

Characterizing Dependency Update Practice Of NPM, PyPI and Cargo Packages

Imranur Rahman

Department of Computer Science
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC, USA
irahman3@ncsu.edu

Nusrat Zahan

Department of Computer Science
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC, USA
nzahan@ncsu.edu

Stephen Magill

Product Innovation
Sonatype
USA
smagill@sonatype.com

William Enck

Department of Computer Science
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC, USA
whenck@ncsu.edu

Laurie Williams

Department of Computer Science
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC, USA
lawilli3@ncsu.edu

Abstract—Keeping dependencies up-to-date prevents software supply chain attacks through outdated and vulnerable dependencies. Developers may use packages’ dependency update practice as one of the selection criteria for choosing a package as a dependency. However, the lack of metrics characterizing packages’ dependency update practice makes this assessment difficult. To measure the up-to-date characteristics of packages, we focus on the dependency management aspect and propose two update metrics: Time-Out-Of-Date (TOOD) and Post-Fix-Exposure-Time (PFET), to measure the *updatedness* of dependencies and *updatedness* of vulnerable dependencies, respectively. We design an algorithm to stabilize the dependency relationships in different time intervals and compute the proposed metrics for each package. Using our proposed metrics, we conduct a large-scale empirical study of update metrics with 2.9M packages, 66.8M package versions, and 26.8M unique package-dependency relations in NPM, PyPI, and Cargo, ranging from the year 2004 to 2023. We analyze the characteristics of the proposed metrics for capturing packages’ dependency update practice in the three ecosystems. Given that the TOODmetric generates a greater volume of data than the PFETmetric, we further explore the numerical relationship between these metrics to assess their potential as substitutes for vulnerability counts metrics. We find that PyPI packages update dependencies faster than NPM and Cargo. Conversely, Cargo packages update their vulnerable dependencies faster than NPM and PyPI. We also find that the general purpose update metric, TOOD, can be a proxy for the security-focused update metric, PFET.

Index Terms—dependency update practice, dependency management, software supply chain security, open source software, semantic versioning, version constraints

I. INTRODUCTION

The recent increase in software supply chain attacks draws attention from both government (Executive Order 14028 [1]) and industry. However, attackers targeting the software supply chain is not a new phenomenon. For instance, in 2017, a major security breach at Equifax (a credit reporting agency), resulted in the theft of hundreds of millions of customer records, costing the company millions of dollars [2]. This breach was due to Equifax using an outdated and vulnerable version of

Apache Struts (identified by CVE-2017-5638 [3]). Moreover, a report from Sonatype on the state of the software supply chain [4] in 2023 highlighted that even two years after the Log4-Shell vulnerability, its compromised version was still being downloaded three million times within just a week. This report suggests that the flawed Log4j versions continue to be used by many software packages. These examples underline a critical issue: many organizations or developers fail to update their software dependencies regularly, which can lead to devastating consequences.

Problem and Scope. Practitioners may use ‘updatedness’ of dependencies to choose a component, but underreported vulnerabilities often hinder such measures. Wermke et al. [5] interviewed practitioners and found that activity measures (e.g., commit frequency, recent releases) can reflect positively on the package, whereas inactive projects and fewer contributions can reflect negatively. This study suggests that practitioners use the ‘updated’ nature of a package as a criterion for making good component choices. However, research on *update metrics*, which evaluates the ‘updated’ nature of packages’ dependencies, is scarce. OpenSSF Scorecard [6], an automated security habit assessment tool for open-source software (OSS) package, has an update metric ‘maintained’ which checks if the package has at least one commit per week in the last 90 days. Technical lag [7], another update metric from the literature, measures a package’s updated nature of dependencies. Nonetheless, the lack of reported vulnerabilities is an obstacle to the widespread use of these metrics [8]. The issue is compounded by vulnerabilities that are silently fixed [9]–[12], making vulnerability count a less reliable measure of security effectiveness. A recent report by White House [13] also reiterates the shortcomings of vulnerability count as a security metric. To address the limitations of the lack of vulnerability data, Shin and Williams [14] concluded that both the fault prediction model and the vulnerability prediction model provide similar abilities in predicting vul-

nerabilities, but did not consider any update metric in the evaluation. To address the aforementioned issues, our study proposes focusing on the *updatedness* of dependencies and the *updatedness* of vulnerable dependencies within a package as new metrics.

Challenges. Evaluating update metrics for software packages involves complexities. Packages often use open dependency requirements (e.g., $\wedge 2.76.0, \sim 2.1.1$), which means the exact version of a dependency that gets installed can vary depending on *when* the installation occurs. This variability, due to time-sensitive dependency resolution [15], introduces challenges in accurately measuring how up-to-date a package’s dependencies are. Open dependency requirements do have an advantage: they relieve developers from the need to update dependencies manually. Nonetheless, this approach complicates the measurement of update metrics, such as Time-To-Update (TTU) and Time-To-Remediate (TTR). TTU and TTR assess how quickly a package adopts new versions of dependencies and new versions of vulnerable dependencies, respectively. However, the open nature of dependency requirements, alongside the possibility of dependency downgrades, leads to unpredictable outcomes and anomalies in these measurements, especially in certain software ecosystems (more details in Section II). In this study, we analyze the effectiveness of TTU and TTR in capturing a package’s dependency update practices and introduce two metrics to more accurately assess the current state of dependency updates in NPM, PyPI, and Cargo.

Goal Statement. *The goal of this study is to aid industry practitioners and developers to make informed decisions on the project dependency selection by showing the trends of update metrics and characterizing the potential of being a metric for making good component choice through an empirical study of update characteristics of open-source packages.*

Approach. Our key observation is that the challenge in accurately measuring how up-to-date software dependencies are stems from how these resolved dependencies change over time. To address this challenge, we have developed an algorithm that stabilizes these dependency relationships in different intervals. Additionally, we are introducing two novel metrics to assess how current a package’s dependencies are. The first metric, Time-Out-Of-Date (TOOD), calculates the duration within the entire lifespan of a package’s dependency relationship during which the package does not have the latest available version of a dependency. The second metric, Post-Fix-Exposure-Time (PFET), measures the time during the package’s dependency relationship lifespan when the package continues using a vulnerable version of a dependency, despite a fixed version being available. Both metrics focus on the aspect of time (time metrics [16]), quantifying how long a package remains in a particular state regarding its dependency versions. This approach offers a new way to understand and improve the maintenance of software dependencies.

The research questions that we aim to answer in this study are: **RQ1:** *How do packages update their dependencies (time out of date) in NPM, PyPI, and Cargo?* **RQ2:** *How do packages update their vulnerable dependencies (post fix exposure*

time) in NPM, PyPI, and Cargo? **RQ3:** *Can time out of date effectively represent or substitute for post fix exposure time?* Answering these questions will provide insights regarding the duration of the exposure window to vulnerabilities for different projects. Our contributions are:

- We propose and formally define two new update metrics (*time out of date* and *post fix exposure time*) to characterize the updatedness of packages in three ecosystems.
- We conduct a large-scale empirical study of update metrics in NPM, PyPI, and Cargo. We analyze 26.8 million package-dependency relations from 2.9 million packages in these three ecosystems. We calculate the update metrics for each $\langle \text{package}, \text{dependency} \rangle$ relation and then aggregate for each package.
- We quantitatively compare our proposed update metrics using statistical hypothesis tests and correlation analysis to explore relationships between them.
- We open-source the dataset of package-dependency relations split into different time intervals with stable dependency relations to foster future research in this direction.

We share a part of our dataset and replication package in Figshare. The full dataset will be published upon acceptance of the paper.

II. RESEARCH GAP

This section provides a brief overview of the research gap (with an illustrative example) in update metrics measurement, setting the stage for our study. Table I shows the dependency relation of `express --> qs` where the dependency requirements of `express` on `qs` are ‘ $\geq 0.0.6$ ’, ‘ $\geq 0.3.0$ ’, and so on. The ‘ $\geq 0.0.6$ ’ allows `express` to automatically update any version of `qs` that meets or exceeds ‘ $\geq 0.0.6$ ’. As of the submission of this manuscript, all requirements of `express`’s dependency on `qs` (**d_req** of Table I) led to the selection of version 6.12.0 as the most recent compatible version of `qs`.

