

Forecasting the risk of software choices

A model to foretell security vulnerabilities from library dependencies and source code evolution

CARLOS E. BUDDE and RANINDYA PARAMITHA, University of Trento, Italy

FABIO MASSACCI, University of Trento, Italy and Vrije Universiteit, The Netherlands

Software security mainly studies vulnerability detection: is my code vulnerable today? This hinders risk estimation, so new approaches are emerging to forecast the occurrence of future vulnerabilities. While useful, these approaches are coarse-grained and hard to employ for project-specific technical decisions. We introduce a model capable of vulnerability forecasting at library level. Formalising source-code evolution in time together with library dependency, our model can estimate the probability that a software project faces a CVE disclosure in a future time window. Our approach is white-box and lightweight, which we demonstrate via experiments involving 1255 CVEs and 768 Java libraries, made public as an open-source artifact. Besides probabilities estimation, e.g. to plan software updates, this formal model can be used to detect security-sensitive points in a project, or measure the health of a development ecosystem.

CCS Concepts: • **Security and privacy** → **Formal security models**; **Vulnerability management**; *Software security engineering*; • **Software and its engineering** → *Software evolution*.

ACM Reference Format:

Carlos E. Budde, Ranindya Paramitha, and Fabio Massacci. 2024. Forecasting the risk of software choices: A model to foretell security vulnerabilities from library dependencies and source code evolution. 1, 1 (November 2024), 30 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nmnnnnn>. nnnnnnn

1 INTRODUCTION

Avoiding or patching *security vulnerabilities*—fragments of code vulnerable to exploits by a malicious party—is a prime concern in cybersecurity [12, 46, 54]. Reporting them, too: on Jan 2024, the European Commission adopted Regulation EU 2024/482, which defines the application of the EUCC as per the 2019 Cybersecurity Act [16, 19]. Now, EUCC certificate holders must report any vulnerability affecting their ICT product to their national body, within 90 days of becoming aware of it. And this picture is not unique to the EU: the legal duties of ICT providers have been increasingly regulated in countries like Korea, the US, Norway, Israel, Singapore, etc. In 2023, national bodies including the NSA, BSI, and KISA, co-authored CISA’s white paper *Secure by Design*, which urges software manufacturers to «*use a tailored threat model during the product development stage to address all potential threats to a system [...] from the preliminary stages of design and development, through customer deployment and maintenance*» [14].

Software vendors approach these duties in many ways. The traditional reactionary policy remediates vulnerabilities as these are discovered in the code of our project—or any of its dependencies. But this neglects that (a) one cannot always replace, let alone fix, third-party code, and (b) the sheer volume of vulnerabilities reported e.g. via a *common*

Authors’ addresses: Carlos E. Budde, carloseteban.budde@unitn.it; Ranindya Paramitha, ranindya.paramitha@unitn.it, University of Trento, Trento, Italy; Fabio Massacci, University of Trento, Trento, Italy and Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.


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

© 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

1



Codebases like $\ell_a = \dots$ jira-core update their dependencies following company policies:

- (a) most updates of ℓ_a decide to keep the same (old) version of dependency ℓ_d ;
- (b) at certain points, the latest available version of ℓ_d is adopted;
- (c) ℓ_a is affected by κ via ℓ_d —this could have been avoided, but κ was unknown when update decisions were made.

Estimating the probability of vulnerabilities like κ *in the future*—i.e. before (c)—is key to improve dependency-update policies.

Fig. 1. Update policies that disregard the probability of future vulnerabilities threaten the security of entire software projects

vulnerability exposure (CVE) quickly becomes unmanageable [43]. This despite metrics like the *common vulnerability scoring system*, which prioritises CVEs by severity but struggles to tell whether they will lead to actual attacks [62].

A recent notable tool in this direction is the *Exploit Prediction Scoring System* (EPSS): «*a completely data-driven*» approach to «*distinguishing vulnerabilities that are exploited in the wild and thus may be prioritized for remediation*» [27]. The EPSS «*leverages 1,477 features for predicting exploitation*» including MITRE CVEs, CISA’s *Known Exploited Vulnerabilities* catalog (KEV), talk of an exploit in social media, etc. [27]. Yet it remains reactionary in nature because *predict* is machine-learning jargon for *detect*: to tell if something is already there, using e.g. hindsight data such as KEV.

Thus, the EPSS—and any use of ML to «*predict*» vulnerabilities—helps to guess whether a vulnerability that affects our code today, is being exploited today and can impact our project. However, this does not address prevention as laid out e.g. in *Secure by Design*: hindsight can help to improve “next time”, e.g. to design a new project, but prevention in current projects calls for anticipation of exploits before these occur—some oracle for vulnerabilities to come [41].

A few recent successes have shown this task to be feasible, e.g. estimating the number of CVEs expected in coming years [35, 72]. Such high-level metrics are however difficult to apply to specific codebases, e.g. to decide whether a dependency shall be updated or otherwise changed. This is illustrated in Fig. 1, where the developers of $\ell_a = \text{com.atlassian.jira:jira-core}$ would want to know, when planning the release of their next version, whether $\ell_d = \text{com.thoughtworks.xstream:xstream}$ should be kept as is, or updated e.g. to its latest version. Making the wrong decision can force developers to factor-in unplanned patches, as happened to ℓ_a in Fig. 1 after time (c).

Such finer-grained decisions call for metrics akin to the ones used in software engineering to measure code quality. But while cyclomatic complexity and code churn can be used to estimate the future cost of maintaining a codebase, such type of metrics have not been able to foretell vulnerabilities in general applications [12, 38, 46, 54].

RQ: Is it possible to measure the likelihood of discovering new (future) vulnerabilities in a specific project?

Technically, any metric that answers positively this research question must avoid label creep: data used to foretell an unseen vulnerability κ in a future time window $T = [t_{\text{start}}, t_{\text{end}}]$ must exclude information on the occurrence of κ during T . Thus, fitting/learning cannot use hindsight data such as CVE or KEV entries for κ . *This work introduces an estimate for the probability of observing κ , fitted on past data from comparable codebases of the entire dependency tree.*

Contributions

- **Estimators** for the probability of having a CVE disclosed in the future for a given codebase, as probability density functions (PDF) with support on future time, i.e. the semi-line $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.
 - ▶ This can be used in situations like Fig. 1, providing quantities useful for company policies—e.g. for the adoption of dependencies updates—to make informed decisions from the cybersecurity perspective.
 - ▶ One PDF describes the likelihood of vulnerabilities in one codebase: we also present an analytical approach to extend our estimators for multi-codebase analysis.
- **Time Dependency Trees (TDT)**: a white-box model that uses the above PDFs to estimate potential vulnerabilities in the dependency tree of a software project, yet avoiding the full expansion of the probability space.
 - ▶ TDT-based estimations leverage PDF metrics by adding a temporal component to the project-level analysis, and using it to estimate the probability that a full dependency tree faces a CVE in the future. This is a lightweight alternative to the analytical approach from above, applicable to projects with dozens of dependencies.
 - ▶ TDTs, as a minimal graph representation of dependencies across time and software codebases, allow for further project- and even ecosystem-level studies, that depend on the evolution in time of entire software codebases.
- **A software artifact** for experimental reproduction of our work [10], in compliance with ACM terminology [1].

Inspired by practical applicability, TDTs revise the hypothesis that, in cross-project and cross-ecosystem analyses, code metrics can be meaningfully correlated to fine-grained vulnerability data such as type, location, and variables. Like economics and sociology, which can foretell to some extent the behaviour of masses of people but not of individuals, our results posit that code metrics can be used for vulnerability analysis at high level, e.g. to estimate the number of vulnerabilities occurring in a characterised codebase in a time span. Marking e.g. individual vulnerable code fragments falls out of scope, and is expected to remain practically infeasible for project-agnostic approaches.

Besides introducing TDTs, this work uses them for a practical demonstration of CVE forecasting. Technically, this starts from the traditional dependency tree(s) of a project under study, which are then transformed into attack trees. The leaves of the tree are decorated with precomputed CDFs, instantiated in time points relative to the release date of the codebases that each leaf represents. This information is then aggregated into an estimate of the (joint) probability of the fastest expected CVE disclosure affecting the entire project.

Nevertheless, vulnerability forecasting is one of the possible applications of TDTs. Sec. 4 mentions how they can also be used to: (a) pinpoint the main suspects (libraries) of expected forthcoming vulnerabilities; (b) discover dangerous pervasive dependencies across several versions of a codebase; (c) assess the health of a development ecosystem; etc.

2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVES

This section further elaborates the example from Fig. 1, refining our original research question into two subquestions and matching research objectives. We begin by defining the terminology used in the rest of the article.

2.1 Terminology

We rely on the terminology established among practitioners—e.g. users of Apache Maven—and consolidated in [51, 52]:

- **Libraries**: A *library*, denoted ℓ , ℓ' , ℓ_x , x , a , etc. is a separately distributed software component, typically consisting of a logically grouped set of classes (or functions, or APIs, etc.) that may be provided in a single file, or a set of files.

- **Library instances:** The term “library” on its own is version- and time-agnostic. A specific version of a library is a *library instance*—we identify them via subindices that can be numeric or i, j, k, v_i , etc. E.g. $\ell_1, \ell_{a_{1.01}}, \ell_{v_1}, x_{v_1}$, etc.
 - In a set of library instances $\{\ell_{a_i}, \ell_{a_j}, \ell_{a_k}, \dots\}$, subindices i, j, k indicate the different versions of library ℓ_a .
 - To simplify our presentation, for each library we assume a total order of versions (e.g. $\ell_{a_i} < \ell_{a_j} < \ell_{a_k}$), where the order of a version is given by its release date s.t. instances with a later release date have higher order.[†]
- **Dependencies:** A *dependency* is a library instance whose functionalities are used by another library instance—e.g. if the execution of a method in ℓ_{a_1} uses a function from ℓ_{b_2} , directly or indirectly, then ℓ_{b_2} is a dependency of ℓ_{a_1} .

