

DSHGT: Dual-Supervisors Heterogeneous Graph Transformer - A pioneer study of using heterogeneous graph learning for detecting software vulnerabilities

Tiehua Zhang*
zhangtiehua.zth@antgroup.com
Ant Group
China

Rui Xu*
furui.xr@antgroup.com
Ant Group
China

Jianping Zhang
zjp353925@antgroup.com
Ant Group
China

Yuzhe Tian
yuzhe.tian@hdr.mq.edu.au
Macquarie University
Australia

Xin Chen
jinming.cx@antgroup.com
Ant Group
China

Xiaowei Huang
wei.huangxw@antfin.com
Ant Group
China

Jun Yin
jun.yinj@antgroup.com
Ant Group
China

Xi Zheng
james.zheng@mq.edu.au
Macquarie University
Australia

ABSTRACT

Vulnerability detection is a critical problem in software security and attracts growing attention both from academia and industry. Traditionally, software security is safeguarded by designated rule-based detectors that heavily rely on empirical expertise, requiring tremendous effort from software experts to generate rule repositories for large code corpus. Recent advances in deep learning, especially Graph Neural Networks (GNN), have uncovered the feasibility of automatic detection of a wide range of software vulnerabilities. However, prior learning-based works only break programs down into a sequence of word tokens for extracting contextual features of codes, or apply GNN largely on homogeneous graph representation (e.g., AST) without discerning complex types of underlying program entities (e.g., methods, variables). In this work, we are one of the first to explore heterogeneous graph representation in the form of Code Property Graph and adapt a well-known heterogeneous graph network with a dual-supervisor structure for the corresponding graph learning task. Using the prototype built, we have conducted extensive experiments on both synthetic datasets and real-world projects. Compared with the state-of-the-art baselines, the results demonstrate promising effectiveness in this research direction in terms of vulnerability detection performance (average F1 improvements over 10% in real-world projects) and transferability from C/C++ to other programming languages (average F1 improvements over 11%).

CCS CONCEPTS

- **Security and privacy** → **Software and application security**;
- **Software and its engineering** → *Software notations and tools*.

KEYWORDS

vulnerability detection, heterogeneous graph learning, code property graph (CPG)

1 INTRODUCTION

Software vulnerabilities are considered a major threat to system robustness and operability. The number of vulnerabilities reported and registered has been increasing significantly over the last decade owing to the growth of software practitioners and complex code-bases [24]. As a result, numerous methods and techniques have been developed to identify software vulnerabilities especially at the early stage of development.

Many vulnerability detection tools have also been developed by big tech companies such as Meta (Getafix [2]), and Google (Tricorder [28]). The underlying techniques can be broadly divided into two categories. Rule-based methods [2, 10, 17, 28, 30] take a set of expert-written rules to capture undesired code behaviours. Learning-based methods [5, 6, 29], on the other hand, intend to learn the underlying latent semantic and syntactic information and use the abnormal code corpus as the training samples. It has been shown in these studies (e.g. [4], [25] and [32]) that the learning-based methods excel in detecting common code vulnerabilities or bugs than that of expert-crafted rules, especially with the recent advancements in deep learning techniques.

Many deep learning-based approaches model the source codes by capturing the shallow, contextual code token structures, which mainly use the recurrent neural network (RNN) and its variant language models [12]. These models are designed to split the code base and its abstract syntax tree into the sequence format, and thus ill-suited for encompassing the well-structured control dependency and data flows of programs. The use of graph neural networks (GNN) has recently emerged for solving code understanding tasks, owing to its potential to generalize both semantic and syntactic information. For instance, a gated GNN is first used in [1] to represent the syntactic and semantic structure of a program snippet, which tends to solve the variable misuse and renaming problems rather than detecting general code vulnerabilities. Following that, a line of research started to explore the feasibility of using GNN to detect bugs in the programs.

While it is tempting to unleash the power of GNNs to accomplish vulnerability detection tasks, encoding the code logic into a reasonable graph structure is non-trivial. Many works only expedite single relationships such as syntax hierarchy, data flow, and control dependency without concerning the heterogeneous attributes in the generated code graph, losing the generality of complex nodes and relation types in the graph [4, 32, 36]. The GNN models trained in this case are proven to perform undesirably in different tasks. Apart from that, another drawback of most GNN works is that the trained program model is constrained to only one type of programming language, thus failing to verify how transferable the model is in other programming languages. Also, the auxiliary information such as method-level annotations in the program often provides an extra dimension of code features which is rarely explored and could be helpful for improving the expressiveness of the model.

In this paper, we conduct a pioneer study to explore whether using heterogeneous graph as the code representation and adapting a promising graph neural network for the representation learning can improve the performance of detecting software vulnerabilities especially across different language platforms and targeting real-world software projects. For this purpose, we implement a novel heterogeneous graph learning-based framework, namely *DSHGT*. *DSHGT* uses and adapts a Heterogeneous Graph Transformer (HGT) [13], reporting a state-of-the-art performance on modelling the heterogeneous graph. *DSHGT* also uses Code Property Graph (CPG) to represent software programs, which was first proposed in [34] as the static vulnerability detection tool. CPG merges elements of abstract syntax trees, control flow graphs and program dependence graphs into a joint graph structure. The rich intra-program relations and logical syntactic flows in the CPG serve itself an ideal candidate for the heterogeneous graph representation in our study. Using *DSHGT* for the intended heterogeneous graph learning, edge-driven weight matrices (e.g., for relationships) and node-driven attentions (e.g., for entities) derived from the initial CPG node embeddings can be parameterized specifically for the underlying heterogeneity. In such a way, nodes and edges of different types in the CPG are able to maintain their specific representation, and *DSHGT* is able to generate diverse embedding representations of the program suitable for the vulnerability detection task.

Additionally, we leverage the annotation information in the code to enhance the embedding capability of *DSHGT*. The word token in the human-written annotations often contains supplementary semantic information about the program apart from code graph representations. To incorporate such information, *DSHGT* introduces a multi-task learning mechanism, in which the trainable parameters in the model are updated by gradients with respect to both vulnerability detection loss and annotation generation loss, which we named dual-supervisors. In summary, the contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

Pioneer Study: We present a pioneer study of Heterogeneous Graph Learning for vulnerability detection by proposing and implementing *DSHGT*, which embeds both semantic and heterogeneity properties of code representations (CPG) for improved vulnerability detection.

Dual-supervisors Learning: We design a multi-task learning framework with dual supervisors to utilize annotation information of codes to enhance the encoding capability of *DSHGT*, which enables *DSHGT* to generalize well to diverse programming languages and real-world software projects.

Extensive Experiments: We conduct extensive experiments on both synthetic vulnerability datasets across different programming languages and real-world projects to verify our hypothesis that using heterogeneous graph learning, especially with dual-supervisor architecture, can improve the state-of-the-art in software vulnerability detection and point out some interesting research directions to follow by the community.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. We first review the related work in section 2. In section 3, we provide prerequisite backgrounds for our proposed *DSHGT*. In section 4, we introduce the detailed methodology of *DSHGT*. In section 5, we present the empirical study results and our discussion. In section 6, we discuss the validity of our proposed method. We draw the conclusion and point out our future research direction in section 7.

2 RELATED WORK

We take an overview of related works in software vulnerabilities detection from three different categories: traditional rule-based approach, deep learning-based approach, and graph learning-based approach.

For the traditional approach, early works on vulnerability detection are heavily reliant on human-crafted rules from domain experts. The work in [9] is the first of this kind to implement rules to identify software bugs and vulnerabilities automatically. Following that, many static analysis tools [2, 10, 17, 28, 30] are developed to cover some well-known security issues, all of which share the same principle that if the scanned code base fails to conform to the re-defined rules, relevant vulnerabilities could occur. It is infeasible to craft rules that cover all possible code vulnerabilities, not to mention the required efforts to cope with the ever-changing code bases.

The rapid development of machine learning, especially deep learning techniques, unleashes the great potential in enabling the automated learning of implicit vulnerable programming patterns. Many early works focus on extracting the features from lines of codes to facilitate vulnerability detection/prediction [5, 6, 29]. For instance, VulDeePecker [22] is the first deep learning-based binary vulnerability detector, which slices the program into code gadgets and utilizes BiLSTM to capture the semantic relations in the data dependence within the code gadgets. Similarly, μ VulDeePecker [37] uses both BiLSTM and code attentions to capture more “localized” information within a code statement, and control dependence among method calls. LIN *et al.* [25] designs a framework that uses data sources of different types for learning unified high-level representations of code snippets. It also uses BiLSTM as the core component of the learning process. DeepBugs [27] uses a feedforward network as the classifier for name-based bug detection, which reasons about names based on semantic representations. However, only the natural code sequences are considered in these works,

and the intra-program flow logic and dependency information are omitted.

