

GenCode: A Generic Data Augmentation Framework for Boosting Deep Learning-Based Code Understanding

Zeming Dong¹, Qiang Hu^{2*}, Xiaofei Xie³, Maxime Cordy²,
Mike Papadakis², Jianjun Zhao¹

¹ Kyushu University, ² University of Luxembourg, ³ Singapore Management University

Abstract

Pre-trained code models lead the era of code intelligence with multiple models have been designed with impressive performance. However, one important problem, data augmentation for code data that automatically helps developers prepare training data lacks study in this field. In this paper, we introduce a generic data augmentation framework, GenCode, to enhance the training of code understanding models. Simply speaking, GenCode follows a generation-and-selection paradigm to prepare useful training code data. Specifically, it employs code transformation techniques to generate new code candidates first and then selects important ones as the training data by importance metrics. To evaluate the effectiveness of GenCode, we conduct experiments on four code understanding tasks (e.g., code clone detection) and three pre-trained code models (e.g., CodeT5). Compared to the *state-of-the-art* (SOTA) code augmentation method, MixCode, GenCode produces code models with 2.92% higher accuracy and 4.90% robustness on average.

Introduction

Deep learning (DL) for code has been one of the successful DL applications over the years. The methodology of applying deep learning to solve *software engineering* (SE) tasks, such as software vulnerability detection (Zhou et al. 2019), is commonly known as *code learning*. From the model level, different DL models specifically designed for code learning have been proposed, such as *CodeBERT* (Feng et al. 2020), *GraphCodeBERT* (Guo et al. 2020), and *CodeT5* (Wang et al. 2021). From the commercial perspective, multiple related products such as Copilot¹ and Tabnine² have been widely used to help our daily development. As a result, in different downstream learning-based code understanding tasks, e.g., code clone detection (Lu et al. 2021) and program classification (Puri et al. 2021), DL already achieved significantly better results than traditional SE techniques.

However, most of the existing research focuses on designing new code representation techniques or code model architectures to further improve the effectiveness of DL for code, one important problem – how to prepare high-quality training data gained limited attention even though recent research demonstrated it highly affects the performance of code

models (Sun et al. 2022). The challenge behind this is preparing training data for code models is heavy work. Although today developers can easily collect raw code data from the open-source community such as GitHub³, data labeling is still expensive, especially for code-related tasks. It needs huge human effort with professional domain knowledge.

To tackle this problem, data augmentation is a famous technique to increase the diversity and quality of training data based only on existing labeled data. In the code learning field techniques such as code refactoring methods and text-oriented transformation methods can be directly used for code augmentation. Unfortunately, existing studies (Bielik and Vechev 2020; Yu, Wang, and Wang 2022) stated that code refactoring methods have limited advantages in the accuracy improvement of code models. Besides, (Dong et al. 2023b) revealed that code models trained using existing data augmentation methods still suffer from the low robustness issue. Moreover, a recent work, MixCode (Dong et al. 2023a), that follows the spirit of Mixup (Zhang et al. 2018) to do code augmentation achieved promising results, but it can be only used for classification tasks. Therefore, there are currently no effective and reliable code augmentation methods that can be generalized across different tasks.

To bridge this gap, inspired by the great success of the typical two-stage *Automated Data Augmentation* (AutoDA) framework in the field of *computer vision* (Cubuk et al. 2020; Yang et al. 2023b), we propose GenCode, the first generation-and-selection-based data augmentation framework for code understanding. Specifically, at each training epoch, GenCode first generates *training candidates* by using different code transformation methods. Here, we consider different types of methods such as semantic-preserving code refactoring methods and syntax-breaking text transformation methods. After that, GenCode selects valuable training data from the candidates with the guidance of importance metrics. The important metric used in GenCode is simply defined as the *loss value* of code data produced by the code model. Finally, the selected samples are used for the model training. We conducted comprehensive experiments to study how GenCode can improve the accuracy and robustness of code models. The experimental results demonstrated that, compared to the SOTA method, MixCode, GenCode can produce code models with a 2.92%

*Corresponding author.

¹<https://github.com/features/copilot>

²<https://www.tabnine.com>

³<https://github.com>

higher accuracy and 4.90% better robustness on average.

To summarize, the main contributions of this paper are:

- We propose the first generation-and-selection-based framework, GenCode, which automatically enriches the training data for boosting the code understanding models.
- We empirically demonstrate that GenCode can produce more accurate and robust code understanding models compared to existing data augmentation methods and conduct an ablation study to explore how different importance scores affect the effectiveness of GenCode.

Background and Related Work

Code Representation

Code representation is a crucial technique that converts source code into a format interpretable by *Deep Neural Networks (DNNs)*, facilitating effective learning of source code features. Since source code can be seen as sequences of tokens or structural graph (Allamanis et al. 2018), researchers employ the techniques in *Natural Language Processing (NLP)* and *Graph Neural Networks (GNNs)* to learn information from code and solve downstream tasks, such as automated program classification (Puri et al. 2021) and code clone detection (Wang et al. 2020). Existing methods for code representation can be roughly divided into two groups, sequence-based representation and graph-based representation. *Sequence-based representation* follows the same procedure of text data processing in NLP to convert raw code data into a sequence of code tokens (Alon et al. 2019). *Graph-based representation* learns the structural information of code. Here, the structural information can be *abstract syntax tree (AST)*, data flow information, and other types of flow information (Dinella et al. 2020; Yasunaga and Liang 2020).

Unlike code representation, our work focuses on code data preprocessing and studies the powerful pre-trained code models CodeBERT, GraphCodeBERT, and CodeT5 that achieved impressive results on code understanding tasks.

Data Augmentation for Code Understanding

Data augmentation is a well-studied technique in the machine learning field that increases the size and diversity of training data by only modifying the existing labeled data, thus, without further human effort. For instance, in the NLP field, researchers tried many ways to augment the text data, e.g., replacing a token with a synonym (Feng et al. 2021).

