

An exploratory study of bug-introducing changes: what happens when bugs are introduced in open source software?

Lukas Schulte
lukas.schulte@uni-passau.de
University of Passau
Passau, Germany

Anamaria Mojica-Hanke
ai.mojica10@uniandes.edu.co
University of Passau
Passau, Germany
Universidad de los Andes
Bogota, Colombia

Mario Linares-Vásquez
m.linaresv@uniandes.edu.co
Universidad de los Andes
Bogota, Colombia

Steffen Herbold
steffen.herbold@uni-passau.de
University of Passau
Passau, Germany

ABSTRACT

Context: Many studies consider the relation between individual aspects and bug-introduction, e.g., software testing and code review. Due to the design of the studies the results are usually only about correlations as interactions or interventions are not considered.

Objective: Within this study, we want to narrow this gap and provide a broad empirical view on aspects of software development and their relation to bug-introducing changes.

Method: We consider the bugs, the type of work when the bug was introduced, aspects of the build process, code review, software tests, and any other discussion related to the bug that we can identify. We use a qualitative approach that first describes variables of the development process and then groups the variables based on their relations. From these groups, we can induce how their (pairwise) interactions affect bug-introducing changes.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Computing methodologies** → Reasoning about belief and knowledge; *Causal reasoning and diagnostics*; • **Software and its engineering** → Software creation and management.

ACM Reference Format:

Lukas Schulte, Anamaria Mojica-Hanke, Mario Linares-Vásquez, and Steffen Herbold. 2018. An exploratory study of bug-introducing changes: what happens when bugs are introduced in open source software?. In *Proceedings of* . ACM, New York, NY, USA, 8 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

A key concern of software engineering is to ensure the quality of a software product, either by avoiding bugs during coding or

by identifying and fixing them afterwards. Within this study, we want to contribute to the knowledge required for the former, i.e., to avoid bugs. Concretely, we aim to improve our understanding of bug-introducing changes, i.e., such changes to software in which a new bug is introduced into the code due to a coding mistake.¹ Bug-introducing changes have been intensively studied, e.g., as part of the defect prediction literature that tries to predict bug-introducing changes [9]. Beyond the empirical study, the literature also provides a good framework that describes how bugs are introduced [13] as well as regarding developer viewpoints on avoiding bugs [15]. There is also knowledge about the coverage of buggy code by software tests [4], the correlation between test-driven development, code coverage, and subsequent bug fixes [2], the impact of code reviews [10], and practices used during debugging [1, 11]. However, this rather helps us to understand what developers tend to do in general to avoid or find bugs, not what happened when bugs are actually introduced.

Moreover, the prior work on what happens during bug-introduction is observational: since there are neither interventions, nor suitable control mechanisms (e.g., considering all – or at least many – other quality assurance aspects that could affect the results) the prior work is not suitable to make causal claims. For example, consider that unit tests and code review are both used together within a data set and that both correlate with less bugs. Without considering data about both, unit tests and code reviews, it would not be possible to make sound claims about either technique: one might be effective and causing the effect, both might be effective, each for a part of the effect, or they might only be effective if used together. Within this study, we plan to provide a first perspective on a joint consideration of many aspects of software development process. Thereby, we can better understand correlations between techniques and, in the long run, narrow the gap between correlational results and causal knowledge.

Our goal is two-fold. First, we will create a new kind of data set, that covers a broad range of aspects of the software development process, i.e., the involved issue tracking, code review, testing, as well as other identifiable development practices. This is in contrast to prior literature that considered specific aspects like code

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2018 Association for Computing Machinery.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

¹We follow terminology introduced by Rodríguez-Pérez *et al.* [13] and use the term bug-introducing change instead of the also often used term bug inducing change.

quality [12], tests [4], or code review [10]: the authors all used different data, which makes it hard to understand possible interactions between these practices. We will use a retrospective repository mining approach, i.e., we will analyze the public resources of the projects under study. These resources commonly include the code base itself, the issue tracker, but also often additional tools like continuous integration system, code review tools, and mailing lists. We will look into the archives of all available systems to understand the development activity that led to the bug-introducing change. Second, we will analyze this data with the goal to identify patterns - or the lack thereof - within the development practices. While the observational data we gain from this analysis is hardly suitable to claim causal relationships between any pattern and bugs, our data and analysis will be a valuable foundation to inductively derive evidence-based theories about the relation between development practices and bugs. This allows the confirmatory design of subsequent studies to establish causal reasons for bug-introduction. While such foundational research does not directly impact software development, it will help researchers, developers, and tool vendors to understand which development practices and processes could be targeted with the best hopes of avoiding bugs.