Neural networks on graphs have drawn increasing attention in recent years, which focus on learning the model based on graph-structured input [16, 19, 35]. Researchers have put efforts into exploring the feasibility of using code graph representations such as Abstract Syntax Trees (AST), Program Dependency Graphs (PDG), and Control Flow Graphs (CFG) for vulnerability detection tasks. The work in [1] first presents how to construct graphs from source code using AST and additional control and data flows, and then uses Gated Graph Neural Networks (GGNN) to detect variable misuse bugs. Afterwards, Devign [36] starts to apply GNN on CPG. It extracts AST, program control and data dependency from CPG to create the joint graph as the composite code representation, from which a GGNN is designed to learn the graph-level embeddings for the downstream vulnerability detection task. FUNDED [32] integrates data and control flow into the AST as the code graph representation and starts to distinguish multiple code relationships when training the GGNN, which is achieved by representing the input program as multiple relation graphs. DeepWukong [4] combines the CFG and PDG to generate a refined subgraph called XFG for the program, and adopts three different GNNs to test the performance for bug prediction. Existing research mainly relies on adopting homogeneous graph learning techniques, from which types of nodes and edges are discarded, making it infeasible to represent heterogeneous structures. However, we argue that the graph representations of codes convey rich semantic and logical information reflected in a variety of node/edge types and are intrinsic to the characteristics of heterogeneous graphs [33]. This motivates us to conduct this pioneering study of heterogeneous graph learning which is shown later to improve over these state-of-the-art.

3 PRELIMINARY

3.1 Heterogeneous Graph

In this section, we provide a formal definition of the heterogeneous graph [8]. A heterogeneous graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{T}_v, \mathcal{T}_e)$ consists of a set of nodes \mathcal{V} with multiple node types \mathcal{T}_v and a set of edges \mathcal{E} with multiple edge types \mathcal{T}_e . To describe the types of nodes and edges, we define two mapping functions: $\tau : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_v$ for the node types, and $\phi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_e$ for the edge types. $\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{D}}$ represents the initial node feature matrix, where \mathcal{N} is the number of nodes and \mathcal{D} is the dimensionality of the feature vector. Finally, we define the Readout function $f : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{1 \times n}$, which summarizes the node and edge features and generates a low-dimensional graph-level embedding with n dimensions.

3.2 Code Property Graph

The Code Property Graph (CPG) is a data structure representing source code, program structure, and execution logic in a unified graph-based representation [34]. It encapsulates the entire program in a single graph that consists of nodes and edges with multiple types, in which each node represents an entity, such as a function/method, a variable, or a class, and each edge represents a relationship between the entities. CPGs provide a comprehensive view

of the program and enable the analysis of code properties and behaviors with the help of control flow, data flow, and intra-program dependence.

Fig. 1 shows a toy example of CPG and its corresponding code snippet. For simplicity, we keep primary control/data flows, program dependence and execution steps for demonstrative purposes, while the specific AST edge types are not shown. The ϵ in Fig. 1B describes the control flow without any condition predicates when executing the program. The program steps over to the condition predicate statement and jumps to different statements based on *true* or *false* conditions (line 6 and 10 in Fig. 1A). The blue edge represents both data and control dependence in the program. For instance, $D_{V_{AR1}}$ shows the data dependence of variable *VARI* initially declared at line 3, and C_{true} indicates that the variable declaration statement at line 6 is dependent on the condition predicate at line 5. The green edge is the simplified relationships in the abstract syntax tree (AST), where the inner nodes represent *operators* (e.g., addition, assignment) and leaf nodes as *operands* (e.g., variable identifier, constants). The full descriptions of node types and edge types in the CPG can be found in Table 7 and Table 8.

3.3 Heterogeneous Graph Transformer

To capture the complex interactions between various types of entities in heterogeneous graphs, Hu *et al.* proposed Heterogeneous Graph Transformer (HGT) [13], which introduces the transformer into the graph neural network to better incorporate the heterogeneous nature of the graph structure.

In HGT, a triplet $\langle \tau(s), \phi(e), \tau(t) \rangle$ can be used to denote the relationships among source node (s), directed edge (e), and target node (t). The function $\tau(\cdot)$ is node type mapping, which outputs the type of input node. Similarly, function $\phi(\cdot)$ denotes the edge type mapping, which outputs the type of input edge. This triplet and the original node embedding for the source and target nodes are the input for HGT. The embedding of nodes is updated through multiple iterations, each of which includes three steps: 1) Attention calculation (Section 4.2.2); 2) Message calculation (Section 4.2.3); and 3) Aggregation of attention and message (Section 4.2.4). We will detail our adaptation of HGT in Section 4.2.

4 HETEROGENEOUS GRAPH LEARNING

In our proposed heterogeneous graph learning procedure, we have the following two main steps. The first step is Graph Construction (shown in Fig. 2). We analyze all the source code and generate the initial CPG (Fig. 2A & Fig. 2B). As we focus on method-level vulnerability analysis in this pioneering study, we extract method-level CPGs from the initial CPG (Fig. 2C). Meanwhile, symbolization is also performed on method-level CPGs to reduce the noise introduced by personalized function/variable naming conventions (Fig. 2D). We then perform the embedding method for each node within the method-level CPGs for the next step (Fig. 2E).

The second step is our adaptation of HGT - Dual-Supervisors HGT Learning (shown in Fig. 3). In Dual-Supervisors HGT learning, we use initial node features as the input of HGT to learn and extract the graph-level information. We then leverage dual-supervisors learning for both vulnerability prediction and annotation generation. We introduce the annotation as the second supervisor to




Figure 1: Sample code and corresponding generated CPG.




Figure 2: Graph Construction

align the latent features learned from the HGT with the underlying semantic meaning through the back-propagation process.

4.1 Graph Construction

We first analyze all the source code files and generate the initial corresponding Code Property Graphs (CPGs). In our case, all the related files (e.g. source code files and dependency library files) are within the same directory. By inputting this directory to an open source code parser *Joern*¹, these source code files are then iterated automatically to generate the corresponding CPG.

In this paper, we concentrate on method-level vulnerability analysis, and Algorithm 1 demonstrates how we construct the method-level CPGs. As indicated in the pseudo-code, the generated CPG is denoted as c , which contains all relationships of source codes within one leaf directory. The set of all directory-level CPGs is denoted as C . Instead of using original CPG c that contains much redundant information in the graph, we perform forward and backward traversal to generate the method-level CPG m . Specifically, both traversals are based on Depth-First Search (DFS) for each *Method* node within c , and the set of all method-level CPGs is denoted as M . Taking Fig 2C as an example, node 3 is a method node, from which we traverse forward through nodes 6,7,8,11,13,14,15, while traversing backward through the node 1. Thus all the nodes be traversed are 1,3,6,7,8,11,13,14,15 including itself. Thus, the corresponding

Algorithm 1 Generating Method-level Code Property Graph

Require: Source code root directory S , *Joern* parser \mathcal{J}
Output: Method-level CPGs set M .

```

1:  $C \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2: for each leaf directory  $l \in \text{dir}(S)$  do
3:   generate CPG  $c$  through  $\mathcal{J}(l)$ , and add to set  $C$ 
4: end for
5:  $M \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
6: for each  $c \in C$  do
7:    $N \leftarrow$  all method type nodes within  $c$ 
8:   for each  $n \in N$  do
9:     start at  $n$ , perform DFS forward traverse
10:    start at  $n$ , perform DFS backward traverse
11:    generate method-level CPG  $m$  for method  $n$ 
12:    add  $m$  to set  $M$ 
13:   end for
14: end for

```

method-level CPG (Method_CPG) could be generated by slicing this traversed set out of the original CPG.

In each CPG (Fig 2B), we construct the heterogeneous graph by mapping the original entities (e.g., Method name) and relationships (e.g., method call) to different types of nodes (e.g., *METHOD*) and edges (e.g., *CALL*). For a full list of nodes and edges we generated for CPG, please refer to Table 7 and Table 8.

