u>
	<b>Added<math>\rightarrow</math>Deleted</b>	<u>0.3771 <math>\pm</math> 0.0196</u>	0.3128 $\pm$ 0.0095	0.6169 $\pm$ 0.0462	<u>0.3103 <math>\pm</math> 0.0174</u>	0.4965 $\pm$ 0.0948
UniXcoder-512	After-only	0.3495 $\pm$ 0.0308	0.2915 $\pm$ 0.0123	0.5879 $\pm$ 0.0642	0.2833 $\pm$ 0.0138	0.4785 $\pm$ 0.1290
	After+Markers	0.3210 $\pm$ 0.0327	0.3025 $\pm$ 0.0112	<u>0.6295 <math>\pm</math> 0.0437</u>	0.2867 $\pm$ 0.0113	0.3789 $\pm$ 0.1013
	Before+After	0.3196 $\pm$ 0.0528	0.2873 $\pm$ 0.0137	0.5823 $\pm$ 0.0913	0.2691 $\pm$ 0.0055	0.4429 $\pm$ 0.2057
	<b>Diff w/ tags</b>	<u>0.3757 <math>\pm</math> 0.0281</u>	<u>0.3197 <math>\pm</math> 0.0147</u>	0.5969 $\pm$ 0.0781	<u>0.3042 <math>\pm</math> 0.0198</u>	<u>0.5249 <math>\pm</math> 0.1552</u>
	Added $\rightarrow$ Deleted	0.3716 $\pm$ 0.0449	0.3142 $\pm$ 0.0141	0.5984 $\pm$ 0.0725	0.3019 $\pm$ 0.0176	0.5196 $\pm$ 0.1649
UniXcoder-1,024	After-only	0.3018 $\pm$ 0.0469	0.2854 $\pm$ 0.0164	0.6211 $\pm$ 0.0499	0.2722 $\pm$ 0.0112	0.3590 $\pm$ 0.1088
	After+Markers	0.2939 $\pm$ 0.0504	0.3009 $\pm$ 0.0145	<u>0.6517 <math>\pm</math> 0.0495</u>	0.2880 $\pm$ 0.0103	0.3205 $\pm$ 0.1221
	Before+After	0.3123 $\pm$ 0.0627	0.2912 $\pm$ 0.0123	0.6027 $\pm$ 0.0841	0.2757 $\pm$ 0.0143	0.4129 $\pm$ 0.2040
	<b>Diff w/ tags</b>	<u>0.3399 <math>\pm</math> 0.0556</u>	<u>0.3129 <math>\pm</math> 0.0160</u>	0.6189 $\pm$ 0.1020	<u>0.3065 <math>\pm</math> 0.0251</u>	0.4451 $\pm$ 0.2209
	Added $\rightarrow$ Deleted	0.3352 $\pm$ 0.0684	0.3024 $\pm$ 0.0163	0.6050 $\pm$ 0.0930	0.2911 $\pm$ 0.0173	<u>0.4580 <math>\pm</math> 0.2313</u>

Table 4. Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA results with effect sizes.

Effect	$F$	df_num	df_den	$p$	$\eta_p^2$	$f$
Model	9.96	3	27	< .001	0.53	1.05
Encoding	13.80	4	36	< .001	0.61	1.24
Model $\times$ Encoding	0.82	12	108	.63	0.08	0.30

pairwise tests with Holm correction revealed that **Diff w/ tags** and **Added $\rightarrow$ Deleted** significantly outperformed **After+Markers** and **Before+After** (all  $p_{\text{Holm}} < .01$ ), while performing comparably to each other. **After-only** showed intermediate performance, significantly better than some weaker encodings but worse than the top two in most cases. The pattern was consistent for CodeBERT, CodeT5+, and UniXcoder-512, whereas for UniXcoder-1,024 the differences diminished and were not statistically significant.