TABLE I. TTU (in days): $r_1 - r_2$ of `express`

pkg	ver	release (r_1)	dep	d_req	d_ver	release (r_2)	TTU
express	2.4.3	2011-07-14	qs	$\geq 0.0.6$	6.12.0	2024-05-06	-4680
express	2.4.4	2011-08-05	qs	$\geq 0.3.0$	6.12.0	2024-05-06	-4658
express	2.5.0	2011-10-24	qs	$\geq 0.3.1$	6.12.0	2024-05-06	-4578
express	2.5.1	2011-11-18	qs	$\geq 0.3.1$	6.12.0	2024-05-06	-4553

The TTU calculation (subtraction of `qs` release, r_2 , from `express` release, r_1 [17]) for different releases of `express` produces negative TTU values. These negative TTU values do not inherently convey meaningful insights regarding the update trajectory of the package. After aggregating TTU over the dependencies of each package and over all the packages in an ecosystem-wide manner, the TTU data exhibit a Gaussian distribution in both NPM and PyPI ecosystems, characterized by a mean that approximates zero. Such a distribution could suggest that a declared dependency is released after this package’s release time which may be possible due to the presence of open version requirements.

Furthermore, version downgrades [18] represent a prevalent practice across diverse ecosystems mostly as a result of

breaking changes, thereby adding complexity to the TTU computation process. Fig. 1 shows the TTU distribution for NPM, PyPI, and Cargo packages (both positive and negative values exist).




FIG. 1. TTU distribution of NPM, PyPI, and Cargo.

Necessity of New Metric: Due to the aforementioned limitations, we need a new way of measuring dependencies to keep the resolved dependency relations *stable* across various timeframes. Additionally, two new metrics, Time-Out-Of-Date (TOOD, redefined version of TTU) and Post-Fix-Exposure-Time (PFET, redefined version of TTR). These metrics are proposed to leverage the stability of dependency relationships to assess the extent to which dependencies are updated. Our proposed Temporal Dependency Resolution (Algo. 1) guarantees that TOOD and PFET will not have any negative data points and can handle open version requirements and downgrades.

III. RELATED WORKS

Technical Lag. Gonzalez-Barahona et al. [7] were the first to propose *technical lag* for FOSS (free, open source software) packages. They use “technical lag” to measure how outdated a software deployment is compared to the latest upstream software packages. Research has followed this direction and presented studies on various ways of measuring technical lag in software ecosystems [19]–[24].

While technical lag shares similarities with our proposed metrics, there are two notable distinctions. First, technical lag assesses how outdated a dependency is through two measurements: time lag (*tLag*) and version lag (*vLag*). *tLag* measures the delay between the release of a dependency version and the latest available version at the time of the package release, determining the degree of outdatedness. However, technical lag does not account for the duration a package maintains an outdated dependency nor the frequency of updates from the package or dependency. Moreover, although technical lag can be determined for each version release of a package [19], existing studies do not offer a method to combine a package’s technical lag across various versions and dependencies, which could provide more comprehensive insights into packages’ overall state. Second, technical lag does not offer a measure

of a package’s security practices, such as whether the package has vulnerable dependencies or how quickly the package updates vulnerable dependencies. In contrast, our metrics consider the $\langle \text{package}, \text{dependency} \rangle$ relationship from a *temporal perspective*, enabling us to incorporate the frequency of updates and aggregate metrics across different releases and dependencies for a package. Also, PFET is specifically designed to measure the usage of vulnerable dependencies, which is not feasible in technical lag.

Outdated & vulnerable dependencies. Prior researcher has studied the outdatedness of dependencies [25]–[30], and separately studied the vulnerable dependencies, their usage, and remediations in different ecosystems [31]–[33]. Studies in *outdated dependencies* and *vulnerable dependencies* are focused on either all updates or only security updates but not both. In contrast, we focus on both outdated and vulnerable dependencies and explore their relationship using our proposed metrics.

Security metrics. ‘Mean/Median-Time-To-Repair’ or ‘Mean/Median-Time-To-Remediate’ (MTTR) and ‘Mean/Median-Time-To-Update’ (MTTU) have been used in the software reliability and maintenance domain for a long time [16], [34]–[36]. Researchers have studied different security metrics (time to close bug/vulnerability, window of exposure, vulnerability count) [37], [38] of various categories (time metric, vulnerability metric) in the software security domain, but these are focused on measuring the security of the package having the vulnerability. In our study, we focus on the security of the package having vulnerable dependencies, not the vulnerable package itself.

MTTR has also been used in different contexts in the industry, e.g., measuring the package’s security [39], [40], measuring the package’s security in terms of dependency [17]. The procedures for measuring MTTR and MTTU are often proprietary and not disclosed for academic research. For instance, Sonatype’s 2019 report [17] contains the measurement of MTTU and MTTR for Maven packages, but the methodology and their process of handling open dependency requirements or version downgrades are not available. To distinguish our work and avoid ambiguity, we adopt PFET as a measure of packages’ security w.r.t. its dependency management.

IV. DEFINITIONS

In this section, we provide definitions for six terms used in our algorithms and metrics with examples.

TABLE II. Version Releases ($\overline{\text{REL}}$) info for express.

system	pkg name	version	release time
NPM	express	3.2.1	2013-04-30
NPM	express	3.2.2	2013-05-03
NPM	express	3.3.4	2013-05-07

Definition 1 (Version Releases – $\overline{\text{REL}}$). Let t be a point of time and P_t be the set of all packages in an ecosystem. For $\forall p_i \in P_t$ we define $r_i \in \overline{\text{REL}}(p_i)$ as the set of

TABLE III. Dependency relation express \dashrightarrow qs after using temporal dependency resolution; **interval start**, **interval end**, **is out of date**, and **is exposed** are calculated using Algo. 1

from pkg p_i	from version r_i	to pkg p_j	to pkg requir. rq_{ij}	to version r_j	to pkg highest rel. r'_j	Interval start T_k	Interval end T_{k+1}	is out of date	is exposed
express	3.2.1	qs	0.6.1	0.6.1	0.6.1	2013-04-30	2013-05-02	false	false
express	3.2.1	qs	0.6.1	0.6.1	0.6.2	2013-05-02	2013-05-03	true	false
express	3.2.2	qs	0.6.3	0.6.3	0.6.3	2013-05-03	2013-05-07	false	false
express	3.2.2	qs	0.6.3	0.6.3	0.6.4	2013-05-07	2013-05-07	true	false
express	3.2.3	qs	0.6.4	0.6.4	0.6.4	2013-05-07	2013-05-09	false	false

version releases of p_i where r_i follows Semantic Versioning (SEMVER), and $time(r_i)$ as the timestamp of release r_i .

We define *Version Releases* (\overline{REL}) as the set of version releases of a package following SEMVER. For the package $p_i = \text{express}$, as depicted in column version in Table II, the set of three releases $r_i = \{3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3\}$. The timestamp of each version release is denoted by $time(r_i)$, e.g., $time(\text{express}@3.2.1) = 2013-04-30$. p_i represents the ‘from pkg’ and ‘to pkg’ columns in Table III.

Definition 2 (Dependency Relation – \overline{DREL}). For $\forall p_i \in P_t$ we define $p_i \dashrightarrow p_j$ as the dependency relation where p_j is a regular direct dependency in $\exists r_i \in \overline{REL}(p_i)$.

If, in any version release, a package has a dependency on another package, we say there is a *Dependency Relation* (\overline{DREL}) from that package to the dependency. For Table III, the dependency relation is express \dashrightarrow qs where qs is a regular direct dependency (not dev or optional dependency) of $\overline{REL}(\text{express})$. p_i represents the ‘from pkg’ and p_j represents ‘to pkg’ in Table III.

Definition 3 (Dependency – \overline{DEP}). For $\forall p_i \in P_t$ we define $\overline{DEP}(p_i) = \{p_j : p_j \in P_t \vee p_i \dashrightarrow p_j\}$ as the dependencies of p_i .

If there is a dependency relation from one package to another package, we say the latter is a *Dependency* (\overline{DEP}) of the former.

Definition 4 (Dependency Requirement – \overline{REQ}). For $\forall p_i \in P_t$ we define $rq_{ij} = \overline{REQ}(r_i, p_j)$ as the dependency requirement of r_i where p_i has a regular dependency on p_j and $r_i \in \overline{REL}(p_i)$.