¹<https://github.com/joernio/joern>

Meanwhile, to alleviate the noise introduced by personalized naming conventions for functions and variables and better preserve the original code semantics [4], we then perform symbolization on method-level CPGs (shown in Fig 2D). Following that, different function and variable names defined by users will be unified to *METHOD'N'()* and *VAR'N'*, where $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. For example, the function names *readData()* and *writeData()* and variable names x and y will be mapped to *METHOD1()*, *METHOD2()*, *VAR1*, and *VAR2*, respectively. The actual numbers N used in the symbolization may vary. As shown in Fig 2E, we then perform Doc2Vec embedding [18] for each node within the method-level CPGs. This embedding serves as the initial node feature and will be refined during the Dual-Supervisors HGT learning.

4.2 Dual-Supervisors HGT Learning

The overall architecture of the Dual-Supervisors HGT (*DSHGT*) is shown in Fig 3. For each target node in a given CPG, we consider all its connected neighbors as source nodes, and for each source node/target node pair we define $\langle \tau(s), \phi(e), \tau(t) \rangle$ triplet as the relationship of this pair (shown in Fig 3A). For each triplet, we then calculate the attention score between the source node and the target node (shown in Fig 3B), calculate the messaging passing score of each source node (shown in Fig 3C), and aggregate the information from the above two steps and update the target node embedding (shown in Fig 3D). To improve the robustness of the learned features (aggregated target node embedding), we use the existing annotation for each method as the additional supervisor in the multi-task learning (shown in Fig 3E). We will walk through each step in more details below.

Note, we use $H^\alpha[\beta]$ to denote node β 's embedding in the α -th layer, and $H^{\alpha-1}[\beta]$ to denote node β 's embedding in the $(\alpha - 1)$ -th layer, through the whole section.

4.2.1 Constructing DSHGT Input Triplet (Fig 3A). For each method CPG, we iteratively walk through the CPG using the depth-first search algorithm and construct the triplet from the root level all the way to the leaf nodes. For instance, when we walk to the node of {11} (i.e. node t) in Fig 3A, we treat the node as the current target node. We found its neighbor nodes are {8}, {15}, {14} and {13} (i.e. node s_1 , s_2 , s_3 and s_4 , respectively). Then we construct the following triplets $\langle \tau(s_1), \phi(e), \tau(t) \rangle$, $\langle \tau(s_2), \phi(e), \tau(t) \rangle$, $\langle \tau(s_3), \phi(e), \tau(t) \rangle$ and $\langle \tau(s_4), \phi(e), \tau(t) \rangle$. We then feed them all to the *DSHGT*. Note, to simplify the figure, we only present the embedding for node t , s_1 and s_2 in Fig 3.

4.2.2 Heterogeneous Attention Calculation (Fig 3B). Firstly, we calculate the attention between s_1 and t , where s_1 is one of the neighbor nodes of t . The calculation involves five equations (Eq. 1 to Eq. 5).

$$Q^i(t) = H^{(l-1)}[t] \cdot Q\text{-Linear}_{\tau(t)}^i \quad (1)$$

where the dimension of $H^{(l-1)}[t]$ (i.e. the embedding of t) is $R^{1 \times d}$, the dimension of $Q\text{-Linear}_{\tau(t)}^i$ is $R^{d \times \frac{d}{h}}$, $i (i \in [1, h])$ represent the i -th head of attention, and the dimension of $Q^i(t)$ is $R^{1 \times \frac{d}{h}}$. We project $H^{(l-1)}[t]$ to $Q^i(t)$ through $Q\text{-Linear}_{\tau(t)}^i$ (i.e. the query matrix), and each $\tau(\cdot)$ has its own matrix $Q\text{-Linear}_{\tau(t)}^i$ on the i -th head.

$$K^i(s_1) = H^{(l-1)}[s_1] \cdot K\text{-Linear}_{\tau(s_1)}^i \quad (2)$$

In Eq. 2, the dimension of $H^{(l-1)}[s_1]$ (i.e. the embedding of s_1) is $R^{1 \times d}$, the dimension of $K\text{-Linear}_{\tau(s_1)}^i$ is $R^{d \times \frac{d}{h}}$, where $i (i \in [1, h])$ represent the i -th head of attention, and the dimension of $K^i(s_1)$ is $R^{1 \times \frac{d}{h}}$. We project $H^{(l-1)}[s_1]$ to $K^i(t)$ through $K\text{-Linear}_{\tau(s_1)}^i$ (i.e. the key matrix), and each $\tau(\cdot)$ has its own matrix $K\text{-Linear}_{\tau(s_1)}^i$ on the i -th head.

$$ATT\text{-head}^i(s_1, e, t) = (K^i(s_1) \times W_{\phi(e)}^{ATT} \times Q^i(t)^T) \times \frac{\mu_{\langle \tau(s_1), \phi(e), \tau(t) \rangle}}{\sqrt{d}} \quad (3)$$

Eq. 3 is for calculating the attention value of the i -th head from s_1 to t . The $W_{\phi(e)}^{ATT} \in R^{\frac{d}{h} \times \frac{d}{h}}$ stands for a learnable parameter matrix for edge type $\phi(e)$, which represents the learnable semantic information for each edge type. The $(K^i(s_1) \times W_{\phi(e)}^{ATT} \times Q^i(t)^T)$ is the original attention value of the i -th head. The dimension of it is $R^{1 \times 1}$ (i.e. $R^{1 \times \frac{d}{h}} \times R^{\frac{d}{h} \times \frac{d}{h}} \times R^{\frac{d}{h} \times 1} \rightarrow R^{1 \times 1}$). The μ is a matrix related with the triplet $\langle \tau(s_1), \phi(e), \tau(t) \rangle$, which acts as a scaling factor for this triplet relationship. Its dimension is $R^{A \times E \times A}$, where $A = |\tau(\cdot)|$ and $E = |\phi(\cdot)|$. It is worth noting that, the magnitude of K and Q dot product increases significantly and will lead *Softmax* function to small gradient values. Thus, we divide the original value by \sqrt{d} to maintain the gradient values after *Softmax*, which could help the training.

$$\mathbf{Attention}_{DSHGT}(s_1, e, t) = \parallel_{i \in [1, h]} ATT\text{-head}^i(s_1, e, t) \quad (4)$$

Eq. 4 is for calculating the attention value from s_1 to t . The h heads attention values from Eq. 3 will be concatenated together to a vector with $R^{h \times 1}$ dimensions. Note the attention calculation will be the same for all the triplets, $\langle \tau(s_2), \phi(e), \tau(t) \rangle$, $\langle \tau(s_3), \phi(e), \tau(t) \rangle$, etc.

To yield the final attention value for each head, we gather attention matrices from all neighbors of $N(t)$ and conduct *Softmax* as shown in Eq. 5.

$$\mathbf{Attention}_{DSHGT}(s, e, t) = \mathit{Softmax}_{\forall s \in N(t)} (\mathbf{Attention}_{DSHGT}(s, e, t)) \quad (5)$$

4.2.3 Heterogeneous Message Calculation (Fig 3C). Secondly, we shows how to calculate the message from s_1 to t , which involves three equations (Eq. 6 to Eq. 8).

$$V^i(s_1) = H^{(l-1)}[s_1] \cdot V\text{-Linear}_{\tau(s_1)}^i \quad (6)$$

In Eq. 6, the dimension of $H^{(l-1)}[s_1]$ is $R^{1 \times d}$, the dimension of $V\text{-Linear}_{\tau(s_1)}^i$ is $R^{d \times \frac{d}{h}}$, where $i (i \in [1, h])$ represent the i -th head of message, and the dimension of $V^i(s_1)$ is $R^{1 \times \frac{d}{h}}$. We project $H^{(l-1)}[s_1]$ to $V^i(s_1)$ through $V\text{-Linear}_{\tau(s_1)}^i$ (i.e. the value dimension), and each $\tau(\cdot)$ has its own parameter $V\text{-Linear}_{\tau(s_1)}^i$ on the i -th head.