Across models, this advantage of change-focused encodings can be explained by two factors. First, as shown in Figure 3, only about 30–40% of functions fit within 512 tokens, so encodings that pass the entire function (**After-only**, **After+Markers**, **Before+After**) often truncate important edits. Second, supplying the entire function can also introduce excessive, mostly unchanged context that distracts the model from the actual modification. The weakness of **Before+After** illustrates both issues: two full functions must fit under the same budget, increasing truncation risk and noise. Supporting the second explanation, UniXcoder performed worse at 1,024 tokens than at 512, suggesting that longer sequences add distracting context rather than improving focus. Finally, in our setting which primarily targets code understanding, CodeBERT again emerged as the strongest PLM, in line with recent studies showing its robustness on classification and comprehension tasks [8, 61].

Table 5. Stage 2 perturbation analysis with CodeBERT (mean  $\pm$  std over 10 runs).

Percent change is relative to the corresponding original encoding.						
Model	Condition	F1	PR-AUC	Accuracy	Precision	Recall
CodeBERT	After+Markers	0.3524 $\pm$ 0.0238	0.3107 $\pm$ 0.0202	0.6152 $\pm$ 0.0577	0.2968 $\pm$ 0.0175	0.4489 $\pm$ 0.1046
	<i>Spurious CHG markers</i>	0.3532 $\pm$ 0.0291	0.3119 $\pm$ 0.0328	0.5830 $\pm$ 0.1134	0.2900 $\pm$ 0.0225	0.4943 $\pm$ 0.1853
		+0.23%				
CodeBERT	Before+After	0.3521 $\pm$ 0.0385	0.3161 $\pm$ 0.0101	0.6161 $\pm$ 0.0553	0.2999 $\pm$ 0.0197	0.4536 $\pm$ 0.1236
	<i>Swapped snapshots</i>	0.3538 $\pm$ 0.0381	0.3178 $\pm$ 0.0095	0.6164 $\pm$ 0.0556	0.3012 $\pm$ 0.0220	0.4565 $\pm$ 0.1236
		+0.48%				
CodeBERT	Diff w/ tags	0.3953 $\pm$ 0.0100	0.3349 $\pm$ 0.0076	0.5987 $\pm$ 0.0346	0.3082 $\pm$ 0.0131	0.5571 $\pm$ 0.0602
	<i>Reversed diff tags</i>	0.3919 $\pm$ 0.0112	0.3345 $\pm$ 0.0079	0.5999 $\pm$ 0.0348	0.3071 $\pm$ 0.0131	0.5476 $\pm$ 0.0628
		-0.86%				
CodeBERT	Added $\rightarrow$ Deleted	0.3971 $\pm$ 0.0114	0.3240 $\pm$ 0.0106	0.5988 $\pm$ 0.0350	0.3093 $\pm$ 0.0156	0.5609 $\pm$ 0.0606
	<i>Swapped added/deleted blocks</i>	0.3953 $\pm$ 0.0095	0.3299 $\pm$ 0.0117	0.5868 $\pm$ 0.0432	0.3042 $\pm$ 0.0148	0.5741 $\pm$ 0.0749
		-0.45%				

### Summary of RQ2

**Diff-style encodings (Diff w/ tags, Added $\rightarrow$ Deleted)** achieved the best performance by emphasizing changed lines and avoiding truncation or extraneous context. In contrast, whole-function encodings lose critical signals, with **Before+After** being most affected. **CodeBERT** showed the strongest performance overall, while UniXcoder suffered performance drops at longer token budgets due to added context noise.

**RQ3:** Does PLM performance degrade under counterfactual perturbations of change representations? As shown in Table 5, across the four perturbations—**Spurious change markers**, **Swapped snapshots**, **Reversed diff tags**, and **Swapped added/deleted blocks**—performance remained effectively unchanged. Even when before/after alignment or polarity direction was disrupted, F1 differences stayed below 1%. This stability is counterintuitive: if PLMs were truly leveraging semantic signals from code changes, such distortions should have produced clear drops in performance metrics. Instead, the negligible differences suggest that the models are not semantically sensitive to modification content, but rather exploit surface-level regularities (e.g., token distributions, positional patterns) that persist under perturbation. In other words, the robustness observed here reflects insensitivity rather than genuine understanding.