- The *dependent (library) instance* is the reciprocal of the dependency, e.g. if ℓ_{b_2} is a dependency of ℓ_{a_1} , then ℓ_{a_1} is a dependent instance of ℓ_{b_2} .

- * In Fig. 2, ℓ_{b_2}, ℓ_{c_3} , and ℓ_{x_7} , are dependencies of ℓ_{a_1} .
- * In turn, ℓ_{a_1} is a dependent instance of them.

- A *direct dependency* is a dependency called directly in the source code of the dependent instance—e.g. ℓ_{b_2} is a direct dependency of ℓ_{a_1} if the latter invokes a function of the former in its source code.

- * In Fig. 2, ℓ_{b_2} is a direct dependency of ℓ_{a_1} , and ℓ_{c_3} is a direct dependency of ℓ_{b_2} .

- A *transitive dependency* is a dependency that is not direct—e.g. if ℓ_{c_3} is not a direct dependency of ℓ_{a_1} , but ℓ_{a_1} uses a function of ℓ_{b_2} that in turn uses a method from ℓ_{c_3} , then ℓ_{c_3} is a transitive dependency of ℓ_{a_1} .

- * In Fig. 2, ℓ_{c_3} and ℓ_{e_1} both are transitive dependencies of ℓ_{a_1} .

- **Dependency tree:** A *dependency tree* (T) is a connected, single-rooted, directed acyclic graph (DAG) whose nodes are library instances, and whose edges point from each instance to its direct dependencies.

- The *root* or *main library* in T is its root node: the only library instance that is not a dependency of any other.

- * The root of the dependency tree in Fig. 2 is the library instance ℓ_{a_1} , pictured on top as usual.

- The *leaves* in T are library instances that have no dependencies. These usually correspond to base libraries of the language, such as the Standard C++ Library, the Java or Python Standard Libraries, etc.

- * The leaves in Fig. 2 are the library instances ℓ_{x_7}, ℓ_{c_3} , and ℓ_{e_1} .

- **Projects:** A *project* is a set of libraries developed and/or maintained together by a group of developers.

- *Own dependencies* for a project are those belonging to the same project as the dependent library instance. This can be lifted to dependency trees, where own dependencies are those belonging to the same project as the root.

- *Third-party dependencies* for a project are, instead, dependencies maintained by other projects.[‡]

- * In Fig. 2, project A is formed by ℓ_{a_1} and ℓ_{x_7} alone, so ℓ_{x_7} is an own dependency while all the rest are third-party.

- **Code size:** For a given library instance ℓ_j :

- Its *own code size*, $|\ell_j|_{own}$, is the summed number of lines of code from all files that form ℓ_j and its own dependencies.

- Its *dependency code size*, $|\ell_j|_{dep}$, is the sum of lines of code of third-party direct and transitive dependencies.

- Its *total code size* is $|\ell_j| = |\ell_j|_{own} + |\ell_j|_{dep}$.

- * In Fig. 2, $|\ell_{a_1}|_{own}$ are the lines of code of ℓ_{a_1} plus those of ℓ_{x_7} , whereas $|\ell_{a_1}|_{dep}$ considers $\ell_{b_2}, \ell_{c_3}, \ell_{d_1}, \ell_{y_1}$, and ℓ_{e_1} .




Fig. 2. **Dependency tree:** arrow means “uses in source code”

[†]Instances released on the same date can be disambiguated via MAJOR.MINOR.PATCH version comparison [55]. This can also be easily generalised to the case of divergent versions—e.g. parallel releases of Apache Tomcat for development branches v8.5 and v9.0—via c-chains, as shown in Sec. 4.

[‡]Developers may structure their own code in separate libraries, which must not be counted as other project’s code but as its own code [52].




Fig. 3. Update policies of ℓ_a need forecasting metrics to avoid future vulnerabilities from dependencies like ℓ_d (same as Fig. 1)

- **Vulnerabilities:** A *vulnerability* is an identification of undesired behaviour in a piece of software, that can be exploited by (i.e. caused and used to the malicious intent of) an attacker:
 - We study publicly disclosed vulnerabilities, such as CVEs, which we refer to using Greek letters ($\kappa, \varrho, \vartheta, \omega, \dots$) or their named IDs (e.g. CVE-2014-0160).
 - The *vulnerable set* of vulnerability κ is the set $\Lambda_\kappa \neq \emptyset$ of library instances whose source code allows the exploit.
 - *Vulnerability propagation* refers to the fact that, if $\ell_{b_2} \in \Lambda_\kappa$ and ℓ_{b_2} is a dependency of ℓ_{a_1} , then ℓ_{a_1} can be affected by an attacker that exploits κ even though $\ell_{a_1} \notin \Lambda_\kappa$.

We also use standard probability theory as the basis for our vulnerability-forecasting model:

- **Probabilities:** A *probability space* is a triple $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ where Ω is the sample space, \mathcal{B} is the Borel σ -algebra on Ω , and $\mu: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a probability function, i.e. $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$, and $\mu(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i) = \sum_{i \in I} \mu(A_i)$ for any denumerable set $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ of disjoint events $A_i \in \mathcal{B}$.
- **PDF, CDF, SF:** A *probability density function* (PDF) is a probability function P whose sample space is the semiline $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. By the conditions above it follows that $P(\{x\}) = 0$ for any point $x \geq 0$.
 - A *cumulative density function*, CDF: $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, is defined for every PDF as: $\text{CDF}(X) \doteq \int_{x=0}^X \text{PDF}(x) dx$.
 - A *survival function*, SF: $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, is defined for every PDF as: $\text{SF}(X) \doteq 1 - \text{CDF}(X)$.

2.2 Motivating Example and Research Questions

EXAMPLE 1. To motivate vulnerability forecasting we use the example of Fig. 3. Found in the wild, it concerns the Jira project which is one of the most popular bug tracker in the world. The core artifact, $\ell_a = \text{jira-core}$, uses the dependency $\ell_d = \text{com.thoughtworks.xstream:xstream}$ for XML serialisation. While the upstream version of ℓ_a is updated monthly, new versions of ℓ_d are adopted much less frequently. In August 2021 two versions of ℓ_a were released but neither updated ℓ_d , which was kept at version 1.4.17. A vulnerability was then disclosed, $\kappa = \text{CVE-2021-39139}$ with CVSS = 8.8, which affected all versions of ℓ_d except for the recently-released xstream:1.4.18 . The timeline in Fig. 3 shows how ℓ_a thus became vulnerable to the security bug κ , which it had had the opportunity to avoid—by updating to the latest version of ℓ_d —but for which it had no hint of its forthcoming.

RQ1: Can we forecast situations like that of Fig. 3, via metrics that quantify their likelihood in the future?

This research question is addressed by the following objective:

(O1) Quantify the probability that a software project faces a security vulnerability in the future:

- this metric should be parameterised by the (future) time horizon captured by the prediction;




Fig. 4. **Forecasting vulnerabilities:** probability of CVE disclosure as a function of time and source code

- it should take into account the vulnerabilities that would affect any dependency on the project.

Fig. 4 exemplifies the intention of objective (O1): integrating the area under the PDF in Fig. 4a for t_h days provides an estimate of the probability that the library instance faces a vulnerability in that time horizon. As we show later in Sec. 5, these metrics can be computed—for FOSS projects—from data freely available online.

Going back to Example 1, hindsight shows that if `jira-core:8.19.1` had migrated to `xstream:1.4.18`, it would have not been vulnerable to κ . To know this *before the disclosure of κ* one must quantify the probability of CVE disclosure as a function of time and source code. Fig. 4a shows the quantification developed in this work applied to `xstream:1.4.17`. By August, when version 8.19.1 of ℓ_a was being prepared for deployment, `xstream:1.4.17` was roughly three months old. Fig. 4a shows how the probability of CVE disclosure for ℓ_d is then growing to its peak, meaning that our estimators advise a (fast) update to `xstream:1.4.18`—hindsight proved that this would have been the correct security move.

While such estimations are probabilistic, so they can “prove right” only a certain number of times, our intention is (not to guess the future but) to compute numeric indicators that help in making informed decisions. That is shown in the previous example using Fig. 4a—but it operates with a single dependency. Fig. 4b shows the same approach applied to two dependencies: one similar to ℓ_d from Example 1, and another one with a much smaller source code, say ℓ_e with 6k LoC. This convolution of two probability density functions results in the probability plane depicted by the contour plot, where a PDF is used as y -axis (this is the PDF of ℓ_d in Fig. 4a), and the other as the x -axis.

From such probability plane a PDF can be extracted, equivalent to that in Fig. 4a, but which describes the joint probability of a having a CVE released for either ℓ_d or ℓ_e , whichever happens first. Thus, the generalization to n dependencies proposed in Fig. 4b is *simple in theory, but hard to harness in practice* as it involves n -dimensional probability spaces whose computation requirements grow $\propto t_h^n$, i.e. exponentially on n .

RQ2: How can one extend these forecasting metrics to software projects with dozens or hundreds of dependencies?

This is addressed by our next objective:

(O2) Make the PDF-based metrics scale polynomially on the number of codebases analyzed:

- the aim is to process projects with dozens of dependencies within minutes in standard desktop systems;
- moreover, while implementations can be language-specific, the concepts on which the metric builds should be applicable to any kind of open-source software.