Recently, data augmentation has gained attention from software engineering researchers. Various data augmentation methods designed for source code have been proposed (Gao et al. 2020; Yefet, Alon, and Yahav 2020; Allamanis, Jackson-Flux, and Brockschmidt 2021; Pour et al. 2021; Bui, Yu, and Jiang 2021; Wang et al. 2022; Park, Kim, and Han 2023; Yang et al. 2023a), with the most general framework involving the use of code refactoring, e.g., *local variable renaming* and *dead store*, to create more code data without breaking the semantics of the original codes. Concretely, code refactoring rewrites the syntactic structure of source code while keeping the semantic information (Lacerda et al. 2020).

Existing works (Bielik and Vechev 2020; Yu, Wang, and Wang 2022; de Paula Rodrigues, Braga, and Dahab 2023;

Dong et al. 2023b, 2024) conducted empirical studies and found code refactoring methods have limited advantages in boosting the training of code models. For instance, a recent empirical study (Dong et al. 2024) on code understanding revealed that the utilization of code refactoring methods only achieved success rates of 66.67% and 41.67% in improving accuracy and robustness, respectively, compared to code model training without data augmentation. Besides, the SOTA code data augmentation method, MixCode, which linearly interpolates pairs of source codes, has been proven more effective than the current general framework code refactoring. However, as a variant of Mixup specifically designed for code data, MixCode is limited to applications in code classification tasks, as it necessitates the label with one-hot encoding.

Compared to existing works, we propose a simple yet effective code augmentation framework that is not only unaffected by the dataset and model constraints but also applicable to both classification and non-classification tasks.

Definition

We first define the problem of data augmentation for code models.

Definition 1. A program code⁴ is defined as a 5-tuple $\mathcal{P} = (\text{content}, \text{se}, \text{sy}, \text{Ip}, \text{Op})$: *content* contains all the text in the code \mathcal{P} ; *se* and *sy* are the semantic and syntax of the code \mathcal{P} ; and *Ip* and *Op* are the input and output of the code \mathcal{P} .

Definition 2. A code model is defined as a 3-tuple $M = (\text{parameter}, \mathcal{P}, Y)$, where *parameter* contains all the weights in code model M , \mathcal{P} is the input code, and Y is the label of \mathcal{P} given a specific downstream code task.

Code models can be any machine learning model such as a simple regression model or a pre-trained model, e.g., CodeT5 (Wang et al. 2021).

Definition 3. Given a code \mathcal{P} , a code transformation method $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}'$, code augmentation is to transform \mathcal{P} to \mathcal{P}' that $\mathcal{P}'.\text{content} = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{P}.\text{content}) \ \& \ \mathcal{P}'.\text{content} \neq \mathcal{P}.\text{content}$.

Here, code transformation methods can be any method that can change the content of program statements such as text data transformation methods (e.g., synonym replacement and code refactoring methods (e.g., dead if statement adding).

Definition 4. Given a code model M , a code \mathcal{P} and its augmented version \mathcal{P}' , semantic-preserving (breaking) code augmentation indicates $\mathcal{P}.\text{se} = \mathcal{P}'.\text{se} \ \& \ M(\mathcal{P}) = M(\mathcal{P}')$ ($\mathcal{P}.\text{se} \neq \mathcal{P}'.\text{se} \ \& \ M(\mathcal{P}) \neq M(\mathcal{P}')$).

Definition 5. Given a code \mathcal{P} and its augmented version \mathcal{P}' , syntax-preserving (breaking) code augmentation indicates $\mathcal{P}.\text{sy} = \mathcal{P}'.\text{sy} \ (\mathcal{P}.\text{sy} \neq \mathcal{P}'.\text{sy})$.

Assumption and Preliminary Study

GenCode selects the most valuable data for the code model training. This approach is grounded on the assumption that the data that code models have less confidence in is more useful for model training. To check whether this assumption is valid or not, we conducted a preliminary study to explore if

⁴For simplicity, we use *code* in the paper.

Table 1: Correlation between loss values and code model accuracy. The P -value less than 0.01 is highlighted with a blue background.

	Coefficient	P-value
Initialized (epoch 0)	0.6075	7.9687e-12
Middle (epoch 10)	0.2440	0.0125
Well-trained (epoch 20)	0.1657	0.0926

there is a correlation between the accuracy of the trained code model and the confidence of the model on the training data. Specifically, the study is conducted on the *Google Code Jam (GCJ)* (Yang et al. 2022) dataset and CodeBERT pre-trained code model. The detailed steps are as follows:

Step 1. We initialize the code model and use code augmentation methods to generate additional data as the training candidate set. The code augmentation methods will be introduced in a later section.

Step 2. We randomly select a number of data from the training candidate set. Here the selected number is the same as the size of the original training data. We repeat this selection 100 times and collect 100 groups of training data. After that, we compute and record the average loss values for each group of training data.

Step 3. We train the code model using each group of training data respectively for a few epochs and thus save 100 trained code models. We then test each code model using the original test data and save 100 accuracies.

Step 4. We use the *Pearson Correlation Coefficient (PCC)* (Schober, Boer, and Schwarte 2018) metric to check the correlation between the loss values and the accuracies.

Table 1 summarizes the results of our preliminary study. Here, we considered three types of code models, the initialed model, the model that has been trained for a few epochs but not converged, and the well-trained code model, to check if our assumption can stand in different scenarios. The results indicate that there is a positive correlation between the loss values of data and the accuracy of code models trained by using these data. From the initialized model to the well-trained model, this correlation becomes weaker but still exists. We conjecture that when the model is in the early stage, most of the data that have high loss values are useful for the model training. However, when training proceeds, the data that still have high loss values are the model itself cannot learn. Thus, there will be a correlation drop from the early epoch to the later ones. Based on this phenomenon, we can propose an effective and reliable data augmentation framework to boost the training of code models based on this phenomenon.