Statistical tests (paired t-tests, Wilcoxon signed-rank tests, bootstrap with Holm correction) confirmed this robustness. Only **Reversed diff tags** showed statistical significance ( $p = 0.0045$  after correction), but the absolute effect size was negligible ( $\Delta = 0.0035$ , Cohen’s  $d_z = 1.33$ ). In practice, such a tiny change does not indicate genuine semantic sensitivity. Taken together, these results reveal an important limitation: current PLMs achieve stable performance not because they robustly model code-change semantics, but because they fall back on shallow cues that remain unaffected by perturbations. This highlights a fundamental gap between snapshot-level code understanding and true modification reasoning, and points to the need for edit-aware pre-training objectives or architectures explicitly designed to capture change semantics.

### Summary of RQ3

PLM performance remained stable under all four perturbations, with F1 drops  $< 1\%$ . Even when polarity direction or before/after order was disrupted, statistical tests confirmed no practical degradation. This robustness indicates reliance on surface-level cues rather than genuine code-change semantics.

## 6 Threats to Validity

### 6.1 Internal Validity

**Choice of Input Encoding.** We evaluated five representative encodings, including formats inspired by prior JIT-SDP studies. However, given that all encodings ultimately derive from `function_before` and `function_after`, other ways of structuring or combining these views may provide richer signals of semantic change. For example, tree-structured or graph-based encodings could expose different aspects of program structure, and hybrid schemes may better capture interactions between edits and surrounding context. Exploring such alternatives remains an open avenue for future work.

**Statistical Power.** All statistical tests were based on 10 independent runs with different seeds. While this design controls stochastic variance, a larger number of repetitions could yield stronger statistical power and narrower confidence intervals. However, prior AI studies on code intelligence tasks rarely report extensive repetitions: many omit random seeds entirely or rely on a single run, and even the more rigorous works seldom exceed 10 repetitions due to the substantial computational cost of PLMs [14, 64]. Running 30 or more trials per configuration is generally infeasible in practice. Our choice of 10 runs follows this common practice while still providing a reasonable trade-off between robustness and resource constraints.

### 6.2 External Validity

**Project Selection Bias.** Our dataset was drawn from large, long-lived infrastructure projects (e.g., Linux, FFmpeg, Chromium). These may differ from smaller applications or libraries in review culture, test maturity, and revert policies. We partially mitigated this risk by including diverse domains and reporting a leave-one-project-out analysis, but broader coverage is needed. In particular, industrial or proprietary projects could exhibit markedly different defect patterns, and including such settings would provide stronger external validity.

**Cross-Language Applicability.** This study focused solely on C/C++ projects. Substantial syntactic and semantic differences across programming languages may limit the applicability of our findings. Extending evaluation to multi-language datasets is a key direction for future work. Such efforts should examine whether our observations hold consistently across different language families.

## 7 Conclusion

This work introduced ReDef, a high-confidence JIT-SDP dataset of function-level modifications with both defective and clean cases: 3,164 defective and 10,268 clean function-level modifications, with manual audits confirming 92% label precision—substantially higher than the prior JIT-SDP corpora. Our curation pipeline combines revert anchoring, longitudinal history screening, and GPT-assisted triage with multiple votes and audits to reduce label noise. Unlike conventional SZZ-based resources which infer bug-inducing commits post hoc and often lack clean counterparts, ReDef offers the community a reliable benchmark for studying change-aware models, enabling reproducible comparison and facilitating exploration of edit-sensitive learning objectives.