The contributions of our planned *exploratory* research are the following:

- A novel data set with diverse data about 72 bugs from two projects, where for each bug the development process that led to the bug-introducing commit is described.
- A control group of 72 commits that are randomly sampled from the same projects of commits in which we are not aware of any bug-introduction that can serve as baseline for comparisons between development practices.
- An analysis of patterns within the data set with the goal to derive hypotheses from relationships between development practices and bugs as foundation for future theory development and confirmation.

The diversity of the data collection requires a harmonized process to ensure that all relevant information is captured, as the effort for subsequent analysis due to missed factors would be large. Pre-registration of this study protocol allows us to fix this in advance, with the additional benefits of the peer-review to reduce the risk of missing important aspects, prescribing the analysis approach beforehand to reduce the likelihood of finding spurious correlations, and the management of expectations on our research (e.g., size of data, scope of analysis, types of valid conclusions).

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we give a short overview of the related work. Next, we introduce our research questions and hypotheses in Section 3. Then, we describe our research protocol, including materials, variables, execution plan, and analysis plan in Section 4. In Section 5, we describe the limitations and conclude the paper with an overview of the generated data.

2 RELATED WORK

In a recent work, Souza *et al.* [15] studied the topic of bug-introduction based on the perception of developers. In their work, they conducted a mixed-methods approach based on surveying developer

opinions about specific practices. This work is closely related to our work, in the sense that it also considered a broad perspective on bug-introducing changes that considers many aspects of software development. Overall, their study covered developer views on the impact of documentation, the complexity of changes, the role of code review and automated testing, version control aspects like merge commits and pull requests, internal quality aspects like code smells and static analysis, the type of changes being conducted, code ownership, dependencies, programming languages, and geographic distribution of teams. Our variables are inspired by this broad perspective and explicitly cover all aspects except for the geographic distribution and type of programming language. The major difference between our work and the work by Souza *et al.* is that we study a population of bugs directly, i.e., collect data about these bugs from the development history, while Souza *et al.* studied this indirectly through developer opinions. These lines of work complement each other, as we need to understand both the perception of the developers, as well as the support in the data for such perceptions.

There is also a large body of work regarding individual development practices and their relation to bug-introducing changes. For example, Tao *et al.* [17] study the role of code understanding, Ghafari *et al.* [4] and Borle *et al.* [2] of test coverage, Kononenko *et al.* [10] of code review, and Querel and Rigby [12] of static analysis tools. Such studies usually find that practices are, to some degree, negatively correlated with bug-introducing changes, i.e., that there are fewer bugs when followed.² Other work studies aspects of the code base, like the values of code metrics and internal code quality [19]. While it is certainly not unreasonable to assume that each of these practices has a positive impact on software development and bug-introducing changes, we cannot understand how the practices interact with each other by studying them individually. This is where our study deviates from the above prior work: we provide a broader view with the goal to be able to observe interactions between the different practices to also enable an understanding regarding how they are working together.

3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

The goal of our study is to contribute to finding an answer to the following research question.

RQ: Which software engineering practices are applied during the development process of bug-introducing code of open-source projects and how does this relate to non-bug-introducing changes within a project?

In comparison to past work that either focused on the effectiveness of specific practices (e.g., [4, 10]) or information from a specific source (e.g., version control systems [12]), we neither restrict the practices we consider, nor the data sources from which we collect information. Instead, we try to collect as much information about the changes as possible. Through this, we will provide a new perspective on bug-introducing changes: instead of looking at specific aspects on their own, we enable a comprehensive view of the engineering practices applied. Additionally, we will apply the same analysis to a sample of other changes to identify a baseline of

²Borle *et al.* [2] is the notable exception in this list, who found no relationship between test coverage and subsequent bug fixes for most settings.

practices used. We can then compare the practices used when bugs were induced to this baseline to possibly observe differences and understand if deviations from the process used for other commits may be correlated to bugs.

4 RESEARCH PROTOCOL

We now define the subjects, variables, execution plan, and analysis plan of our research protocol.