In Sec. 4 we propose a succinct model for the evolution of software in time, that can be coupled with PDF data via attack tree analysis, to produce the desired quantities in a time linear on the number of dependencies of the project. In that sense, we posit that *the dependency tree of a software project should be at the core of any prediction model, since the average commercial product includes FOSS libraries that can make up 75% of its codebase, and recent studies show that the total technical leverage can be much higher* [44, 53]. Therefore, a prime concern is to estimate which (FOSS) dependencies will be responsible for most vulnerability disclosures—we discuss this further in Sec. 3.1, and in Secs. 4.1 to 4.3 we propose a way to study the problem at a high-level of abstraction, lightweight as per objective (O2).

However, while dependencies are key to reason about security vulnerabilities, standard dependency trees are snapshots that do not capture the evolution of software in time. Yet time plays a decisive factor in security, e.g. to identify the versions of a codebase that are affected by a vulnerability discovered in the latest release.

The literature usually takes a pragmatic approach to overcome such lack of expressiveness: when a vulnerability is disclosed for a library instance, it is common practice to consider vulnerable all prior versions as well—see [7, 46, 47] and κ in Fig. 1. We argue that *the main reason why traditional models for vulnerability analysis disregard software evolution is their focus on the vulnerabilities themselves, and not on the library instances where these are found, let alone their evolution in time*. Our take is thus to enrich dependency trees with code versioning, merging code dependencies with software evolution, to allow for a simultaneous analysis of vulnerability propagation across *the dependencies* and *evolution in time* of a codebase. The resulting concept of *time dependency trees* introduced in Sec. 4.3 allows to forecast the future vulnerabilities from any dependency of a library, spot codebases that act as single-point-of-failure for entire projects, quantify the health of an ecosystem in relationship to the number of libraries affected by vulnerability events, etc.

The above is one application example, but time dependency trees can serve further purposes. They provide a minimal representation of the dependencies of a project across time, which allows for studying complete software environments to, among other things: (1) determine the presence of dependencies whose exploitation threatens seemingly independent projects; (2) spot codebases that represent a single-point-of-failure for several versions of a project; (3) quantify the health of an ecosystem in relationship to the number of library instances affected by vulnerability events, etc.

Article outline. Next, after discussing related work and basic theory in Sec. 3, time dependency trees are introduced in Sec. 4 and some general applications are outlined. Then, Sec. 5 details the data process used to compute PDFs like Fig. 4a, and Sec. 6 shows its use on time dependency trees for the estimation of CVE disclosure probabilities in Maven. Finally, Sec. 7 describes a full-analytical alternative, and Sec. 8 discusses the strong and weak points of all models and methods introduced. This work concludes in Sec. 9 and proposes some future lines of research.

3 BACKGROUND

3.1 Related work on software vulnerabilities

There is an extensive body of work that studies software vulnerabilities, analyzing their discovery and prediction (i.e. foretelling its occurrence in the future) from measurable properties of software development projects. To gather contributions relevant to this work, we systematised our literature search in Scopus and consulted the survey by Ghaffarian and Shahriari [22]; more details about the literature search are given in Appendix A. We refined the search results by focusing on works that introduce methods/models to discover or foretell vulnerabilities in code, including

Table 1. Works that have proposed models to discover or foretell vulnerabilities in source code

Work	Goal [▽]		Data [▲]				Method [◇]			Approach [▲]			Projects/Libs.		Purport
	Disc.	Pred.	CVEs	Code	VCS	Dep.	Corr.	Class.	T.Ser.	AH	SA	ML	Language	#	
[70]	✓			✓			✓	✓				✓	C/C++	20	Find vulnerabilities regardless of existent logs such as CVEs (although CWEs may be used). This includes formal methods and static/dynamic code analysis.
[8]	✓			✓			✓	✓				✓	C	3	
[3]	✓				✓		✓	✓				✓	PHP	3	
[9]	✓			✓	✓			✓		✓			C/C++, PHP, Java, JS, SQL	10	
[38]	✓			✓	✓			✓		✓		✓	C, Java	549	Detect known vulnerabilities (and their correlation to developer activity metrics) from VCS only—e.g. commit churn, peer comments, etc.
[36]	✓		✓		✓			✓		✓			C	3	
[45]	✓		✓		✓		✓			✓			C	1	
[46]	✓		✓		✓		✓		✓	✓			C, ASM	3	
[12]	✓		✓	✓				✓				✓	C/C++	3	Detect known vulnerabilities (and their correlation to code metrics) from code only—e.g. number of classes, code cloning, cyclomatic complexity, etc.
[21]	✓		✓	✓				✓				✓	Java	7	
[64]	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓		✓	✓		Java	4	
[65]	✓		✓	✓			✓			✓			Java	3	
[66]	✓		✓	✓			✓			✓			Java	5	
[59]	✓		✓	✓				✓				✓	C	7	
[2]	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓				✓	C/C++	>150k	
[30]	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓			C/C++	8	Detect known vulnerabilities (and their correlation to code and developer activity metrics) from both code and VCS, but without considering the effect of dependencies in their propagation.
[4]	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			✓		C/C++	5	
[13]	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	C/C++, Java	1	
[60]	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	C/C++	2	
[52]	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓			Java	500	Detect known vulnerabilities using code or VCS, via dependency-aware models that can find the offending code, thus helping in its resolution (own vs. third-party library).
[39]	✓		✓	✓		✓		✓		✓			JS	624	
[37]	✓		✓	✓		✓		✓				✓	Java	>300k	
[54]	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓		Java, Ruby, Python	450	
[35]		✓	✓						✓		✓	✓	Agnostic	4	Time regression to predict vulnerabilities from NVD logs, but the models do not use domain-specific data relevant for security.
[72]		✓	✓								✓	✓	Agnostic	9	
[34]		✓	✓								✓	✓	Agnostic	25	
[57]		✓	✓								✓		Agnostic	5	

[▽] **Goal:** discovery/detection, or prediction (i.e. foretell occurrence in the future), of vulnerabilities in code.

[▲] **Data:** main input of the model, namely source code, version control system, code dependency tree, or vulnerability records.

[◇] **Method:** Correlation (e.g. between churn and vulnerabilities), Classification (e.g. this function is vulnerable), or Time Series.

[▲] **Approach:** Ad hoc (e.g. human inspection or custom scripts), Statistical Analysis, or Machine Learning.

Note: We omit works that do not propose new models to find/foretell vulnerabilities [7, 18, 22, 26, 29, 43, 48, 67, 68, 71, 73].

correlation studies between project metrics, and number and severity of vulnerabilities. We classify and discuss the resulting 26 works—and the research gaps found—next and in Table 1.

Machine Learning (ML) is today the most popular approach to studying software vulnerabilities, in terms of the number of projects and libraries analyzed. This is followed by classical statistical analyses such as hypothesis tests which, alongside ML, count with well-known software support, for example, TensorFlow (Python, Java, C++), SciPy (Python), Matlab models, the R programming language, etc. Almost all these works present methods to analyze the source code or version control system (VCS) of a library, to detect vulnerable code fragments or compute metrics that suggest its presence today. In other words, they try to *discover existent vulnerabilities*—by applying available algorithms to massive amounts of data—but disregard the *estimation of future vulnerabilities*, as indicated by the blanks in the columns **Goal** / **Pred.** and **Method** / **T.Ser.** in Table 1. Therefore, even though the proposed model have a varying degree

of accuracy, and leaving aside the known limitations on the explainability of the outcomes [22], these models do not study the future consequences of current choices (e.g. a decision to keep legacy dependencies), which are known to affect the number, severity, and type of vulnerabilities faced in the future [52, 72].

Gap 1: Foretelling vulnerabilities. *Literature in the field focuses on existent vulnerabilities—estimating the (likelihood of) occurrence of vulnerabilities in the future is a largely neglected field.*

A smaller set of works train time regression models on NVD data, addressing Gap 1 to some extent [34, 35, 57, 72]. Akin to the methods used for stock market fluctuations—e.g. ARIMA—these works forecast the number of vulnerabilities expected in software projects. This can help managerial decisions to a certain degree, e.g. to draw a ballpark figure of the global manpower needed for project security updates. However, such high-level predictions cannot give deeper insight into the nature of the vulnerabilities [17, 42]. This is unavoidable in time regression models trained exclusively on the variable to predict—number of CVEs in this case—that ignore other data required for domain-specific forecasting, as highlighted with a dotted box in the last three rows of Table 1.

Gap 2: Coarse prediction models. *The relatively few works that attempt to foretell future vulnerabilities do so at a high level—they give no white-box, low-level information that can help in its mitigation.*

A vulnerability forecast, or discovery for that matter, is most useful when it provides information on the nature and causes of the problem, that developers can use to fix them or mitigate its impact. That is why most works in Table 1 are project- or language-specific, using code metrics or VCS data to pinpoint which functions or commits are likely to contain a vulnerability. In that sense, the dependency tree of a library provides vital information regarding inherited vulnerabilities, which could make up to 75% of the total [53]. However, and as highlighted in the column **Data / Dep.** of Table 1, only four works were found to use the dependency tree to discover vulnerabilities in libraries, and we found no work that uses it to foretell vulnerabilities [37, 39, 52, 54].

Gap 3: Code dependency tree. *The dependency tree is key to analyse the vulnerabilities of a library—however, all vulnerability-foretelling works disregard it, and very few vulnerability-discovery works make use of it.*

The dependency tree is paramount to foretell vulnerabilities, since the typical commercial product includes libraries for up to three-quarters of its codebase, thus constituting a major source of potential attacks [33, 52, 53]. From such future vulnerabilities, the biggest threat is posed by those which will be *publicly disclosed*, as these enable immediate attacks and trigger urgent and costly remediation steps.