Using ReDef, we fine-tuned three strong PLMs—CodeBERT, CodeT5+, and UniXcoder—under five input encodings. Compact, change-focused encodings and tagged diffs achieved the best results, whereas whole-function inputs often diluted the signal and suffered from truncation under token limits. Notably, UniXcoder performed worse at a 1,024-token budget than at 512, showing that more context does not necessarily help when change information becomes obscured.

Counterfactual perturbations of change representations yielded almost no performance degradation. Even when we swapped the order of deleted and added blocks or mislabeled unchanged lines as modified, F1 remained nearly identical. If PLMs had truly internalized the semantics of edits, such distortions should have impaired performance. This outcome exposes a critical blind spot in how current PLMs are evaluated on code modifications: what appears to be robustness is, in fact, an artifact of surface-level cue reliance. Our findings caution against interpreting strong benchmark scores as evidence of genuine change understanding.

Threats to validity remain. We examined only five encoding strategies, but alternative ways of presenting `function_before` and `function_after` may provide richer semantic signals. Our dataset focuses on large C/C++ projects, leaving open questions about smaller repositories and other languages. Finally, although we repeated all experiments with ten random seeds, stronger statistical power could be obtained with more runs.

Future work should probe why PLMs lag in modification understanding compared to single-snapshot tasks such as vulnerability detection. Promising directions include pre-training objectives that explicitly expose models to edits and diffs, as well as richer change representations or architectures that make modification semantics more accessible to PLMs. Beyond PLMs, evaluating decoder-based code LLMs (e.g., CodeLlama, StarCoder) and API models (e.g., GPT-4o) under the same protocol will test whether larger generative models can close this gap.

We hope that ReDef and our evaluation protocol will serve as a foundation for the next generation of change-aware, semantics-sensitive defect prediction models.

## Data Availability

An anonymous link containing the dataset, construction scripts, and experimental code is publicly available for reproducibility: <https://figshare.com/s/4f202bc0921e26b41dc2>.

## References

- [1] Manar Abu Talib, Ali Bou Nassif, Mohammad Azzeh, Yaser Alesh, and Yaman Afadar. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning of pre-trained code models for just-in-time defect prediction. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 36(27):16911–16940, 2024.
- [2] Petar Afric, Davor Vukadin, Marin Silic, and Goran Delac. Empirical study: How issue classification influences software defect prediction. *IEEE access*, 11:11732–11748, 2023.
- [3] Syafiq Al Atiiq, Christian Gehrman, and Kevin Dahlén. Vulnerability detection in popular programming languages with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15905*, 2024.
- [4] A Balam and S Vasundra. Prediction of software fault-prone classes using ensemble random forest with adaptive synthetic sampling algorithm. *Automated Software Engineering*, 29(1):6, 2022.
- [5] Robert M Bell, Thomas J Ostrand, and Elaine J Weyuker. The limited impact of individual developer data on software defect prediction. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 18(3):478–505, 2013.
- [6] Yizheng Chen, Zhoujie Ding, Lamy Alowain, Xinyun Chen, and David Wagner. Diversevul: A new vulnerable source code dataset for deep learning based vulnerability detection. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses*, pages 654–668, 2023.
- [7] Jacob Cohen. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. routledge, 2013.
- [8] Abdelhalim Dahou, Ansgar Scherp, Sebastian Kurten, Brigitte Mathiak, and Madhu Chauhan. Semantic source code segmentation using small and large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.08992*, 2025.
- [9] Yangruibo Ding, Yanjun Fu, Omniyyah Ibrahim, Chawin Sitawarin, Xinyun Chen, Basel Alomair, David Wagner, Baishakhi Ray, and Yizheng Chen. Vulnerability detection with code language models: How far are we? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.18624*, 2024.