Figure 3: DSHGT Learning

$$MSG\text{-}head^i(s_1, e, t) = V^i(s_1) \times W_{\phi(e)}^{MSG} \quad (7)$$

Eq. 7 calculates the message value of the i -th head from s_1 to t . The $W_{\phi(e)}^{MSG} \in R^{\frac{d}{h} \times \frac{d}{h}}$ stands for a learnable parameter matrix for edge type $\phi(e)$, and each $\phi(\cdot)$ has its own $W_{\phi(e)}^{MSG}$ matrix. The dimension of $MSG\text{-}head^i(s_1, e, t)$ is $R^{1 \times \frac{d}{h}}$ (i.e. $R^{1 \times \frac{d}{h}} \times R^{\frac{d}{h} \times \frac{d}{h}} \rightarrow R^{1 \times \frac{d}{h}}$).

$$\mathbf{Message}_{DSHGT}(s_1, e, t) = \parallel_{i \in [1, h]} MSG\text{-}head^i(s_1, e, t) \quad (8)$$

The message value from s_1 to t is calculated in Eq. 8, in which the h heads message values from Eq. 7 will be concatenated together to a matrix with $R^{h \times \frac{d}{h}}$ dimensions. Note the message calculation will be the same for all the triplets, $\langle \tau(s_2), \phi(e), \tau(t) \rangle$, $\langle \tau(s_3), \phi(e), \tau(t) \rangle$, etc.

4.2.4 *Heterogeneous Node Embedding Aggregation*(Fig 3D). Thirdly, we calculate the aggregation of attention and message from s_1 to t .

$$\tilde{H}^l[t_{s_1}] = \mathbf{Attention}_{DSHGT}(s_1, e, t) \otimes \mathbf{Message}_{DSHGT}(s_1, e, t) \quad (9)$$

The weighted message from s_1 is shown in Eq. 9, where \otimes is element-wise multiplication. The dimension of $\mathbf{Attention}_{DSHGT}(s_1, e, t)$ is $R^{h \times 1}$, and the dimension of $\mathbf{Message}_{DSHGT}(s_1, e, t)$ is $R^{h \times \frac{d}{h}}$. Note the weighted message calculation will be the same for all the triplets.

After calculating the weighted message for all neighbors of $N(t)$, we could update the target node t embedding based on messages from its neighbors.

$$\tilde{H}^l[t] = \bigoplus_{\forall s \in N(t)} \tilde{H}^l[t_s] \quad (10)$$

We then reshape the vector to $\tilde{H}^l[t] \in R^{1 \times d}$.

$$H^l[t] = \alpha(\tilde{H}^l[t] \cdot A\text{-Linear}_{\tau(t)}) + H^{l-1}[t] \quad (11)$$

In Eq. 11, the $\tilde{H}^l[t]$ stands for the node t embedding for current layer, the $H^{l-1}[t]$ stands for the node t embedding from previous layer, the α is the activation function (i.e. ReLU). We project $\tilde{H}^l[t]$ through $A\text{-Linear}_{\tau(t)} \in R^{d \times d}$. Note each $\tau(\cdot)$ has its own parameter in $A\text{-Linear}_{\tau(t)}$. The projection (i.e. $A\text{-Linear}_{\tau(t)}(\tilde{H}^l[t])$) will then go through the activation function before adding up the node t embedding from the previous layer as residual, and yield the final node t embedding for the current layer. In one iteration, we update all the nodes' embedding within the heterogeneous graph following the same procedure. We iterate this calculation for every nodes within the method-level CPG for L layers. The L -th layer output $H^L[t]$ (Fig 3D) will be used for downstream tasks.

4.2.5 *Dual-Supervisors Learning* (Fig 3E). The DSHGT node embedding procedure will go through L times (i.e. L layers of DSHGT), and each layer will use the previous layer's embedding as input (the initial layer's input is based on the CPG embedding, details in Section 4.1). In our experiments, we perform empirical study and set $L = 3$ (details analyzed in Section 5.4). As the output form DSHGT (i.e. $H^L[t]$) is node-based embedding, we construct a *Readout* layer for graph-level embedding output:

$$z^{\mathcal{G}} = \text{MEAN} \left(\text{MLP} \left(X \oplus H^L \right) \right) \quad (12)$$

Instead of directly taking out the embeddings, we concatenate them with the initial node embedding, pass through a shallow multi-layer perceptron (MLP), and follow with a row-wise *MEAN* operation. X is defined in Section 3.1, which represents the initial node embedding.

This output then goes through a dual-supervisors structure (i.e. MLP and Decoder) for multi-task purposes (Fig 3E). For detecting vulnerabilities within the source code (Fig 3E(b)), we use 1 layer MLP for **0/1** classification, where **0** stands for no vulnerability while **1** means the source code segment contains vulnerabilities. On the other hand, We consider the graph-level embedding as an *Encoder* for the source code and design the corresponding *Decoder* (1-layer LSTM) to summarize the corresponding source code annotations sequence-to-sequence (Fig 3E(c)). Then we compare the generated annotations with annotations within source code (i.e. the ground

truth) and yield cross entropy loss for multi-tasks. To leverage the loss from the two supervisors, we implement the following equation for loss fusion:

$$loss = (1 - \lambda) \times loss_{main} + \lambda \times loss_{sup} \quad (13)$$

In Eq. 13, $loss_{main}$ is the loss of 0/1 classification and $loss_{sup}$ is the loss of annotations prediction. The λ is the parameter for adjusting the weight of $loss_{sup}$ in $loss$.

5 EXPERIMENT

We evaluate the performance of our framework on different datasets against a number of state-of-the-art graph-based or traditional vulnerability detection models. We aim to answer the following research questions.

- RQ1:** How well our proposed framework performs compared with other baselines in public C/C++ vulnerability datasets?
- RQ2:** Can the framework achieve a consistently higher vulnerability detection capability when applied to other programming languages?
- RQ3:** How to balance the contribution from the two supervisors (i.e., vulnerability and annotation oracles) to improve the performance?
- RQ4:** How much can the CPG input representation and HGT backbone improve the performance?
- RQ5:** How effective is our proposed method when applied to detect vulnerabilities in real-world open-source projects?

5.1 Experimental Setup

We describe the experimental setup in this section, including the environment, baselines, evaluation metrics, and the datasets preparation.

5.1.1 Environment. We implemented our heterogeneous graph-based vulnerability detection model using Python v3.7 and Pytorch v1.11.0. As mentioned in Section 4.1, we leveraged *Joern* to generate the initial CPG of different programming languages. We trained and tested our model on a computer with an 8-core 3.8 GHz Intel Xeon CPU and an NVIDIA 3080Ti GPU. The hyperparameter setup could be found in Table 1.

5.1.2 Baselines. We compared our *DSHGT* with the following state-of-the-art baselines and reported the comparison statistics.

- LIN et al.** [25] designs a framework that uses data sources of different types for learning unified high-level representations of code snippets. It uses BiLSTM as the core component of the learning process.
- DEVIGN** [36] combines AST, program control and data dependency as the joint graph to represent the composite code representation, from which a gated graph neural network model is designed to learn the graph-level embeddings for the vulnerability detection task.
- FUNDED** [32] integrates data and control flow into the AST as the code graph representation, which is then used as the input for the gated graph neural network (GGNN) to train the vulnerability detection model. It uses Word2Vec [26] to generate the initial node embedding.

Table 1: Hyperparameter setup

Name	Setup
Readout func (HGT)	2 linear layers, 1 output layer
Layer depth (HGT)	3
Attention head (HGT)	4
Loss function	Cross entropy loss
Optimizer	Adam [15]
Learning rate	2e-3
Dropout rate	0.5
Batch size	64
Epochs	50
Weight initializer	Xavier [11]

DeepWukong [4] is also a graph learning-based approach that encodes both textual and structured information of code into code representations. It is designed specifically to detect C/C++ vulnerabilities. It uses Doc2Vec [18] to generate initial node embeddings from PDG.

Note that for all baseline models, we used the default hyperparameters as reported in the respective literature.

5.1.3 Evaluation Metrics. We used **Accuracy**, **Precision**, **Recall** and **F1** scores to evaluate the vulnerabilities detected by a model, which are widely used in the machine learning community to verify the generalization ability of a predictive model [24].

5.1.4 Dataset Preparation. We used several vulnerability datasets to verify our model and compared the performance with baseline models.

For **RQ1** to **RQ4**, we chose the *Software Assurance Reference Dataset (SARD)*, which is a widely used vulnerability database with a large set of synthetic programs [4, 24, 32]. In **SARD**, a program is labelled as good (not vulnerable), bad (vulnerable) or mix (vulnerable with patched updates). For vulnerable programs, **SARD** describes the vulnerability and the vulnerability type in **CWE-ID** (Common Weakness Enumeration Identifier) formats. It also contains the human-crafted annotations in the program as supplementary information of the codes. We used a total of 17 categories for C/C++, Java and PHP. These categories are harvested from **SARD**, which is comprehensive and covers most of the vulnerability types.