When declaring a dependency, a package can specify constraints on dependency version releases, and we call this the *Dependency Requirement* (\overline{REQ}). For instance, in Table III, one dependency requirement $\overline{REQ}(r_i, p_j)$ is $\overline{REQ}(\text{express}@3.2.1, \text{qs}) = 0.6.1$. rq_{ij} denotes the ‘to pkg requir.’ in Table III.

Definition 5 (Dependency Resolution – \overline{RESOL}). For $\forall p_i \in P_t$ and $r_i \in \overline{REL}(p_i)$ we define $d_j = \overline{RESOL}(\overline{REQ}(r_i, p_j), t)$ as the dependency resolution which is satisfied by $\overline{REQ}(r_i, p_j)$ at time t (according to the specific ecosystem rules) and $d_j \subseteq \overline{REL}(p_j)$.

When declaring a dependency, a package can specify version ranges, and the *Dependency Resolution* (\overline{RESOL}) is the version that satisfies the requirement at a specific time [41]. For instance, in Table III, one dependency resolution is $\overline{RESOL}(\overline{REQ}(\text{express}@3.2.1, \text{qs}), t_1) = 0.6.1$ at time $t_1 = 2013-04-30$. The \overline{RESOL} symbolizes the ‘to version’ in Fig. III.

Definition 6 (Security Advisories). Let A be the list of security advisories. For a security advisory $a \in A$, the affected package is $p_k \leftarrow \text{pkg}(a)$, the affected version releases are $r_k \leftarrow \overline{AFF}(\overline{REL}(p_k))$, and the fixed version is $r'_k \leftarrow \text{fixed}(a)$.

We define a *Security Advisory* as a public announcement of a security vulnerability in a package. OSV.dev [42] is a platform that publishes and compiles security advisories in different ecosystems. To illustrate, for advisory GHSA-c24v-8rfc-w8vw, the affected package is $p_k = \text{pkg}(a) = \text{npm}/\text{vite}$, the affected version releases are $r_k = \overline{AFF}(\overline{REL}(p_k)) = \{[2.7.0, 2.9.16], [3.0.0, 3.2.7], [4.0.0, 4.5.1], [5.0.0, 5.0.11]\}$, and the fixed version $r'_k = \text{fixed}(a) = \{2.9.17, 3.2.8, 4.5.2, 5.0.12\}$.

V. UPDATE METRICS

In this section, we first provide a visual walkthrough and description of our temporal dependency resolution algorithm and then describe our proposed update metrics, Time-Out-Of-Date (TOOD) and Post-Fix-Exposure-Time (PFET), using definitions from Section IV. TOOD defines the time a package spent in its lifetime having outdated dependency and PFET defines the time a package spent in its lifetime having vulnerable dependency. The formal definitions of TOOD and PFET are described later in this section.

Temporal Dependency Resolution Example. Fig. 2 shows the lifetime of a package’s dependency relationship \overline{DREL} with time on the x-axis. At the beginning of this \overline{DREL} , T_1 , package (pkg) version $\text{pkg}@0.0.1$ introduces $\text{dep}@1.0.7$ as a dependency (dep), specified as $\text{dep} = 1.0.7$, which at that point is the latest version of dep. So, we mark this interval as up-to-date (■). This interval ends when the dep releases a newer version, 2.0.0, and a new interval begins (T_2). In this time interval, the latest version of $\text{pkg}@0.0.1$ becomes out-of-date since it still depends on $\text{dep}@1.0.7$ due to its earlier specification. So, we mark this interval as TOOD (■).

) and it continues until pkg releases a new version 0.0.2 (T_3). pkg@0.0.2 lists dep@2.0.0 as a dependency with requirement $dep = 2.0.0$, the highest dependency version at that time. So, we mark this as updated (light blue), and the next interval starts with the release of dep@2.0.1 (T_4). In this interval, pkg@0.0.2 still has dep@2.0.0, which is not up-to-date, and we mark this TOOD (dark blue). Then, pkg@0.0.3 is released (T_5) shortly after an advisory has been published affecting versions dep@[1.0.7-2.0.0], with dep@2.0.1 being the patched version. During this time, pkg@0.0.3 depends on now vulnerable dep@2.0.0, and we mark this interval as PFET (pink). Finally, pkg@0.0.4 is released having the updated and fixed version dep@2.0.1 (T_6), so we mark this interval as up-to-date (light blue).




FIG. 2. Dependency lifetime progression with light blue for up-to-date, dark blue for TOOD, and pink for TOOD & PFET

Temporal Dependency Resolution Algorithm. Initially, we have a set of packages (denoted as ‘from pkg’, p_i) along with their respective released versions (‘from version’, r_i) and associated dependency requirements (‘to pkg requir.’, $r_{q_{ij}}$). These serve as inputs to our Algo. 1. To clarify terminology, p_i is referred to as the importing package (‘from pkg’) to disambiguate from p_j , which we refer to as the ‘dependency’ (‘to pkg’) mentioned in the dependency requirements.

We examine the duration of the relationship between each pkg-dep pair (p_i, p_j), dividing it into distinct intervals T^{ij} (line 2). The initial point T_1 is when the importing package p_i first includes the dependency p_j . Subsequent timestamp $T_k \in T^{ij}$ represents when either the importing package or the dependency releases a new version. The entire lifetime can be described as a series of intervals $I = \{[T_1, T_2], [T_2, T_3], \dots, [T_i, T_{i+1}], \dots\}$ where by definition, no new version of the importing package or the dependency is released in each $[T_i, T_{i+1}]$ interval (‘interval start’, and ‘interval end’ respectively, referred by line 3). Each row of Table III depicts each such interval.

During each interval I_k , we resolve the dependency requirement ($r_{q_{ij}}$) according to the ecosystem rule (‘to version’, r_j) considering only the releases available by the dependency p_j at time T_k (line 7). If the dependency requirement ($r_{q_{ij}}$) permits multiple dependency versions, we select the highest version among those that match based on the SEMVER rule. We also determine the highest available version of the dependency (‘to pkg highest rel.’, r'_j , in line 8).

Since, by definition, the importing package or the dependency does not release any new version in each interval (I_k),

the dependency relation is guaranteed to be stable in every interval.

Algorithm 1: Temporal Dependency Resolution

Input: All dependency relations $p_i \dashrightarrow p_j$ where $\forall p_i, p_j \in P_t$ and $p_i \neq p_j$
Input: A list of version releases $r_i \in \overline{REL}(p_i)$, timestamps $time(r_i)$ and list of advisories A
Output: A list of resolved dependencies for each (p_i, p_j) pair along with TOOD and PFET info

- 1 **for** Each pair $(p_i \dashrightarrow p_j)$ **do**
- 2 Lifetime of $(p_i \dashrightarrow p_j)$, $T^{ij} \leftarrow \{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n\}$;
- 3 Split T^{ij} into intervals, $I \leftarrow \{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n\}$ where $I_k \leftarrow [T_k, T_{k+1})$;
- 4 **for** Each Interval $I_k \leftarrow [T_k, T_{k+1})$ **do**
- 5 Version of p_i , $r_i \leftarrow \overline{REL}(p_i)$;
- 6 Dependency requirement, $r_{q_{ij}} \leftarrow \overline{REQ}(r_i, p_j)$;
- 7 Resolved version of p_j ,
 $r_j \leftarrow \overline{RESOL}(\overline{REQ}(r_i, p_j), T_{k+1} - 1)$;
- 8 Highest available version of p_j , $r'_j \leftarrow \max\{r_j : r_j \leftarrow \overline{REL}(p_j) \cap time(r_j) < T_{k+1}\}$;
- 9 **for** Each tuple $\tau = \langle p_i, r_i, p_j, r_{q_{ij}}, r_j, r'_j, T_k, T_{k+1} \rangle$ **do**
- 10 **if** $r_j = r'_j$ **then**
- 11 $t_{TOOD(ij)} \leftarrow False$;
- 12 **else**
- 13 $t_{TOOD(ij)} \leftarrow True$;
- 14 $t_{PFET(ij)} \leftarrow False$;
- 15 **for** Each advisory $a \in A$ **do**
- 16 Affected package $p_k \leftarrow pkg(a)$;
- 17 Affected version releases
 $r_k \leftarrow \overline{AFF}(\overline{REL}(p_k))$;
- 18 Fixed version $r'_k \leftarrow fixed(a)$;
- 19 **if** $t_{TOOD(ij)} = True$ & $p_k = p_j$ &
 $r_j \in r_k$ **then**
- 20 $t_{PFET(ij)} \leftarrow True$;
- 21 Add $\langle t_{TOOD(ij)}, t_{PFET(ij)} \rangle$ to τ ;

Total time. The total time for a package is the lifetime of the package considering all dependency relations. $t_{total(ij)}$ (in Eq. 1, 2, 3, 4) indicates the total lifetime of a \langle package, dependency \rangle relation pair. In Fig. 2, the total time for that certain dependency is $T_n - T_1$ assuming T_i indicates a timestamp. The total time for a package p_i is the sum of $t_{total(ij)}$ over the dependencies of p_i , i.e., $\sum_{j \in \overline{DEF}(p_i)} t_{total(ij)}$.