4.1 Subjects

The subjects of our investigation are bug-introducing changes. Since noise within automatically collected defect data is a well-known problem (see, e.g., [6, 13]), we use a manually validated data set. While there are several manually validated data sets for bugs (e.g., Defects4J [8], LLTC4J [5]), we are aware of only one data set for bug-introducing changes: the data collected by Rodríguez-Pérez *et al.* [13] about the Nova module of OpenStack and ElasticSearch (see Table 1). For both projects, Rodríguez-Pérez *et al.* collected detailed data about the introducing changes for 60 bugs, i.e., 120 bugs in total. These bugs are further divided into intrinsic bugs (introduced by changes to the source code) and extrinsic bugs (introduced by external factors, such as bugs in dependencies or requirements changes). Within our work, we focus only on intrinsic bugs, as extrinsic bugs are not the direct responsibility of the developers of a project and there is no bug-introducing change [6]. Furthermore, Rodríguez-Pérez *et al.* could not determine the bug-introducing changes for all intrinsic bugs. As a result, only a subset of 34 bugs for Nova and 38 bugs for ElasticSearch is suitable for our study, i.e., the intrinsic bugs for which the bug-introducing changes were found.

For the control group, we sample commits that are not bug-introducing. First, we identify bug-introducing commits using a standard SZZ algorithm [14], except that we ignore whitespace changes. We identify bug fixes through both keywords and links to bug issues [19]. This likely avoids false negatives at the cost of false positives [6], and allows us to restrict the sample to commits for which no (known and fixed) bugs were introduced without manual validation. For each bug in our data, we randomly select one non-bug-introducing commit from within 30 days (i.e., one month) before or after the bug. Through this, our sample will pair each bug-introducing commit with one non-bug-introducing commit from roughly the same time. If we cannot find a commit within the 61 day window (± 30 days, day of commit), we increase the window size until we find a commit and report this as part of our results. If we have multiple bug-introducing commits with overlapping time windows, we ensure that no duplicates are sampled.

As Rodríguez-Pérez *et al.* [13] explain, Nova and ElasticSearch are good and interesting subjects for a study, due to the diversity of the people involved, the number of developers and companies contributing to the projects, the long development history, and the rich information available about the history of these projects beyond the source code.

4.2 Variables

At the core of our study is our intent to capture a large amount of development process-related information about the bug-introducing

change, as well as general information about the bug itself. We will achieve this through a large set of variables, whose values will be derived from different information sources. Regardless of the information source, we have three kinds of variables. 1) Identifiers, e.g., for issues and commits that are important meta data to provide the trace links to our data sources, as well as the required support to gather additional information about these data sources in subsequent studies. 2) Automatically collected variables that either capture aspects of the development process like the number of developers involved or serve as a proxy for such aspects (e.g., the percentage of lines responsible for the bug-introduction as proxy for estimating if the bug-introduction is a small aspect of the overall change or a major part of the overall development activity). 3) Manually coded variables, where researchers analyze data regarding specific aspects to describe the development activities. The reasons for manual intervention could be because the task is too complex to automate (e.g., to codify the type of bug) or because manual inference is more efficient (e.g., to determine if there were test changes). Where viable, we support the manual coding with automatically collected data, e.g., when determining labels from an issue tracker that just requires manual classification by the researcher.

As dependent variable, we have whether a commit was bug-introducing or not. Consequently, the value of our dependent variable is determined by whether a commit is part of the sample of 72 bugs from Rodríguez-Pérez *et al.* [13] or of the control group.

Tables 2 and 3 list the independent variables of our study. For each variable, we give the identifier, the name, the scale, and the description. The tables are divided into compartments, such that each compartment contains related variables, i.e., about the fixed bug (variables F1-F8), the introducing issues (I1-I8),³ the mailing list (ML1-ML6), potential information from other media (O1-O4), the use of a continuous integration system (CI1-CI3), the build process (B1-B3), the commit that introduced the change (C1-C20), and the code review (R1-R8). For the control group, we cannot measure the variables F1-F8, C3-C6, C11, C12, C14, C16, C18, C20, C22, M5, and M6, as they are directly related to the bugs, which do not exist in our control group by definition.

In addition to the variables, we collect the raw data directly from the repositories that we use to mine the information. This ensures that our manual coding can be reproduced and facilitates that others may gather additional information for subsequent studies. In line with our above variables, we collect the following raw data:

- bug issue and discussion;
- source code of the introducing commit and fixing commit;
- introducing issues and discussions;
- code reviews and pull requests;
- build logs from the continuous integration system;
- reports regarding test results and test coverage;
- related mailing list posts; and
- related data from other media.