For **RQ5**, we leveraged two real-world open-source projects, **FFmpeg**² and **QEMU**³. These two large open-source projects are written in C, involving many contributions and code commits from software developers. The labels of **FFmpeg** and **QEMU** are based on vulnerability-fix commits or non-vulnerability fix commits of these projects. The Vulnerability fix commits (VFCs) are the code commits that fix a potential vulnerability of a function/method, while the non-vulnerability-fix commits (non-VFCs) are commits considered less relevant to fix vulnerabilities. The detailed statistics and descriptions of the datasets can be found in Table 9.

5.2 Performance Analysis on SARD (RQ1)

We first verified the effectiveness of the proposed model and other baselines on a number of CWE vulnerability types, from which the models are trained and tested on **SARD** synthetic code samples. Note that the training and testing data ratio is 70% and 30%,

²<https://ffmpeg.org/>

³<https://www.qemu.org/>

Table 2: Results of the comparison with different baselines on SARD

Metric \ Model	DEVIGN		LIN et al.		FUNDED		DeepWukong		<i>DSHGT_{noAnno}</i>		<i>DSHGT</i>	
	ACC	F1	ACC	F1	ACC	F1	ACC	F1	ACC	F1	ACC	F1
CWE-119	0.79	0.81	0.85	0.78	0.83	0.85	0.82	0.84	0.80	0.86	0.84	0.87
CWE-400	0.84	0.81	0.79	0.76	0.84	0.80	0.84	0.79	0.82	0.83	0.83	0.85
CWE-404	0.84	0.82	0.83	0.74	0.81	0.85	0.83	0.84	0.83	0.88	0.88	0.90
CWE-369	0.83	0.78	0.82	0.80	0.86	0.84	0.91	0.87	0.90	0.91	0.89	0.88
CWE-191	0.82	0.76	0.80	0.73	0.87	0.90	0.75	0.81	0.81	0.87	0.85	0.91
CWE-476	0.91	0.87	0.89	0.83	0.83	0.87	0.90	0.86	0.85	0.84	0.86	0.89
CWE-467	0.79	0.84	0.87	0.81	0.85	0.86	0.88	0.86	0.86	0.83	0.90	0.87
CWE-78	0.82	0.84	0.89	0.79	0.83	0.86	0.84	0.83	0.84	0.86	0.85	0.84
CWE-772	0.83	0.77	0.85	0.81	0.86	0.87	0.86	0.83	0.86	0.88	0.90	0.88
CWE-190	0.86	0.83	0.83	0.79	0.86	0.84	0.87	0.83	0.85	0.82	0.92	0.87
CWE-770	0.87	0.84	0.89	0.80	0.85	0.87	0.86	0.87	0.85	0.86	0.90	0.89
CWE-666	0.85	0.84	0.88	0.86	0.89	0.90	0.87	0.92	0.86	0.91	0.90	0.93
CWE-665	0.83	0.87	0.90	0.79	0.93	0.88	0.92	0.89	0.92	0.92	0.94	0.92
CWE-758	0.84	0.87	0.86	0.83	0.84	0.88	0.87	0.92	0.85	0.89	0.91	0.93
CWE-469	0.75	0.79	0.78	0.76	0.86	0.83	0.76	0.79	0.83	0.84	0.83	0.86
CWE-676	0.84	0.80	0.84	0.75	0.92	0.91	0.89	0.83	0.86	0.89	0.90	0.91
CWE-834	0.70	0.62	0.76	0.74	0.84	0.79	0.74	0.72	0.83	0.76	0.87	0.82

respectively. Table 2 reports the evaluation metrics on each vulnerability type. In general, even without incorporating the semantic meaning of annotations into the model (*DSHGT_{noAnno}*), our proposed model achieves promising results on almost all vulnerability types. *DSHGT_{noAnno}* is the variant of *DSHGT* only training on code representation graph using vulnerability oracle. Devign, Lin et al., DeepWukong, and *DSHGT_{noAnno}* give low F1 and accuracy score on the CWE-834 dataset, which describes an “Excessive Iteration” vulnerability that leads to the over-consumption of resources and can be adversely affected by attackers. This type of vulnerability presents no clear sign of vulnerable code patterns and is hardly identified by learning solely on code graph representations or code tokens. *DSHGT*, on the other hand, also leverages the semantic annotation information of the programs to enhance the robustness of the detection ability, thus achieving much better results compared with *DSHGT_{noAnno}* and other baselines. It can also be observed that both Devign and Lin et al. perform undesirable on CWE-469, in which the vulnerability is caused by the misuse of the pointer variable. *DSHGT* is the best-performing model on this dataset, indicating that the intra-program dependence in the CPG provides sufficient information when modelling the code graph in this case. FUNDED achieves marginal performance gain compared with *DSHGT* and DeepWukong on CWE-676. We discover that this dataset relates to “Use of Potentially Dangerous Function” vulnerability, which can be identified by models capable of encoding control flow information. Therefore, FUNDED, DeepWukong and *DSHGT* achieve similar results on this dataset. Lin et al. achieves the best Accuracy score on CWE-78, indicating high True Positive and Negative numbers. Yet it reports a low F1 score with poor results on Precision and Recall. Overall, *DSHGT* achieves the best results on most of the tested datasets, with an average 88.05% on accuracy and 88.35% on F1.

```

1 ...
2 #ifdef _WIN32
3 #define COMMAND_INT_PATHL"%WINDIR%\\system32\\cmd.exe"
4 ...
5 #else /* NOT _WIN32 */
6 #define COMMAND_INT_PATHL"/bin/sh"
7 #endif
8 ...
9 wchar_t *args[] = {COMMAND_INT_PATH, COMMAND_ARG1,
10 COMMAND_ARG3, NULL};
11 _wspawnv(_P_WAIT, COMMAND_INT_PATH, args);
12 ...

```

(a) C/C++ code sample

```

1 ...
2 String osCommand;
3 if (System.getProperty("os.name").toLowerCase().indexOf("win") >= 0) {
4     osCommand = "c:\\WINDOWS\\SYSTEM32\\cmd.exe /c dir ";
5 } else {
6     osCommand = "/bin/ls ";
7 }
8 ...
9 Process p = Runtime.getRuntime().exec(osCommand + data);
10 p.waitFor();
11 ...

```

(b) Java code sample

Figure 4: Both C/C++ and Java code samples with “OS Command Injection” vulnerability on CWE-78.

5.3 Transferability on Other Programming Languages (RQ2)

We experimented with the transferring capability of our proposed model against other baselines. To achieve that, we adopted the transfer learning technique by keeping the model structure and weights trained on C/C++ dataset, and fine-tuned that on other programming languages for vulnerability detection tasks. It is proven




Figure 5: Knowledge transferring capability from C/C++ to other programming languages.

feasible in [32] that the model trained in one programming languages domain can preserve the knowledge of vulnerable code patterns and thus be used to detect the similar vulnerabilities in other programming languages.

In this case, we first trained our model and other baselines on CWE-78 of C/C++ datasets. To transfer the knowledge learned from C/C++, we only fine-tuned the final MLP classifier of each model (2 linear layers and 1 output layer) for 10 epochs. We consider two cases that use transfer learning, C/C++ to Java and C/C++ to PHP. Figure 5 shows the result of the models’ transferability. It can be observed that our pre-trained model can better capture the prior vulnerable code patterns and achieve promising results when applied to other programming languages, with 84% accuracy from C to Java and 88% accuracy from C to PHP. We further explored the rationale behind the effectiveness of using transfer learning. It can be observed from Figure 4 that both C/C++ and Java code samples in CWE-78 construct an OS command (highlighted in red) using externally-influenced input from an upstream component without validating the special element that could harm the system, thus are under threat of command inject attacks. In the CPG of both code samples, a control flow edge should exist if this command variable is validated before being used by other threads, thus presenting a similar code pattern regardless of language syntax. The result verifies that our model can better capture both contextual semantics and underlying structure (syntax, control- and data-flow) of the codes with the help of CPG and the corresponding heterogeneous graph learning, thus able to preserve the language-agnostic vulnerable code patterns.