- [10] Karim O Elish and Mahmoud O Elish. Predicting defect-prone software modules using support vector machines. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 81(5):649–660, 2008.
- [11] Jiahao Fan, Yi Li, Shaohua Wang, and Tien N Nguyen. Ac/c++ code vulnerability dataset with code changes and cve summaries. In *Proceedings of the 17th international conference on mining software repositories*, pages 508–512, 2020.
- [12] Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Xiaocheng Feng, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Bing Qin, Ting Liu, Daxin Jiang, et al. Codebert: A pre-trained model for programming and natural languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08155*, 2020.
- [13] Shuzheng Gao, Wenxin Mao, Cuiyun Gao, Li Li, Xing Hu, Xin Xia, and Michael R Lyu. Learning in the wild: Towards leveraging unlabeled data for effectively tuning pre-trained code models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 1–13, 2024.
- [14] Anastasiia Grishina, Max Hort, and Leon Moonen. The earlybird catches the bug: On exploiting early layers of encoder models for more efficient code classification. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 895–907, 2023.
- [15] Daya Guo, Shuai Lu, Nan Duan, Yanlin Wang, Ming Zhou, and Jian Yin. Unixcoder: Unified cross-modal pre-training for code representation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.03850*, 2022.
- [16] Yuxiang Guo, Xiaopeng Gao, Zhenyu Zhang, Wing Kwong Chan, and Bo Jiang. A study on the impact of pre-trained model on just-in-time defect prediction. In *2023 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability, and Security (QRS)*, pages 105–116. IEEE, 2023.
- [17] Steffen Herbold, Alexander Trautsch, Fabian Trautsch, and Benjamin Ledel. Problems with szz and features: An empirical study of the state of practice of defect prediction data collection. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 27(2):42, 2022.
- [18] Thong Hoang, Hoa Khanh Dam, Yasutaka Kamei, David Lo, and Naoyasu Ubayashi. Deepjit: an end-to-end deep learning framework for just-in-time defect prediction. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 16th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*, pages 34–45. IEEE, 2019.
- [19] Thong Hoang, Hong Jin Kang, David Lo, and Julia Lawall. Cc2vec: Distributed representations of code changes. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd international conference on software engineering*, pages 518–529, 2020.
- [20] Sture Holm. A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian journal of statistics*, pages 65–70, 1979.
- [21] Shamsul Huda, Sultan Alyahya, Md Mohsin Ali, Shafiq Ahmad, Jemal Abawajy, Hmood Al-Dossari, and John Yearwood. A framework for software defect prediction and metric selection. *IEEE access*, 6:2844–2858, 2017.
- [22] Robin Jia and Percy Liang. Adversarial examples for evaluating reading comprehension systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.07328*, 2017.
- [23] Yuze Jiang, Beijun Shen, and Xiaodong Gu. Just-in-time software defect prediction via bi-modal change representation learning. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 219:112253, 2025.
- [24] René Just, Darioush Jalali, and Michael D Ernst. Defects4j: A database of existing faults to enable controlled testing studies for java programs. In *Proceedings of the 2014 international symposium on software testing and analysis*, pages 437–440, 2014.
- [25] Yasutaka Kamei, Emad Shihab, Bram Adams, Ahmed E Hassan, Audris Mockus, Anand Sinha, and Naoyasu Ubayashi. A large-scale empirical study of just-in-time quality assurance. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 39(6):757–773, 2012.
- [26] Yasutaka Kamei, Takafumi Fukushima, Shane McIntosh, Kazuhiro Yamashita, Naoyasu Ubayashi, and Ahmed E Hassan. Studying just-in-time defect prediction using cross-project models. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 21(5):2072–2106, 2016.
- [27] Yusuf Kartal, E Kaan Akdeniz, and Kemal Özkan. Automating modern code review processes with code similarity measurement. *Information and Software Technology*, 173:107490, 2024.
- [28] Taghi M Khoshgoftaar and Naeem Seliya. Tree-based software quality estimation models for fault prediction. In *Proceedings Eighth IEEE Symposium on Software Metrics*, pages 203–214. IEEE, 2002.
- [29] Sunghun Kim, E James Whitehead, and Yi Zhang. Classifying software changes: Clean or buggy? *IEEE Transactions on software engineering*, 34(2):181–196, 2008.
- [30] Gary King and Langche Zeng. Logistic regression in rare events data. *Political analysis*, 9(2):137–163, 2001.
- [31] Daniël Lakens. Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: a practical primer for t-tests and anovas. *Frontiers in psychology*, 4:863, 2013.
- [32] Zhiyu Li, Shuai Lu, Daya Guo, Nan Duan, Shailesh Jannu, Grant Jenks, Deep Majumder, Jared Green, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Shengyu Fu, et al. Automating code review activities by large-scale pre-training. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 1035–1047, 2022.