4.3 Execution Plan

The collection of the meta data and automatically collected variables will be enabled by the SmartSHARK platform [20, 21]. For

³Issues that were worked on when the bug was introduced.

Project	Homepage	#Bugs included
OpenStack Nova	https://www.openstack.org/software/releases/ocata/components/nova	34
Elastic Search	https://www.elastic.co/elasticsearch/	38

Table 1: Subjects of our study. Bugs included shows the number of bugs from both subjects, for which sufficient data about their introduction is available from the prior work by Rodríguez-Pérez *et al.* [13].

most of the required data, the tooling is already available. For the remaining data, the available tooling will be extended appropriately, e.g., to collect data from the Launchpad issue tracker used by Nova. The manually coded will be collected via prepared spreadsheets, such that we have two columns per variables: one for the determined value of the variable (e.g., whether bug-covering tests were added) and one for the source of this information (e.g., the concrete test cases). While we have a fixed set of possible values for some variables (e.g., none, partial, and all for bug-covering test changes), we use inductive coding [18] for the variables where we believe that an a-priori definition of all possible nominal values is not feasible or does not fit our purpose (e.g., when encoding discussion topics). The codes for the nominal variables and their descriptions will be maintained in a separate spreadsheet that serves as code book. Whenever data for a variable is not available (e.g., because there is no introducing issue or there was no code review) the values of all related variables will be set to “Not Available (NA)”.

The manual data collection is conducted by two researchers and is done in three phases: 1) initial labeling; 2) unification of the code book; and 3) resolution of disagreements. In the first phase, the two researchers collect the data for each bug by filling out the spreadsheet. The two researchers use independent code books for the inductive coding. Whenever they add a new code as value for one of the variables, they add this to their code book. We estimate that encoding for a single bug will require significant time, as different information sources (e.g., the fixing issue and code review) need to be considered and the values for 62 variables need to be determined, most of them manually. In terms of effort, we estimate an average of one to two hours per bug, meaning that each of the two researchers spends between 144 and 288 hours collecting data, i.e., about 4-8 weeks of work (assuming 40h per week).

In the second phase, the two code books are unified into one agreed-upon code book. This encompasses finding common names for the same concept (e.g., system testing and system test) as well as finding an agreed upon and consistent level of abstraction (e.g., continuous integration instead of GitHub Action and Travis CI). All changes to the code book are recorded and implemented through a mapping of the original codes to the new codes. Where possible, the mapping will be automatically applied before the discussion of disagreements. If this is not possible (e.g., because one researcher used the category test, but it was decided to use more fine-grained categories like integration test and system test instead), the entry will be marked and the mapping will be resolved during the resolution of disagreements.

In the third phase, disagreements between labels are resolved. The two researchers consider the individual labels for each bug. In case the labels agree, this will be the label in the final data set. In case of disagreements, the researchers will analyze the cause

for this (e.g., missing information) and come to a common resolution. If no solution can be achieved by the two researchers, a third researcher will be involved. The reason for a resolution is recorded. The required trace links to the sources of the labels aid the researchers with the resolution of disagreements. We will determine the interrater agreement using Cohen’s κ , as an indicator for the reliability of the data. The computation of κ is based on the harmonized codes to avoid an overestimation of the disagreement, because the same concepts were found and just recorded using diverging codes.

4.4 Analysis Plan

The goal of our analysis is to find patterns within the variables and at the same time understand if the conclusions of prior work are potentially affected adversely due to correlations between different aspects of a development process. This analysis will also be the building block for a larger theory of the impact of development practices when used together. To achieve this, we focus on relationships between the variables to understand whether the use of practices correlates with each other and possibly even if we observe differences between the bug-introducing changes and the control group. Unfortunately, this is non-trivial, because we have a large number of nominal variables. This precludes the use of, e.g., correlation heatmaps to get a simple visual overview of the relationships that could further be formalized by considering the strengths of the correlations. Given that we have some variables that are actually lists of nominals, this gets even more difficult. Further, some variables only exist for bugs, but not in the control group. To work around these challenges, we conduct a qualitative analysis of the data based on the following strategy.