Most works in Table 1 look for such threats, leveraging CVE logs to detect or predict vulnerable code fragments. In other words, their granularity is finer than files, which has resulted in limited project- and time-extrapolation [54]. Instead, we focus on the coarser level of *vulnerable library instances*, by using NVD data to identify instances in the dependency tree that are affected by disclosed vulnerabilities, which are the red flags whose exclusion pays off to engineer [24, 33]. Besides addressing the generalisability of the forecasts, this is coherent with the fact that most of the codebase is not controlled by the project team. Therefore, it is arguably more realistic to engineer the change of a dependency (e.g. update/drop a library instance), than to expect to be able to modify its source code [44].

But such coarsening in the level of analysis does not change the fact that vulnerabilities (or vulnerable library instances) are a minority of code when compared to the complete codebase of a project. This brings forward another research shortcoming: the rarity of vulnerability disclosures, which is overlooked by most of the literature. But disregarding rare events is not possible in a field where a missing bounds check affecting 40 LoC endangers millions of

credit accounts*. What happens instead is that most models that try to discover and foretell vulnerabilities, treat these as usual (not rare) events. The issue with this is that, from a modeling perspective, it is fundamental to account for such rare nature of the input data, since generalizing from niche cases—e.g. two vulnerable code fragments in a codebase with hundreds of files, each with dozens of versions—is bound to bias most estimation models [72].

Gap 4: Vulnerabilities are rare events. *The expected number of vulnerabilities affecting a library in an update period is zero—however, most works disregard this, deploying models which therefore have limited extrapolation capacity.*

Only two works in Table 1 acknowledge Gap 4: Shin et al. [60] mention that «*vulnerabilities are rare occurrences*» but their methodology shows no dedicated rare-event treatment; Yasasin et al. [72] interpreted vulnerability data as a time series—similarly to what we do in Sec. 4.1—and used statistical regression models that would not suffer too much in predictive capability due to the rareness of vulnerabilities, e.g. Croston’s. This treats data uniformly, as in time series analysis for the stock market. However, for software security, Chakraborty et al. [12] note that such models can be a hindrance since they «*do not take into account semantic dependencies that play a vital role in vulnerability predictions*».

In contrast to the above, our approach to Gap 4—which for us translates into a scarcity of fitting data—is clustering. Prior to statistical fitting of probability density functions (PDFs), we lump together libraries whose properties result in a similar likelihood of vulnerability disclosures. These “properties” are metrics from the code that are relevant for security, such as the base of external dependencies of a library as measured by its technical leverage [44]. Thus, we address the rarity of vulnerabilities and at the same time mitigate overfitting, by proposing a model for the estimation of future vulnerabilities that is sensitive to (publicly available) semantic information of software security.

Regarding gaps 1 to 3, our approach in Secs. 4 and 5 covers the first two by proposing a model to estimate future vulnerabilities, that can pinpoint the library instances where these may originate. This makes use of the code dependency tree of the main library under analysis, thus covering Gap 3.

The end result are graphs designed to foretell vulnerabilities, which are white-box models of project code that developers can use to select dependencies, in a manner that minimises the vulnerabilities to expect in a foreseeable time horizon. The theoretical foundations for the structure of these graphs, and for the propagation of vulnerability probabilities, is based on attack tree analysis.

3.2 Attack tree analysis

An attack tree (AT) is a hierarchical diagram that describes potential attacks on a system. Its single root on top represents the attacker’s goal, and the leaves—known as *basic attack steps* or BAS—represent the indivisible actions of the attacker. Intermediate nodes are labeled with gates that determine how their lower-connected nodes activate them: standard ATs have OR and AND gates only, but many extensions exist to model more elaborate attacks [32].

ATs are closely related to our modeling of library attacks by exploits in the dependencies. Structurally, they are equivalent to the dependency trees defined in Sec. 2.1: the AT root represents an attack on the main library, and the BASes represents compromising a dependency. Nodes in ATs have a type: since a single vulnerable dependency among many can compromise a library, here it suffices to consider OR intermediate nodes alone. This results in the following bijection between a dependency tree (D) and an AT (T), also illustrated in Fig. 5 and example 2:

- each leaf ℓ in D maps to a BAS b_ℓ in T , representing an exploit to the own code of ℓ ;
- each non-leaf node ℓ' in D maps to an OR gate $g_{\ell'}$ and a BAS $b_{\ell'}$ in T such that:

*CVE-2014-0160 “Heartbleed” [11]: <https://github.com/openssl/openssl/commit/731f431497f463f3a2a97236fe0187b11c44aead?diff=split>




Fig. 5. Bijection between dependency trees (left) and ATs

EXAMPLE 2. Fig. 5 to the left demonstrates the bijection between dependency trees and standard attack trees. There are two cases to distinguish:

- **leaf nodes** in the dependency tree are mapped to a single BAS in the AT—see e.g. the dashed line in Fig. 5 for the leaf node $l_{x_7} \mapsto \{b_{x_7}\}$;
- **non-leaf nodes** in the dependency tree are mapped to an OR gate, and also to a BAS—see e.g. the dotted line for the non-leaf node $l_{c_5} \mapsto \{g_{c_5}, b_{c_5}\}$.

- $b_{\ell'}$ represents an exploit to the own code of ℓ' ;
- $g_{\ell'}$ has an input edge from $b_{\ell'}$;
- each direct dependency of ℓ' in D is an input edge of $g_{\ell'}$.

Besides their similar structure, ATs are interesting for this study because they are often analyzed quantitatively to compute security metrics. Typical examples are the minimal time [6], minimal cost [5], or maximal probability [28] of a successful attack, as well as Pareto analyses that study trade-offs among attributes [20]. *We are mostly interested in probability propagation, in the AT representation of a dependency tree, which we will use to compute the time-bounded likelihood of a vulnerability exploit.* Further metrics can be approached similarly, e.g. estimating the expected time to next zero-day by representing the occurrence of security vulnerabilities with rates of CVE publication.

3.3 Common assumptions in the field

In what follows we work under the standard assumptions of the literature in the field—see e.g. the works in Table 1:

- A1** - In a given time span, libraries with similar (security-relevant) properties are likely to face a similar amount of vulnerability disclosures that affect them.
- A2** - The history of vulnerabilities faced by a library—or family of libraries—is indicative of the expected vulnerabilities to face in the future.

Assumption A1 depends on *time* and *library properties*, where the former is typically approached under the principle of regression to the mean, viz. the longer the time span, the more likely it is to observe coincidences in the number of vulnerabilities observed for two libraries with similar “properties”.

The concept of *library properties* that are relevant for security purposes is less well understood, as elaborated in detail above. Sec. 5 motivates the use of two such properties for our demonstration: *own-size* and *class* of the library, the latter divided between libraries with a web-oriented purpose (Remote network) or not (Local). Different properties could be used—in any case, and in contrast to most related works in Table 1, our model does not use them directly to predict vulnerabilities. Instead, we use properties to lump together libraries that can be considered similar from a security perspective, thereby creating clusters from which we then develop our prediction models, namely PDFs.

This procedure aligns well with assumption A2, on which we stand to develop statistical fittings similar to works [34, 72]. Two main differences with respect to such works are that (a) besides vulnerability records we also use domain knowledge, namely code metrics, and (b) we fit an independent model to each cluster of libraries, so different best-fit models can intervene in the estimation of vulnerabilities for one main library.

Thus, for us, *clustering*—i.e. lumping together libraries with similar security properties—serves two purposes:

- *mitigate rare events*, because zero vulnerabilities are expected to affect the typical library instance in a few months’ time, so constructing an empirical model from the history of a cluster of libraries (as opposed to a single library) increases the amount of available data, and thus the quality of the model;
- *avoid overfitting*, since the statistical or ML algorithms are trained on a variety of data, expected to be similar from the security perspective but different in other dimensions.

4 EVOLUTION OF LIBRARY DEPENDENCIES IN TIME: A FORMAL MODEL

We seek a general and extensible way to estimate the probability of future vulnerabilities in our code, that may come from library dependencies. This section elaborates a formal basis for the general model we develop to that end—in Sec. 5 we show how to implement one such prediction model in practice.

4.1 Evolution of a software codebase

We work with a continuous notion of time. For (time) interval $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ we use square brackets and parentheses respectively to signify closed and open ends, e.g. $T = [t_{\text{start}}, t_{\text{end}}) \neq \emptyset$ means that $t_{\text{start}} \in T$ and $t_{\text{end}} \notin T$. When a new notation is introduced we highlight it by using the symbol \doteq instead of equals ($=$).

It is standard to assume a total order of versions in the development of a library in time—see Pashchenko et al. [51, 52], Prana et al. [54], Shin et al. [60], etc. This disregards situations when a chain of releases is forked, and development is maintained for two or more henceforth incomparable versions of a library.

EXAMPLE 3. Apache Tomcat offers parallel support for versions 8.5, 9.0, and 10.0 [69], which results in there not being a total order among such versions of the library. For instance, code changes uploaded to version 8.5.75 (Jan 17, 2022) were not added to version 9.0.58 (Jan 15, 2022).

To cover these cases, we consider each parallel version of the library as a “codebase chain” independent from the rest. In Example 3 this means that Tomcat v8.5 defines a chain of development, and Tomcat v9.0 defines a different one. This solution allows modeling common patches as parallel updates on each chain, which is a common practice e.g. via git cherry-picking. Moreover, notwithstanding the commit history, the released version-tagged codebases (i.e. library instances[§]) are comparable among each other *within a chain*. We formalise all this under the concept of c-chains.

Definition 4.1 (c-chain). A *codebase chain*, or *c-chain* for short, is a series $\{\ell_{v_j}\}_{j=1}^m$ of library instances such that there is a total order $<$ for $\{v_j\}_{j=1}^m$ based on their release dates, where $v_{j'} > v_j$ indicates that $\ell_{v_{j'}}$ was developed from the codebase of ℓ_{v_j} .