- [33] Bo Lin, Shangwen Wang, Zhongxin Liu, Yepang Liu, Xin Xia, and Xiaoguang Mao. Cct5: A code-change-oriented pre-trained model. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 1509–1521, 2023.
- [34] Tsung-Yi Lin, Priya Goyal, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Dollár. Focal loss for dense object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2980–2988, 2017.
- [35] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*, 2017.
- [36] Yunbo Lyu, Hong Jin Kang, Ratnadira Widyasari, Julia Lawall, and David Lo. Evaluating szz implementations: An empirical study on the linux kernel. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 50(9):2219–2239, 2024.
- [37] Ruchika Malhotra. A systematic review of machine learning techniques for software fault prediction. *Applied Soft Computing*, 27:504–518, 2015.
- [38] Ehsan Mashhadi and Hadi Hemmati. Applying codebert for automated program repair of java simple bugs. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 18th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*, pages 505–509. IEEE, 2021.
- [39] Tung Thanh Nguyen, Tien N Nguyen, and Tu Minh Phuong. Topic-based defect prediction (nier track). In *Proceedings of the 33rd international conference on software engineering*, pages 932–935, 2011.
- [40] Chao Ni, Wei Wang, Kaiwen Yang, Xin Xia, Kui Liu, and David Lo. The best of both worlds: integrating semantic features with expert features for defect prediction and localization. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 672–683, 2022.
- [41] Chao Ni, Xinrong Guo, Yan Zhu, Xiaodan Xu, and Xiaohu Yang. Function-level vulnerability detection through fusing multi-modal knowledge. In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 1911–1918. IEEE, 2023.
- [42] Changan Niu, Chuanyi Li, Vincent Ng, Dongxiao Chen, Jidong Ge, and Bin Luo. An empirical comparison of pre-trained models of source code. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 2136–2148. IEEE, 2023.
- [43] Feifei Niu, Junqian Shao, Christoph Mayr-Dorn, Liguoguo Huang, Wesley KG Assunção, Chuanyi Li, Jidong Ge, and Alexander Egyed. Refactoring  $\neq$  bug-inducing: Improving defect prediction with code change tactics analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.19714*, 2025.
- [44] Safa Omri and Carsten Sinz. Deep learning for software defect prediction: A survey. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 42nd international conference on software engineering workshops*, pages 209–214, 2020.
- [45] Thomas J Ostrand and Elaine J Weyuker. How to measure success of fault prediction models. In *Fourth international workshop on Software quality assurance: in conjunction with the 6th ESEC/FSE joint meeting*, pages 25–30, 2007.
- [46] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. Semantically equivalent adversarial rules for debugging nlp models. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (volume 1: long papers)*, pages 856–865, 2018.
- [47] Emad Shihab, Ahmed E Hassan, Bram Adams, and Zhen Ming Jiang. An industrial study on the risk of software changes. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGSOFT 20th International Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 1–11, 2012.
- [48] Jacek Śliwerski, Thomas Zimmermann, and Andreas Zeller. When do changes induce fixes? *ACM sigsoft software engineering notes*, 30(4):1–5, 2005.
- [49] Weisong Sun, Chunrong Fang, Yudu You, Yun Miao, Yi Liu, Yuekang Li, Gelei Deng, Shenghan Huang, Yuchen Chen, Qianjun Zhang, et al. Automatic code summarization via chatgpt: How far are we? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12865*, 2023.
- [50] Robert J Tibshirani and Bradley Efron. An introduction to the bootstrap. *Monographs on statistics and applied probability*, 57(1):1–436, 1993.
- [51] Ayşe Tosun, Burak Turhan, and Ayşe Bener. Practical considerations in deploying ai for defect prediction: a case study within the turkish telecommunication industry. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Predictor Models in Software Engineering*, pages 1–9, 2009.
- [52] Burak Turhan, Tim Menzies, Ayşe Bener, and Justin Di Stefano. On the relative value of cross-company and within-company data for defect prediction. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 14(5):540–578, 2009.
- [53] Romi Satria Wahono. A systematic literature review of software defect prediction. *Journal of software engineering*, 1(1):1–16, 2015.
- [54] Jun Wang, Beijun Shen, and Yuting Chen. Compressed c4. 5 models for software defect prediction. In *2012 12th International Conference on quality software*, pages 13–16. IEEE, 2012.
- [55] Song Wang, Taiyue Liu, Jaechang Nam, and Lin Tan. Deep semantic feature learning for software defect prediction. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 46(12):1267–1293, 2018.
- [56] Weishi Wang, Yue Wang, Shafiq Joty, and Steven CH Hoi. Rap-gen: Retrieval-augmented patch generation with codet5 for automatic program repair. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 146–158, 2023.