We start by analyzing all pairs of variables, except for the meta data. For each of the pairs, we provide a short written description (e.g., no relationship, occurs often together). We consider their relationship in the set of bugs, the control group, and both groups together. For pairs of numeric data, we use Spearman’s ρ to measure the correlation and test for the significance of the correlation with a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. For pairs of nominal data (incl. booleans), we use cross-tabulation. We augment this with χ^2 tests for the significance. We will report if the results are significant with a threshold of $\alpha = 0.05$ for significance without any correction for repeated tests. For pairs of nominal and numeric data, we consider the distributions of the numeric data per nominal category. Since we will have at least one category with a sample size of less than or equal to 36,⁴ we do not conduct statistical tests for differences between distributions here at all. Instead, we conduct a visual comparison that accounts for the number of observations

⁴We have 72 bugs and at least two categories, thus, one of them must have a count of at most 72/2.

ID and Name	Scale	Description
F1: Bug ID	nominal	Identifier of the bug within the issue tracking system.
F2: Bug severity	nominal	Severity of the bug, e.g., major or minor.
F3: Bug labels	list of nominal	Additional labels of the bug, e.g., components or similar.
F4: #Bug discussants	integer	Number of people involved in the reporting and discussion of the bug.
F5: Aspects of the bug discussion	list of nominal	Aspects that were discussed, e.g., how to fix the bug or related features. Stored as a list as discussion may have multiple aspects.
F6: Type of bug	list of nominal	Type of bug that was introduced following the taxonomy proposed by Catolino <i>et al.</i> [3] as one of the following: configuration issue, network issue, database-related issue, GUI-related issue, performance issue, permission/deprecation issue, security issue, program anomaly issue, and test code-related issue.
I1: Introducing issue ids	list of nominal	Identifier of the issue as part of which the development happened, that introduced the bug. All related variables are lists, as there might have been parallel development on multiple issues.
I2: Introducing issue types	list of nominal	Type of the introducing issue, e.g., bug or improvement.
I3: Introducing issue severities	list of nominal	Severity of the introducing issue.
I4: Introducing issue labels	list of lists of nominal	Additional labels of the introducing issue.
I5: #Introducing issue discussants	list of integer	Number of people involved in the reporting and discussion of the issue.
I6: Aspects of introducing issue discussion	list of lists of nominal	Aspects that were discussed, e.g., discussion of solution variants. Stored as a list as a discussion may have multiple aspects.
I7: #Introducing issue commits	list of integer	Number of commits in which the introducing issue was addressed.
M1: ML bug discussion ids	nominal	Identifier of emails related to the discussion of the bug on the Mailing List (ML).
M2: #ML bug discussants	integer	Number of people involved in the discussion of the bug on the mailing list.
M3: Aspects of ML bug discussion	list of nominal	Aspects that were discussed.
M4: ML introducing change discussion ids	nominal	Identifier of emails related to the discussion of the changes (e.g., issues) that led to the introduction of the bug.
M5: #ML bug introduction discussants	integer	Number of people involved in the discussion of the bug on the mailing list.
M6: Aspects of ML bug introduction discussion	nominal	Aspects that were discussed.
O1: Identifier of related information in other media	list of nominal	Identifier of all discussions about the bug that we could locate in other media of the project.
O2: Type of other media in which bug was discussed	list of nominal	Types of other media that were used, e.g., developer blogs, forums, and chats.
O3: #Discussants in other other media	list of integer	Number of discussants involved in other media.
O4: Aspects of discussions in other media	list of list of nominals	Aspects that were discussed in other media.
CI1: CI build id	nominal	Identifier of a build in the continuous integration (CI) system.
CI2: CI build status	nominal	Status of the CI build.
CI3: CI build status change	boolean	Whether the status of the CI build is the same as for the previous commit.
B1: Build tools	list of nominal	Tooling used for building the software, e.g., Gradle or Maven. List in case multiple tools are used as part of a tool chain.
B2: Dependency resolution	nominal	How external dependencies are resolved, e.g., to imported libraries. Possible values are remote repositories (e.g., maven central), project cache (i.e., a cache of dependencies that is maintained by the project), and mixed.
B3: Build practices	list of nominal	The practices that are used as part of the build process as a list of nominal values. We pre-define a set of categories as part of this registration. This set will be inductively extended as part of the data collection, if required. The pre-defined categories are: usage of bug finding static analysis tool (e.g., SpotBugs), usage of style checking static analysis tools (e.g., Checkstyle), execution automated unit and integration tests, execution and reporting of automated system tests, execution and reporting of other automated tests (e.g., performance tests), measurement and reporting of code coverage, and generation of source code documentation

Table 2: Variables used within our study (1/2).