Metric 1 (Time-Out-Of-Date – TOOD). Time-Out-Of-Date (TOOD) of a package is the average aggregated time the package uses an outdated dependency version in its lifetime. TOOD can be calculated as average aggregated time with outdated dependency ($t_{TOOD(i)}$) or as a ratio of the average aggregated time with outdated dependency out of the total

lifetime ($t_{TOODr(i)}$).

$t_{TOOD(ij)}$ (line 10- 13) indicates if the resolved dependency is up-to-date in each interval of the <package, dependency> pair. We can get the TOOD for a package p_i by aggregating $t_{TOOD(ij)}$ over the dependencies of p_i .

Formally speaking, TOOD of package p_i is:

$$t_{TOOD(i)} = \frac{\sum_{j \in \overline{DEP}(p_i)} t_{TOOD(ij)}}{|\overline{DEP}(p_i)|} \quad (1)$$

and ratio of TOOD for package p_i out of its total lifetime is:

$$t_{TOODr(i)} = \frac{\frac{\sum_{j \in dep(i)} t_{TOOD(ij)}}{\sum_{j \in dep(i)} t_{total(ij)}}}{\frac{|\overline{DEP}(p_i)|}{\sum_{j \in \overline{DEP}(p_i)} t_{total(ij)}}} = \frac{t_{TOOD(i)}}{\sum_{j \in \overline{DEP}(p_i)} t_{total(ij)}} \quad (2)$$

In Algo. 1, we have a list of resolved dependencies for each <package, dependency> pair ($p_i \dashrightarrow p_j$) split into multiple intervals. For each interval, I_k , we check if the resolved version of the dependency, r_j ('to pkg'), matches the highest available released version of that dependency, r'_j ('to pkg highest rel.'), during that interval (line 10). If they match, the importing package has the up-to-date dependency for that interval, and we mark that as up-to-date (line 11). Otherwise, the importing package does not have the requirement to keep the dependency version up-to-date (line 13).

Metric 2 (Post-Fix-Exposure-Time – PFET). *Post-Fix-Exposure-Time (PFET) is the average aggregated time a package uses with an outdated and vulnerable dependency version in its lifetime. PFET can be calculated as the average aggregated time with outdated and vulnerable dependency ($t_{PFET(i)}$) or as a ratio of the average aggregated time with outdated and vulnerable dependency out of the total lifetime ($t_{PFETr(i)}$).*

$t_{PFET(ij)}$ (line 14- 20) indicates if the resolved dependency is 'outdated' and vulnerable to some security advisory in each interval of the <package, dependency> pair. We can get the PFET for a package p_i by aggregating $t_{PFET(ij)}$ over the dependencies of p_i .

Formally speaking, PFET of package p_i is:

$$t_{PFET(i)} = \frac{\sum_{j \in \overline{DEP}(p_i)} t_{PFET(ij)}}{|\overline{DEP}(p_i)|} \quad (3)$$

and ratio of PFET for package p_i out of its total lifetime is:

$$t_{PFETr(i)} = \frac{\frac{\sum_{j \in dep(i)} t_{PFET(ij)}}{\sum_{j \in dep(i)} t_{total(ij)}}}{\frac{|\overline{DEP}(p_i)|}{\sum_{j \in \overline{DEP}(p_i)} t_{total(ij)}}} = \frac{t_{PFET(i)}}{\sum_{j \in \overline{DEP}(p_i)} t_{total(ij)}} \quad (4)$$

In Algo. 1, we have a list of resolved dependencies for each <package, dependency> pair ($p_i \dashrightarrow p_j$) split into multiple

intervals. For each interval, I_k , we check in line 19 if the resolved dependency version is up-to-date with the highest available released version during that interval ($t_{TOOD} = True$) and if the resolved dependency version is affected by any advisory a even if a fixed version is available ($r_j \in r_k$). If both conditions are true, the importing package uses a vulnerable dependency version in that interval even though a fixed version is available, and we mark that as 'is exposed' (line 20).

In this study, we calculate TOOD and PFET metrics for the whole lifetime of the package. However, we can add time constraints to the above equation to calculate our metrics for a specific time range.

Penalizing packages for not updating their dependencies to their highest available version. Our rationale for penalizing the packages for not updating their dependencies to the highest available version, rather than just to the latest minor or patch version within the same major version. For developers, maintaining the latest release within the current major version to circumvent the risk of introducing breaking changes does not fully remove the risk of having breaking changes. Especially for packages with a large number of components and high stability requirements, updating one dependency can be challenging because of the necessity to test the whole system [43] and the fear of breaking changes. Over time, failing to update dependencies can lead to missed opportunities for new features, bug fixes, and security patches. This phenomenon is referred to as "technical debt" for software development [44]–[48], which refers to the implied cost of additional rework required in software development due to choosing a fast but limited solution over a better approach that might take longer to implement. A similar concept is "design debt" [49], which translates the concept from code to the design of software systems. Extending these analogies to package dependencies, we argue that failure to keep dependencies up-to-date is a form of "technical debt" but for dependencies. When developers allow their packages' dependencies to become outdated and remain so, updating those dependencies to the latest version becomes increasingly difficult over time. This reluctance to update significantly older dependency versions leads to a loss of the advantages that the latest versions offer. Additionally, to get the best out of the SEMVER rules and get auto updates in the dependencies, the upstream package should follow SEMVER properly. If the upstream package does not follow SEMVER properly, the downstream package might have breaking changes even within the same major version of the dependency. As mentioned by previous studies [15], [50]–[53], developers do not always follow the SEMVER rules properly. So, we argue that updating the dependencies to the highest available version should be the gold standard for checking the updatedness of the dependencies.

VI. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data Collection. We collect the package versions and dependency relations from Google BigQuery [54] (dataset id: bigquery-public-data.deps_dev_v1), which is the same data

TABLE IV. Statistics of the dataset.

ecosystem	# vul.	# pkgs	# pkg-ver	# pkg with dependency	# pkg-dep relation
Cargo	1, 287	137, 319	28, 346, 565	90, 333	673, 211
NPM	13, 922	2, 448, 781	34, 723, 685	1, 807, 730	24, 987, 760
PyPI	11, 409	356, 971	3, 827, 478	202, 742	1, 230, 331
total	26, 618	2, 943, 071	66, 897, 728	2, 100, 805	26, 891, 302

source for deps.dev [55]. Our data encompasses three ecosystems: Cargo [56] (*Rust*), NPM [57] (*Javascript*), and PyPI [58] (*Python*). We collect the security advisories (vulnerability data) from OSV.dev [42]. The statistics of our compiled dataset are presented in Table IV.




FIG. 3. High-level workflow diagram

Package Exclusion Criteria: In instances where a parent package has fewer than five versions, we infer that the package is a trivial or toy project [59], [60]. Additional indicators of trivial packages include packages having an age of < 30 days. So, we set the inclusion criteria for parent packages to have at least five versions and an age (time difference between the first and the last release) of at least 30 days. Note that this exclusion criterion applies exclusively to packages and not to dependencies since we do not want to calculate our metrics for trivial packages, but if a package uses a trivial package as a dependency, we still want to calculate the metrics for that package. Additionally, we miss the packages having age < 30 days at the time of our data collection, even if they are not trivial or toy packages. Moreover, our metrics involve the need to have dependencies since we are measuring the *updated* nature of dependencies. So, packages that do not have any dependencies are excluded from our analysis.