Finding: There is a positive correlation between the loss values of code data and the accuracy of code models trained by using these data. When the code model is randomly initialized, this correlation is significant (with a P -value less than 0.01).

Methodology

Overview

The goal of GenCode is to produce code models with better performance on test data by training models on carefully generated data. Given a training set of program \mathcal{P}_{train} , its transformed version \mathcal{P}'_{train} , and a set of test programs \mathcal{P}_{test} , after the training process $\text{train}(\cdot)$, $\rho(M'(\mathcal{P}_{test})) > \rho(M(\mathcal{P}_{test}))$, where $M.\text{parameter} = \text{train}(M, \mathcal{P}_{train})$ & $M'.\text{parameter} = \text{train}(M', \mathcal{P}'_{train})$, and $\rho(\cdot)$ is the performance measurement.

GenCode follows the generation-and-selection workflow and utilizes different types of code transformation methods to generate diverse code data first, then selects code data that are most useful for training as the training data. Algorithm 1 shows how GenCode works. In each training epoch, GenCode automatically generates more code data (Line 3 to Line 5, Definition 3) and then selects the most important ones (Line 6 to Line 9) to train the code model (Line 10). Here, the data importance is measured by the loss values produced by the code model which is the most common indicator to check how the model performs on the data. Overall, GenCode contains two main steps, utilizing code data augmentation methods to compose the *search space* and *importance-guided data selection*.

Algorithm 1: GenCode

Require: M : initialized DNN model
Require: \mathcal{P}, Y : original code data and labels
Require: $\mathcal{T} = \{t\}$: a set of code augmentation methods
Ensure: M : trained model

- 1: **for** $run \leftarrow \{0, \dots, \#epochs\}$ **do**
- 2: $\mathcal{P}', Y' \leftarrow \phi, \phi$ ▷ initialization
- 3: **for** $t \in \mathcal{T}$ **do**
- 4: $\mathcal{P}' \leftarrow \mathcal{P}' \cup t(\mathcal{P})$
- 5: $Y' \leftarrow Y' \cup Y$ ▷ code augmentation
- 6: $I \leftarrow \text{Importance}(M, \mathcal{P}')$ ▷ computing importance
- 7: $Index \leftarrow \text{argSort}(I) [: | |\mathcal{P}'| |]$ ▷ sort by importance
- 8: $X_{train} \leftarrow \mathcal{P}' [Index]$
- 9: $Y_{train} \leftarrow Y' [Index]$
- 10: $M \leftarrow \text{Train}(M, X_{train}, Y_{train})$
- 11: **return** M

Search Space

Even though the code has strict syntax constraints, recent work (Dong et al. 2023b) found that these data augmentation methods that slightly break the syntax of the source code e.g., *Random Swap*, can still be useful for code model training. To enhance the diversity of source code within the feature space, therefore, GenCode considers two types of code augmentation methods, semantic/syntax-preserving methods, and syntax-breaking methods (see Definition 4 and Definition 5).

GenCode adapts code refactoring methods as semantic/syntax-preserving methods. Code refactoring methods follow the constraints of programming languages to edit the code while keeping the main functionality of the code. On the other hand, text augmentation methods are used as syntax-breaking methods in GenCode which are widely

Table 2: Atomic data augmentation operators adopted in GenCode.

Syntax-preserving		Syntax-breaking
API renaming	Filed enhancement	Synonym replacement (SR) Random insertion (RI) Random swap (RS) Random deletion (RD) Back-translation (BT)
Arguments adding	For loop enhancement	
Arguments renaming	If enhancement	
Dead for adding	Local variable adding	
Dead if adding	Local variable renaming	
Dead if-else adding	Method name renaming	
Dead switch adding	Plus zero	
Dead while adding	Print adding	
Duplication	Return optimal	




Figure 1: An example of atomic data augmentation operators.

used in the NLP field. For example, text augmentation methods can randomly delete some tokens in the code. However, even though the syntax has been broken, the code model can still successfully predict those codes since it reads the code as a sequence. In total, as shown in Table 2, GenCode currently supports 18 code refactoring methods and 5 text augmentation methods. Besides, Figure 1 provides an example of the training candidate that is to generate the search space. In the syntax-preserving, we present a code refactoring method named *API Renaming*, which involves modifying the function name from "main()" to "even()". In the syntax-breaking, we demonstrate another instance of *API Renaming*, where two different statements within a program are randomly selected and their positions swapped. As depicted in this example, the third and fourth lines have been interchanged.

Importance-Guided Data Selection

After constructing the training candidate, we then choose the most valuable code data that can benefit the code model training. Based on our *Finding* drawn from the preliminary study, GenCode chooses the simplest way to measure the importance of code data to the model – the *loss* value. That means, GenCode takes all the transformed code as input to the code model and records all the loss values first, then ranks all the code in descending order based on the loss values and selects the first K code as the training data. Following the common setting in the data augmentation problem (Dong

et al. 2023a), K is set as the number of original training data. GenCode chooses loss value as the indicator since it can be generalized to any code model and task.

Evaluation

We evaluate both the accuracy and robustness of trained code models. Besides, we check how does importance score affects the effectiveness of GenCode.