ID and Name	Scale	Description
C1: Introducing commit	nominal	Revision hash of the bug-introducing change.
C2: Commit type	nominal	How the commit was added to the main branch as one of the following: direct commit, merge of pull request, merge of textual diff provided, other.
C3: Number of files changes	integer	Number of files that were changed.
C4: Commit file bugginess	float	Percentage of changed files that were responsible for the bug introduction.
C5: Commit total line bugginess	float	Percentage of code lines within the commit that are bug-introducing.
C6: Commit file line bugginess	float	Percentage of lines within the files that have bug-introducing changes.
C7: Committer type	nominal	Whether the developer was a core developer, peripheral developer, or first-time committer. Categories will be defined following Joblin <i>et al.</i> [7].
C8: Multiple concerns	boolean	Whether the commit addressed multiple concerns, e.g., because multiple intends are stated in the commit messages or there are changes beyond the indent based on the the commit message.
C9: Commit type	list of nominal	Commit type according to Swanson [16] as perfective, corrective, adaptive. Encoded as a list, in case a commit tangles multiple concerns (e.g. a bug fix and a feature addition at the same time).
C10: Test changes	boolean	Whether any automated tests were added or changed.
C11: Bug-covering test changes	nominal	Whether any tests covering the bug were added or changed. None, if there are no such changes; partial, if there are changes but not all introducing lines are covered; and covered, if all introducing lines are covered.
C12: Bug-covering changes prior or subsequent commit	nominal	Same as bug-covering test changes, except that neighboring commits (parents and children) and other commits for introducing issues are considered as well.
C13: Test failures	boolean	Whether there are any test failures reported.
C14: Bug-covering test failures	boolean	Whether there are any test failures reported that cover the bug-introducing change.
C15: Documentation changes	boolean	Whether any documentation was changed.
C16: Bug affecting documentation	boolean	Whether any documentation directly related to the lines in which the bug was introduced changed, e.g., the comment of a method with bug-introducing code or in-line comments between bug-introducing code lines.
C17: Refactorings	boolean	Whether any refactorings were conducted as part of the bug-introducing change.
C18: Bug-introducing refactorings	boolean	Whether there are any refactorings within the bug-introducing code.
C19: Design changes	boolean	Whether the change includes changes to the design (or architecture) of the software, e.g., by adding new classes or packages.
C20: Bug-introducing design changes	boolean	Whether there are any design changes as part of the bug-introducing code.
C21: Change of external dependencies	boolean	Whether there are any changes to the external dependencies, e.g., updates, additions, or removal of external libraries.
C22: Bug-introducing dependency changes	boolean	Whether there are any changes to the external dependencies that affect the bug-introducing code.
R1: Code review id	list of nominal	Identifier of the review within the code review tool.
R2: Review tool	list of list of nominal	Tooling that was used to conduct the code review, e.g., Gerrit, GitHub pull request review functions, or textual comments in the issue based on code provided within a branch or textual diff. One list of nominals for each system, as we may have multiple comments in multiple locations.
R3: #Reviewers	list of integer	Number of developers that reviewed code.
R4: Reviewer type	list of list of nominal	Whether the reviewers were core developers, peripheral developers, or not involved in the project before.
R5: #Review comments	integer	Number of comments left by reviewers.
R6: Rounds of code review	integer	Rounds of subsequent code review. A new round starts when the author provides and update of the code and request reviewers to reassess the code.
R7: Caused changes	boolean	True if the code review led to changes in the code.
R8: Aspects of review comments	list of nominal	Aspects discussed as part of the code review, e.g., current bugs, style changes, efficiency, or similar.

Table 3: Variables used within our study (2/2).

per category. Lists of nominals will be expanded and each entry will be treated as an individual boolean one-hot encoded variable for this analysis. This gives us $\frac{(\#Variables-1)^2}{2}$ pair-wise comparisons (the upper triangle without a diagonal of a square matrix) and for these comparisons also the differences between the bugs and the control group. As next step, we will sort the results of the pairs into three groups:

- G1: Variables that are likely unrelated in both the bugs and the control group. For such pairs, it is unproblematic if they are considered together when studying their relation to other aspects of software development.
- G2: Variables that are likely related and the relation is the same in the bugs and in the control group. For such pairs, it should be unproblematic if they are considered together when we study the relationship to bug-introduction, because their relation should not have an effect on this, since the effect on bug-introduction should materializes as a difference between the groups.
- G3: The relationship between the variables is different for the bugs and the control group. For such pairs, there is a large risk of problems, when they are not considered together when analyzing their relationship to bug-introduction, as the pair of variables has a signal related to bug introduction, i.e., the difference in their relationship. The effect of this signal can only be understood if these variables are considered together in future studies.