Methodology. Fig. 3 presents our overall research methodology. We initiate the process by collecting the data from Google BigQuery and OSV.dev (step ①). For **RQ1** and **RQ2**, we first employ the temporal dependency resolution algorithm (Algo 1) to split each dependency relation into time intervals and calculate the TOOD and PFET for each dependency relation in each package (step ②). After using Algo 1, we have the ‘is out of date’ ($t_{TOOD(ij)}$) and ‘is exposed’ ($t_{PFET(ij)}$) for each time frame for each $\langle \text{package}, \text{dependency} \rangle$ pair.

To calculate TOOD for a package ($t_{TOOD(i)}$), we sum up the $t_{TOOD(ij)}$ for each dependency of that package and divide that by the number of dependencies using Eq. 1. Additionally, to calculate the proportion of lifetime TOOD for a package ($t_{TOODr(i)}$), we divide the sum of $i_{TOOD(ij)}$ for each dependency of that package by sum of the total lifetime $t_{total(ij)}$ of each $\langle \text{package}, \text{dependency} \rangle$ relationship, and we further divide by the number of dependencies using Eq. 2 (step ③). Similarly, we use Eq. 3 and 4 to calculate the PFET for a package ($t_{PFET(i)}$), and proportion of lifetime PFET for a package ($t_{PFETr(i)}$). After having TOOD and PFET data for

each package, we use violin plots to understand the distribution of data. We choose violin plot instead of box-plot since violin plot shows everything box-plot shows, e.g., medians, ranges, variability, and violin plot’s shape shows the density of the data similar to a density estimation plot [61] (step ④).

For **RQ3**, we claim that if TOOD and PFET derive from the same statistical distribution, then TOOD might serve as a proxy for PFET. To validate this hypothesis, we employ both statistical tests and correlation analysis for a quantitative assessment and graphical methods such as QQ-plots for a qualitative perspective. We first conduct statistical analysis to answer our **RQ3**. Our analysis commences with the choice of hypothesis tests for our discrete, non-parametric, non-normal, and non-paired data (step ⑤). We choose several hypothesis (2-sample or k-sample) tests suitable for our data’s characteristics, including the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test [62]–[65], Epps-Singleton (ES) test [66], [67], k-sample Anderson-Darling (AD) test [68], Mann-Whitney (MW) U rank test [69]–[71], and Cramér–von Mises (CM) test [72], [73] to compare the TOOD and PFET data because these tests are suitable for our data characteristics. The hypothesis test’s null hypothesis (H_0) is that the two data sets are from the same distribution. The alternative hypothesis (H_1) is that the two distributions are different. The chosen hypothesis tests compare the data samples and report a statistic and a p -value.

Our choice of having multiple hypothesis tests is to ensure the robustness of our conclusion since the tests have different purposes and capabilities. The KS test reports the maximum difference in empirical cumulative distribution function (ECDF) of the two samples, whereas the CM test reports the quadratic distance in ECDF. The AD test reports the weighted quadratic distance, and this test emphasizes the tails of the distribution, whereas the KS test focuses on the mid-section of the distribution. The MW U test assesses if one distribution tends to have values that are consistently higher or lower than the other. Each test offers unique capabilities, focusing on different aspects of comparing distribution, from maximum deviations to differences in distribution tails. The p -value is the probability of observing a test statistic as extreme as the one computed from the sample data under the null hypothesis. If the p -value is less than the significance level (α), we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the two samples are from different distributions since it represents the probability that the observed differences between the two distributions are due to chance. We used `scipy`’s implementation of these tests [74], and to ensure the homogeneity of the results, we set the same significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$) for all the tests (step ⑥).

Further, we investigate the relationship between TOOD and PFET using correlation analysis. To quantify the relationship between TOOD and PFET, we use the Pearson correlation coefficient, Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient, and Kendall rank correlation coefficient (step ⑦). High values from these coefficients (> 0.7) would suggest a strong positive relationship [75], supporting the notion that TOOD could effectively replace PFET in assessing dependency-related security risks.




FIG. 4. Time out of date




FIG. 5. Percentage of lifetime TOOD

Then, we do a qualitative analysis with QQ-plots to visualize the relationship between TOOD and PFET (step 8).

VII. RESULTS

The research questions that we aim to answer in this study are: **RQ1**: How do packages update their dependencies (time out of date) in NPM, PyPI, and Cargo? **RQ2**: How do packages update their vulnerable dependencies (post fix exposure time) in NPM, PyPI, and Cargo? **RQ3**: Can time out of date effectively represent or substitute for post fix exposure time?

In **RQ1** and **RQ2**, we empirically evaluate the TOOD and PFET metrics for the three ecosystems, and in **RQ3**, we statistically assess the relationship between TOOD and PFET to determine if TOOD can effectively represent or substitute for PFET.

A. RQ1: TOOD

We look into the violin plots of TOOD to understand the *updatedness* of packages dependencies (Fig. 4) and proportion of lifetime packages spent with *outdated* dependencies (Fig. 5).

$t_{TOOD(i)}$: Fig. 4 shows a violin plot of TOOD in NPM, PyPI, and Cargo. All the plots are left-skewed, indicating that most packages have a low TOOD (e.g., 50% NPM package has TOOD < 582 days), which means most packages update their dependencies quickly. Also, every plot has a long tail, indicating that every ecosystem has some packages that do not update their dependencies for a long time (up to 4495 days). Table V shows that PyPI has the lowest mean TOOD.

$t_{TOODr(i)}$: From Fig. 5, we can see that the mean percentage of lifetime having outdated dependency in NPM is higher than in PyPI, which aligns with the previous observation. The violin plots are skewed to the left side for each ecosystem but less skewed than Fig. 4. Also, PyPI has a flattened-out tail compared to the other two ecosystems, indicating that most packages in PyPI have a lower percentage of lifetime having outdated dependency than NPM and Cargo.

B. RQ2: PFET

We look into the violin plots of PFET to understand the *updatedness* of packages vulnerable dependencies (Fig. 6)




FIG. 6. Post fix exposure time

and proportion of lifetime packages spent with vulnerable dependencies (Fig. 7).

$t_{PFET(i)}$: Fig. 6 shows a violin chart visualizing the distribution across average post fix exposure times in days for Cargo, NPM, and PyPI packages. The 1st, 2nd (mean), and 3rd quantiles are shown as \cdots , $- - -$, and \cdots respectively. Cargo and PyPI have a concentrated distribution, with most PFET (e.g., interquartile range) being less than 1000 days. NPM shows a more spread-out distribution, indicating variability in PFET.

$t_{PFETr(i)}$: From Fig. 7, we can see that the mean percentage of lifetime having outdated & vulnerable dependency in NPM is higher than in PyPI and Cargo, which aligns




FIG. 7. Percentage of lifetime PFET

TABLE V. Statistics of TOOD and PFET data.

metric	ecosystem	count	mean	stddev	min	max
$t_{PFET(i)}$	Cargo	313	366	422	2	2,545
	NPM	219,310	962	684	1	4,295
	PyPI	4,930	436	425	1	3,301
$t_{TOOD(i)}$	Cargo	9,690	166	357	0	2,594
	NPM	1,366,592	582	743	0	4,495
	PyPI	128,979	109	284	0	3,438

TABLE VI. p -values of statistical tests.

max TOOD	sample size	KS	ES	AD	MW	CM
800	10	0.57	0.59	0.22	0.47	0.49
	50	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.16	0.09
	100	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.05	0.01
	200	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
	500	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
1000	10	0.75	0.78	0.24	0.58	0.66
	50	0.30	0.21	0.19	0.33	0.30
	100	0.09	0.03	0.06	0.18	0.11
	200	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.06	0.02
	500	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
2000	10	0.84	0.78	0.24	0.66	0.80
	50	0.43	0.29	0.24	0.50	0.53
	100	0.15	0.10	0.21	0.37	0.29
	200	0.01	0.01	0.08	0.22	0.09
	500	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.06	<0.01
5000	10	0.76	0.81	0.24	0.49	0.69
	50	0.30	0.41	0.22	0.26	0.31
	100	0.09	0.17	0.11	0.13	0.12
	200	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	0.04	0.02
	500	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01

with the previous observation. Cargo has the 3rd quantile at $< 50\%$, indicating that most Cargo packages have $< 50\%$ of their lifetime having outdated & vulnerable dependency. NPM and PyPI have evenly distributed graphs, indicating that most packages have a higher percentage of lifetime having outdated & vulnerable dependency than Cargo.