Datasets and Models

Datasets and Models We evaluate GenCode on four code understanding tasks, bug detection (Hu et al. 2019), authorship attribution (Yang et al. 2022), code clone detection (Yang et al. 2022) (Note that, MixCode is not suitable for this task since its input is code pairs.), and problem classification (Puri et al. 2021). For each code task, we fine-tune three types of models based on pre-trained code models, CodeBERT, GraphCodeBERT, and CodeT5. For the model training, we follow existing works (Hu et al. 2019; Wang et al. 2021; Puri et al. 2021; Yang et al. 2022; Dong et al. 2023a), to set all configurations. Specifically, we set the training epoch as 50 for all tasks and models. Regarding the optimizer, we utilize *Adam* (Kingma and Ba 2014) with a learning rate of 10^{-3} for all the models. Besides, we use early stopping with a patience of 20 to mitigate overfitting. To reduce the influence of randomness, we train each model five times and report the average results along with the standard deviation. For MixCode, we follow the recommendation of the original paper and set the Mixup ratio as $\alpha = 0.1$. For the setting of adversarial attacks, we directly use the default configurations provided by the original papers (Yang et al. 2022).

Evaluation Metrics. In the evaluation, we assess the performance of trained models from two perspectives, namely, *clean accuracy* and *model robustness*. For the robustness evaluation, we check the *attack success rate (ASR)* metric of two well-established adversarial attack methods, namely, *ALERT* (Yang et al. 2022), which uses variable renaming while considering natural semantics, and *MHM* (Zhang et al. 2020), which also randomly replaces variable names but does not account for natural semantics. We do not consider the natural robustness since the existing natural robustness datasets can not fully support our studied tasks, i.e., no natural robustness datasets support authorship attribution, bug detection, and code clone detection.

Baseline Methods. We consider *model training without data augmentation (No Aug)*, *Refactor* (Yu, Wang, and Wang 2022), a family of text-oriented data augmentation methods (Dong et al. 2023b), and *MixCode* as baseline methods. *Refactor*, which keeps code syntax rules, is a widely used data augmentation framework specifically designed for code data. In contrast, text-oriented code data augmentation methods, which slightly break syntax rules, have recently proven more effective than Refactor. Additionally, *MixCode* is a more recent and high-performing code data augmentation method that significantly enhances code models.

Accuracy Evaluation

Overall accuracy. Column *Accuracy* in Table 3 summarizes the final test accuracy of code models trained by using dif-

Table 3: Effectiveness of data augmentation methods w.r.t. test accuracy \uparrow (average \pm standard deviation, %) on original test data and ASR \downarrow (%) on test data. The best results are highlighted in blue. Code understanding tasks include **Authorship attribution** (GCJ), **Bug detection** (Refactory), **Problem classification** (Java250), and **Clone detection** (BigCloneBench).

Model	DA method	GCJ			Refactory			Java250			BigCloneBench		
		Accuracy \uparrow	MHM \downarrow	ALERT \downarrow	Accuracy \uparrow	MHM \downarrow	ALERT \downarrow	Accuracy \uparrow	MHM \downarrow	ALERT \downarrow	Accuracy \uparrow	MHM \downarrow	ALERT \downarrow
CodeBERT	No Aug	90.96 \pm 0.07	33.31	56.13	96.21 \pm 0.13	36.31	42.31	96.36 \pm 0.09	40.55	53.37	96.91 \pm 0.12	9.74	24.61
	Refactor	91.74 \pm 0.11	35.56	52.84	95.95 \pm 0.19	32.64	40.89	96.44 \pm 0.12	38.35	52.56	96.97 \pm 0.21	8.55	18.29
	SR	70.66 \pm 0.11	35.46	52.71	96.71 \pm 0.11	39.25	53.91	96.21 \pm 0.02	42.01	53.79	97.02 \pm 0.15	12.52	26.11
	RI	59.91 \pm 0.21	40.78	65.76	96.43 \pm 0.18	38.45	45.57	96.15 \pm 0.06	43.15	55.07	97.38 \pm 0.23	8.31	30.08
	RS	93.24 \pm 0.13	28.26	52.44	96.73 \pm 0.15	38.63	45.98	96.49 \pm 0.04	39.36	50.79	96.92 \pm 0.12	13.41	30.13
	RD	76.98 \pm 0.09	35.65	55.46	96.46 \pm 0.18	30.23	41.32	96.61 \pm 0.12	38.31	52.42	97.11 \pm 0.19	9.58	30.15
	BT	82.74 \pm 0.15	40.38	55.95	94.31 \pm 0.38	62.98	69.87	96.06 \pm 0.06	42.21	53.32	97.13 \pm 0.17	11.29	26.32
	MixCode	92.21 \pm 0.25	29.28	52.53	96.76 \pm 0.31	31.04	41.01	96.62 \pm 0.23	36.14	50.67	-	-	-
	GenCode	96.23 \pm 0.18	22.33	46.62	99.32 \pm 0.14	23.75	31.25	98.89 \pm 0.09	29.89	40.65	98.93 \pm 0.11	7.12	15.83
	GraphCodeBERT	No Aug	93.96 \pm 0.15	31.23	56.02	96.84 \pm 0.16	22.97	30.26	96.41 \pm 0.11	23.16	42.66	96.88 \pm 0.09	4.19
Refactor		91.72 \pm 0.21	30.31	56.58	95.49 \pm 0.21	24.26	32.57	96.53 \pm 0.15	23.13	42.42	97.11 \pm 0.23	6.05	6.17
SR		89.46 \pm 0.13	40.02	66.68	95.57 \pm 0.13	28.39	47.15	96.46 \pm 0.14	22.92	42.18	97.14 \pm 0.16	6.13	10.16
RI		80.47 \pm 0.21	43.51	65.75	94.51 \pm 0.25	25.08	32.87	96.52 \pm 0.09	22.37	42.33	97.35 \pm 0.17	2.23	6.28
RS		94.76 \pm 0.15	30.18	54.75	97.88 \pm 0.15	21.85	29.67	96.44 \pm 0.14	22.68	41.98	97.54 \pm 0.12	6.03	11.94
RD		91.71 \pm 0.26	31.73	60.92	96.53 \pm 0.19	20.35	26.98	96.56 \pm 0.21	22.39	41.84	97.16 \pm 0.21	6.18	8.27
BT		80.47 \pm 0.05	41.65	62.99	95.99 \pm 0.27	35.56	46.23	96.39 \pm 0.13	22.91	42.32	97.11 \pm 0.16	8.18	14.12
MixCode		94.19 \pm 0.25	30.26	54.49	97.29 \pm 0.15	14.89	26.53	96.89 \pm 0.19	20.03	42.01	-	-	-
GenCode		97.93 \pm 0.14	26.43	48.87	99.45 \pm 0.17	15.78	21.92	99.16 \pm 0.13	18.76	33.81	99.23 \pm 0.08	1.86	4.62
CodeT5		No Aug	95.02 \pm 0.07	30.78	55.67	97.22 \pm 0.17	22.45	29.69	96.98 \pm 0.08	31.76	49.82	97.38 \pm 0.13	10.32
	Refactor	92.21 \pm 0.14	30.12	55.93	96.43 \pm 0.22	28.76	35.45	96.92 \pm 0.11	30.66	47.12	97.24 \pm 0.12	9.32	22.05
	SR	90.14 \pm 0.21	39.21	51.84	94.67 \pm 0.14	28.24	36.26	96.53 \pm 0.05	28.65	46.01	97.31 \pm 0.08	15.87	25.98
	RI	78.77 \pm 0.05	41.02	63.46	95.02 \pm 0.15	24.78	33.61	96.11 \pm 0.09	27.14	46.76	97.46 \pm 0.13	10.43	29.76
	RS	95.66 \pm 0.14	29.35	51.74	97.97 \pm 0.29	21.32	27.76	96.34 \pm 0.11	28.45	48.45	97.03 \pm 0.15	14.33	30.43
	RD	92.01 \pm 0.11	31.04	56.85	97.52 \pm 0.26	19.93	24.87	97.21 \pm 0.07	26.09	45.24	97.43 \pm 0.07	9.98	28.87
	BT	81.45 \pm 0.13	39.65	54.24	95.38 \pm 0.11	33.62	43.67	96.45 \pm 0.14	29.47	45.38	97.65 \pm 0.14	10.43	25.34
	MixCode	94.32 \pm 0.16	29.82	42.56	97.32 \pm 0.13	12.49	18.32	96.91 \pm 0.11	28.73	48.87	-	-	-
	GenCode	98.85 \pm 0.11	23.57	44.76	99.64 \pm 0.06	12.13	19.56	99.38 \pm 0.11	21.63	39.76	99.34 \pm 0.12	7.39	12.15