Finally, we will analyze the groups to derive insights into our research question, i.e., which practices are used (directly from the data) and how they relate to each other and to bug introduction. As part of this analysis, we will also consider the amount of significant results of the χ^2 test. If we observe that we have about 5% (or less) significant results, this would be within the expectation of false positives with a threshold for significance of $\alpha = 0.05$, as the p-values are uniform under the null hypothesis. Thus, if we have a small number of significant results, this indicates that the correlations we found might be spurious.

In addition to the above analysis, we will also provide general data about the distributions of the variables both within the set of bugs and the control groups to also enable a general understanding of the data composition.

5 LIMITATIONS

We identified two limitations regarding our study. First, while we broadly cover a large set of variables using a manually validated data set as foundation, this results in a relatively small sample size of only 72 bugs and 72 not bug-introducing commits as control group. Combined with the fact that the data is observational, we cannot make any causal claims and the sample size is a big threat to the external validity of our results. Nevertheless, our results should be useful to understand the role of correlations and our broad set of variables should be able to guide future studies that can either provide more targeted and larger data sets for specific aspects or maybe even lead to design of interventions to study specific aspects. Second, our study does not involve the developers, but only considers the data produced by them. However, since there already

is prior work on developer perceptions (e.g., [15]), we believe that our work complements this perspective.

6 PUBLICATION OF GENERATED DATA

All materials we collect will be shared in a publicly available long-term archive, including all manually coded data.

7 CONCLUSION

We will conduct an exploratory study that aims to narrow the gap between understanding correlations of individual aspects of software development and bug-introduction and a more holistic perspective that considers many aspects of software development at once. Such considerations are the first step to moving from observational correlation studies towards studies that enable causal inference regarding bug introduction.

REFERENCES

- [1] Moritz Beller, Niels Spruit, Diomidis Spinellis, and Andy Zaidman. 2018. On the Dichotomy of Debugging Behavior among Programmers. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Software Engineering (Gothenburg, Sweden) (ICSE '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 572–583. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3180155.3180175>
- [2] Neil C. Borle, Meysam Feghhi, Eleni Stroulia, Russell Greiner, and Abram Hindle. 2017. Analyzing the effects of test driven development in GitHub. *Empirical Software Engineering* 23, 4 (Nov. 2017), 1931–1958. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-017-9576-3>
- [3] Gemma Catolino, Fabio Palomba, Andy Zaidman, and Filomena Ferrucci. 2019. Not all bugs are the same: Understanding, characterizing, and classifying bug types. *Journal of Systems and Software* 152 (2019), 165–181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2019.03.002>
- [4] Mohammad Ghafari, Markus Eggman, and Oscar Nierstrasz. 2019. Testability First!. In *2019 ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement (ESEM)*. 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ESEM.2019.8870170>
- [5] Steffen Herbold, Alexander Trautsch, Benjamin Ledel, Alireza Aghamohammadi, Taher A. Ghaleb, Kuljit Kaur Chahal, Tim Bossenmaier, Bhavet Nagaria, Philip Makedonski, Matin Nili Ahmadabadi, Kristof Szabados, Helge Spieker, Matej Madeja, Nathaniel Hoy, Valentia Lenarduzzi, Shangwen Wang, Gema Rodriguez-Pérez, Ricardo Colomo-Palacios, Roberto Verdecchia, Paramvir Singh, Yihao Qin, Debasish Chakraborti, Willard Davis, Vijay Walunj, Hongjun Wu, Diego Marcilio, Omar Alam, Abdullah Aldaeji, Idan Amit, Burak Turhan, Simon Eismann, Anna-Katharina Wickert, Ivano Malavolta, Matúš Sulír, Fátiméh Fard, Austin Z. Henley, Stratos Kourtzanidis, Eray Tuzun, Christoph Treude, Simin Maleki Shamasbi, Ivan Pashchenko, Marvin Wyrich, James Davis, Alexander Serebrenik, Ella Albrecht, Ethem Utku Aktas, Daniel Strüber, and Johannes Erbel. 2022. A fine-grained data set and analysis of tangling in bug fixing commits. *Empirical Software Engineering* 27, 6 (July 2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-021-10083-5>
- [6] Steffen Herbold, Alexander Trautsch, Fabian Trautsch, and Benjamin Ledel. 2022. Problems with SZZ and Features: An empirical study of the state of practice of defect prediction data collection. *Empirical Software Engineering* 27, 2 (2022), 1–49.
- [7] Mitchell Joblin, Sven Apel, Claus Hunsen, and Wolfgang Mauerer. 2017. Classifying developers into core and peripheral: An empirical study on count and network metrics. In *2017 IEEE/ACM 39th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 164–174.
- [8] René Just, Darioush Jalali, and Michael D. Ernst. 2014. 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 (San Jose, CA, USA) (ISSTA 2014)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 437–440. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2610384.2628055>
- [9] Yasutaka Kamei, Emad Shihab, Bram Adams, Ahmed E Hassan, Audris Mockus, Anand Sinha, and Naoyasu Ubayashi. 2012. A large-scale empirical study of just-in-time quality assurance. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 39, 6 (2012), 757–773.
- [10] Olexii Kononenko, Olga Baysal, Latifa Guerrouj, Yaxin Cao, and Michael W. Godfrey. 2015. Investigating code review quality: Do people and participation matter?. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME)*. 111–120. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSM.2015.7332457>
- [11] Michael Perscheid, Benjamin Siegmund, Marcel Taumel, and Robert Hirschfeld. 2016. Studying the advancement in debugging practice of professional