We use the abbreviated notation $\ell_{v_1} < \ell_{v_2} < \dots < \ell_{v_m}$ to denote the c-chain of library ℓ with m library instances, $\{\ell_{v_j}\}_{j=1}^m$, whose versions satisfy $v_j < v_{j'}$ for all $1 \leq j < j' \leq m$.

Def. 4.1 allows for a single library ℓ to span multiple (incomparable) c-chains. In such cases, we identify each independent c-chain by appending some unique id—e.g. its MAJOR.Minor version number—to the library name/symbol. This singles out the c-chain, which can then have the standard version subindices described in Sec. 2.1.

EXAMPLE 4. Applying this concept to Example 3 on Apache Tomcat yields e.g. $\ell_{8.5_{8.5.74}} < \ell_{8.5_{8.5.75}} < \ell_{8.5_{8.5.76}}$ for the c-chain of v8.5, and $\ell_{9.0_{9.0.57}} < \ell_{9.0_{9.0.58}} < \ell_{9.0_{9.0.59}}$ for v9.0. Since elements are incomparable across c-chains, neither $\ell_{8.5_{8.5.75}} < \ell_{9.0_{9.0.58}}$ nor $\ell_{8.5_{8.5.75}} > \ell_{9.0_{9.0.58}}$ (denoted $\ell_{8.5_{8.5.75}} \not\prec \ell_{9.0_{9.0.58}}$), in accordance to Example 3.

[§]This assumes a bijection between CVS tags (e.g. in GitHub) and repository library versions (Maven), but some scenarios can be more complex [25].




Fig. 6. Tracking different instances of the library ℓ_d in the dependency tree of the library ℓ_a across multiple versions

This resembles modeling $\ell_{8.5}$ and $\ell_{9.0}$ as independent libraries. The main difference is that c-chains of a library almost always belong to the same project, which affects metrics like technical leverage [44]. Furthermore, library instances from different c-chains of the same library are likely to exhibit correlated—or even the same—vulnerabilities. That is, even though their code evolution is incomparable, the common origin of the main codebase results in a relatively high probability of common vulnerabilities. For concrete examples consider CVE-2021-33037 and CVE-2021-41079, both affecting various library instances in the c-chains v8.5, v9.0, and v10.0 of Apache Tomcat.

This parallel development, but the likelihood of common vulnerabilities, is key to estimating the disclosure of vulnerabilities in the future. Below in Sec. 4.3 we introduce a model to facilitate such estimation, by considering the dependency tree of a library, articulated with the evolution of software in time via structures derived from c-chains. Ideally, this would simply use c-chains (of dependencies) to link in time the various dependency trees of some main library. However, that cannot model different instances of a library coexisting in a dependency tree—we revise that next.

4.2 Different instances of the same library in a dependency tree

While c-chains can capture the evolution of a library in isolation, they fall short of modeling its embedding in a software ecosystem. The main modeling limitation to consider is when a dependency tree has different instances of one library.

EXAMPLE 5. Library ℓ_d in Fig. 6a is a dependency of the root library ℓ_a . The leftmost dependency tree in Fig. 6a shows that ℓ_{d_2} is a direct dependency of ℓ_{a_1} , and at the same time ℓ_{d_1} is a transitive dependency (via ℓ_{c_1}). These are two different versions of ℓ_d , which means that the root ℓ_{a_1} simultaneously depends on both instances of that library: ℓ_{d_2} and ℓ_{d_1} . Later on, the developers of ℓ_a release a new version— ℓ_{a_2} , see the dependency tree in the middle of Fig. 6a—updating its direct dependency to ℓ_{d_3} . Therefore, at that next point in time, the root library depends on ℓ_{d_3} and ℓ_{d_1} .

In general, when studying the evolution in time of a dependency tree, a dependency like ℓ_d in Example 5 gives rise to not just one, but many c-chains. In the example we have the c-chain $\ell_{d_2} < \ell_{d_3}$ on the one side (for ℓ_d as a direct dependency of ℓ_a), and ℓ_{d_1} alone on the other side (as a transitive dependency via ℓ_c).

To cater for these cases, one must keep track of all versions of each dependency that are present in a dependency tree. Moreover, the adoption of new dependencies must be considered, as well as the dropping of deprecated ones. We capture all these scenarios with the concept of d-matrix.

Definition 4.2 (d-matrix). A *dependency matrix*, or *d-matrix for short*, is a series $\ell = \{\ell_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of m -tuples such that its i -th projection for $1 \leq i \leq n$ is a c-chain of library ℓ , denoted $\ell[i] \doteq \ell_i = \{\ell_j\}_{j=1}^m$.

D-matrices model the evolution in time of multiple dependencies of one library, as they may occur in a dependency tree. For notational convenience we allow *version stuttering*, e.g. the projection $\ell[i]$ could yield the sequence of library instances $\langle \ell_{v_1}, \ell_{v_2}, \ell_{v_2}, \ell_{v_3} \rangle$, which is in fact the c-chain $\ell_{v_1} < \ell_{v_2} < \ell_{v_3}$. Version downgrading is treated analogously.

To model the adoption and dropping of dependencies we introduce the dummy symbol ℓ_x , used to represent the absence of a library instance in a d-matrix. Symbol ℓ_x would typically occur in the extremes of the projections of d-matrices, as in $\langle \ell_x, \ell_x, \ell_{v_1}, \ell_{v_2}, \ell_{v_2}, \ell_{v_3}, \ell_x \rangle$: here it represents a case in which, for the first two time steps, the library ℓ was not a dependency of the tree under analysis; then the library instance ℓ_{v_1} becomes a dependency; then that dependency is updated to ℓ_{v_2} , and kept like that for the next version; then it is updated to ℓ_{v_3} ; and finally the dependency is dropped for the last time step. This too results in the c-chain $\ell_{v_1} < \ell_{v_2} < \ell_{v_3}$.

EXAMPLE 6. Fig. 6a shows how the root library ℓ_d depends on two different versions of ℓ_d . The corresponding 2×3 d-matrix for that scenario is shown in Fig. 6c, which exhibits version stuttering for instances ℓ_{d_3} and ℓ_{d_1} , and uses the dummy library ℓ_x to represent how ℓ_{c_2} dropped its dependency of ℓ_d in the last time step. The first and second projections of that d-matrix, $\ell_d[1]$ and $\ell_d[2]$, are the c-chains of ℓ_d shown in Fig. 6b.

To keep a consistent order of library instances, the c-chains that form a d-matrix are aligned in time. In other words, a d-matrix ℓ is structured like a matrix as in Fig. 6c, with a row $1 \leq i \leq n$ for each c-chain, and a column $1 \leq j \leq m$ for each version of the main library under study. Projecting the d-matrix by row alone yields a c-chain: $\ell[i] = \ell[i, \cdot] = \ell_1 < \ell_2 < \dots < \ell_m$. Projecting by both row and column yields a library instance: $\ell[i, j] = \ell_j$. As in Example 5, some c-chains may be longer than others: this is catered for by taking the earliest and latest instances of the library as the extremes of all c-chains, and padding with ℓ_x where necessary.

We now have the tools to define a formal model for the evolution of dependency trees in time: *time dependency trees*.

4.3 Time dependency trees

Standard dependency trees are time agnostic, since their nodes are library instances connected solely by code-dependency relationships. This hinders the estimation of future vulnerabilities: first, because such trees do not connect different instances from the same library (which may face positively-correlated vulnerability disclosures); and, more importantly, because the development history of a library—ignored by standard dependency trees—has a bearing on the likelihood of incoming vulnerability discoveries. Therefore, to develop a vulnerability-forecasting model, we see the need to merge standard dependency trees with a formalised notion of software evolution in time.

Time dependency trees use d-matrices to give a structured time dimension to dependency trees, allowing for a simultaneous analysis of vulnerability propagation across *the dependencies* and *evolution in time* of a codebase.[¶]

Definition 4.3 (TDT). Let $\{\ell_{v_j}\}_{j=1}^m \neq \emptyset$ be a c-chain; we call *dependency tree of ℓ_{v_j}* , denoted $D(\ell_{v_j})$, to the dependency tree whose root is the library instance ℓ_{v_j} . Let also $D_t(\ell) \doteq D(\ell_{v_j})$ for any time $t \in [t_{\text{rel}}(\ell_{v_j}), t_{\text{rel}}(\ell_{v_{j+1}}))$, i.e. any time instant at or after the release of ℓ_{v_j} , but before the release of $\ell_{v_{j+1}}$. Moreover let $T = [t_{\text{start}}, t_{\text{end}}]$ be a time span that encloses the c-chain $\{\ell_{v_j}\}_{j=1}^m$, such that the release times satisfy $t_{\text{rel}}(\ell_{v_1}) = t_{\text{start}} \leq t_{\text{end}} = t_{\text{rel}}(\ell_{v_m})$.

The *time dependency tree (TDT) of library ℓ in the time period T* is the family of dependency trees $D_T(\ell) \doteq \{D_t(\ell)\}_{t \in T}$.

When T is clear from context we omit it: then the TDT denoted $D(\ell) \doteq D_T(\ell)$ is an infinite family which, instantiated at time $t \in T$, results in the standard dependency tree $D_t(\ell)$. This infinite semantics stems from our use of continuous time; nevertheless, the syntactic representation of a TDT is finite and, moreover, minimal for the set of codebases considered. More specifically, a TDT can be represented as a DAG such that:

- (1) there is one node per library instance, in the family of dependency trees within the time span T ;

[¶]Possible connections to abstract interpretation theory and graph transformations are discussed below in Sec. 9.




Fig. 7. Time Dependency Trees as per Def. 4.3, illustrative examples

- (2) there is an edge from each library instance to each direct dependency;
- (3) there is an edge from each library instance to any (one) successor in the corresponding c-chain.