ferent code data augmentation methods including GenCode. Surprisingly, from the results, we can see that most of the existing code augmentation methods except *RS* and *MixCode* negatively affect the performance of code models. This finding is similar to the conclusion from recent code augmentation studies (Bielik and Vechev 2020; Yu, Wang, and Wang 2022; Dong et al. 2023b) which states code augmentation has limited advantage in boosting the training of code models and also indicates that data augmentation for code is a challenging problem.

Then, compared to the existing data augmentation methods, the results demonstrate that GenCode consistently enhances the training and achieves the best results across all the considered datasets and models. Concretely, on average, GenCode generates models with 4.52%, 3.05%, 2.56%, and 2.11% higher accuracy than *No Aug* in GCJ, Refactory, Java250, and BigCloneBench, respectively. Besides, compared to *MixCode*, GenCode can achieve 4.1%, 2.34%, and 2.33% better results in GCJ, Refactory, and Java250 datasets, respectively.

Statistical analysis. We conducted statistical tests, including the *T-Test* and *Wilcoxon signed-rank test*, across all pre-trained models. The results show that GenCode significantly (with p -value < 0.05) outperforms other methods including *MixCode*. In conclusion, GenCode is effective in training accurate code models.

Convergence speed analysis. Figure 2 depicts the average test accuracy at each training epoch of CodeBERT using different data augmentation methods. The results demonstrated that GenCode consistently outperforms other baseline methods during the whole training process. We can conclude that the choice of the number of training epochs will not affect the advantages of our method over other methods.

Considering Figure 3, we can see that the embedding produced by GenCode is clearly distributed compared to other methods. Besides, we computed the average distance between the data points from different classes, i.e., the average distance between red points and blue points in Figure 3. The

Table 4: Average distance between the data points from different classes. The best is highlighted with a blue background, and the worst is highlighted with a gray background.

DA method	Refactor	SR	RI	RS
Average distance	6.02	8.05	7.02	8.06
DA method	RD	BT	MixCode	GenCode
Average distance	7.03	6.00	4.05	8.78

Table 5: Mean values of maximum probabilities. The best results are highlighted in blue. Code understanding tasks include **Authorship attribution** (GCJ), **Bug detection** (Refactory), **Problem classification** (Java250), and **Clone detection** (BigCloneBench).

Model	DA method	GCJ	Refactory	Java250	BigCloneBench
CodeBERT	No Aug	0.0381945	0.9368535	0.9554731	0.9651272
	Refactor	0.0391864	0.9643155	0.9620814	0.9654681
	SR	0.0380562	0.9527686	0.9341456	0.9583812
	RI	0.0371215	0.9189242	0.9327171	0.9704512
	RS	0.0392987	0.9561591	0.9581767	0.9410937
	RD	0.0392987	0.9723022	0.9634647	0.9631375
	BT	0.0379581	0.9566747	0.9417861	0.9667154
	MixCode	0.0390714	0.9687351	0.9685594	-
	GenCode	0.0413779	0.9808122	0.9714346	0.9786421

results are shown in the following Table. The results confirm that GenCode can better distinguish the two classes. Interestingly, we found that *MixCode* has the smallest distance result. That means even though *MixCode* can train code models with good performance, the code models have low confidence in their predictions, thus, the data are near the decision boundaries. This phenomenon is similar to the findings in (Verma et al. 2019), where the representations obtained by interpolating hidden states have two desirable properties: the class-representations are flattened into a minimal amount of directions of variation, and all points in between these flat representations, most unobserved during training and off the data manifold, are assigned low-confidence predictions.