5.4 Impact of Dual-supervisors (RQ3)

To answer RQ3, we studied the necessity of designing multi-task learning with dual supervisors to enhance the performance of DSHGT as well as how to balance between two supervisors responsible for dealing with the vulnerability label oracle and the annotation oracle, in which the textual annotations are used as supplementary information. Note the use of auxiliary annotations of code snippets is proven helpful for tasks like code completion [7], code summarization [23], and code retrieval [31]. We thus hypothesize that the graph code embedding should contain rich semantic information capable of summarizing the code snippets in annotation formats. In the experiment, the sensitivity of λ is explored to control the level of impact caused by contextual annotations when training the model, in which 0 indicates only training the model

Table 3: Results on different code graph representations

Metric	DataSet	
	Code Representation	CWE-119
AST	ACCURACY	0.68
	PRECISION	0.72
	RECALL	0.57
	F1	0.64
PDG	ACCURACY	0.79
	PRECISION	0.81
	RECALL	0.70
	F1	0.75
AST+CFG	ACCURACY	0.81
	PRECISION	0.83
	RECALL	0.73
	F1	0.78
AST+PDG	ACCURACY	0.85
	PRECISION	0.89
	RECALL	0.74
	F1	0.83
CPG	ACCURACY	0.83
	PRECISION	0.92
	RECALL	0.79
	F1	0.86

Table 4: Analysis on HGT layer and training time cost on CWE-119

Metric	HGT Layer Depths				
	1	2	3	4	5
F1	0.79	0.87	0.89	0.88	0.85
Training Time Cost/h	4.83	9.45	14.88	19.81	23.64




Figure 6: Change of Acc and F1 along with λ on CWE-119.

based on vulnerability labels, while 1 means only optimizing the model towards generating correct annotation summaries of codes (reflected in Eq.13). We first experiment on the HGT layer depth and compare the change of layer depth against detection performance and mode training cost. It is shown in Table 4 that the time cost increases with the increase of HGT layer depths, and F1 reaches the highest when layer depth is 3. We thus choose 3 as the layer depth setup for HGT. Regarding the sensitivity of λ , Figure 6 reveals the

Table 5: Ablation study on graph learning and non-graph learning on CPG

Model		Metric	ACCURACY	PRECISION	RECALL	F1
		BiLSTM	0.72	0.74	0.65	0.69
w/o graph-based learning						
graph-based learning		HGT_{homo}	0.79	0.80	0.68	0.74
		HGT_{heter}	0.83	0.92	0.79	0.86

Table 6: Results of the comparison with different baselines on real-world projects

Metric		Model	DEVIGN	LIN et al.	DeepWukong	FUNDED	DSHGT
			DataSet				
FFmpeg	ACCURACY		0.74	0.64	0.75	0.75	0.79
	PRECISION		0.81	0.72	0.79	0.83	0.86
	RECALL		0.68	0.58	0.71	0.67	0.73
	F1		0.70	0.66	0.78	0.79	0.84
QEMU	ACCURACY		0.73	0.60	0.72	0.72	0.78
	PRECISION		0.78	0.70	0.80	0.76	0.84
	RECALL		0.69	0.54	0.69	0.68	0.73
	F1		0.74	0.64	0.75	0.73	0.82

change of Accuracy and F1 scores along with λ . Both scores reach the highest when $\lambda = 0.2$ and decrease afterwards, indicating that over-reliance on annotations aggravates the vulnerability detection ability subject to the quality and number of annotations in the programs, while using semantic information in annotations is beneficial to some extent. It is not uncommon to have a mixture of good and bad annotations in the program. Taking CWE-119 as an example, we discover that some annotations like “*fixes the problem of not freeing the data in the source*” have specific meanings or descriptions for the method, the semantics of which are then comprehended into the graph-level embedding through the training process and become helpful for determining whether the method is vulnerable, while there exist many annotations like “*use good-source and badsink by changing the first GLOBAL_CONST_TRUE to GLOBAL_CONST_FALSE*”, which are not helpful. Over-reliance on such annotations thus (large λ) deteriorates the vulnerability detection performance.

5.5 Ablation Study (RQ4)

We first investigate the use of AST, PDG, AST+CFG, and AST+PDG as different code graph representations, aiming to check the effectiveness of using CPG. As shown in Table 3, the model trained by AST-based graphs generates the worst results, meaning the sole syntax information is insufficient when detecting the code’s vulnerabilities. In general, using heterogeneous code graph representations such as AST+CFG and AST+PDG produces better results than using AST and PDG separately, and CPG achieves the best results among all as it combines properties of AST, CFG and PDG.

Additionally, we explore the importance of heterogeneous graph learning when it comes to encoding the CPG. As pointed out in the previous section, the core component of enabling heterogeneous graph learning is HGT, which presents good performance when incorporating the large number neighbors of different types, *i.e.*, complex node and edge heterogeneity in the graph structure [13]. To answer this, we implemented HGT_{homo} , which is the variant

of HGT and only maintains a single set of parameters for all relations (e.g., *Q-Linear*, *K-Linear* and *V-Linear* matrices share same parameters regardless of types). By doing so, HGT_{homo} preserves the graph learning ability while ignoring the various node/edge types in the CPG. It can be seen clearly that HGT_{heter} demonstrates a significant performance gain across all metrics, proving the great importance of encoding the structural heterogeneity of the program graphs. Specifically, HGT_{heter} keeps distinct edge-based metrics $W_{\phi(e)}^{ATT}$ and $W_{\phi(e)}^{MSG}$ for each edge type $\phi(e)$, which enables the model to distinguish the semantic differences of relations even between the same node types. Additionally, the edge-driven attention mechanism allows the target node to measure the importance of each connected source node with different edge types. For instance, in the case of buffer overflow vulnerability in CWE-119, the falsely converted *unsign* length variable (source node) by *atoi* contributes more to the *memcpy* method (target node) with a larger attention value over the data dependency edge type. The importance of this *unsign* variable’s node embedding will eventually reflect in the graph-level embedding through readout operation, which then helps downstream vulnerability detection task. Apart from that, we also study the role of graph learning in the experiment. Similar to [21, 25], we use BiLSTM as the alternative to encode the code snippets, which tokenizes the code representation (*i.e.*, CPG in this case) as input while ignoring the syntax, semantics, and flows structure information in the graphs. The experimental results show that HGT_{heter} outperforms BiLSTM with a greater 10% performance gain, manifesting the significance of incorporating structure information when modelling the code snippets.

5.6 Results on Real-world Open Source Projects (RQ5)

We verify the effectiveness of our proposed framework and other baselines on real-world programs extracted from C/C++ open-source projects *FFmpeg* and *QEMU*. The detailed statistics of these projects are shown in Table 9.

Table 6 records the experimental results on these projects. In general, we observe a drop in performance for both our proposed framework and other baselines on real-world open projects, as there are much fewer labeled vulnerable samples in these two projects than synthetic code samples in **SARD**. This attributes to the existence of vulnerability label noise in both **FFmpeg** and **QEMU** since the function-level vulnerabilities are labelled based on determining vulnerability-fix commits or non-vulnerability fix commits of these projects. Additionally, Lin et al. underperform for all metrics, especially for **Recall** (high volumes of false-negative predictions), suggesting that only using code tokens in the program to train the detection model is insufficient nor applicable to real-world projects. Other baselines present results with marginal differences, while **DSHGT** outperforms all of them. We discover that both projects contain a large number of fixes for vulnerabilities such as *Memory Leak* and *Buffer Overflow*, which require to better encode the information of different edge types (control flow and dependency information) into the graph-level embedding for better detection results. **DSHGT** learns on the CPG without losing the heterogeneity attributes, thus is more generalized even on real-world projects. Overall, **DSHGT** delivers the best performance for **Accuracy** (7.9% improvement on average), **Precision** (7.65% improvement on average), **Recall** (7.5% improvement on average) and **F1** (10.6% improvement on average). A promising way to improve the performance on real-world projects is to adapt state-of-the-art zero-shot or few-shot learning specifically for heterogeneous graph networks.