C. RQ3: TOOD as a substitute for PFET

Quantitative Analysis: Initially, we hypothesize that TOOD and PFET are coming from the exponential distribution by looking at their violin plots. We used `fitter` [76] to find the goodness-of-fit distribution for TOOD and PFET separately and found that exponential distribution is the best fit for both TOOD and PFET data. Next, we aim to compare the TOOD and PFET data to see if they are coming from the same distribution. However, we could not directly use our chosen hypothesis tests because of their sensitivity to large data size [77]–[79]. To overcome the issues with large data sizes, we randomly sample data points from TOOD and PFET to reduce the sample size, which can be used with the statistical tests. To ensure that the random sampling does not affect the results, we repeat the sampling process 1000 times and calculate the p -values of the statistical tests. We also test with different maximum TOOD values to see if the results are consistent across different TOOD values. The p -values of the




FIG. 8. QQ plot of TOOD vs PFET




FIG. 9. QQ plot of TOOD vs PFET (percentage of lifetime)

statistical tests are shown in Table VI. p -values $> \alpha(0.05)$ (bold in Table VI) indicates that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, and we can conclude that TOOD and PFET are coming from the same distribution. From Table VI, p -values are greater than $\alpha(0.05)$ when the sample size is < 100 when we consider the whole data samples.

In our correlations analysis between TOOD and PFET, we find that the Spearman, Pearson, and Kendall correlation coefficients are 0.7, 0.7, and 0.5. We can conclude that TOOD and PFET are strongly and positively correlated (coefficient in each test > 0.7), and TOOD can substitute for PFET.

Qualitative Analysis: Another way to assess the similarity between two samples is to use a quantile-quantile (QQ) plot [62]. If the data samples follow the same distribution, the points in the QQ plot should lie on or close to the line $y = x$ (the red line). From Fig. 8, the data points follow closely to the red line up to 900 days (approximately 2.5 years), but there is a deviation after that. We plot an ECDF of TOOD and PFET in Fig. 10 to show the deviation more clearly. Visually, we can conclude that TOOD reasonably represents PFET for packages with age < 900 days.

By the same reasoning, we can assess the QQ plot of the percentage of lifetime of packages having outdated & vulnerable dependency and the percentage of lifetime of packages having outdated dependency in Fig. 9. The data points follow a linear trend except for the first few data points, which can be explained by our design choice of not having 0 PFET but




FIG. 10. Empirical CDF of TOOD vs PFET

having 0 TOOD.

VIII. DISCUSSION

In this section, we discuss the potential implications of our results.

Implications of our study. In all the violin plots of our results, each of the three ecosystems shows a presence of long tails, indicating that few packages have a very high PFET as well as TOOD. We can consider these data points as outliers that do not reflect the overall condition of the ecosystem and often represent older packages that have not been updated for an extended period. This phenomenon can also be explained by taking package/dependency abandonment [80], [81] into account. We can conclude that these packages are not maintained anymore, and every ecosystem (even the newest ones) has such abandoned packages.

Based on our analysis and the statistics presented in Table V, PyPI packages excel in dependency management, typically exhibiting fewer outdated dependencies than NPM and Cargo packages. Cargo packages, on average, show a lower risk associated with outdated and vulnerable dependencies, while NPM packages fare the worst in this respect. These phenomena could be associated with the dependency management strategy of the ecosystem, e.g., by default, NPM uses open versioning, and Cargo uses pinned dependencies [82]. The size of the ecosystem (number of packages and number of vulnerable packages) can be another factor influencing our results. Furthermore, our statistical analysis suggests that TOOD can be a substitute for PFET since TOOD and PFET both follow the same distribution (with reduced data size) and demonstrate a strong correlation.

Iterating our motivation about good component choice, developers can look into our metrics to understand the *updated* characteristics of a package. Ideally, a package with both 0 TOOD and 0 PFET represents the best case, indicating that dependencies were always up-to-date and no exposure to vulnerable dependencies. However, this ideal scenario might not always be achievable by packages due to various reasons, e.g., version requirement specifications, the time needed for integration testing after a new dependency version is available etc. Thus, the objective for any package should be to have

as low TOOD and PFET as possible. Our metrics allow developers to make informed comparisons among feature-equivalent packages when choosing a package as a dependency for their needs.

Update metrics comparing to vulnerability data. In our study, we analyzed TOOD metric for all the packages with dependencies (1.5M), and PFET metric for all the packages with vulnerable dependencies (224k) across three ecosystems. However, the vulnerability data is only available for the packages known to contain vulnerabilities (26k). Given the reasonable assumption that the number of packages with vulnerabilities is always less than the number of dependent packages affected by these vulnerabilities, we can infer a hierarchical relationship in the data quantity. Specifically, the number of packages with vulnerabilities ($|Vul|$) represents the lower bound for the number of packages for which we have PFET data ($|PFET|$), as PFET metrics are calculated for dependents of vulnerable packages. Furthermore, the presence of PFET data inherently implies the availability of TOOD data ($|TOOD|$), although the converse is not true. Thus, we establish a numerical relationship: $|Vul| \leq |PFET| \leq |TOOD|$. This logic suggests that PFET data covers a broader range of packages than vulnerability counts alone, making PFET a more comprehensive metric for assessing the security implications of package dependencies. And since TOOD can be used as a proxy for PFET (from our results), TOOD can be used as a comprehensive metric for assessing the security implications of package dependencies as well.

IX. THREATS TO VALIDITY

In this section, we discuss potential limitations and how they might impact the interpretation of the results.

External Validity. The main external validity threat is the generalizability of our results to characteristics in other ecosystems. We carefully chose the three ecosystems to have a diverse set of ecosystems, where NPM is the largest, PyPI is the oldest, and Cargo is the newest among the major software ecosystems. While each ecosystem possesses unique features that might not directly correlate with those we studied, we believe the insights gained should also be broadly applicable to other ecosystems. Additionally, our study does not involve human participants, eliminating the need for IRB approval. Our analysis relies solely on existing vulnerability data; therefore, no new vulnerabilities were discovered, and no disclosure process is necessary.

Internal Validity. We use the security advisory dataset from OSV.dev, which may not be comprehensive. If an advisory is published but not included in the OSV dataset, that may impact our results. Additionally, we do not consider whether the vulnerable dependency version is exploitable or reachable [83] from the package. We treat all vulnerabilities equally regardless of the CVSS score or the severity of the vulnerability. We manually check 20 packages' versions and relations with the public package registries and find that the data is accurate. Moreover, each package manager has its own way of handling dependency resolutions, and for the dependency resolutions,

we rely on the Open Source Insights [55] resolved version data. Our analysis omits package versions not adhering to SEMVER rules, a conservative choice to enable a more rigorous analysis. In addition, Open Source Insights dependency resolution fails in some cases (e.g. missing timestamp), and we mark those as warnings in our dataset. We do not calculate update metrics for those packages, and we argue that this might have a very small impact on our results. Moreover, we only consider direct dependencies in our TOOD and PFET analysis because we design our update metrics this way. One interesting future work could be to see how the update metrics change considering transitive dependencies. In addition, we only consider regular dependencies in our TOOD and PFET analysis and omit dev and optional dependencies. Also, we only analyze the update metrics for packages on which other factors (e.g., number of versions, number of major versions, number of dependencies, number of dependents, package age, etc.) might have an impact. This is out of the scope of this paper, and we leave it for future work. On the other hand, we show only the TTU data as an example of research gap II but not the TTR data. We argue that TTR data will follow similar limitations since in TTR, we consider only the vulnerable dependencies, and in contrast, in TTU, we consider all the dependencies.

X. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

In this study, we introduce and empirically assess two update metrics for OSS packages: TOOD and PFET. We conduct a large-scale empirical study on three major software ecosystems: NPM, PyPI, and Cargo, and establish the relationship between TOOD and PFET. Our study focuses on only OSS packages. However, since closed-sourced components can have these OSS components as a dependency, measuring the update metrics of those closed-sourced components would be an interesting future work. We encourage future research to validate our metrics with security best practices and to explore the impact of these metrics on the security and maintainability of software systems.