Visualizing principal component analysis. Furthermore, we explore why models trained by GenCode have higher ac-




Figure 2: Convergence speed of CodeBERT using different code data augmentation methods in each task.




Figure 3: Visualization of code embeddings after dimension reduction using Principal Component Analysis (PCA). Model: CodeBERT, dataset: Refactory, task: Bug detection.

Table 6: Effectiveness of data augmentation methods w.r.t. test accuracy \uparrow (average \pm standard deviation, %) on original test data and ASR \downarrow (%) on test data. The best results are highlighted in blue. Code understanding tasks include **Authorship attribution** (GCJ), **Bug detection** (Refactory), **Problem classification** (Java250), and **Clone detection** (BigCloneBench).

Model	DA method	GCJ			Refactory			Java250			BigCloneBench		
		Accuracy \uparrow	MHM \downarrow	ALERT \downarrow	Accuracy \uparrow	MHM \downarrow	ALERT \downarrow	Accuracy \uparrow	MHM \downarrow	ALERT \downarrow	Accuracy \uparrow	MHM \downarrow	ALERT \downarrow
CodeBERT	GenCode (Random)	94.74 \pm 0.21	25.21	50.32	98.82 \pm 0.15	27.65	36.65	98.24 \pm 0.11	32.52	44.87	98.27 \pm 0.19	8.01	18.12
	GenCode (Min)	93.34 \pm 0.32	35.66	66.67	96.13 \pm 0.21	65.51	69.76	96.43 \pm 0.17	46.76	53.86	97.23 \pm 0.14	20.65	41.32
	GenCode	96.23 \pm 0.18	22.33	42.62	99.32 \pm 0.24	22.75	29.25	98.89 \pm 0.09	29.89	40.65	98.93 \pm 0.15	7.12	15.83
GraphCodeBERT	GenCode (Random)	95.26 \pm 0.11	29.97	50.63	98.93 \pm 0.18	17.56	24.29	98.68 \pm 0.22	20.65	38.86	98.67 \pm 0.13	2.04	5.97
	GenCode (Min)	93.53 \pm 0.17	40.55	68.23	96.31 \pm 0.24	38.73	46.98	96.72 \pm 0.12	26.87	46.67	97.22 \pm 0.21	11.45	21.23
	GenCode	97.93 \pm 0.14	26.43	39.87	99.45 \pm 0.17	15.78	20.92	99.16 \pm 0.13	18.76	33.81	99.23 \pm 0.09	1.86	4.62
CodeT5	GenCode (Random)	96.24 \pm 0.21	25.03	47.61	98.99 \pm 0.21	18.46	23.67	98.93 \pm 0.16	25.11	42.34	98.83 \pm 0.08	8.67	17.42
	GenCode (Min)	94.11 \pm 0.31	38.65	59.89	98.29 \pm 0.12	35.67	48.59	97.03 \pm 0.23	32.61	49.27	97.01 \pm 0.15	18.36	25.54
	GenCode	98.85 \pm 0.16	23.57	38.76	99.64 \pm 0.37	12.13	18.81	99.38 \pm 0.11	21.63	39.76	99.34 \pm 0.12	7.39	12.15

accuracy than models trained using other methods by analyzing the code representation capability of trained code embeddings. Specifically, 1) first, we extract the code embeddings produced by each trained model using all the test data as code features. 2) Then, since the extracted features are high dimensions and hard to analyze, we reduce the dimensions

of code data features using the *Principal Component Analysis (PCA)* (Maćkiewicz and Ratajczak 1993) algorithm. 3) After that, we visualize the reduced 2-dimensional vectors. Normally, the features extracted by a well-trained model are more clearly distributed based on the data labels. Figure 3 depicts the visualized features extracted from CodeBERT using

the Refactory dataset. We can see that the code embeddings trained by using GenCode are more clearly distributed than embedding extracted by other models, i.e., the buggy code and correct code are greatly different in the figure. These results indicate that GenCode can train good code embeddings and, therefore, produce better accurate code models for code understanding tasks. Besides, we computed the average distance between the data points from different classes, i.e., the average distance between red points and blue points in Figure. 3. The results from Table 4 confirm that GenCode can better distinguish the two classes. Interestingly, we found that MixCode has the smallest distance result. That means even though MixCode can train code models with good performance, the code models have low confidence in their predictions, thus, the data are near the decision boundaries. This phenomenon is similar to the findings in (Verma et al. 2019), where interpolating hidden state representations yields two beneficial properties: 1) class representations are flattened into a minimal number of directions of variation, and 2) all points between these flat representations are assigned low-confidence predictions.

Robustness Evaluation

Overall robustness. Column *MHM* and *ALERT* in Table 3 summarize the attack success rate of adversarial attack methods against code models. First, we can see that similar to the observation in Accuracy Evaluation, not all data augmentation methods can improve the robustness of code models. This finding is consistent with the existing works (Dong et al. 2023b). Specifically, in the baseline methods, only *RS* and *MixCode* have a positive impact on the robustness of code models. Considering our method, GenCode consistently improves the robustness of code models and achieves the best results in 21 out of 24 cases. On average, compared to *No Aug*, models trained by GenCode have an 8.42% lower ASR (higher robustness). This result breaks the previous finding (Bielik and Vechev 2020) that states simply adding additional generated code to the training dataset to train code models has limited benefits in improving their robustness. On the other hand, compared to *MixCode*, GenCode can train code models with 4.90% higher robustness on average.