6 THREAT TO VALIDITY

External validity: In our experiments, we chose 4 baselines: **LIN et al.** [25], **DEVIGN** [36], **FUNDED** [32] and **DeepWukong** [4]. We believe these 4 baselines could represent the state-of-the-art research outputs, including non-graph learning methods for code tokens and graph learning methods for code graph representations. For the datasets used, we used 17 categories of *C/C++*, *Java* and *PHP* from **SARD**, which shall cover the most commonly seen vulnerability types. Due to the lack of labeled vulnerabilities datasets from real-world projects, we could only evaluate **DSHGT** on the real-world open-source projects (*i.e.* **FFmpeg** and **QEMU**, which has also been used by [20], [25] and [36]). As these two projects also allow code contributions, we believe they are good representations of state-of-the-art real-world projects. Even though our proposed **DSHGT** has shown the transferability to detect *Java* and *PHP* vulnerabilities after being trained on the *C/C++* dataset, the vulnerability datasets for programming languages other than *C/C++* are still limited. We will continue to work on this issue and build up related datasets for future usage in this community.

Internal validity: The quality of code annotations used for training might not align with the ground truth perfectly due to the semantic complexity of codes and human errors. As discussed in Section 5.4, the hand-written annotation highly relies on the programmers’ personal habits, and different programmers could provide different annotations for the same source code segment. Thus, we do not rely heavily on the annotation supervisor, and our empirical study shows that our **DSHGT** reaches the highest performance when $\lambda = 0.2$. We plan to use **DSHGT** in the future for those real-world software projects where we have finer-granularity control of the

annotation quality to remove the confounding variables such as human errors or other noises.

Construct validity The layer depth of *HGT* in **DSHGT** is set to 3 based on the empirical study result (as shown in Section 5.4). The target node embedding is updated through the attentive message passing from neighbor nodes. As the layer numbers increase, the *HGT* will eventually face the oversmoothing problem [3], where distinct information conveyed by neighbors become hard to distinguish owing to the over-iterative message passing, and leads to performance degradation. We leverage a simple 1 layer LSTM as the decoder for the annotation supervisor part, which already demonstrates promising results in the experiment. It suggests the potential of using auxiliary annotations as supplementary information to assist the vulnerability detection task. As a future task, we can leverage more calibrated semantic extraction models such as those pretrained NLP models [14] as the annotation decoder.

7 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we present our pioneer study of using heterogeneous graph learning for detecting software vulnerabilities. In this work, we have chosen to use CPG as the heterogeneous graph and customized a dual-supervisor graph learning model. The extensive experiments on synthetic and real-world software projects show promising results. We are one of the first to explore the importance of conducting research in heterogeneous graph learning to detect software vulnerability for the software engineering community. Besides good results in different programming languages and real-world projects, software engineers can leverage the largely open-sourced new results from graph learning and NLP communities to further enhance this line of research to have better heterogeneous graph representation other than CPG, leverage more robust learning models for latent features in the underlying heterogeneous graph, and utilize more reliable and controllable supervisors in addition to the binary vulnerability oracle.

REFERENCES

- [1] Miltiadis Allamanis, Marc Brockschmidt, and Mahmoud Khademi. 2018. Learning to Represent Programs with Graphs. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- [2] Johannes Bader, Andrew Scott, Michael Pradel, and Satish Chandra. 2019. Getafix: Learning to Fix Bugs Automatically. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 3, OOPSLA (2019), 1–27.
- [3] Deli Chen, Yankai Lin, Wei Li, Peng Li, Jie Zhou, and Xu Sun. 2020. Measuring and relieving the over-smoothing problem for graph neural networks from the topological view. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 34. 3438–3445.
- [4] Xiao Cheng, Haoyu Wang, Jiayi Hua, Guoai Xu, and Yulei Sui. 2021. Deepwukong: Statically Detecting Software Vulnerabilities Using Deep Graph Neural Network. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)* 30, 3 (2021), 1–33.
- [5] Boris Chernis and Rakesh Verma. 2018. Machine Learning Methods for Software Vulnerability Detection. *Proceedings of the Fourth ACM International Workshop on Security and Privacy Analytics*, 31–39.
- [6] Istehad Chowdhury and Mohammad Zulkernine. 2011. Using Complexity, Coupling, and Cohesion Metrics as Early Indicators of Vulnerabilities. *Journal of Systems Architecture* 57, 3 (2011), 294–313.
- [7] Matteo Ciniselli, Nathan Cooper, Luca Pascarella, Antonio Mastropaolo, Emad Aghajani, Denys Poshyvanyk, Massimiliano Di Penta, and Gabriele Bavota. 2021. An Empirical Study on the Usage of Transformer Models for Code Completion. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 48, 12 (2021), 4818–4837.
- [8] Yuxiao Dong, Nitesh V Chawla, and Ananthram Swami. 2017. Metapath2vec: Scalable Representation Learning for Heterogeneous Networks. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 135–144.
- [9] Dawson Engler, David Yu Chen, Seth Hallem, Andy Chou, and Benjamin Chelf. 2001. Bugs as Deviant Behavior: A General Approach to Inferring Errors in Systems Code. *ACM SIGOPS Operating Systems Review* 35, 5 (2001), 57–72.
- [10] Oliver Ferschke, Iryna Gurevych, and Marc Rittberger. 2012. FlawFinder: A Modular System for Predicting Quality Flaws in Wikipedia. In *CLEF (Online Working Notes/Labs/Workshop)*. 1–10.
- [11] Xavier Glorot and Yoshua Bengio. 2010. Understanding the Difficulty of Training Deep Feedforward Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 249–256.
- [12] Hazim Hanif, Mohd Hairul Nizam Md Nasir, Mohd Faizal Ab Razak, Ahmad Firdaus, and Nor Badrul Anuar. 2021. The Rise of Software Vulnerability: Taxonomy of Software Vulnerabilities Detection and Machine Learning Approaches. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* 179 (2021), 103009.
- [13] Ziniu Hu, Yuxiao Dong, Kuansan Wang, and Yizhou Sun. 2020. Heterogeneous Graph Transformer. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2020*. 2704–2710.
- [14] Katikapalli Subramanyam Kalyan, Ajit Rajasekharan, and Sivanesan Sangeetha. 2021. Ammus: A survey of transformer-based pretrained models in natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.05542* (2021).
- [15] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).
- [16] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2016. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907* (2016).
- [17] Ted Kremenek. 2008. Finding Software Bugs with the Clang Static Analyzer. *Apple Inc* (2008), 2008–08.
- [18] Quoc Le and Tomas Mikolov. 2014. Distributed Representations of Sentences and Documents. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 1188–1196.
- [19] Yujia Li, Daniel Tarlow, Marc Brockschmidt, and Richard Zemel. 2015. Gated Graph Sequence Neural Networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.05493* (2015).
- [20] Zhen Li, Deqing Zou, Shouhuai Xu, Zhaoxuan Chen, Yawei Zhu, and Hai Jin. 2021. Vuldeelocator: A Deep Learning-based Fine-grained Vulnerability Detector. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 19, 4 (2021), 2821–2837.
- [21] Zhen Li, Deqing Zou, Shouhuai Xu, Hai Jin, Yawei Zhu, and Zhaoxuan Chen. 2021. Sysevr: A Framework for Using Deep Learning to Detect Software Vulnerabilities. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 19, 4 (2021), 2244–2258.
- [22] Zhen Li, Deqing Zou, Shouhuai Xu, Xinyu Ou, Hai Jin, Sujuan Wang, Zhijun Deng, and Yuyi Zhong. 2018. Vuldeepecker: A Deep Learning-based System for Vulnerability Detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.01681* (2018).
- [23] Rong Liang, Tiegua Zhang, Yujie Lu, Yuze Liu, Zhen Huang, and Xin Chen. 2022. AstBERT: Enabling Language Model for Financial Code Understanding with Abstract Syntax Trees. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Financial Technology and Natural Language Processing (FinNLP)*. 10–17.
- [24] Guanjun Lin, Sheng Wen, Qing-Long Han, Jun Zhang, and Yang Xiang. 2020. Software Vulnerability Detection Using Deep Neural Networks: A Survey. *Proc. IEEE* 108, 10 (2020), 1825–1848.
- [25] Guanjun Lin, Jun Zhang, Wei Luo, Lei Pan, Olivier De Vel, Paul Montague, and Yang Xiang. 2019. Software Vulnerability Discovery via Learning Multi-domain Knowledge Bases. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 18, 5 (2019), 2469–2485.
- [26] Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781* (2013).
- [27] Michael Pradel and Koushik Sen. 2018. Deepbugs: A Learning Approach to Name-based Bug Detection. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 2, OOPSLA (2018), 1–25.
- [28] Caitlin Sadowski, Jeffrey van Gogh, Ciera Jaspas, Emma Soederberg, and Collin Winter. 2015. Tricorder: Building a Program Analysis Ecosystem. In *International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*.
- [29] Yonghee Shin, Andrew Meneely, Laurie Williams, and Jason A Osborne. 2010. Evaluating Complexity, Code Churn, and Developer Activity Metrics as Indicators of Software Vulnerabilities. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 37, 6 (2010), 772–787.
- [30] John Viega, JT Bloch, Yoshi Kohno, and Gary McGraw. 2001. A Static Vulnerability Scanner for C and C++ Code. In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*. 257–269.
- [31] Yao Wan, Jingdong Shu, Yulei Sui, Guandong Xu, Zhou Zhao, Jian Wu, and Philip Yu. 2019. Multi-modal Attention Network Learning for Semantic Source Code Retrieval. In *2019 34th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 13–25.
- [32] Huanqing Wang, Guixin Ye, Zhanyong Tang, Shin Hwei Tan, Songfang Huang, Dingyi Fang, Yansong Feng, Lizhong Bian, and Zheng Wang. 2020. Combining Graph-based Learning with Automated Data Collection for Code Vulnerability Detection. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 16 (2020), 1943–1958.
- [33] Xiao Wang, Deyu Bo, Chuan Shi, Shaohua Fan, Yanfang Ye, and S Yu Philip. 2022. A Survey on Heterogeneous Graph Embedding: Methods, Techniques, Applications and Sources. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* (2022).
- [34] Fabian Yamaguchi, Nico Golde, Daniel Arp, and Konrad Rieck. 2014. Modeling and Discovering Vulnerabilities with Code Property Graphs. In *2014 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. IEEE, 590–604.
- [35] Tiegua Zhang, Yuze Liu, Xin Chen, Xiaowei Huang, Feng Zhu, and Xi Zheng. 2021. GPS: A Policy-driven Sampling Approach for Graph Representation Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.14482* (2021).
- [36] Yaqin Zhou, Shangqing Liu, Jingkai Siow, Xiaoning Du, and Yang Liu. 2019. Devign: Effective Vulnerability Identification by Learning Comprehensive Program Semantics via Graph Neural Networks. *Proceedings of the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32 (2019).
- [37] Deqing Zou, Sujuan Wang, Shouhuai Xu, Zhen Li, and Hai Jin. 2019. μ VulDeePecker: A Deep Learning-Based System for Multiclass Vulnerability Detection. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 18, 5 (2019), 2224–2236.