EXAMPLE 7. Consider the sequence of dependency trees from Fig. 7a, where the main library is ℓ_a and the implicit time span is $T = [t_1, t_3]$ for $t_i \doteq t_{\text{rel}}(\ell_{a_i})$. The corresponding TDT of ℓ_a , $D(\ell_a)$, can be represented as the DAG in Fig. 7b, where dependency edges—item (2) in the enumeration above—are black solid arrows, and c-chain edges—item (3)—are green dashed arrows. Instantiating $D(\ell_a)$ at any time point before the release of ℓ_{a_2} , $t \in [t_1, t_2]$, yields the first dependency tree of the sequence: $D_t(\ell_a) = D(\ell_{a_1})$. Instead, for $t' \in [t_2, t_3]$ we get $D_{t'}(\ell_a) = D(\ell_{a_2})$.

We call the above *time-indexing*; then $D(\ell_a)$ in Example 7 encapsulates the history of dependency trees of ℓ_a , accessible via time-indexing. Orthogonally we can do *library-slicing* by restricting the TDT to specific dependencies, to retrieve the d-matrix of the corresponding library in the time span T . We denote this explicitly as a restriction, $D(\ell)|_{\ell'}$, which yields the d-matrix $\ell' = \{\ell'_i\}_{i=1}^n$ bounded temporally by $T = [t_{\text{start}}, t_{\text{end}}]$ with $t_{\text{start}} = \min t_{\text{rel}}(\ell') \leq \max t_{\text{rel}}(\ell') = t_{\text{end}}$, where $\min t_{\text{rel}}(\ell') \doteq \min_{i=1}^n \{t_{\text{rel}}(\ell[i, 1])\}$ is the min time of release among the (n or less) instances of library ℓ' present in $D_{t_{\text{start}}}(\ell)$, and analogously for $\max t_{\text{rel}}(\ell')$ and the max time of release.

EXAMPLE 8. In $D(\ell_a)$ from Fig. 7b, the relevant versions of dependency ℓ_c are given by $D(\ell_a)|_{\ell_c} = [\ell_{c_1} \ell_{c_1} \ell_{c_2}]$, which contracts to the c-chain $\ell_{c_1} < \ell_{c_2}$. Different instances of the same library in dependency trees are retrieved equivalently, e.g. $D(\ell_a)|_{\ell_d}$ yields the d-matrix depicted in Fig. 6c, which can be interpreted as c-chains (Fig. 6b) or flattened to the set $\{\ell_{d_i}\}_{i=1}^3$ of all relevant instances of library ℓ_d .

EXAMPLE 9. Fig. 7 illustrates the concepts introduced so far. For a real-life example consider the TDT for the main library from Example 1, $\ell_a = \text{com.atlassian.jira:jira-core}$, and take three-time instants: $t_1 = \text{May 25}$, $t_2 = \text{Jun 25}$, and $t_3 = \text{Jul 25 (2021)}$. The main library instances are: $\ell_{a_1} = \text{com.atlassian.jira:jira-core:8.17.0}$, $\ell_{a_2} = \dots 8.18.0m1$, and $\ell_{a_3} = \dots 8.18.1$. Restricting the analysis to the dependency of Example 1, $\ell_d = \text{com.thoughtworks.xstream:xstream}$, yields the dependencies $\ell_{d_1} = \text{xstream:1.4.15}$, and $\ell_{d_2} = \ell_{d_3} = \text{xstream:1.4.17}$, plus all recursive dependencies for a total of 22 library instances, counting the own code of ℓ_{a_k} and ℓ_{d_k} . The corresponding TDT for this analysis is depicted in Fig. 8

5 ESTIMATING THE PROBABILITY OF FUTURE VULNERABILITIES

The previous section introduced time dependency trees, addressing RQ2. To address RQ1 (“Can we forecast [vulnerabilities] via metrics that quantify their likelihood in the future?”) this section shows how TDTs can be used to estimate the probability that future vulnerabilities affect a library, considering different time points of its history.




Fig. 8. Portion of the TDT for the library from Example 1, for three time points that cover $\text{jira-core}:\{8.17.0, 8.18.0m1, 8.18.1\}$

We produce forecasts on past events as a means to validate the method—technical details are given here, with an empirical demonstration following in Sec. 6. *The same approach can be used for future security planning, by proposing (instead of revising) changes in the dependency trees spanned from the TDT—we discuss this in the conclusions.*

General methodology

To estimate the probability of vulnerability disclosure in a library, we compare different time points of its TDT and compute—for each resulting instance—the expected probability of facing a vulnerability in the forthcoming n days. The input required for this are: the forecast time horizon in days, $0 < n < \infty$; the TDT of the main library, $D(\ell)$; and one or more time points to index $D(\ell)$. The output are the probabilities, for ℓ at each given time point, of facing a vulnerability within the next n days. The methodology is summarised next, and detailed in Secs. 5.1 to 5.4.

Overview of methodological steps:

- (S1) **Environment preprocessing (“clustering”)** _____ Sec. 5.1
Input: (i) software development environment, e.g. Maven central, PyPI, npm, etc.; (ii) list of measurable properties of the library instances, e.g. own size in LoC, cyclomatic complexity, etc.; (iii) bounds for the properties values, e.g. $\text{LoC} \leq 10k < \text{LoC}$.
Output: clusters $\{C_i\}_{i \in I}$ of libraries in the environment, as per the requested properties and bounds.
Procedure: (a) measure the properties of the library instances in scope; (b) partition the population of libraries, defining one *cluster* per combination of possible property values as divided by the value bounds.
- (S2) **Vulnerability data aggregation via PDF fitting** _____ Sec. 5.2
Input: (i) development environment, as above; (ii) clusters $\{C_i\}_{i \in I}$ from step (S1); (iii) vulnerability records, e.g. CVEs from the NVD.
Output: PDFs $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$, one per cluster, for the probability of vulnerability disclosure as a function of time (since library instance release).
Procedure: (a) map each vulnerability to the (“evidence”) library instances that contain them; (b) compute the time between the release of each evidence library instance and the publication of the vulnerability; (c) per cluster, fit a PDF to the dataset of time periods computed.
- (S3) **TDT instantiations and conversions to ATs** _____ Sec. 5.3
Input: (i) TDT of main library, $D(\ell)$; (ii) time points to instantiate the TDT, $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^m$, with $m \geq 1$.
Output: ATs $\{\mathcal{T}_k\}_{k=1}^m$, corresponding to the dependency trees of ℓ at time points $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^m$.
Procedure: (a) index the TDT at every time point $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^m$, to obtain the corresponding dependency trees $\{D_{t_k}(\ell)\}_{k=1}^m$; (b) with the bijection from Sec. 3.2 generate the corresponding ATs, i.e. one \mathcal{T}_k for every $D_k \doteq D_{t_k}(\ell)$.

(S4) **Probabilities estimation** _____ Sec. 5.4

Input: (i) forecast time horizon in days, $0 < n < \infty$; (ii) PDFs $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ from step (S2); (iii) ATs $\{\mathcal{T}_k\}_{k=1}^m$ from step (S3).

Output: Estimates $\{\hat{p}_k\}_{k=1}^m$, where p_k is the probability that any vulnerability affects ℓ within n days counting from the time point t_k .

Procedure: Each leaf x of an AT \mathcal{T}_k from step (S3) stands for a dependency x of ℓ at time t_k : (a) identify the cluster to which x belongs, and its corresponding CDF F_x from step (S2); (b) displace F_x to the left by the release time of x , and integrate for n days; (c) label with that probability the leaf of \mathcal{T}_k corresponding to x ; (d) propagate all such probabilities in the AT: the result is the probability estimate \hat{p}_k .

5.1 Environment preprocessing (clustering)

Each future-vulnerability estimate is computed from a PDF, that describes the probability that a CVE is published for an arbitrary library instance (ℓ_x) as a function of time since its release ($f_x: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow [0, 1]$). Such PDFs are empirical, fitted from data on the time between the release of ℓ_x and the publication of a CVE affecting its own codebase^{||}. So e.g. if we have two such CVEs published for ℓ_x after 30 and 65 days of its release, the data-fitting pool for f_x is $P_x = \{30, 65\}$.

But such vulnerabilities are rare events in the space of library instances—see Sec. 3.1—meaning that not only $|P_x|$ is generally too low to justify the goodness of fit of f_x , but even $P_x = \emptyset$ in the vast majority of cases.

A workaround is to aggregate data in the development environment \mathcal{E} of ℓ_x , e.g. fit a single PDF f_C from P_C with $C \doteq \{\ell_x \in \mathcal{E} \mid \ell_x \text{ has a CVE}\}$. However, the distribution of vulnerabilities is not homogeneous in the space of library instances of an environment. In particular, some ℓ_x have CVEs disclosed often, even monthly, while others have no CVE altogether. A partition $\bigsqcup_{i \in I} C_i = C$ must then be found, that (i) yields sufficient data points in each P_i to fit a PDF f_i , e.g. $|C_i| > 30$, and (ii) puts library instances ℓ_x and ℓ_y in different C_i if they have different security characteristics.

Approaching this as a standard ML clusterisation problem is error-prone, due to the absence of ground truth on features—code properties—that are relevant for security vulnerabilities. For example, interpreting (ii) as the problem «*find the partition that minimises the variance of each P_i s.t. (i) holds*» is incorrect: reducing times variance does not mean that one captured the same security aspects in the corresponding cluster of libraries C_i —see Sec. 8.2 for a discussion.