- software developers. *Software Quality Journal* 25, 1 (Jan. 2016), 83–110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11219-015-9294-2>
- [12] Louis-Philippe Querel and Peter C. Rigby. 2021. Warning-Introducing Commits vs Bug-Introducing Commits: A tool, statistical models, and a preliminary user study. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 29th International Conference on Program Comprehension (ICPC)*. 433–443. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICPC52881.2021.00051>
- [13] Gema Rodríguez-Pérez, Gregorio Robles, Alexander Serebrenik, Andy Zaidman, Daniel M. Germán, and Jesus M. Gonzalez-Barahona. 2020. How bugs are born: a model to identify how bugs are introduced in software components. *Empirical Software Engineering* (04 Feb 2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-019-09781-y>
- [14] Jacek Śliwerski, Thomas Zimmermann, and Andreas Zeller. 2005. When Do Changes Induce Fixes?. In *Proceedings of the 2005 International Workshop on Mining Software Repositories* (St. Louis, Missouri) (*MSR '05*). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1082983.1083147>
- [15] Jairo Souza, Rodrigo Lima, Balduino Fonseca, Bruno Cartaxo, Márcio Ribeiro, Gustavo Pinto, Rohit Gheyi, and Alessandro Garcia. 2022. Developers' viewpoints to avoid bug-introducing changes. *Information and Software Technology* 143 (2022), 106766. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2021.106766>
- [16] E. Burton Swanson. 1976. The Dimensions of Maintenance. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Software Engineering* (San Francisco, California, USA) (*ICSE '76*). IEEE Computer Society Press, Washington, DC, USA, 492–497.
- [17] Yida Tao, Yingnong Dang, Tao Xie, Dongmei Zhang, and Sunghun Kim. 2012. How Do Software Engineers Understand Code Changes? An Exploratory Study in Industry. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGSOFT 20th International Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering* (Cary, North Carolina) (*FSE '12*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 51, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2393596.2393656>
- [18] David R. Thomas. 2006. A General Inductive Approach for Analyzing Qualitative Evaluation Data. *American Journal of Evaluation* 27, 2 (2006), 237–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214005283748>
- [19] Alexander Trautsch, Steffen Herbold, and Jens Grabowski. 2020. Static source code metrics and static analysis warnings for fine-grained just-in-time defect prediction. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME)*. 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSME46990.2020.00022>
- [20] Alexander Trautsch, Fabian Trautsch, Steffen Herbold, Benjamin Ledel, and Jens Grabowski. 2020. The smartshark ecosystem for software repository mining. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings*. 25–28.
- [21] Fabian Trautsch, Steffen Herbold, Philip Makedonski, and Jens Grabowski. 2018. Addressing problems with replicability and validity of repository mining studies through a smart data platform. *Empirical Software Engineering* 23, 2 (2018), 1036–1083.