8 APPENDIX

We show supplementary tables in this Appendix.

Table 7: All node types in CPG.

node_type	description
META_DATA	This node contains the CPG meta data.
FILE	File nodes represent source files or a shared objects from which the CPG was generated.
NAMESPACE	This node represents a namespace.
NAMESPACE_BLOCK	A reference to a namespace.
METHOD	This node represents procedures, functions, methods.
METHOD_PARAMETER_IN	This node represents a formal input parameter.
METHOD_PARAMETER_OUT	This node represents a formal output parameter.
METHOD_RETURN	This node represents an (unnamed) formal method return parameter.
MEMBER	This node represents a type member of a class, struct or union.
TYPE	This node represents a type instance, a concrete instantiation of a type declaration.
TYPE_ARGUMENT	This node represents a type argument which is used to instantiate a parametrized type.
TYPE_DECL	This node represents a type declaration.
TYPE_PARAMETER	This node represents a formal type parameter, the type parameter as given in a type-parametrized method or type declaration.
AST_NODE	This is the base type for all nodes of the abstract syntax tree (AST).
BLOCK	This node represents a compound statement.
CALL	A (function/method/procedure) call.
CALL_REPR	This is the base class of CALL.
CONTROL_STRUCTURE	This node represents a control structure as introduced by control structure statements.
EXPRESSION	This node is the base class for all nodes that represent code pieces that can be evaluated.
FIELD_IDENTIFIER	This node represents the field accessed in a field access.
IDENTIFIER	This node represents an identifier as used when referring to a variable by name..
JUMP_LABEL	This node specifies the label and thus the JUMP_TARGET of control structures BREAK and CONTINUE.
JUMP_TARGET	A jump target is a location that has been specifically marked as the target of a jump.
LITERAL	This node represents a literal such as an integer or string constant.
LOCAL	This node represents a local variable.
METHOD_REF	This node represents a reference to a method/function/procedure as it appears when a method is passed as an argument in a call.
MODIFIER	This node represents a (language-dependent) modifier such as 'static', 'private' or 'public'.
RETURN	This node represents a return instruction.
TYPE_REF	Reference to a type/class.
UNKNOWN	This node represents an AST node but there is no suitable AST node type.
CFG_NODE	Base class for all control flow nodes.
COMMENT	A source code comment node.
FINDING	Finding nodes are used to store analysis results in the graph.
KEY_VALUE_PAIR	This node represents a key-value pair.
LOCATION	A location node summarizes a source code location.
TAG	This node represents a tag.
TAG_NODE_PAIR	This node contains an arbitrary node and an associated tag node.
CONFIG_FILE	This node represent a configuration file.
BINDING	BINDING nodes represent name-signature pairs that can be resolved at a type declaration.
ANNOTATION	A method annotation node.
ANNOTATION_LITERAL	A literal value assigned to an ANNOTATION_PARAMETER.
ANNOTATION_PARAMETER	Formal annotation parameter.
ANNOTATION_PARAMETER_ASSIGN	Assignment of annotation argument to annotation parameter.
ARRAY_INITIALIZER	Initialization construct for arrays.
DECLARATION	Base node class for all declarations.

Table 8: All edge types in CPG.

edge_type	description
SOURCE_FILE	This edge connects a node to the node that represents its source file.
ALIAS_OF	This edge represents an alias relation between a type declaration and a type.
BINDS_TO	This edge connects type arguments to type parameters to indicate that the type argument is used to instantiate the type parameter.
INHERITS_FROM	Inheritance relation between a type declaration and a type.
AST	This edge connects a parent node to its child in the abstract syntax tree.
CONDITION	The edge connects control structure nodes to the expressions that holds their conditions.
ARGUMENT	Argument edges connect call sites to their arguments as well as the expressions that return.
CALL	This edge connects call sites.
RECEIVER	RECEIVER edges connect call sites to their receiver arguments.
CFG	This edge indicates control flow from the source to the destination node.
DOMINATE	This edge indicates that the source node immediately dominates the destination node.
POST_DOMINATE	This edge indicates that the source node immediately post dominates the destination node.
CDG	A CDG edge expresses that the destination node is control dependent on the source node.
REACHING_DEF	A reaching definition edge indicates that a variable produced at the source node reaches the destination node without being reassigned on the way.
CONTAINS	This edge connects a node to the method that contains it.
EVAL_TYPE	This edge connects a node to its evaluation type.
PARAMETER_LINK	This edge connects a method input parameter to the corresponding method output parameter.
TAGGED_BY	This edge connects a node to the a TAG node.
BINDS	This edge connects a type declaration (TYPE_DECL) with a binding node (BINDING).
REF	This edge indicates that the source node is an identifier that denotes access to the destination node.

Table 9: Dataset Overview

Language	Vul Category	Description	Vulnerable Samples	Non-vulnerable Samples
C/C++	CWE-119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	1597	5406
	CWE-400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	2786	8563
	CWE-404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	1054	3748
	CWE-369	Divide By Zero	2691	8266
	CWE-191	Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound)	3473	10572
	CWE-476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1467	7336
	CWE-78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	10519	37854
	CWE-772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	4755	11847
	CWE-467	Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type	867	3573
	CWE-190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	3648	10487
	CWE-770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	843	2973
	CWE-666	Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime	1321	4589
	CWE-665	Improper Initialization	1436	4680
	CWE-758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1674	5745
	CWE-469	Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size	667	2745
CWE-676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	478	1394	
CWE-834	Excessive Iteration	362	1644	
JAVA	CWE-78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	476	1576
PHP	CWE-78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	268	473
Real-World Open Source Projects	FFmpeg	FFmpeg is a software for handling video, audio, and other multimedia files and streams. Its major vulnerability type is overflow vulnerability.	4981	4788
	QEMU	QEMU is a hardware virtualization software, and its main vulnerability types include DoS attacks, code execution vulnerabilities caused by overflows, and privilege escalation vulnerabilities.	7479	10070