REFERENCES

- [1] Executive Order on Improving the Nation's Cybersecurity. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/05/12/executive-order-on-improving-the-nations-cybersecurity/>, 2021-05-12. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [2] Brandon Carlson, Kevin Leach, Darko Marinov, Meiyappan Nagappan, and Atul Prakash. Open Source Vulnerability Notification. In Francis Bordeleau, Alberto Sillitti, Paulo Meirelles, and Valentina Lenarduzzi, editors, *Open Source Systems*, volume 556, pages 12–23. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2019.
- [3] CVE-2017-5638: The Apache Struts vulnerability explained. <https://www.synopsys.com/blogs/software-security/cve-2017-5638-apache-struts-vulnerability-explained.html>, 2017. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [4] State of the Software Supply Chain. <https://www.sonatype.com/state-of-the-software-supply-chain/open-source-supply-and-demand>, 2023. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [5] Dominik Wermke, Jan H. Klemmer, Noah Wöhler, Juliane Schmäser, Harshini Sri Ramulu, Yasemin Acar, and Sascha Fahl. "Always Contribute Back": A Qualitative Study on Security Challenges of the Open Source Supply Chain. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1545–1560, May 2023.

- [6] OSSF Scorecard: Build better security habits, one test at a time. <https://securityscorecards.dev/>. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [7] Jesus M. Gonzalez-Barahona, Paul Sherwood, Gregorio Robles, and Daniel Izquierdo. Technical Lag in Software Compilations: Measuring How Outdated a Software Deployment Is. In Federico Balaguer, Roberto Di Cosmo, Alejandra Garrido, Fabio Kon, Gregorio Robles, and Stefano Zacchiroli, editors, *Open Source Systems: Towards Robust Practices*, IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology, pages 182–192, Cham, 2017. Springer International Publishing.
- [8] Omar Hussain Alhazmi, Yashwant K Malaiya, and Indrajit Ray. Measuring, analyzing and predicting security vulnerabilities in software systems. *computers & security*, 26(3):219–228, 2007.
- [9] Z. Xu, B. Chen, M. Chandramohan, Y. Liu, and F. Song. SPAIN: Security Patch Analysis for Binaries towards Understanding the Pain and Pills. In *2017 IEEE/ACM 39th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 462–472, May 2017. ISSN: 1558-1225.
- [10] X. Wang, K. Sun, A. Batcheller, and S. Jajodia. Detecting "0-Day" Vulnerability: An Empirical Study of Secret Security Patch in OSS. In *2019 49th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN)*, pages 485–492, June 2019. ISSN: 1530-0889.
- [11] Giang Nguyen-Truong, Hong Jin Kang, David Lo, Abhishek Sharma, Andrew Santosa, Asankhaya Sharma, and Ang Ming Yi. Hermes: and Using Commit-Issue Linking to Detect Vulnerability-Fixing Commits. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*, March 2022.
- [12] Antonino Sabetta and Michele Bezzi. A Practical Approach to the Automatic Classification of Security-Relevant Commits. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (IC-SME)*, pages 579–582, September 2018. ISSN: 2576-3148.
- [13] BACK TO THE BUILDING BLOCKS: A PATH TOWARD SECURE AND MEASURABLE SOFTWARE. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/Final-ONCD-Technical-Report.pdf>, 2024. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [14] Yonghee Shin and Laurie Williams. Can traditional fault prediction models be used for vulnerability prediction? *Empirical Software Engineering*, 18(1):25–59, February 2013.
- [15] Donald Pinckney, Federico Cassano, Arjun Guha, and Jonathan Bell. A Large Scale Analysis of Semantic Versioning in NPM. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories*, 2023.
- [16] Patrick Morrison, David Moye, Rahul Pandita, and Laurie Williams. Mapping the field of software life cycle security metrics. *Information and Software Technology*, 102:146–159, October 2018.
- [17] State of the Software Supply Chain. https://www.sonatype.com/hubfs/SSC/2019%20SSC/SON_SSSC-Report-2019_jun16-DRAFT.pdf, 2019. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [18] Filipe Roseiro Cogo, Gustavo A. Oliva, and Ahmed E. Hassan. An Empirical Study of Dependency Downgrades in the npm Ecosystem. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 47(11):2457–2470, November 2021.
- [19] Ahmed Zerouali, Eleni Constantinou, Tom Mens, Gregorio Robles, and Jesus Gonzalez-Barahona. An Empirical Analysis of Technical Lag in npm Package Dependencies. In *ICSR*, April 2018.
- [20] Alexandre Decan, Tom Mens, and Eleni Constantinou. On the Evolution of Technical Lag in the npm Package Dependency Network. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSM)*, pages 404–414, September 2018.
- [21] Ahmed Zerouali, Tom Mens, Jesus Gonzalez-Barahona, Alexandre Decan, Eleni Constantinou, and Gregorio Robles. A formal framework for measuring technical lag in component repositories — and its application to npm. *Journal of Software: Evolution and Process*, 31(8):e2157, 2019.
- [22] Ahmed Zerouali, Tom Mens, Alexandre Decan, Jesus Gonzalez-Barahona, and Gregorio Robles. A multi-dimensional analysis of technical lag in Debian-based Docker images. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 26(2):19, February 2021.
- [23] Jacob Stringer, Amjed Tahir, Kelly Blincoe, and Jens Dietrich. Technical Lag of Dependencies in Major Package Managers. In *2020 27th Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference (APSEC)*, pages 228–237, December 2020.
- [24] Bodin Chinthanet, Raula Gaikovina Kula, Shane McIntosh, Takashi Ishio, Akinori Ihara, and Kenichi Matsumoto. Lags in the release, adoption, and propagation of npm vulnerability fixes. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 26(3):47, March 2021.

- [25] Tyler McDonnell, Baishakhi Ray, and Miryung Kim. An Empirical Study of API Stability and Adoption in the Android Ecosystem. In *2013 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance*, pages 70–79, September 2013.
- [26] Raula Gaikovina Kula, Daniel M. German, Takashi Ishio, and Katsuro Inoue. Trusting a library: A study of the latency to adopt the latest Maven release. In *2015 IEEE 22nd International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution, and Reengineering (SANER)*, pages 520–524, March 2015.
- [27] Joel Cox, Eric Bouwers, Marko van Eekelen, and Joost Visser. Measuring Dependency Freshness in Software Systems. In *2015 IEEE/ACM 37th IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering*, volume 2, pages 109–118, May 2015.
- [28] Erik Derr, Sven Bugiel, Sascha Fahl, Yasemin Acar, and Michael Backes. Keep me Updated: An Empirical Study of Third-Party Library Updatability on Android. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 2187–2200, Dallas Texas USA, October 2017. ACM.
- [29] Ying Wang, Bihuan Chen, Kaifeng Huang, Bowen Shi, Congying Xu, Xin Peng, Yijian Wu, and Yang Liu. An Empirical Study of Usages, Updates and Risks of Third-Party Libraries in Java Projects. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME)*, pages 35–45, September 2020.
- [30] Kaifeng Huang, Bihuan Chen, Congying Xu, Ying Wang, Bowen Shi, Xin Peng, Yijian Wu, and Yang Liu. Characterizing usages, updates and risks of third-party libraries in Java projects. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 27(4):90, April 2022.
- [31] Ivan Pashchenko, Henrik Plate, Serena Elisa Ponta, Antonino Sabetta, and Fabio Massacci. Vulnerable open source dependencies: Counting those that matter. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement*, pages 1–10, Oulu Finland, October 2018. ACM.
- [32] Raula Gaikovina Kula, Daniel M. German, Ali Ouni, Takashi Ishio, and Katsuro Inoue. Do developers update their library dependencies? *Empirical Software Engineering*, 23(1):384–417, February 2018.
- [33] Markus Zimmermann, Cristian-Alexandru Staicu, and Michael Pradel. Small World with High Risks: A Study of Security Threats in the npm Ecosystem. In *28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 19)*, page 17. USENIX Association, 2019.
- [34] Swapna S. Gokhale and Kishor S. Trivedi. A time/structure based software reliability model. *Annals of Software Engineering*, 8(1):85–121, February 1999.
- [35] Miguel Calvo and Marta Beltrán. Applying the Goal, Question, Metric method to derive tailored dynamic cyber risk metrics. *Information & Computer Security*, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print), January 2023.
- [36] Allen M. Johnson and Miroslaw Malek. Survey of software tools for evaluating reliability, availability, and serviceability. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 20(4):227–269, December 1988.
- [37] Mary Ann Davidson. The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly: Stepping on the Security Scale. In *2009 Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, pages 187–195, December 2009.
- [38] Yolanta Beres, Marco Casassa Mont, Jonathan Griffin, and Simon Shiu. Using security metrics coupled with predictive modeling and simulation to assess security processes. In *2009 3rd International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement*, pages 564–573, October 2009.
- [39] MTTR: The Most Important Security Metric. <https://www.darkreading.com/cyberattacks-data-breaches/mttr-most-important-security-metric>, 2024. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [40] MTTD and MTTR in Cybersecurity. <https://plextrac.com/mttd-and-mttr-in-cybersecurity/>. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [41] Graham Jenson, Jens Dietrich, and Hans W. Guesgen. An Empirical Study of the Component Dependency Resolution Search Space. In Lars Grunske, Ralf Reussner, and Frantisek Plasil, editors, *Component-Based Software Engineering*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 182–199, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010. Springer.
- [42] osv.dev : A distributed vulnerability database for open source. <https://osv.dev>. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [43] Maelick Claes, Tom Mens, Roberto Di Cosmo, and Jerome Vouillon. A Historical Analysis of Debian Package Incompatibilities. In *2015 IEEE/ACM 12th Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories*, pages 212–223, Florence, Italy, May 2015. IEEE.
- [44] Ward Cunningham. The WyCash portfolio management system. *ACM SIGPLAN OOPS Messenger*, 4(2):29–30, April 1993.
- [45] Philippe Kruchten, Robert L. Nord, and Ipek Ozkaya. Technical Debt: From Metaphor to Theory and Practice. *IEEE Software*, 29(6):18–21, November 2012.
- [46] Neil A. Ernst, Stephany Bellomo, Ipek Ozkaya, Robert L. Nord, and Ian Gorton. Measure it? Manage it? Ignore it? software practitioners and technical debt. In *Proceedings of the 2015 10th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 50–60, Bergamo Italy, August 2015. ACM.
- [47] Edith Tom, Aybüke Aarum, and Richard Vidgen. An exploration of technical debt. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 86(6):1498–1516, June 2013.
- [48] Zengyang Li, Paris Avgeriou, and Peng Liang. A systematic mapping study on technical debt and its management. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 101:193–220, March 2015.
- [49] Joshua Kerievsky. *Refactoring to patterns*. Addison-Wesley, 2007.
- [50] Alexandre Decan and Tom Mens. What Do Package Dependencies Tell Us About Semantic Versioning? *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 47(6):1226–1240, June 2021.
- [51] Steven Raemaekers, Arie van Deursen, and Joost Visser. Semantic Versioning versus Breaking Changes: A Study of the Maven Repository. In *2014 IEEE 14th International Working Conference on Source Code Analysis and Manipulation*, pages 215–224, September 2014.
- [52] Jens Dietrich, David Pearce, Jacob Stringer, Amjed Tahir, and Kelly Blincoe. Dependency Versioning in the Wild. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 16th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*, pages 349–359, May 2019.
- [53] Lina Ochoa, Thomas Degueule, Jean-Rémy Falleri, and Jurgen Vinju. Breaking bad? Semantic versioning and impact of breaking changes in Maven Central. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 27(3):61, March 2022.
- [54] Open Source Insights API (BigQuery). <https://docs.deps.dev/bigquery/v1/>. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [55] Open Source Insights: Understand your dependencies. <https://deps.dev/>. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [56] crates.io: Rust Package Registry. <https://crates.io>. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [57] Node.js Package Manager. <https://npmjs.com>. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [58] The Python Package Index. <https://pypi.org>. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [59] Rabe Abdalkareem, Olivier Nourry, Sultan Wehaibi, Suhaib Mujahid, and Emad Shihab. Why do developers use trivial packages? an empirical case study on npm. In *Proceedings of the 2017 11th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE 2017*, pages 385–395, New York, NY, USA, August 2017. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [60] Rabe Abdalkareem, Vinicius Oda, Suhaib Mujahid, and Emad Shihab. On the impact of using trivial packages: An empirical case study on npm and PyPI. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 25(2):1168–1204, March 2020.
- [61] Jerry L. Hintze and Ray D. Nelson. Violin Plots: A Box Plot-Density Trace Synergism. *The American Statistician*, 52(2):181–184, May 1998.
- [62] M. B. WILK and R. GNANADESIKAN. Probability plotting methods for the analysis for the analysis of data. *Biometrika*, 55(1):1–17, March 1968.
- [63] J. L. Hodges. The significance probability of the smirnov two-sample test. *Arkiv för Matematik*, 3(5):469–486, January 1958.
- [64] F. F. Gan and K. J. Koehler. Goodness-of-Fit Tests Based on $P - P$ Probability Plots. *Technometrics*, 32(3):289–303, August 1990.
- [65] Aaron Clauset, Cosma Rohilla Shalizi, and M. E. J. Newman. Power-Law Distributions in Empirical Data. *SIAM Review*, 51(4):661–703, November 2009.
- [66] T.W. Epps and Kenneth J. Singleton. An omnibus test for the two-sample problem using the empirical characteristic function. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 26(3-4):177–203, December 1986.
- [67] Sebastian J. Goerg and Johannes Kaiser. Nonparametric Testing of Distributions—the Epps–Singleton Two-Sample Test using the Empirical Characteristic Function. *The Stata Journal*, 9(3):454–465, September 2009.
- [68] F. W. Scholz and M. A. Stephens. K-Sample Anderson–Darling Tests. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 82(399):918–924, September 1987.

- [69] H. B. Mann and D. R. Whitney. On a Test of Whether one of Two Random Variables is Stochastically Larger than the Other. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 18(1):50–60, 1947.
- [70] A. Di Bucchianico. Combinatorics, computer algebra and the Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 79(2):349–364, July 1999.
- [71] Michael P. Fay and Michael A. Proschan. Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney or t-test? On assumptions for hypothesis tests and multiple interpretations of decision rules. *Statistics surveys*, 4:1–39, 2010.
- [72] T. W. Anderson. On the Distribution of the Two-Sample Cramér-von Mises Criterion. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 33(3):1148–1159, 1962.
- [73] William Jay Conover. *Practical nonparametric statistics*, volume 350. john wiley & sons, 1999.
- [74] SciPy v1.12.0 Manual. <https://docs.scipy.org/doc/scipy/index.html>. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [75] Bruce Ratner. The correlation coefficient: Its values range between+ 1/- 1, or do they? *Journal of targeting, measurement and analysis for marketing*, 17(2):139–142, 2009.
- [76] Fitter. <https://fitter.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [77] Xavier Javines Bilon. Normality and significance testing in simple linear regression model for large sample sizes: A simulation study. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation*, 52(6):2781–2797, June 2023.
- [78] Mingfeng Lin, Henry C. Lucas, and Galit Shmueli. Research Commentary—Too Big to Fail: Large Samples and the p-Value Problem. *Information Systems Research*, 24(4):906–917, December 2013.
- [79] Björn Lantz. The large sample size fallacy. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 27(2):487–492, 2013.
- [80] Courtney Miller, Christian Kästner, and Bogdan Vasilescu. “We Feel Like We’re Winging It:” A Study on Navigating Open-Source Dependency Abandonment. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 1281–1293, San Francisco CA USA, November 2023. ACM.
- [81] Filipe R. Cogo, Gustavo A. Oliva, and Ahmed E. Hassan. Deprecation of Packages and Releases in Software Ecosystems: A Case Study on NPM. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 48(7):2208–2223, July 2022.
- [82] The Cargo Book. <https://doc.rust-lang.org/cargo/reference/specifying-dependencies.html>, 2024. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.
- [83] CISA. Vulnerability Exploitability eXchange (VEX) : Use Cases. https://www.cisa.gov/sites/default/files/2023-01/VEX_Use_Cases_April2022.pdf. Last accessed: 18-Mar-2024.