Statistical analysis. We also conduct statistical tests using *T-Test* and *Wilcoxon signed-rank test*. When comparing existing data augmentation methods, GenCode consistently exhibits a *p-value* < 0.05 across all pre-trained models. In conclusion, GenCode can produce more adversarial robust code understanding models than other methods.

Maximum probability analysis. To explore why GenCode produces a more robust code model, we check the *confidence* of trained models using different code data augmentation methods on the original test data. Normally, if the DNN model is more confident in the test data, it is more difficult to attack this model using this data (Wu et al. 2018). To do so, for each dataset and code model, we collect the maximum probability of the corrected classified test data produced by the code model first. Then, we calculate the mean values of these maximum probability scores. The results of the mean values of maximum probabilities are shown in Table 5. We can see that code models trained by GenCode

are more confident in the test data than models trained using other code data augmentation methods. As a result, GenCode trained code models are harder to attack.

Ablation Study

Even though we have preliminarily shown that selecting the code samples with higher loss values is a valid way to train good models, it is still necessary to study to what extent the advantage can be brought from this selection strategy. Therefore, in this part, we conduct an ablation study to compare GenCode with its two variants, GenCode with data selection using minimum loss values - GenCode (Min) and random selection - GenCode (Random), respectively.

Table 6 summarizes the accuracy and robustness of trained code models using different selection strategies. We can see GenCode consistently outperforms the two variants under all testing criteria. Selecting code samples with minimum loss values is the worst way for GenCode. Interestingly, we found that GenCode (Random) performs better than all baseline methods (i.e., *No Aug*, *Refactor*, and *MixCode*) in terms of both accuracy and robustness improvements based on the results. This phenomenon indicates simply combining all syntax-preserving methods including code refactoring methods and syntax-breaking including text-oriented methods is already a good code data augmentation method.

Discussion

Even though the accuracy of our studied code models already achieved relatively high accuracy in these tasks, i.e., most of them have more than 90% accuracy, their robustness is still low. Regarding the large language models (LLMs), we have checked the literature and found that the clone detection task is still challenging for LLMs, e.g., ChatGPT has only 0.784 Precision for Java-Java pair detection (Khajezade et al. 2024). For other program understanding tasks that have a large number of classes, e.g., the Java250 dataset used in our experiments has 250 classes. It is also hard to use open-source LLMs such as ChatGPT to predict the label since we need to add many label guidance in the prompt.

Conclusion

We propose the first generation-and-selection-based framework, GenCode, to boost code understanding models. The basic assumption behind GenCode is that the less confident data contributes more to the model training. Based on this assumption, GenCode utilizes atomic data augmentation operators to generate candidate training data first and selects data with maximum loss values to train the code model. Our evaluation demonstrates that GenCode can produce more accurate and robust models than *MixCode* with 2.92% accuracy and 4.90% robustness improvement, respectively. Besides, we analyze how the importance score affects the effectiveness of GenCode.

In the future, we plan to 1) explore the combination of GenCode with other confidence scores, such as uncertainty metrics and active learning methods; 2) study the effectiveness of GenCode on fine-tuning open-source large language models, e.g., Llama.