The theoretically optimal solution for this problem is conjectured to depend on the development environment *even for feature importance*, e.g. it could happen that the number of lines of code is relevant to separate clusters of Java or Python libraries, but not Haskell ones. But even if optimal solutions exist, finding them is out of scope. Instead, our empirical demonstration of the general method in Sec. 6 proceeds pragmatically by selecting two security-linked properties, that are measurable on our corpus of library instances and allow a partition into four clusters $\{C_i\}_{i=1}^4$.

5.2 Vulnerability data aggregation via PDF fitting

Given a c-chain $\ell_{v_j} < \ell_{v_{j+1}} < \dots < \ell_{v_i} < \ell_{v_{i+1}} \dots$ we say that library instance ℓ_{v_i} is *evidence* of some CVE ' κ ' when κ is a direct vulnerability of the c-chain (i.e. it affects the own code of library ℓ), and v_i is the last version of ℓ where κ is observed. Given that CVEs usually affect several related library instances, evidence libraries are needed to count the data point corresponding to a CVE only once per c-chain.

While any library in the c-chain that is vulnerable to a CVE serves as evidence, e.g. the first one, responsible disclosure makes it common to *publish CVEs based on the latest code that they affect*—because a patch is first released and the CVE is published afterwards. More importantly, when a CVE κ is found in ℓ_{v_i} , the classical conservative approach is to deem *all previous libraries ℓ_{v_j} with $j < i$ also vulnerable to κ* —see e.g. CVE-2021-39139 in Example 1. Thus, using the latest vulnerable version of the c-chain as evidence (i) ensures correct counting and (ii) is consistent with current practice. In

^{||}Statistical correctness is ensured by counting each CVE *once* for the specific codebase that it affects, viz. transitive vulnerabilities are not counted.




Fig. 9. $\mathcal{T}_3 = \text{AT}$ corresponding to time-index t_3 in the TDT from Fig. 8, i.e. the dependency tree of `jira-core:8.18.1` (D_3).

turn, when a CVE κ affects more than one c-chain (e.g. CVE-2010-2076, CVE-2021-22569, and CVE-2021-33037) then κ is counted as a data point once for each corresponding library evidence.

Let *grace period* denote the number of days between the release of a library instance ℓ_{v_i} , and the disclosure of a CVE for which ℓ_{v_i} is evidence. The PDF f_i of cluster C_i is fitted on the grace periods of the library instances in C_i . Since this is empirical data we resort to kernel-density estimation [50, 56]. Thus, the resulting cumulative density function (CDF) for cluster C_i , $F_i: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, measures the probability of disclosure of a CVE up to time $t \geq 0$ counting from the time of release of a library instance $\ell_{v_i} \in C_i$. In other words, $S_i(t) \doteq 1 - F_i(t)$ is the survival function of library instances $\ell_{v_i} \in C_i$ for the event “disclosure of a CVE affecting the own code of ℓ_{v_i} at time t after the release of ℓ_{v_i} ”.

5.3 TDTs instantiation and conversions to ATs

To estimate the probability of future vulnerabilities of ℓ , we start from its TDT and index it in the time point(s) requested by the user to retrieve the corresponding dependency tree. Let $D_k \doteq D_{t_k}(\ell)$ be one such instantiated dependency tree: by Def. 4.3 it contains all library instances that are dependencies of ℓ at time t_k . Applying to D_k the transformation from Sec. 3.2 we obtain the corresponding attack tree \mathcal{T}_k , which contains one leaf node—called basic attack step or BAS—for every library instance occurring in D_k , including the own codebase of ℓ at t_k .

EXAMPLE 10. Let us show this on the TDT from Fig. 8, which studies `xstream.com.thoughtworks:xstream` as dependency of the main library `com.atlassian.jira:jira-core` between $t_1 = \text{May 15}$ and $t_3 = \text{Jul 25, 2021}$. At t_3 , the root of D_3 is the library instance `jira-core:8.18.1`. It has dependencies, so it is a non-leaf node that is mapped to a BAS leaf and an OR gate—see Sec. 3.2—that are shown at the top of \mathcal{T}_3 in Fig. 9. The BAS is the circle labelled `jira-core:8.18.1`, that stands for the own code base of that library instance. The OR gate has two children: this BAS and `xstream:1.4.17`, meaning that a vulnerability affecting `jira-core:8.18.1` can come from its own codebase, or from the direct dependency `xstream:1.4.17`. But `xstream:1.4.17` is also a non-leaf node in D_3 , and thus represented by its own OR gate and BAS—see Fig. 9. This recursion in D_3 ends when the leaf nodes are reached, i.e. library instances without dependencies such as `xmllpull:1.1.3.1`. Those are the base cases of the recursion, each mapped to a BAS showing at the bottom of \mathcal{T}_3 in Fig. 9.

5.4 Probabilities estimation

For time point t_k let \mathcal{T}_k be the AT corresponding to the dependency tree of ℓ at time t_k . Each leaf in \mathcal{T}_k , say BAS^x , stands for a dependency ℓ_x of ℓ at time t_k . But library instance ℓ_x was released before t_k , so to use the PDFs fitted during step (S2), whose origin is the release date of the library, we must first displace the PDF origin by the time elapsed since such release. For that we measure the time $\Delta_k^x \doteq t_k - t_{\text{rel}}(\ell_x) > 0$ elapsed between the release of dependency ℓ_x and t_k . Then we compute $\hat{p}_k^x \doteq F_i(\Delta_k^x + n) - F_i(\Delta_k^x)$, where F_i is the CDF of the cluster C_i to which dependency ℓ_x belongs. That is a probability value, that corresponds to the likelihood that a CVE is released for $\ell_x \in C_i$ within n days since t_k . We decorate BAS^x in \mathcal{T}_k with \hat{p}_k^x , and move to the next leaf. Once this has been done for all leaves, these discrete probabilities are propagated in the AT via standard algorithms: the result is the probability estimate \hat{p}_k .

EXAMPLE 11. Let us estimate the probability of facing a vulnerability in the running example, for $t_3 = \text{Jul } 25, 2021$ (viz. \mathcal{T}_3 from Fig. 9), and for a time horizon of $n = 45$ days. The transitive dependency $\ell_x = \text{xm1pu11:1.1.3.1}$ —bottom-right corner in Fig. 9—has 1768 LoC and is web-oriented, so its PDF is that of the cluster $C_i = \text{Small/Medium} \cap \text{Remote network}$ that we introduce next in Sec. 6. We have the corresponding CDF from steps (S1) and (S2), F_i , but its origin is located at the release date of this library instance: $t_{\text{rel}}(\ell_x) = \text{Jun } 16, 2003$, which is quite far back in the past. The desired probability—covering n days since t_3 —lies to the right of that origin, namely $\Delta_3^x = t_3 - t_{\text{rel}}(\ell_x)$ days to the right. Therefore, we estimate the desired probability for ℓ_x as $\hat{p}_3^x = F_i(\Delta_3^x + n) - F_i(\Delta_3^x) \approx 7.80 \cdot 10^{-4}$, and decorate the corresponding BAS in \mathcal{T}_3 with that value. Repeating this procedure for dependency $\ell_y = \text{mxparser:1.2.1}$ yields a much larger estimate, $\hat{p}_3^y = 8.36 \cdot 10^{-2}$, mainly because its release date $t_{\text{rel}}(\ell_y) = \text{Mar } 11, 2021$, is much closer to t_3 , viz. this is a relatively new library instance for which a CVE release is still quite likely in principle. Once all probabilities have been estimated for the BASes in \mathcal{T}_3 , we propagate the total probability through the AT [40], which yields the final estimate $\hat{p}_3 \approx 0.158$ of facing a vulnerability in $n = 45$ days since $t_3 = \text{Jul } 25$. In Sec. 6.3 we show that for $t_2 = \text{Jun } 25$ one gets $\hat{p}_2 \approx 0.096$, which is coherent with the Maven data processed by our methods and, much more importantly, is able to foretell the situation found in the motivating example from Fig. 1.

6 APPLICATION TO THE MAVEN ECOSYSTEM

This section reports the outcomes obtained by applying the methodology from Sec. 5 to 1255 CVEs and 768 FOSS libraries from the Java/Maven ecosystem. We make our results available—including the execution scripts and partial results for the for examples in Sec. 5—as FOSS via a software-reproduction package [10].

Computational efficiency. Steps (S1) and (S2) can be done for a relevant subset of the environment, and reused in several studies after executing them once. For instance, this empirical demonstration works on Maven libraries with severe vulnerabilities—viz. $\text{CVSS} \geq 7$ —which were split into four clusters. In contrast, while steps (S3) and (S4) have lower runtime and memory footprint, they are recomputed for each new user input. By way of example, using a standard i7-CPU laptop with 32 GB RAM, our prototypical Python implementation takes a few minutes to perform all these steps in our corpus. Execution of steps (S3) and (S4) takes a few seconds—see artifact below. An efficiency-driven implementation, e.g. using the BDD algorithms from [40], can scale these results to thousands of dependencies.

Data and Artifact Availability. We provide public access to all files and scripts generated and used in this work, to make them available for reproduction and reuse of our results, in [10] and in this link: <https://zenodo.org/records/10895796>.^{††}

^{††}**NOTE to reviewers:** this is now shared under restricted access for reviewing purposes only: it will be made public upon acceptance of the manuscript. A private URL to access it can be found in [10], or clicking the link above—the URL <https://zenodo.org/records/10895796> will not grant permission.




Fig. 10. Data-selection and enrichment process: from Maven libraries to n -dimensional vulnerability PDFs

6.1 Environment preprocessing (clustering)

We chose Java/Maven as our target ecosystem. We selected libraries for which the source code (of their library instances) is attainable via the Maven Central repository, so own codebase size is a usable metric for clusterisation. Another library-selection criterion was the existence of a CVE affecting it—because the goal of our experiment was to fit PDFs to the grace period between the release of a library instance, and the publication of a CVE for which it is evidence. We further enrich the data retrieved, through structured processes, as an experimental approximation towards the optimal solution conjectured in Sec. 5.1. This data gathering, enrichment, and clusterisation, was implemented as follows.