- [57] Yue Wang, Hung Le, Akhilesh Deepak Gotmare, Nghi DQ Bui, Junnan Li, and Steven CH Hoi. Codet5+: Open code large language models for code understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07922*, 2023.
- [58] Ziliang Wang, Ge Li, Jia Li, Yihong Dong, Yingfei Xiong, and Zhi Jin. Line-level semantic structure learning for code vulnerability detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.18877*, 2024.
- [59] Frank Wilcoxon. Individual comparisons by ranking methods. *Biometrics bulletin*, 1(6):80–83, 1945.
- [60] Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuxiang Wei, and Lingming Zhang. Automated program repair in the era of large pre-trained language models. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 1482–1494. IEEE, 2023.
- [61] Yan Xiao, Xinyue Zuo, Lei Xue, Kailong Wang, Jin Song Dong, and Ivan Beschastnikh. Empirical study on transformer-based techniques for software engineering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00399*, 2023.
- [62] Meng Yan, Xin Xia, David Lo, Ahmed E Hassan, and Shanping Li. Characterizing and identifying reverted commits. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 24(4):2171–2208, 2019.
- [63] Xinli Yang, David Lo, Xin Xia, Yun Zhang, and Jianling Sun. Deep learning for just-in-time defect prediction. In *2015 IEEE International conference on software quality, reliability and security*, pages 17–26. IEEE, 2015.
- [64] Tong Ye, Lingfei Wu, Tengfei Ma, Xuhong Zhang, Yangkai Du, Peiyu Liu, Shouling Ji, and Wenhai Wang. Tram: A token-level retrieval-augmented mechanism for source code summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11074*, 2023.
- [65] Ting Zhang, Ivana Clairine Irsan, Ferdian Thung, and David Lo. Revisiting sentiment analysis for software engineering in the era of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 34(3):1–30, 2025.
- [66] Ting Zhang, Chengran Yang, Yindu Su, Martin Weyssow, Hung Nguyen, Tan Bui, Hong Jin Kang, Yikun Li, Eng Lieh Ouh, Lwin Khin Shar, et al. Benchmarking large language models for multi-language software vulnerability detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.01449*, 2025.
- [67] Yaqin Zhou, Shangqing Liu, Jingkai Siow, Xiaoning Du, and Yang Liu. Devign: Effective vulnerability identification by learning comprehensive program semantics via graph neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.