References

- Allamanis, M.; Barr, E. T.; Devanbu, P.; and Sutton, C. 2018. A survey of machine learning for big code and naturalness. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 51(4): 1–37.
- Allamanis, M.; Jackson-Flux, H. R.; and Brockschmidt, M. 2021. Self-Supervised Bug Detection and Repair. In Beygelzimer, A.; Dauphin, Y.; Liang, P.; and Vaughan, J. W., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Alon, U.; Brody, S.; Levy, O.; and Yahav, E. 2019. code2seq: generating sequences from structured representations of code. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Bielik, P.; and Vechev, M. 2020. Adversarial robustness for code. In III, H. D.; and Singh, A., eds., *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 896–907. PMLR.
- Bui, N. D.; Yu, Y.; and Jiang, L. 2021. Self-supervised contrastive learning for code retrieval and summarization via semantic-preserving transformations. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, SIGIR '21, 511–521. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Cubuk, E. D.; Zoph, B.; Shlens, J.; and Le, Q. V. 2020. Randaugment: Practical automated data augmentation with a reduced search space. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, 702–703.
- de Paula Rodrigues, G. E.; Braga, A. M.; and Dahab, R. 2023. Detecting Cryptography Misuses With Machine Learning: Graph Embeddings, Transfer Learning and Data Augmentation in Source Code Related Tasks. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability*.
- Dinella, E.; Dai, H.; Li, Z.; Naik, M.; Song, L.; and Wang, K. 2020. HOPPITY: LEARNING GRAPH TRANSFORMATIONS TO DETECT AND FIX BUGS IN PROGRAMS. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Dong, Z.; Hu, Q.; Guo, Y.; Cordy, M.; Papadakis, M.; Zhang, Z.; Traon, Y. L.; and Zhao, J. 2023a. MixCode: Enhancing Code Classification by Mixup-Based Data Augmentation. In *SANER*, 379–390.
- Dong, Z.; Hu, Q.; Guo, Y.; Zhang, Z.; Cordy, M.; Papadakis, M.; Traon, Y. L.; and Zhao, J. 2023b. Boosting Source Code Learning with Data Augmentation: An Empirical Study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.06808*.
- Dong, Z.; Hu, Q.; Zhang, Z.; and Zhao, J. 2024. On the effectiveness of graph data augmentation for source code learning. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 285: 111328.
- Feng, S. Y.; Gangal, V.; Wei, J.; Chandar, S.; Vosoughi, S.; Mitamura, T.; and Hovy, E. 2021. A Survey of Data Augmentation Approaches for NLP. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, 968–988. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Feng, Z.; Guo, D.; Tang, D.; Duan, N.; Feng, X.; Gong, M.; Shou, L.; Qin, B.; Liu, T.; Jiang, D.; and Zhou, M. 2020. CodeBERT: a pre-trained model for programming and natural languages. 1536–1547.
- Gao, X.; Saha, R. K.; Prasad, M. R.; and Roychoudhury, A. 2020. Fuzz testing based data augmentation to improve robustness of deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering*, ICSE '20, 1147–1158. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450371216.
- Guo, D.; Ren, S.; Lu, S.; Feng, Z.; Tang, D.; Liu, S.; Zhou, L.; Duan, N.; Svyatkovskiy, A.; Fu, S.; et al. 2020. Graphcodebert: Pre-training code representations with data flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.08366*.
- Hu, Y.; Ahmed, U. Z.; Mehtaev, S.; Leong, B.; and Roychoudhury, A. 2019. Re-factoring based program repair applied to programming assignments. In *34th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, 388–398. IEEE.
- Khajezade, M.; Wu, J. J.; Fard, F. H.; Rodríguez-Pérez, G.; and Shehata, M. S. 2024. Investigating the Efficacy of Large Language Models for Code Clone Detection. In *Proceedings of the 32nd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Program Comprehension*, 161–165.
- Kingma, D. P.; and Ba, J. 2014. Adam: a method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.
- Lacerda, G.; Petrillo, F.; Pimenta, M.; and Guéhéneuc, Y. G. 2020. Code smells and refactoring: A tertiary systematic review of challenges and observations. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 167: 110610.
- Lu, S.; Guo, D.; Ren, S.; Huang, J.; Svyatkovskiy, A.; Blanco, A.; Clement, C.; Drain, D.; Jiang, D.; Tang, D.; et al. 2021. Codexglue: a machine learning benchmark dataset for code understanding and generation. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Maćkiewicz, A.; and Ratajczak, W. 1993. Principal components analysis (PCA). *Computers & Geosciences*, 19(3): 303–342.
- Park, S.; Kim, Y.; and Han, Y.-S. 2023. Contrastive Learning with Keyword-based Data Augmentation for Code Search and Code Question Answering. In Vlachos, A.; and Augenstein, I., eds., *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 3609–3619. Dubrovnik, Croatia: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pour, M. V.; Li, Z.; Ma, L.; and Hemmati, H. 2021. A search-based testing framework for deep neural networks of source code embedding. In *14th IEEE Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST)*, 36–46. Los Alamitos, CA, USA: IEEE Computer Society.
- Puri, R.; Kung, D. S.; Janssen, G.; Zhang, W.; Domeniconi, G.; Zolotov, V.; Dolby, J.; Chen, J.; Choudhury, M.; Decker, L.; et al. 2021. CodeNet: a large-scale AI for code dataset for learning a diversity of coding tasks.
- Schober, P.; Boer, C.; and Schwarte, L. A. 2018. Correlation coefficients: appropriate use and interpretation. *Anesthesia & analgesia*, 126(5): 1763–1768.
- Sun, Z.; Li, L.; Liu, Y.; and Du, X. 2022. On the importance of building high-quality training datasets for neural code search. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference*

- on *Software Engineering*, ICSE '22, 1609–1620. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Verma, V.; Lamb, A.; Beckham, C.; Najafi, A.; Mitliagkas, I.; Lopez-Paz, D.; and Bengio, Y. 2019. Manifold mixup: better representations by interpolating hidden states. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 6438–6447. PMLR.
- Wang, D.; Jia, Z.; Li, S.; Yu, Y.; Xiong, Y.; Dong, W.; and Liao, X. 2022. Bridging pre-trained models and downstream tasks for source code understanding. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*, 287–298. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Wang, W.; Li, G.; Ma, B.; Xia, X.; and Jin, Z. 2020. Detecting code clones with graph neural network and flow-augmented abstract syntax tree. In *2020 IEEE 27th International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*, 261–271. IEEE.
- Wang, Y.; Wang, W.; Joty, S.; and Hoi, S. C. 2021. CodeT5: Identifier-aware Unified Pre-trained Encoder-Decoder Models for Code Understanding and Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 8696–8708. Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wu, X.; Jang, U.; Chen, J.; Chen, L.; and Jha, S. 2018. Reinforcing Adversarial Robustness using Model Confidence Induced by Adversarial Training. In Dy, J.; and Krause, A., eds., *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 5334–5342. PMLR.
- Yang, G.; Zhou, Y.; Chen, X.; Zhang, X.; Han, T.; and Chen, T. 2023a. ExploitGen: Template-augmented exploit code generation based on CodeBERT. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 197: 111577.
- Yang, Z.; Shi, J.; He, J.; and Lo, D. 2022. Natural attack for pre-trained models of code. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*, ICSE '22, 1482–1493. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450392211.
- Yang, Z.; Sinnott, R. O.; Bailey, J.; and Ke, Q. 2023b. A survey of automated data augmentation algorithms for deep learning-based image classification tasks. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 65(7): 2805–2861.
- Yasunaga, M.; and Liang, P. 2020. Graph-Based, Self-Supervised Program Repair from Diagnostic Feedback. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML'20. JMLR.org.
- Yefet, N.; Alon, U.; and Yahav, E. 2020. Adversarial examples for models of code. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 4(OOPSLA): 1–30.
- Yu, S.; Wang, T.; and Wang, J. 2022. Data augmentation by program transformation. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 190: 111304.
- Zhang, H.; Cisse, M.; Dauphin, Y. N.; and Lopez-Paz, D. 2018. mixup: beyond empirical risk minimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Zhang, H.; Li, Z.; Li, G.; Ma, L.; Liu, Y.; and Jin, Z. 2020. Generating adversarial examples for holding robustness of source code processing models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, 1169–1176.
- Zhou, Y.; Liu, S.; Siow, J.; Du, X.; and Liu, Y. 2019. Devign: effective vulnerability identification by learning comprehensive program semantics via graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. Red Hook, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery.