

# TGMM: Combining Parse Tree with GPU for Scalable Multilingual and Multi-Granularity Code Clone Detection

Yuhang Ye<sup>a</sup>, Yuekun Wang<sup>a</sup>, Yinxing Xue<sup>a</sup>, Yueming Wu<sup>b,\*</sup>, Yang Liu<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*School of Computer Science and Technology, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China*

<sup>b</sup>*School of Computer Science and Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore*

---

## Abstract

The rapid evolution of programming languages and software systems has necessitated the implementation of multilingual and scalable clone detection tools. However, it is difficult to achieve the above requirements at the same time. Most existing tools only focus on one challenge. In this work, we propose TGMM, a tree and GPU-based tool for multilingual and multi-granularity code clone detection. By generating parse trees based on user-provided grammar files, TGMM can extract code blocks at a specified granularity and detect Type-3 clones efficiently. In order to show the performance of TGMM, we compare it with seven state-of-the-art tools in terms of recall, precision, and execution time. TGMM ranks first in execution time and precision, while its recall is comparable to the others. Moreover, we analyzed the language extensibility of TGMM across 30 mainstream programming languages. Out of these, a total of 25 languages were supported, while the remaining five currently lack the necessary grammar files. Finally, we analyzed the clone characteristics of nine popular languages at five common granularities, hoping to inspire future researchers. The source code of TGMM is available at: <https://github.com/TGMM24/TGMM.git>.

**Keywords:** Clone detection, GPU acceleration, Multilingual, Big code

---

## 1. Introduction

Code clones, which are portions of code that are similar or identical to each other, are prevalent in software systems [1]. Clones are divided into four types (i.e., Type 1-4 clones) based on their characteristics and the level of similarity. Type 1-3 clones are introduced by developers directly copying existing code. Type 4 clones are composed of functionally similar code. Clone code introduces numerous maintenance challenges, including increased bug propagation and decreased understandability [2, 3, 4]. Therefore, the development of practical tools for detecting clones is crucial for improving software quality and reducing the overall cost of software maintenance.

In the past two decades, numerous clone detection methods have been proposed. They can be divided into text-based [5, 6, 7], token-based [8, 9, 10], tree-based [11, 12, 13], and graph-based [14, 15, 16, 17] approaches according to the code representations they used. The text and token-based methods are suitable for scalable clone detection because they do not need to process the structure information of the code block but simply convert them to text or token sequences and then perform similarity comparison. For example, SourcererCC [9] and NiL [6] can complete 250 million lines of code (MLOC) clone detection with a short execution time. However, it is challenging for these methods to detect complex clones since they don't

consider code structure information. In order to detect more clones, tree and graph-based clone detection tools have been proposed. For example, the tree-based AST-CC [12] and graph-based CCgraph [14] have achieved satisfactory results in Type-3/4 clone detection. However, the tree or graph-matching algorithms are computationally expensive, making them difficult to use for large-scale clone detection. Moreover, as programming languages (hereinafter referred to as "languages") continue to evolve, there is a need for a code clone detection tool that can keep up with the changing landscape. Nevertheless, due to the diversity and complexity of language syntax, it is challenging to support multilingual clone detection [18]. To address this challenge, Zhu *et al.* proposed MSCCD [19], a tool with the best language extensibility at present. They convert the source codes in different languages into token sequences with the help of ANTLR [20], which is a widely used parser generator. However, MSCCD has restricted support for certain languages, such as Objective-C and Ruby, owing to the constraints imposed by the keyword filter employed for code block extraction. As for effectiveness, since MSCCD does not consider any program structure details, it is difficult to detect complex code clones. As for scalability, MSCCD can only be extended to 100 MLOC clone detection and cannot scale to 250 MLOC analysis due to the amount of calculation [19].

In response to the above need, we propose TGMM, a Tree and GPU-based tool for Multilingual and Multi-granularity code clone detection. It is a practical design choice to support multilingual clone detection with ANTLR. Since its inception, ANTLR has over 170 grammar files and more than 7300 commits, ensuring its ability to keep pace with evolving grammar.

---

\*Corresponding author

Email addresses: yyh834771838@mail.ustc.edu.cn (Yuhang Ye), wykkk@mail.ustc.edu.cn (Yuekun Wang), yxxue@ustc.edu.cn (Yinxing Xue), wuyueming21@gmail.com (Yueming Wu), yangliu@ntu.edu.sg (Yang Liu)

Leveraging ANTLR’s capabilities, TGMM initially generates a parse tree for source code based on the user-provided grammar file. Then TGMM can extract code blocks of specific granularities according to the root node of the subtree. Due to the complex structure of tree representation, its storage and similarity comparison are expensive. To address this challenge, TGMM transforms subtree by node type into a node sequence, which preserves the tree structure information. With the help of GPU, TGMM can efficiently construct a suffix array based on these node sequences. The utilization of GPU enables parallel processing of code clone detection tasks, leading to substantial speedup compared to traditional CPU-based approaches. Moreover, TGMM employs data grouping to support scalable clone detection. Finally, TGMM uses the suffix array to find fixed-length clone units and merges them to obtain the final clone pairs.

We evaluate TGMM with comprehensive experiments. First, since various types of nodes contain diverse information, we initially conducted an analysis of TGMM’s performance across different nodes and parameters (see Table 3,4). Once the parameters were set, we compared TGMM with existing state-of-the-art clone detection tools in terms of recall, precision, and execution time. Notably, TGMM detected 100 MLOC input in just two hours, which is three times faster than MSCCD [19] and six times faster than SourcererCC. Subsequently, we performed a comparative analysis of TGMM’s recall and precision with BigCloneBench [21], a representative benchmark for clone detection, using the same methodology as SourcererCC and MSCCD. The results demonstrated that the recall of TGMM is comparable to the state-of-the-art clone detection tools, and the precision ranks first (see Table 5). Furthermore, we analyzed the language extensibility of TGMM according to PYPL [22], a ranking of the most popular languages. Out of the 30 languages listed, TGMM supports 25. Lastly, we utilized TGMM to analyze granular clone phenomena and their causes in several GitHub repositories across nine popular languages (see Figure 7). This analysis aims to assist users in formulating more refined code audit strategies for different languages.

The key contributions of our work are as follows:

- By combining parse tree with GPU, we design a novel clone detection tool, namely TGMM, which can support multilingual and multi-granularity clone detection to meet the individual needs of users. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time to use GPU to accelerate tree-based code clone detection.
- To examine the capability of TGMM, we perform evaluations to verify the support of TGMM for popular languages and compare it with state-of-the-art tools in terms of recall, precision, and execution speed. Experimental results show that TGMM can detect more code clones with high precision and is able to complete 250 MLOC analyses.
- To demonstrate the practicability of TGMM, we also conduct a multi-granularity case study with nine popular languages across 45 GitHub repositories with the most stars, showing the clone distribution and originality rate for all repositories corresponding to each language.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section

2 introduces the background of our work. Section 3 presents the methodology employed in TGMM, including the details of code block extraction and the approach used for multilingual clone detection, followed by various experiments conducted to answer three research questions in Section 4. Section 6 provides an overview of related research on code clone detection. Section 5 discusses the threats to validity and some important issues regarding the tool. Finally, we conclude the paper with a summary of our contributions and future research directions in Section 7.

## 2. Background

### 2.1. ANTLR

ANTLR (ANother Tool for Language Recognition) is a powerful and widely used parser generator that facilitates the development of language processors, such as compilers, interpreters, and translators. It combines the benefits of LL(k)<sup>1</sup> parsing algorithm [23] with the flexibility of context-free grammar, making it an ideal choice for both simple and complex language specifications. With its intuitive grammar notation and extensive code generation capabilities, ANTLR has gained popularity in academia and industry. It provides a robust framework for parsing and analyzing code in various languages. By leveraging ANTLR’s grammar-based approach, researchers have developed innovative methods to extract language-specific features and represent code segments uniformly, enabling efficient multilingual clone detection. Furthermore, ANTLR’s advanced error reporting and recovery mechanisms contribute to enhanced debugging and error handling during the parsing process. Overall, ANTLR stands as a reliable and efficient tool for language recognition, empowering researchers to build robust multilingual processors with ease.

### 2.2. Suffix Tree and Suffix Array




Figure 1: An Example for Suffix Tree and Suffix Array

Suffix trees and suffix arrays are powerful data structures that enable efficient processing and analysis of strings. A suffix tree represents all the suffixes of a given string, while a suffix

<sup>1</sup>The “LL” stands for “left-to-right, leftmost derivation”, and the “(K)” indicates the number of lookahead tokens the parser uses to make decisions.

array is an ordered array of all the suffixes. These structures offer fast search, substring matching, and pattern recognition capabilities, making them indispensable tools in various applications. Figure 1 shows the suffix tree and suffix array for the string “abaaba”. Each prefix corresponds to a path starting at the root of the suffix tree. Each duplicate substring must be a prefix of some suffix. For instance, in Figure 1.1, the paths corresponding to suffixes 0 and 3 contain two common nodes: “a” and “ba”. Consequently, the length of their duplicate substring is 3. The suffix array provides the suffixes in lexicographic order, enabling us to directly compare adjacent suffixes to determine the common prefix length (CPL), which is shown on the right in Figure 1.2. By leveraging this property of the suffix tree and suffix array, we can easily get the longest common subsequence (LCS) of several strings, which proves useful in clone detection.

Notably, suffix tree consumes more memory due to their tree-like structure but offer faster query times. On the other hand, the suffix array is more space-efficient but requires more computation resources. However, we can leverage the power of GPU (Graphics Processing Unit) to accelerate the construction process of suffix array and make it suitable for code clone detection, as we show in Section 3.3.

### 2.3. Definitions

We use the following well-accepted definitions [24, 25]:

**Code Block:** A section of code within a programming language that is enclosed by specific delimiters.

**Code Segment:** A continuous segment in a code block.

**Clone Unit:** A pair of identical code segments of fixed length.

**Clone Pair:** A pair of similar code blocks.

**Type-1:** These code blocks are nearly identical, with the only variations being in white space, layout, and comments.

**Type-2:** These code blocks are almost identical, except for differences in variable names and literal values, in addition to the differences found in Type-1.

**Type-3:** These code blocks are modified by adding, removing, or changing statements, along with the differences found in Type-1/2.

**Type-4:** These code blocks achieve the same computation with different syntactic implementations.

## 3. Approach

This section introduces our proposed clone detector, namely TGMM (Tree and GPU-based tool for Multilingual and Multi-granularity code clone detection).




Figure 2: System Overview of TGMM

### 3.1. System Overview

The framework of TGMM is shown in Figure 2. TGMM can be divided into four main phases: *Code Block Extraction*, *Suffix Array Generation*, *Three-Tuple Construction*, and *Code Clone Detection*.

- **Code Block Extraction:** The purpose of this phase is to extract specific code blocks from the source code and transform them into intermediate representations. The input is the source code and the output is all the serialized code blocks at a particular granularity.

- **Suffix Array Generation:** In this phase, we initially concatenate the output of the prior phase to form an extended sequence, and subsequently create a suffix array for this composite sequence. The construction process can be expedited by leveraging the power of GPU.

- **Three-Tuple Construction:** This phase is dedicated to constructing a three-tuple list from the suffix array. A three-tuple represents a clone unit, and its derivation relies on the length of the shared prefix between adjacent elements in the suffix array.

- **Code Clone Detection:** In this phase, we commence by harnessing the GPU to sort the three-tuple list. Three-tuples originating from the same code block are grouped together. The above process yields the overlapping nodes of their corresponding code blocks, aiding in the identification of potential clone pairs. The ultimate output comprises all identified clone pairs.

### 3.2. Code Block Extraction




Figure 3: Extract Code Blocks from Parse Tree

Nowadays, there have been significant advancements in code clone detection, but the support for language extension mechanisms is still relatively sparse. Ain *et al.* [26] collected and analyzed 13 popular tools from 2013 to 2018. Among these tools, only CCFinderSW [18] offers an extension mechanism to support additional languages, while the other 12 tools are limited to supporting a small number of popular languages. As CCFinderSW works by converting grammar definitions into regular expressions, it lacks support for languages like Lua, as regular expressions cannot express arbitrary context-free sentences. In addition to CCFinderSW, there are also some multilingual clone detection tools based on TXL [27], such as SourcererCC [9] and NiCad [5]. SourcererCC only supports

Java, C, and C#, and NiCad supports a limited number of 12 languages. TXL has the disadvantages of slow parsing speed, poor scalability, and unfriendliness to novices. After a simple experiment, TXL takes 44 minutes to parse 100 MLOC Java code, while ANTLR takes only 13 minutes. TXL needs to write a new “.txl” file to find normalized or other granularity clones, while ANTLR only needs to change some variables. ANTLR provides a professional book [28] that describes the usage of ANTLR. So we chose ANTLR, which truly supports multilingual syntax parsing tools. MSCCD [19] has demonstrated the effectiveness, ease of extensibility, and comprehensiveness of ANTLR for scalable multilingual clone detection. With the help of ANTLR, TGMM currently supports more than 170 languages in the “grammars-v4” repository [29]. Moreover, users can easily modify or create a grammar file to meet personalized needs.

Source files are usually relatively large. After statistical analysis, the average number of CPP file lines in the “opencv” repository [30] is 517. So it is necessary to partition the source files into code blocks to search for fine-grained clones [25]. However, it is a significant challenge for multilingual clone detection tools. For example, SourcererCC failed to extract the correct blocks of these functions whose parameters were split into several lines. Additionally, different languages need different syntax analyzers, and replacing the syntax analyzer for the existing tools also requires source-code-level redevelopment. Figure 3 shows our solution. We first convert the source code into a parse tree according to the grammar files. Subsequently, the parse tree is partitioned into multiple subtrees. Every subtree presents a semantic code block. For example, in Figure 3, the class-level code block is the subtree rooted in “classdef”, and the function-level and loop-level code blocks are the subtree rooted in “funcdef” and “for\_stmt”, respectively. The syntax tree structure is the same for different types of source files. So we can divide the source file into several code blocks in the same way according to the subtrees’ root node.

Note that original parse trees are not suitable for code clone detection. Because the number of nodes in the parse tree is usually more than twice the number of tokens. This is unacceptable for large-scale code clone detection. So we analyzed the impact of node type on TGMM recall and decided to keep these nodes with one child in Section 4.2. Then the simplified subtree is converted into a node sequence by preorder traversal. Each node sequence corresponds to a code block. Therefore, we can extract specific types of code blocks according to user requirements. Then concatenate their corresponding node sequences to obtain the data array, which is later used to generate the suffix array (SA). During this period, we also need to generate a label array to record the code block ID corresponding to each node in the data array.

### 3.3. Suffix Array Generation

In Section 2.2, we introduced the suffix tree and suffix array. Constructing suffix trees requires a significant amount of memory, whereas constructing suffix arrays requires significant computation. Sajjani *et al.* argue that suffix-tree-based approaches fail in large-scale clone detection [9]. There are many

Table 1: GPU vs. CPU Time Cost of Suffix Array Generation

	10M	50M	100M
10	0.06, 51.58	0.21, 318.54	0.38, 662.92
100	0.04, 39.53	0.15, 243.58	0.26, 494.68
200	0.04, 39.12	0.14, 238.16	0.26, 483.60

<sup>1</sup> Top side: sequence length; Left side: alphabet size.

<sup>2</sup> Item: the left is the GPU runtime, while the right is the CPU runtime.




Figure 4: Suffix Array Generation

optimization algorithms for constructing of suffix arrays, such as prefix-doubling. Prefix-doubling sorts the suffixes of a string by their prefixes, doubling the length of those prefixes every iteration. Koschke *et al.* [31] adopted the technique and succeeded in clone detection on a 250 MLOC code base with 23.5 hours (running on a 64GB RAM machine). However, the time cost is still unsatisfactory. Fortunately, the generation process can be further accelerated by GPU. Sun *et al.* [32] proposed a GPU-based parallelized solution, named Data Parallel Prefix-Doubling (DPPD), to accelerate suffix array construction. We compared the time cost of using prefix doubling to generate the suffix array between an Intel i7-12700H CPU and GTX2080Ti GPU. The result is shown in Table 1. Using the GPU to generate the suffix array is nearly 1000 times faster than the CPU. The longer the sequence, the more pronounced the acceleration effect.

Figure 4 shows the general process of generating a suffix array. Each suffix string is represented as an integer denoting the index of its leading character in a suffix array. These indices are listed on the left margin of the “Sorted Suffix Array” rectangle in Figure 4. Especially, suffixes sharing the same prefixes are grouped together as neighboring entries within the suffix array. This feature is crucial for the three-tuple construction.

### 3.4. Three-Tuple Construction

The source files from the input project are partitioned and converted into a suffix array (denoted as “sa”) and a label array (denoted as “la”) in the previous steps. The  $i$ th value  $sa_i$  represents a suffix string of length  $l_{mcs}$  starting at the  $sa_i$ th node in the data array, and it is from the  $la_i$ th code block. The neighboring entries in  $sa$  have the same prefix. So we can get the overlap node number of two code blocks based on these same prefixes. However, it is time-consuming to get all common prefixes. Suppose there are two identical code blocks  $b_1$  and  $b_2$ , and their corresponding node sequences are  $x$  and  $y$  with a length of  $L$ . When we iterate over neighboring elements of the suffix array generated by these two code blocks, the 0th value  $x_0$  needs to compare  $L$  elements backward. The 1th value  $x_1$  needs to compare  $L - 1$  elements backward. By analogy, we can get the total number of comparisons as  $L(L - 1)/2$ .

To address this challenge, we set the length of the backward traversal to a fixed value, denoted  $l_{cs}$  (i.e., the length for the code segment). The reason will be explained in the following code clone detection phase. We record the common prefix information through three-tuple ( $pos, block_1, block_2$ ), where  $block_1$  and  $block_2$  are the code blocks to be detected,  $pos$  is the start position of the clone unit in the  $block_1$ . In fact, **a three-tuple is a clone unit**. The same is the case above. The 0th value  $x_0$  only needs to compare  $l_{cs}$  elements backward to get a three-tuple ( $x_0, b_1, b_2$ ). It is the same for the other nodes. This brings the number of comparisons down to  $l_{cs} * (L - l_{cs})$ . Finally, when we merge these clone units, the overlap node number of  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  is still  $L$ . This guarantees consistent results when the number of comparisons is reduced.

Furthermore, since the length of the prefix that needs to be compared is fixed, we can create an array named  $mccHash$  to store the hash values of adjacent  $l_{cs}$  nodes. The  $i$ th value  $mccHash_i$  represents the hash value of  $[data_i, \dots, data_{(i+l_{cs})}]$ . Through  $mccHash$ , we can reduce the number of comparisons to  $L - l_{cs}$ . The gain increases even more when given coarse-grained code blocks.

Algorithm 1 lists the main steps of three-tuple construction. The input includes a suffix array  $sa$ , a label array  $la$ , and two global variables  $l_{cs}$  and  $mccHash$  explained above. If the distance from the current node to the end of its corresponding code block is already less than  $l_{cs}$ , it is impossible to have the same prefix with other code segments longer than  $l_{cs}$  (lines 6-8). If a pair of code segments have different labels, but the hash values are the same, add them to the  $ttList$  and ensure that the small label comes first to reduce the number of clone pairs (lines 14-19). If their hash values are different, jump out of the current loop directly (line 21) because the common prefix length for the following code segments must be less than  $l_{cs}$ . At last, TGMM returns a three-tuple list, which is used for the following code clone detection.

### 3.5. Code Clone Detection

**Code Clone Detection.** Code clones are detected by merging these clone units from the three-tuple list. In order to merge them, it is essential to identify whether they come from the

---

#### Algorithm 1: Three-Tuple Construction

---

**Input:**  $sa$  is the suffix array,  $la$  is the node label array,  $l_{cs}$  is the minimal length for code segment, and  $mccHash$  is a global array stores the hash values of adjacent  $l_{cs}$  nodes.

**Output:** A collection of three-tuple

```

1 Function TTConstructoin( $sa, la$ )
2    $ttList = []$ 
3    $sal = sa.length$ 
4   for  $i = 0$  to  $sal$  do
5      $ni = sa[i], li = la[ni]$ 
6     if  $li \neq la[ni + l_{cs}]$  then
7       continue
8     end
9     for  $k = i + 1$  to  $sal$  do
10       $nk = sa[k], lk = la[nk]$ 
11      if  $li == lk$  or  $lk \neq la[nk + l_{cs}]$  then
12        continue
13      end
14      if  $mccHash[ni] == mccHash[nk]$  then
15        if  $li < lk$  then
16           $ttList.append(ThreeTuple(ni, li, lk))$ 
17        else
18           $ttList.append(ThreeTuple(nk, lk, li))$ 
19        end
20      else
21        break
22      end
23    end
24  end
25  return  $ttList$ 
26 End Function

```

---



---

#### Algorithm 2: Code Clone Detection

---

**Input:** The sorted list of three-tuples:  $ttList$ , a global map  $allBlock$  stores all code blocks' information, and  $\theta$  is the similarity threshold specified by the user

**Output:** A collection of clone pairs

```

1 Function convertTT2ClonePairs( $ttList$ )
2    $clonePairs = \{\}, len = l_{cs}$ 
3    $S_{i,r}$  = the 0th value of  $ttList$ 
4    $sp = S_{i,r}.pos, l_1 = S_{i,r}.block_1, l_2 = S_{i,r}.block_2$ 
5   foreach  $tr$  in  $ttList$  do
6     if  $tr.block_1 == l_1$  and  $tr.block_2 == l_2$  then
7        $len += \min(tr.pos - sp, l_{cs})$ 
8        $sp = tr.pos$ 
9     else
10       $maxLen = \max(allBlock[l_1].length,$ 
11         $allBlock[l_2].length)$ 
12       $sim = len / maxLen$ 
13      if  $sim > \theta$  then
14         $clonePairs.append(\{l_1, l_2\})$ 
15      end
16       $sp = tr.pos, l1 = tr.block_1, l2 = tr.block_2, len =$ 
17         $l_{cs}$ 
18    end
19  end
20  return  $clonePairs$ 
21 End Function

```

---






Figure 5: Merging Three-Tuples

same code blocks. This identification process is achieved efficiently by sorting the three-tuples based on their code blocks. While sorting is typically time-consuming, this is not the case when utilizing the power of GPU. With the assistance of the “thrust/sort.h” library [33], the sorting operation is significantly accelerated, allowing for faster identification and merging of clone units. After a simple test, it took 694s to sort 900 million three-tuples on the CPU, and only 9.8s on the GPU, nearly 70 times faster. After sorting, we only need to consider merging adjacent three-tuples to get the final clone pairs.




Figure 6: Optimization with Data Grouping

Algorithm 2 lists the main steps of converting three-tuples into clone pairs. The core of the algorithm is to merge adjacent three-tuples from the same pair of code blocks. If the adjacent clone units can be merged, let  $len$  add the length of their non-overlapping area (lines 6-8), as shown in Figure 5. Otherwise, calculate the similarity between the current two code blocks to determine whether to report them as a clone pair (lines 9-14). To calculate the similarity, we refer to the definition and algorithm proposed by SourcererCC, which has good recall and scalability for syntactic code clone detection. However, we require that the same node must appear in a clone unit. This will result in a lower similarity but higher precision. Therefore, the similarity threshold used in our experiment section is lower than that of SourcererCC. The similarity is measured as follows:

$$sim(x, y) = \frac{Overlap(x, y)}{\max(|N_x|, |N_y|)} \quad (1)$$

where the numerator is the overlap node number of code block  $x$  and  $y$ , and the denominator is the larger value of the node number after filtering.

**Large-scale Optimization.** As the size of the source code increases, the intermediate variables used for clone detection may exceed the available capacity of the CPU or GPU. So data

grouping is a crucial component of large-scale clone detection. To address this challenge, we divide the concatenated subtree sequence into  $N$  groups to ensure that the GPU can load two groups at the same time. We concatenate any two groups of subsequence and transmit them to the GPU to detect inter-group and intra-group clones. Therefore, it is necessary to perform the above code clone detection  $N(N - 1)/2$  times. Additionally, since the number of tree node types is less than 255, we can merge every four adjacent nodes in the sequence to obtain 32-bit data to shorten the sequence length. This optimization was originally introduced by us, and it is not present in SAGA [34]. This can greatly reduce memory consumption and speed up the generation of suffix arrays. Through experimental testing, 11GB of graphics memory can load 30 million nodes and 500 million three-tuples at one time. Users can specify the subsequence length of each group according to the graphics card capacity. The overall process is shown in Figure 6.

## 4. Evaluation

In this section, we conduct evaluation experiments on TGMM to answer the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** What are the suitable tree nodes and parameters for TGMM?
- **RQ2:** How does TGMM perform in terms of recall, precision, and execution time?
- **RQ3:** How many languages does TGMM support, and how does the distribution of clones at various granularities vary among different languages?

### 4.1. Experimental Settings

#### 4.1.1. Dataset

The evaluation of recall and precision is conducted on BigCloneBench [21]. It is a clone detection benchmark of known clones in the IJaDataset-2.0 source repository [35], which contains 25,000 open-source Java systems. BigCloneBench contains over 8 million Java-based inter- and intra-project function-level clone pairs. Each pair is labeled with a clone type. To provide a more detailed distinction between Type-3 and Type-4 clones, BigCloneBench employs syntactic similarity measurements. A diff algorithm is employed to identify the ratio of common lines or tokens, taking into account their order. It divided the Type-3/4 clones into four categories: Very-Strongly Type-3 (VST3), Strongly Type-3 (ST3), Moderately Type-3 (MT3), and Weakly Type-3/Type-4 (WT3/T4). The similarities of different clone types are shown in Table 2. Specifically, we utilize the same dataset employed in ASTNN [36] and TACC [37], which is a subset of BigCloneBench. Table 2 shows the composition of this dataset.

Table 2: Similarity and Number of Different Clone Types

	T1	T2	VST3	ST3	MT3	WT3/T4
S. <sup>1</sup>	1	1	[0.9, 1)	[0.7, 0.9)	[0.5, 0.7)	[0, 0.5)
N. <sup>1</sup>	15,555	3,663	1,804	9,289	10,473	31,835

<sup>1</sup> S.: the similarity of different clone types; N.: the number of different types of clone pairs.

In order to evaluate the execution time and scalability of TGMM, we randomly selected Java files from the IJaDataset-2.0 to construct our test dataset. We used the Unix tool “cloc” [38] to measure the lines of code, excluding comments and blank lines. The size of the dataset ranges from 10KLOC to 250 MLOC.

#### 4.1.2. Comparisons

We compared TGMM with pertinent state-of-the-art clone detection approaches, which are likewise cited by SourcererCC or MSCCD for the sake of comparison.

- **MSCCD** [19] is a grammar pluggable code clone detection tool based on the tokens shared by two token bags.
- **SourcererCC** [9] detects clones by assessing the token overlap ratio between two functions.
- **CCAligner** [39] utilizes the asymmetric similarity coefficient for similarity measure.
- **CCFinderX** [40] detects clones by characterizing the code in multiple dimensions, which are called clone metrics.
- **Deckard** [41] detects clones by clustering similar subtrees, which are characterized by numerical vectors.
- **NiCad** [5] is a well-known clone detector that identifies clones by the longest common subsequence between two functions.
- **iClones** [42] utilizes Baker’s algorithm, *pdup* [43], for the extraction of clones from the generalized suffix trees, which are generated based on the token sequences of the source code.

#### 4.1.3. Environment

All subsequent experiments were conducted on a single workstation featuring an Intel i7-12700H CPU with 14 cores and 20 threads, accompanied by an NVIDIA GTX 2080Ti graphics card equipped with 11GB of graphics memory. To ensure fairness, the workstation was configured with a limited 32GB of RAM and a 1TB SSD disk space.

#### 4.1.4. Metrics

We use recall and precision to evaluate the performance of TGMM, which is widely used in clone detection. To calculate recall and precision, we need to have the following values:

- **True Positives (TP)**: The number of clone pairs correctly identified as positive.
- **False Positives (FP)**: The number of clone pairs incorrectly identified as positive.
- **False Negatives (FN)**: The number of clone pairs incorrectly identified as negative.

Once you have these values, we can calculate recall and precision with the following formulas:

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

## 4.2. RQ1: Node Selection and Parameter Settings

**Node Selection:** In Section 3.2, we have previously mentioned that raw parse trees are not directly applicable to large-scale clone detection due to their excessive number of nodes.

However, by selecting appropriate nodes, it is possible to enhance the efficiency of clone detection and minimize irrelevant clones. We categorize tree nodes into three types based on their number of child nodes. The first type is the leaf nodes, which are nodes without any children. The second type is the core nodes, which include nodes with only one child. The third type is the multiway nodes, which are nodes with more than one child. In order to determine the most suitable node type for code clone detection, we conducted an evaluation of TGMM’s performance in terms of recall, precision, and execution time across different node types and their combinations.

As there is currently no standardized benchmark or established methodology for measuring precision, we opted to assess precision through manual analysis. The specific approach employed in this evaluation aligns with the practices utilized in SourcererCC and MSCCD. To ensure a credible assessment, we randomly selected 400 clone pairs that were detected by TGMM. These clone pairs were distributed to five independent judges who were tasked with determining the correctness of each pair. To arrive at a conclusive outcome, we utilized the principle of majority decision. This meant that when there was disagreement among the judges, the judgment of the majority was considered the final decision. The execution time refers to the average duration of five repetitive runs of TGMM on the aforementioned dataset. The evaluation settings were configured with  $l_{cs}$  at 24 and  $\theta$  at 0.6.

Table 3: Node Type Selection

Node	N.(M) <sup>1</sup>	Recall(%)					P.(%) <sup>1</sup>	T.(s) <sup>1</sup>
		T1	T2	VST3	ST3	MT3		
L. <sup>1</sup>	12.69	100	84	70	17	3	100	85
C. <sup>1</sup>	13.94	100	100	97	65	14	97	186
M. <sup>1</sup>	6.13	100	83	90	32	2	85	93
L.&C.	26.63	100	93	74	33	5	100	124
L.&M.	18.82	100	86	73	18	3	99	96
C.&M.	20.07	100	100	98	72	20	88	411
All	32.76	100	95	74	34	6	100	180

<sup>1</sup> N. represents the number of nodes; P. represents precision; T. represents the execution time.

<sup>2</sup> L. represents leaf nodes; C. represents core nodes; M. represents multiway nodes.

The result is shown in Table 3. Since the recall on WT3/T4 is close to zero, they are not shown in the table to save space. When only considering leaf nodes, the model exhibits the fastest execution speed but has the lowest recall. This is because the value assigned to the leaf node is an unnormalized token, resulting in a reduced recall for Type-2 clones. Leaf nodes lack structural information. Moreover, Type-3 clone code segments are typically fragmented. Consequently, the distribution of different nodes becomes random and the clone sequences tend to be short, leading to a low recall for Type-3 clones. On the other hand, when solely focusing on core nodes, the model performs well across all aspects. There are two categories of core nodes based on the type of information they hold: structural and textual information. Before the parser enters a specific code portion, it generates a corresponding core node. For instance, in Figure 3, there exists a “funcbody” node before entering the function body and a “for\_stmt” node before entering the “for”

loop. These nodes retain structural information. Before creating a leaf node for the terminator, the parser generates a core node that captures the terminator’s type. These core nodes are similar to normalized tokens. As a result, core nodes encompass structural and text information, contributing to higher recall for clone detection. Conversely, multiway nodes are far from leaf nodes and lack text information. This leads to a low recall for clone detection. Moreover, higher-level nodes tend to have lower discrimination. Multiway nodes are usually at higher levels, which leads to lower precision.

Considering the combination of multiple node types, due to the unique nature of leaf nodes, combinations including them exhibit lower recall. The combination of core nodes and multiway nodes boasts the highest recall. Nonetheless, the multiway nodes are generally situated at higher levels with fewer variations. This can make it challenging to distinguish between different code blocks. Moreover, it will increase the number of three-tuples, consequently leading to an augmented time and memory burden. Given a comprehensive analysis of recall, precision, and execution time, we select core nodes to detect clones.

Table 4: Parameter Settings

$\theta, l_{cs}$	Recall(%)					P.(%) <sup>1</sup>	T.(s) <sup>1</sup>
	T1	T2	VST3	ST3	MT3		
0.5, 16	100	100	100	81	31	83	251
0.6, 16	100	100	98	74	19	94	249
0.7, 16	100	100	94	51	7	100	253
0.5, 20	100	100	99	76	26	88	213
0.6, 20	100	100	97	67	17	95	216
0.7, 20	100	100	92	50	7	100	214
0.5, 24	100	100	99	73	22	91	177
0.6, 24	100	100	97	65	14	97	176
0.7, 24	100	100	92	41	5	100	176

<sup>1</sup> P. represents precision, and T. represents the execution time.

**Parameter Settings:** The length of the code segment determines the size of clone units. The value of  $l_{cs}$  does not affect Type-1 and Type-2 clones since their overlap nodes are continuous. However, it has a significant impact on Type-3 clones. Choosing a larger value for  $l_{cs}$  may miss shorter clone code fragments, while a smaller value may produce numerous insignificant clone candidates that affect precision and execution time. Therefore, it is necessary to select an appropriate  $l_{cs}$ . The current consensus in academia suggests that meaningful clones should consist of a minimum of fifty tokens or six lines [44, 41, 40]. Since TGMM detects clones based on parse trees, we assume that the length of node sequences corresponding to meaningful clones is at least fifty. If the similarity threshold is set at 0.6, then two Type-3 clones, each with a length of fifty, can only differ by a maximum gap of twenty nodes. The clone unit should not be too small and should be comparable to a typical gap. Additionally, in Section 3.2, we merged adjacent four nodes, which makes  $l_{cs}$  need to be a multiple of four. Based on the above factors, we explored the performance of the model when  $l_{cs}$  was set to 16, 20, and 24, respectively. For the similarity, we consider the following three thresholds: 0.5, 0.6, and 0.7.

We evaluated the performance of TGMM in terms of recall,

precision, and execution time for different combinations of  $l_{cs}$  and  $\theta$ . The result is shown in Table 4. It can be seen from Table 4 that with the increase of  $\theta$  and  $l_{cs}$ , the overall recall shows a downward trend, while the precision is on the rise. The execution time is only related to  $l_{cs}$ . Because the size of  $l_{cs}$  is directly related to the number of three-tuples,  $\theta$  is only used in the final process of determining whether it is a clone. Comprehensively considering these three influencing factors, we finally decided to set  $l_{cs}$  to 24 and  $\theta$  to 0.6.

**Answer for RQ1:** Through comparative analysis, we decided to keep only the core nodes while setting the clone unit length to 24 and the similarity threshold to 0.6.

#### 4.3. RQ2: Performance

We are confident that TGMM’s performance in detecting clones is not affected by the changes in language. Because the process is independent of language. We evaluate the recall and precision of TGMM on the subset of BigCloneBench and measure execution time on IJaDataset. The evaluation method is the same as RQ1. Throughout all the experiments discussed in this section, TGMM was configured with a minimum clone size of fifty nodes, a similarity threshold of 0.6, and a clone unit length of 24.

Table 5: Recall and Precision Comparison

Tool	Recall(%)					P.(%) <sup>1</sup>
	T1	T2	VST3	ST3	MT3	
TGMM	100	100	97	65	14	97
MSCCD	100	98	93	61	6	91
SourcererCC	100	98	93	61	5	83
CCAligner	100	99	97	70	10	80
CCFinderX	100	93	62	15	1	72
Deckard	60	58	62	31	12	60
NiCad	100	100	100	95	1	56
iClones	100	82	82	24	0	91

<sup>1</sup> P. represents precision.

**Recall:** The tags in BigCloneBench pertain to functions. Hence we only consider function-level clones. It should be noted that the presence of fine-grained clones between two functions, such as loop statements and conditional statements, does not necessarily imply that these functions are clones themselves. The recall measurements are presented in Table 5. TGMM achieves a perfect recall for Type-1/2 clones. VST3 follows closely with the second highest recall, only 3% lower than NiCad (100%). ST3 ranks third. Notably, MT3 attains the highest recall, surpassing Deckard (a tree-based code clone detection tool) [41] by 2%. Given that TGMM employs the same calculation formula as MSCCD and SourcererCC, we focus on comparing its performance to these two tools. When detecting relatively simple clones like Type-1, Type-2, VST3, and ST3, text information proves decisive, whereas structural information offers limited assistance. Consequently, TGMM’s recall marginally exceeds theirs on simple clones. However, in the case of MT3, where text similarity decreases significantly, the role of structural information becomes more prominent. As a result, TGMM’s recall for MT3 clones doubles that of MSCCD and SourcererCC.



Table 6: Execution Time for Varying Input Size.

LOC	TGMM	MSCCD	SourcererCC	CCAligner	CCFinderX	Deckard	NiCad	iClones
10k	3s	4s	3s	1s	4s	4s	1s	1s
100K	15s	17s	6s	3s	21s	29s	4s	2s
1M	1m12s	3m13s	31s	1m53s	2m18s	25m33s	11s	-
10M	9m54s	1h15m	11m38s	24m56s	28m51s	-	17m19s	-
100M	1h53m	6h7m	11h43m	-	3d6h	-	-	-
250M	10h49m	-	2d19h	-	-	-	-	-

**Precision:** Precision is assessed using the same methodology as RQ1. As presented in Table 5, TGMM demonstrates the highest level of precision. We attribute this to our approach of merging clone units to obtain the overlap node numbers of two code blocks. It’s worth noting that clone units represent Type-1/2 clone code fragments with a length of  $l_{cs}$ . Therefore, we do not count discrete identical nodes, which accounts for TGMM’s high precision. Despite NiCad and CCAligner performing well in terms of recall, their precision is not satisfactory, which will introduce many negative pairs and increase the workload. The low precision of Nicad may be due to the use of identifier abstraction and blind identifier normalization. As for Deckard, we relaxed his similarity threshold to 0.85. This will detect more Type-3 clones but reduce precision.

**Execution Time:** The execution times of different tools under varying input magnitudes are presented in Table 6. On small-scale inputs, TGMM demonstrates comparable speed to existing state-of-the-art tools. However, when dealing with large inputs like 100 MLOC, there are four tools that can complete clone detection. Among these, TGMM surpasses the others in terms of running speed, securing the first position. When the input grows to 250 MLOC, only TGMM and SourcererCC can complete clone detection. We divide TGMM into two parts: preprocessing and clone detection. In the preprocessing stage, for example, TGMM takes one hour and seven minutes (59% of the total time) to process the input of 100 MLOC and three hours and six minutes (29% of the total time) to process the input of 250 MLOC. It is evident that in order to support multilingual clone detection, we have made certain speed sacrifices. This is because we need to parse the source file into a parse tree and extract code blocks of different granularity from it, which is similar to MSCCD. Despite this, TGMM is much faster than Deckard, which also uses a tree-based approach for detecting code clones.

**Answer for RQ2:** TGMM matches existing state-of-the-art tools in recall and surpasses them in precision and execution time. TGMM can be extended to 250 MLOC with the help of data grouping.

#### 4.4. RQ3: Multilingual Clone Analysis

TGMM theoretically supports all languages with the help of ANTLRv4 grammar files. Additionally, TGMM offers comprehensive support for arbitrary granularity clone detection, which can even be subdivided into variable declarations or return statements. Depending on specific scenarios, users have

the flexibility to choose the most suitable clone detection granularity. For the experiments in this section, we have selected five common granularities: file, class, function, loop, and branch. These granularities represent fundamental and standardized components of languages. Each granularity encompasses multiple types of detection objects. For instance, in the case of loops, we consider all loop constructs as detection objects. These include “while” loops, “for” loops, and “do-while” loops. Our experiment is divided into two main parts: **multilingual support and clone distribution**.

**Multilingual Support:** Once we are capable of generating parse trees for source code, based on a specific grammar specification, TGMM can successfully carry out the entire clone detection process. Therefore, in this section, we examined the parsing results of various languages during the TGMM preprocessing stage. In order to ensure the reliability and applicability of the experimental findings, we analyzed TGMM’s compatibility with all languages included in the PYPL’s most popular list until July 2023. The PYPL ranking is established by analyzing the frequency of searches for language tutorials on Google. To maintain generalizability, we randomly selected solutions to several problems from the Rosetta Code [45] for each language, ensuring that each granularity level comprises a minimum of ten corresponding code blocks. The Rosetta Code serves as an online programming repository that offers solutions to common programming tasks across multiple languages. This allows us to test the compatibility of TGMM with different languages using similarly structured source files.

The experimental results are presented in Table 7. Out of the 30 selected languages, TGMM can perfectly support 17 languages, whereas eight languages have certain version restrictions, and the remaining five languages lack corresponding grammar files. This is an impressive outcome. However, it should be noted that TGMM is not limited to the aforementioned languages. For the eight languages with version restrictions, only a few non-mainstream versions are missing. For instance, Swift only lacks support for the swift4 version. In addition, Swift is designed to maintain backward compatibility during its version iteration process, ensuring that code written in older versions can still be utilized in the new ones.

In fact, most languages follow the above principles during the upgrade process. This advantageous attribute allows us to leverage the new version of the grammar file to parse code written in older versions. Although occasional minor errors may occur due to version differences, we can choose to overlook them and parse subsequent code. These slight errors resulting from version changes are generally acceptable. If a higher level of




Figure 7: Multi-Granularity Clone Analysis of Nine Languages

precision is required, we can adapt to these changes by modifying specific content in the grammar file. As for the remaining five languages, TGMM does not support them currently due to the lack of corresponding grammar files. However, TGMM supports clone detection in user-defined languages, making it theoretically capable of supporting clone detection for any language.

Table 7: Language Expansion Analysis

Lang.	P/N	Lang.	P/N	Lang.	P/N	Lang.	P/N
Py.	✓	TS.	✓	Ada	✱	Julia	✗
Java	✓	Swift	✱	Ps.	✗	Groovy	✗
JS.	✓	Rust	✓	VBA	✓	Haskell	✓
C#	✓	OC.	✓	Dart	✱	Perl	✗
C	✓	Go	✓	Lua	✓	Cobol	✱
C++	✓	Kotlin	✓	VB.	✱	Pascal	✱
PHP	✓	Matlab	✱	Abap	✗		
R	✓	Ruby	✱	Scala	✓		

<sup>1</sup> ✓: perfect support; ✱: lack of some versions; ✗: lack of corresponding grammar files.

<sup>2</sup> Py.: Python; JS.: JavaScript; TS.: TypeScript; OC.: Objective-C; Ps.: Powershell; VB.: Visual Basic.

**Clone Distribution:** Identifying clones at various levels of granularity enables developers to determine the most suitable strategies for refactoring, thus improving code maintainability and reducing redundancy. In this section, we employed TGMM to analyze the distribution of clones across open-source projects in nine widely-used programming languages. To evaluate multilingual supportability, we followed the same methodology as MSCCD [19] in constructing the dataset. To ensure representative results, we meticulously selected the top five repositories with the highest number of stars on GitHub for each language. This does not include educational repositories. These repositories often involve a restricted number of files and are not indicative of the typical scenarios encountered in clone detection.

To provide a more precise reflection of the clone distribution in each language, we introduce two metrics: the file origi-

nality rate (FOR) and the code independence rate (CIR). They are calculated as follows:  $FOR = \frac{OF}{TF}$  and  $CIR = \frac{OC}{TC}$ , where OF (original file) denotes the count of files that do not contain any clones at all, while TF (total file) represents the total number of files. OC (original code) represents the total number of lines of code blocks that do not belong to any of the clone pairs, and TC (total code) indicates the total line number of code blocks. Given the line number of each file is different, we utilized both metrics. A lower FOR indicates a broader distribution of clones, while a lower CIR signifies a more pronounced clone phenomenon. Moreover, considering that the average node number of code blocks differs across various granularities, we explored the clone distribution for each granularity by establishing minimum node thresholds of 20 and 50, respectively.

The results are illustrated in Figure 7. The blue line indicates the proportion of clones at a specific granularity compared to all clones, called clone rate (CR), while the green and red lines represent the FOR and CIR, respectively. Among these nine languages, TypeScript exhibits the highest CIR and FOR for each granularity, with the clones predominantly concentrated at the file level. Because TypeScript’s design philosophy promotes structured data manipulation, immutability, and reusable modules. Instead of creating clones, TypeScript emphasizes immutability and references to existing objects. Furthermore, TypeScript encourages modular code organization and separation of concerns. This approach leads to gathering related functionality at the file level.

As for Python, half of its clones are concentrated at the function level. Python’s success as a general-purpose programming language has encouraged the creation of domain-specific clones that cater to specific industries or application domains. Of the five Python repositories we selected, three belong to the AI field and share similar frameworks and libraries. This led to a rapid increase in the number of clones. In addition, the popularity of Python’s functional programming features, such as lambda functions, closures, and higher-order functions, has

motivated the development of clones that specialize in function level. In addition to Python, clones of Swift, Java, C/Cpp, CSharp, and Kotlin are also gathered at function granularity. So we believe that function-level clones are important for software maintenance.

Interestingly, the number of JavaScript clones at branch granularity accounts for more than 50% of the total clones, while the clone at loop granularity is close to zero. This is determined by the application scenario of JavaScript. While loop statements like “for” and “while” are still employed in JavaScript projects when there’s a need for repetitive operations, the overall emphasis on branch statements is typically more pronounced. This can be attributed to JavaScript’s prevalent use cases, including event-driven programming, conditional logic, and asynchronous operations. Furthermore, JavaScript accommodates functional programming approaches, which can diminish the necessity for conventional loop statements. Functions operate on collections through higher-order functions such as map, filter, and reduce, which internally handle iterations. Notably, due to the lack of class concept in C, the relevant indicator at class granularity is zero. Reducing the minimum token threshold from 50 to 20 has led to a substantial increase in CR at the function granularity for Java and Kotlin. In contrast, other languages have exhibited more significant improvements at the branch granularity. As branching statements are typically concise, a reduction in the threshold introduces numerous shorter code blocks. These blocks have a higher probability of being recognized as clones, even though they may be meaningless.

**Answer for RQ3:** Among the 30 most popular languages, TGMM provides support for 25 of them. The clones detected by TGMM align with the real codebase and are valuable for source code maintenance.

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1. Threats to Validity

The “Grammars-V4” repository does not enforce uniform naming conventions across different levels of granularity for different languages. For instance, the node corresponding to a function block in the parse tree of a Java file is labeled “method-Declaration”, whereas, for Python, it’s “funcdef”. This discrepancy may necessitate users to alter the source code when employing TGMM for clone detection in diverse languages. Although the user only needs to change a variable, it does not follow sound and established software engineering principles and practices. To mitigate this threat, we have directly harmonized the grammar definition files for the 9 most commonly used languages. Furthermore, the modification rules are described in detail so that the user knows which variable to change when detecting clones of some niche languages.

Parse trees, while housing valuable structural information that aids in uncovering semantic clones, are not practically employable for direct use in clone detection. This limitation arises from the fact that the number of nodes in a parse tree is typically

around twice the number of tokens, coupled with the presence of numerous redundant nodes, both of which can significantly diminish the efficiency of clone detection. To address this challenge, we categorized node types into three distinct classes and conducted a thorough analysis of their influence on clone detection. Ultimately, the decision was made to only preserve the core nodes. This strategic choice enhances the efficiency of clone detection without compromising TGMM’s performance.

### 5.2. Differences from MSCCD

The most similar related detector to TGMM is MSCCD [19], which also leverages Antlr to address the objectives of multilingual and multi-granularity clone detection. The first point of distinction between TGMM and MSCCD lies in the intermediate representation of the code. MSCCD operates as a token-based detector, while TGMM adopts a tree-based approach. In the case of MSCCD, it initially employs the parse tree generated by Antlr to identify code blocks at a specific granularity and then proceeds to create token bags for them. Notably, it does not harness the structural information inherent in the tree. In contrast, TGMM transforms the parse tree into an intermediate representation, which enhances its capacity to detect Type-3 clones.

Secondly, their approaches to similarity calculation differ substantially. MSCCD adheres to the similarity calculation algorithm of SourcererCC [9], which relies on the ratio of shared tokens within two token bags to present similarity. This approach treats tokens as isolated entities, without considering their sequential relationships. Conversely, TGMM computes the similarity between two code blocks by merging all identical code segments between them. This not only takes into account the order information between nodes but also requires that the duplicated nodes cannot be discrete. As a result, TGMM is capable of mitigating false negatives arising from the same discrete elements with distinct semantics.

Thirdly, MSCCD detects clones based on the ratio of shared tokens in two token bags, which is difficult to accelerate with GPU. In contrast, TGMM employs suffix arrays to detect clones. The inherently concurrent nature of suffix arrays enables efficient GPU utilization, resulting in rapid clone detection. For instance, in the case of 100 MLOC input, TGMM accomplished clone detection in 2 hours, while MSCCD required 6 hours. The acceleration effect becomes more pronounced as the input size grows. Additionally, MSCCD was not optimized for large-scale clone detection, rendering it incapable of completing clone detection with 250 MLOC input due to limited memory. In contrast, TGMM employs a data grouping technique, enabling it to accomplish clone detection with 250 MLOC input in 11 hours.

Finally, MSCCD deploys a keyword filter to reduce the number of candidate code blocks. Nevertheless, the keyword filter is language-specific, thereby constraining MSCCD’s compatibility with certain languages, such as Objective-C and Ruby. In contrast, TGMM operates without such restrictions, rendering it more versatile for multilingual clone detection.

### 5.3. Why not Compare TGMM with Deep Learning Models?

In recent years, numerous DL-based clone detectors have emerged, such as CCLearner [46], ASTNN [36], and CodeBERT [47]. They seemingly exhibit exceptional performance. However, the deep learning-based clone detectors have poor generalizability. Choi [48] and Liu [49] indicate that these DL-based clone detectors depend on the presence of substantial volumes of labeled training data and cannot generalize well to new data. Unfortunately, datasets containing a considerable number of labeled pairs are currently exclusive to Java. This limitation poses a challenge for the extension of these detectors to other languages. TACC [37] also noted that the DL-based detectors, ASTNN and RtvNN [50], fail to attain a satisfactory level of precision on the GCJ dataset [51] after being trained on BCB, and their training process tends to be rather time-consuming. Given the aforementioned facts, we didn't compare TGMM with DL-based detectors.

## 6. Related Work

In recent years, there has been a rise in the development of new clone detection tools. These tools employ various approaches and representations of source code to address different challenges. The challenges primarily fall into three categories: multilingual, big-code, and Type-3/4 clone detection.

**Multilingual Clone Detection:** Before clone detection, CCfinderSW adds an interface to convert diverse grammar files into regular expressions with a unified format to realize multilingual clone detection. However, it lacks support for context-free languages like Lua and is limited to detecting Type-1/2 clones exclusively. MSCCD offers easy extensibility to new languages through ANTLR but has restricted support for certain languages, such as Objective-C and Ruby, due to the keyword filters they use.

**Big-Code Clone Detection:** Since the release of SourcererCC, researchers have dedicated more attention to addressing this challenge [52, 53]. NiL adopts partial inverted indexes to reduce memory consumption [6]. Moreover, it utilizes the Hunt-Szymanski algorithm [54] to accelerate the LCS solution process. On the other hand, SAGA overcomes memory limitations by utilizing data chunking and accelerates the clone detection process with GPU [34]. SAGA stores common prefix information through five-tuple. However, there is a waste of time and space in this way of recording, as we explained in Section 3.4. The above approaches can be scaled to a large repository of 250 MLOC. However, these methods are token-based and cannot support multilingual clone detection. User-specified granularity is also not supported.

**Type-3/4 Clone Detection:** Several techniques have been proposed to detect Type-3 clones. CCFinder [8] introduced a token-based approach to identify similar code fragments, while Deckard [41] classifies code blocks by clustering numerical vectors transformed from subtrees. NiCad and NiL calculate the similarity between code blocks through the LCS. SourcererCC and MSCCD get code block similarity according to the overlap token number. These methods all achieved promising

results in detecting Type-3 clones. However, detecting Type-4 clones is particularly challenging due to the need for a semantic understanding of the code. To address this, Amme *et al.* [15] analyzes control flow graphs' dominance paths to capture the semantic information of code fragments. Moreover, the deep learning-based clone detection tools can also address this challenge [46, 55, 56, 57]. For example, Zhao *et al.* [58] proposed a deep learning model, DeepSim. It encodes the code control flow and data flow into a semantic matrix and categorizes clone pairs based on this representation. Hu *et al.* [57] convert the abstract syntax tree into a 72-dimensional vector, which is fed into a machine learning model. However, the deep learning-based clone detectors have poor generalizability indicating that the model has overfitted to the training data and cannot generalize to unseen functionalities [48, 49].

**Cross-language Clone Detection:** CLCDSA [59] identifies clones across different languages by analyzing distinct syntactic features of source code, while LICCA [60] utilizes the SSQSA [61] platform to extract both syntactic and semantic characteristics of code fragments. Presently, TGMM does not possess the capability to detect clones in different languages. Nevertheless, TGMM can theoretically achieve this functionality by creating similar grammar files for different languages based on specific rules, ensuring that the parse trees of the same type of code blocks are identical.

## 7. Conclusion

In this paper, we present TGMM, a tree-based code clone detection tool that offers support for detecting clones at any granularity. TGMM has the best language expansion ability and can quickly complete the code clone detection for the input of 250 MLOC. In terms of recall and precision, TGMM stands on par with state-of-the-art tools. We analyzed the clone characteristics of nine popular languages at five common granularities on 45 GitHub responsibilities, which provides some valuable insights for future research. The source code of TGMM is available at: <https://github.com/TGMM24/TGMM.git>.

## Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank the editors and the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions, which can substantially improve the quality of this work.

## Declaration of Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## CRedit Authorship Contribution Statement

**Yuhang Ye:** Data curation, Software, Writing - original draft. **Yuekun Wang:** Data curation, Software. **Yinxing Xue:** Conceptualization, Writing - review & editing. **Yueming Wu:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - review & editing, Supervision. **Yang Liu:** Conceptualization.

## References

- [1] R. Al-Ekram, C. Kapser, R. Holt, M. Godfrey, Cloning by accident: an empirical study of source code cloning across software systems, in: 2005 International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering, 2005., IEEE, 2005, pp. 10–pp.
- [2] S. Thummalapenta, L. Cerulo, L. Aversano, M. Di Penta, An empirical study on the maintenance of source code clones, *Empirical Software Engineering* 15 (2010) 1–34.
- [3] M. Mondal, M. S. Rahman, R. K. Saha, C. K. Roy, J. Krinke, K. A. Schneider, An empirical study of the impacts of clones in software maintenance, in: 2011 IEEE 19th International Conference on Program Comprehension, IEEE, 2011, pp. 242–245.
- [4] F. Rahman, C. Bird, P. Devanbu, Clones: What is that smell?, *Empirical Software Engineering* 17 (2012) 503–530.
- [5] C. K. Roy, J. R. Cordy, Nicad: Accurate detection of near-miss intentional clones using flexible pretty-printing and code normalization, in: 2008 16th IEEE international conference on program comprehension, IEEE, 2008, pp. 172–181.
- [6] T. Nakagawa, Y. Higo, S. Kusumoto, Nil: large-scale detection of large-variance clones, in: Proceedings of the 29th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, 2021, pp. 830–841.
- [7] S. Ducasse, M. Rieger, S. Demeyer, A language independent approach for detecting duplicated code, in: Proceedings IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance-1999 (ICSM'99). 'Software Maintenance for Business Change' (Cat. No. 99CB36360), IEEE, 1999, pp. 109–118.
- [8] T. Kamiya, S. Kusumoto, K. Inoue, Ccfinder: A multilinguistic token-based code clone detection system for large scale source code, *IEEE transactions on software engineering* 28 (7) (2002) 654–670.
- [9] H. Sajjani, V. Saini, J. Svajlenko, C. K. Roy, C. V. Lopes, Sourcerccc: Scaling code clone detection to big-code, in: Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Software Engineering, 2016, pp. 1157–1168.
- [10] M. Wu, P. Wang, K. Yin, H. Cheng, Y. Xu, C. K. Roy, Lvmapper: A large-variance clone detector using sequencing alignment approach, *IEEE access* 8 (2020) 27986–27997.
- [11] F.-M. Lazar, O. Baniyas, Clone detection algorithm based on the abstract syntax tree approach, in: 2014 IEEE 9th IEEE International Symposium on Applied Computational Intelligence and Informatics (SACI), IEEE, 2014, pp. 73–78.
- [12] J. Zhao, K. Xia, Y. Fu, B. Cui, An ast-based code plagiarism detection algorithm, in: 2015 10th International conference on broadband and wireless computing, communication and applications (BWCCA), IEEE, 2015, pp. 178–182.
- [13] Y. Yang, Z. Ren, X. Chen, H. Jiang, Structural function based code clone detection using a new hybrid technique, in: 2018 IEEE 42nd annual computer software and applications conference (COMPSAC), Vol. 1, IEEE, 2018, pp. 286–291.
- [14] Y. Zou, B. Ban, Y. Xue, Y. Xu, Ccgraph: a pdg-based code clone detector with approximate graph matching, in: Proceedings of the 35th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, 2020, pp. 931–942.
- [15] W. Amme, T. S. Heinze, A. Schäfer, You look so different: Finding structural clones and subclones in java source code, in: 2021 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME), 2021, pp. 70–80. doi:10.1109/ICSME52107.2021.00013.
- [16] N. Marastoni, A. Continella, D. Quarta, S. Zanero, M. D. Preda, Groupdroid: Automatically grouping mobile malware by extracting code similarities, in: Proceedings of the 7th Software Security, Protection, and Reverse Engineering/Software Security and Protection Workshop, 2017, pp. 1–12.
- [17] X. Zhan, L. Fan, S. Chen, F. We, T. Liu, X. Luo, Y. Liu, Atvhunter: Reliable version detection of third-party libraries for vulnerability identification in android applications, in: 2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE), IEEE, 2021, pp. 1695–1707.
- [18] Y. Semura, N. Yoshida, E. Choi, K. Inoue, Ccfndersw: Clone detection tool with flexible multilingual tokenization, in: 2017 24th Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference (APSEC), IEEE, 2017, pp. 654–659.
- [19] W. Zhu, N. Yoshida, T. Kamiya, E. Choi, H. Takada, Mscc: grammar pluggable clone detection based on antlr parser generation, in: Proceedings of the 30th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Program Comprehension, 2022, pp. 460–470.
- [20] T. Parr, Antlr, <https://www.antlr.org/> (2012).
- [21] J. Svajlenko, J. F. Islam, I. Keivanloo, C. K. Roy, M. M. Mia, Towards a big data curated benchmark of inter-project code clones, in: 2014 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution, IEEE, 2014, pp. 476–480.
- [22] P. Carbonnelle, Pypl, <https://pypl.github.io/PYPL.html> (2023).
- [23] S. Sippu, E. Soisalon-Soininen, On ll(k) parsing, *Information and Control* 53 (3) (1982) 141–164.
- [24] C. K. Roy, J. R. Cordy, A survey on software clone detection research, *Queen's School of computing TR 541 (115)* (2007) 64–68.
- [25] K. Roy Chanchal, R. Cordy James, Koschke rainer. 2009, Comparison and evaluation of code clone detection techniques and tools: A qualitative approach. *Science of Computer Programming* 74 (7) (2009) 470–495.
- [26] Q. U. Ain, W. H. Butt, M. W. Anwar, F. Azam, B. Maqbool, A systematic review on code clone detection, *IEEE access* 7 (2019) 86121–86144.
- [27] Q. U. in Canada, Tx1, <https://www.tx1.ca/> (2022).
- [28] T. Parr, The definitive antlr 4 reference, <https://pragprog.com/titles/tpantlr2/the-definitive-antlr-4-reference/> (2013).
- [29] grammar-v4, <https://github.com/antlr/grammars-v4> (2023).
- [30] opencv, <https://github.com/opencv/opencv> (2023).
- [31] R. Koschke, Large-scale inter-system clone detection using suffix trees, in: 2012 16th European Conference on Software Maintenance and Reengineering, IEEE, 2012, pp. 309–318.
- [32] W. Sun, Using gpu to accelerate suffix array construction, in: 2014 7th International Conference on Biomedical Engineering and Informatics, IEEE, 2014, pp. 677–682.
- [33] Thrust: thrust/sort.h, [https://thrust.github.io/doc/sort\\_8h.html](https://thrust.github.io/doc/sort_8h.html) (2023).
- [34] G. Li, Y. Wu, C. K. Roy, J. Sun, X. Peng, N. Zhan, B. Hu, J. Ma, Saga: efficient and large-scale detection of near-miss clones with gpu acceleration, in: 2020 IEEE 27th International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER), IEEE, 2020, pp. 272–283.
- [35] A. S. E. Group., Ijadataset 2.0., [https://1drv.ms/u/s!AhXBm6MKt\\_yLj\\_tk29GJnc9BKoIvCg?e=oVTVJm](https://1drv.ms/u/s!AhXBm6MKt_yLj_tk29GJnc9BKoIvCg?e=oVTVJm) (2013).
- [36] J. Zhang, X. Wang, H. Zhang, H. Sun, K. Wang, X. Liu, A novel neural source code representation based on abstract syntax tree, in: 2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE), IEEE, 2019, pp. 783–794.
- [37] Y. Wang, Y. Ye, Y. Wu, W. Zhang, Y. Xue, Y. Liu, Comparison and evaluation of clone detection techniques with different code representations, in: 2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE), IEEE, 2023, pp. 332–344.
- [38] A. Danial, Cloc, <https://cloc.sourceforge.net/> (2017).
- [39] P. Wang, J. Svajlenko, Y. Wu, Y. Xu, C. K. Roy, Ccaligner: a token based large-gap clone detector, in: Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Software Engineering, 2018, pp. 1066–1077.
- [40] T. Kamiya, Ccfindex: An interactive code clone analysis environment, *Code Clone Analysis: Research, Tools, and Practices* (2021) 31–44.
- [41] L. Jiang, G. Misherghi, Z. Su, S. Glondu, Deckard: Scalable and accurate tree-based detection of code clones, in: 29th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE'07), IEEE, 2007, pp. 96–105.
- [42] N. Göde, R. Koschke, Incremental clone detection, in: 2009 13th european conference on software maintenance and reengineering, IEEE, 2009, pp. 219–228.
- [43] B. S. Baker, Parameterized duplication in strings: Algorithms and an application to software maintenance, *SIAM Journal on Computing* 26 (5) (1997) 1343–1362.
- [44] S. Bellon, R. Koschke, G. Antoniol, J. Krinke, E. Merlo, Comparison and evaluation of clone detection tools, *IEEE Transactions on software engineering* 33 (9) (2007) 577–591.
- [45] M. Mol, Rosetta code, [https://rosettacode.org/wiki/Rosetta\\_Code](https://rosettacode.org/wiki/Rosetta_Code) (2022).
- [46] L. Li, H. Feng, W. Zhuang, N. Meng, B. Ryder, Cclearner: A deep learning-based clone detection approach, in: 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME), IEEE, 2017, pp. 249–260.
- [47] Z. Feng, D. Guo, D. Tang, N. Duan, X. Feng, M. Gong, L. Shou, B. Qin, T. Liu, D. Jiang, et al., Codebert: A pre-trained model for programming and natural languages, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08155* (2020).
- [48] E. Choi, N. Fuke, Y. Fujiwara, N. Yoshida, K. Inoue, Investigating

- the generalizability of deep learning-based clone detectors, in: 2023 IEEE/ACM 31st International Conference on Program Comprehension (ICPC), 2023, pp. 181–185. doi:10.1109/ICPC58990.2023.00032.
- [49] C. Liu, Z. Lin, J.-G. Lou, L. Wen, D. Zhang, Can neural clone detection generalize to unseen functionalities?, in: 2021 36th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE), 2021, pp. 617–629. doi:10.1109/ASE51524.2021.9678907.
- [50] M. White, M. Tufano, C. Vendome, D. Poshyvanyk, Deep learning code fragments for code clone detection, in: Proceedings of the 31st IEEE/ACM international conference on automated software engineering, 2016, pp. 87–98.
- [51] Google code jam, <https://code.google.com/codejam/contests.html> (2020).
- [52] J. Akram, Z. Shi, M. Mumtaz, P. Luo, Dccd: An efficient and scalable distributed code clone detection technique for big code., in: SEKE, 2018, pp. 354–353.
- [53] J. Svajlenko, C. K. Roy, Fast and flexible large-scale clone detection with cloneworks., in: ICSE (Companion Volume), 2017, pp. 27–30.
- [54] J. W. Hunt, T. G. Szymanski, A fast algorithm for computing longest common subsequences. *Commun. ACM* 20 (5) (1977) 350–353. doi:10.1145/359581.359603. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/359581.359603>
- [55] L. Büch, A. Andrzejak, Learning-based recursive aggregation of abstract syntax trees for code clone detection, in: 2019 IEEE 26th International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER), IEEE, 2019, pp. 95–104.
- [56] X. Gu, H. Zhang, S. Kim, Deep code search, in: Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Software Engineering, 2018, pp. 933–944.
- [57] Y. Hu, D. Zou, J. Peng, Y. Wu, J. Shan, H. Jin, Treecen: Building tree graph for scalable semantic code clone detection, in: Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, 2022, pp. 1–12.
- [58] G. Zhao, J. Huang, Deepsim: deep learning code functional similarity, in: Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, 2018, pp. 141–151.
- [59] K. W. Nafi, T. S. Kar, B. Roy, C. K. Roy, K. A. Schneider, Clcdsa: cross language code clone detection using syntactical features and api documentation, in: 2019 34th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE), IEEE, 2019, pp. 1026–1037.
- [60] T. Vislavski, G. Rakić, N. Cardozo, Z. Budimac, Licca: A tool for cross-language clone detection, in: 2018 IEEE 25th international conference on software analysis, evolution and reengineering (SANER), IEEE, 2018, pp. 512–516.
- [61] Z. Budimac, G. Rakić, M. Savić, Ssqsa architecture, in: Proceedings of the Fifth Balkan Conference in Informatics, 2012, pp. 287–290.