Selection and enrichment of Java/Maven libraries. (enumeration matches the data files in Fig. 10)

A Initial filter via CVE:

- we selected CVE entries, from the Snyk database [61], that affect Java code and have high- or critical-severity;
- this matched 1255 entries that affect 36040 g:a:v's in Maven, corresponding to 768 unique Java libraries (g:a's).

B Evidence libraries with available codebase:

- from the 36k library instances, we cross-checked the affected version range of each CVE entry and the g:a:v data entries in Maven Central, to select those that are evidence of a CVE—see Sec. 5.2^{‡‡};
- the selected library instances were checked for source-code availability, and those available in Maven had their own codebase size measured via the TechLeverage API [44];
- the results were 394 evidence library instances (with an own-size), corresponding to 256 unique Java libraries.

C Network exploitability of CVE:

- those library instances were enriched with their own-size, but still lacked data on their web-orientation, which is one of the dimensions that will be used in clusterisation; as a necessary first step in that direction, we queried the NVD database to determine whether the AV metric of the corresponding CVEs is Network or not.

D Web-orientation of evidence library instances:

- the final step is to classify each library as web-oriented (codename Remote network) or not (Local);
- this was performed, for the 256 unique Java libraries, via the structured process from [49].

Clusterisation of the selected libraries. Data selection and enrichment resulted in 394 Java library instances, that are evidence to at least one high- or critical-severity CVE, and whose own-size and web-orientation is known. These two properties allowed us to divide the corpus into four quadrants such that, for a given library instance ℓ_i : **(a) its own-size** is classified as either Small/Medium ($|\ell_i|_{own} \leq 100k$) or Large; and **(b) its web-orientation** is either Remote network (i.e. will likely be directly exposed to the Internet) or Local. Each ℓ_i thus falls in one of the four *clusters* $\{C_i\}_{i=1}^4$ that result from this cross-product between own-size and web-orientation, as shown in Fig. 11.

^{‡‡}While 17% of the CVEs affect multiple c-chains, thus spawning multiple evidence, 13% of the g:a:v's are affected by multiple (as many as 11) CVEs.




Fig. 11. Histogram of libraries used for clustering: own code size vs. web-orientation

Library instances were split in four quadrants $\{C_i\}_{i=1}^4$ according to their own codebase size ($\leq 100k$ LoC) and web-orientation. Remote network libraries are more abundant than Local ones due to our selection of g:a:vs with high- or critical-severity CVEs. In numbers:

- Local vs. Remote network: 81 vs. 313
- Small/Medium vs. Large: 166 vs. 228
- Local \cap Small/Medium = 41
- Local \cap Large = 40
- Remote network \cap Small/Medium = 125
- Remote network \cap Large = 188

For **(a)**, while literature usually correlates code size to code security [12, 21, 64], different languages have different thresholds to classify libraries by size. We follow Massacci and Pashchenko [44] who, studying security risks of vulnerabilities in Java/Maven dependencies, found evidence of qualitative differences among libraries larger or smaller than $100k$ LoC. In detail, technical-leverage shows how this threshold sets apart libraries «*that mostly prefer to adopt third-party dependencies*», viz. $|\ell_i|_{own} \leq 100k$, from those that «*tend to increase the size of their libraries*» [44]. This is important: we study vulnerabilities rooted in the (own) source code of a library, and must consider qualitative changes in development behaviour that affect that code. The $100k$ LoC threshold is a language-specific example to distinguish between Small/Medium libraries—where vulnerabilities will most likely come from dependencies—from Large ones—where vulnerabilities become increasingly likely to originate from the own code.

For **(b)**, the expectation is that web-oriented libraries receive more attention and, orthogonally, large libraries increase the chances of an offending line and hence of vulnerabilities. Small web-oriented libraries are expected to second these, and non-web oriented libraries—both large and small—should be the ones where vulnerabilities are the most scarce, appearing quite late after library release (“if you look, you find, but one seldom looks”). This classification employed a mapping of PyPI *Topic classifiers* to Maven g:a:vs, that identifies libraries’ main functional purpose through an expert-driven structured procedure [49]. The resulting categories *Communications*, *Database*, *System*, *Security*, *Utilities*, and *Internet* were then classified as Remote network (i.e. web-oriented), while the rest are Local [49].

6.2 Vulnerability data aggregation via PDF fitting

The output of the previous step were four clusters $\{C_i\}_{i=1}^4$, each lumping together evidence library instances in the same own-size and web-orientation class. This data was enriched with the grace periods, i.e. the number of days that passed between the release of those library instances, and the publication of a CVE for which they are evidence.

Thus, for each cluster, we obtain a pool P_i of natural numbers equal to the grace periods of the $\ell_i \in C_i$. A Kernel Density Estimate K_i was fit from each P_i , since KDEs approximate empirical data for which there are no prior assumptions other than its probabilistic nature [50, 56]. We implemented a Python script that performs these operations, using the KDEUnivariate class from the nonparametric module of the statsmodels library [58].

From K_i one can then obtain an approximated probability density function f_i , and its corresponding CDF F_i , that describes the probability of having a CVE publication as a function of time, from the release date of any library instance belonging to the cluster C_i from which K_i was fitted. The result of this process is presented in Fig. 12. This information




Fig. 12. PDF for each cluster of libraries (class \times size) fitted using KDE

The x axis is the time between the release of a $g:a:v$, and the publication of a CVE for which that $g:a:v$ is evidence—see Sec. 5.2. Libraries are divided by web-orientation (Local vs. Remote network) and own-code size (Small/Medium, $\leq 100k$ LoC, vs. Large):

- The left skew for Remote network Large libraries suggests higher attention by the security community on web-exposed libraries, as expected.
- Small/Medium libraries show similar CVE publication times regardless of web-orientation, which could be due to the fewer LoC that need revision.

can be extrapolated to further libraries, say $\ell_x \notin C_i$, as long as ℓ_x can be identified as belonging to cluster C_i by virtue of its own-size and web-orientation.


6.3 TDTs instantiation and probability estimation

Example 11 illustrated how one can use this machinery to estimate the probability of facing a vulnerability in the running example. This was done for $t_3 = \text{Jul } 25, 2021$, and for a time horizon of $n = 45$ days. The same approach can be followed e.g. for $t_2 = \text{Jun } 25$, in which case the root of the corresponding dependency tree is `jira-core:8.18.0m1`. Looking at the TDT from Fig. 8 one can see that the only library instance that changes between these two time points is that root. However, another changing factor w.r.t. the analysis for t_3 in Example 11 is the time elapsed since the release of all the library instances—and Fig. 12 shows how this time difference affects the probability of facing a CVE.

Let us study e.g. the individual dependency $\ell_y = \text{mxmlparser:1.2.1}$ (bottom-right in Fig. 9). With 12561 LoC it is classified as Small/Medium sized, Remote network—it is a fork of the XmlPull parsing engine `xpp3`, see [49]—and Maven indicates that it was released on Mar 11, 2021. Therefore, its probability estimate since t_2 uses $\Delta_2^y = t_2 - t_{\text{rel}}(\ell_y) = 106$ days, resulting in $\hat{p}_2^y = F_1(\Delta_2^y + n) - F_1(\Delta_2^y) \approx 5.52 \cdot 10^{-2}$. This is almost half of $\hat{p}_3^y \approx 8.36 \cdot 10^{-2}$, which the same library instance yields for t_3 where $\Delta_3^y = t_3 - t_{\text{rel}}(\ell_y) = 136$ days.

In contrast, when the release of a dependency library instance was over 15 months ago, computations via our empirical PDFs for this Java dataset (Fig. 12) are less informative. This happens for example for `jaxb-api:2.3.1`, which was released on Dec 9, 2008, and which here receives the same residual probability $5.79 \cdot 10^{-4}$ for t_2 and t_3 .

However, it does not take many cases like $\ell_y = \text{mxmlparser:1.2.1}$ to increase the probability of facing a CVE in the full dependency tree. In particular, $\ell_z = \text{xstream:1.4.17}$ is a Large (151629 LoC) Remote network library released on May 14, 2021, whose estimate $\hat{p}_2^z \approx 0.032$ at t_2 increases to $\hat{p}_3^z \approx 0.070$ at t_3 . Plugging in all values in the ATs \mathcal{T}_2 and \mathcal{T}_3 of the main library, we estimate a total probability $\hat{p}_2 \approx 0.096$ of facing a CVE in 45 days since $t_2 = \text{Jun } 25$, which is 40% lower



Darker regions indicate higher probability of a CVE from any dependency. Remote network libraries are more skewed towards the origin, suggesting higher attention by the security community. Updating:

- before 1 month keeps all probabilities low;
- is of little use after 6 M.

Fig. 13. Probability of facing a CVE from two source codes, one Small/Medium and one Large, applying eq. (1) to Fig. 12

than the value $\hat{p}_3 \approx 0.158$ that we obtain for $t_3 = \text{Jul 25}$. The ATs also reveal that this probability increase (from t_2 to t_3) in the entire project comes mainly from dependencies ℓ_y and ℓ_z .

In other words, our estimators detect a rise—for a time window of 45 days since the end of June—of the probability of a vulnerability affecting $\ell_a = \text{jira-core}$. Moreover, the analysis shows that this rise comes mainly from its dependencies `myparser:1.2.1` and `xstream:1.4.17`—so updating them would “reset their PDFs”, reducing the probability of facing a CVE release in the coming period. This aligns well with the hindsight of Example 1, and could have been produced before Aug 2021. Thus, developers of `jira-core` could have used this estimated quantity as motivation to *plan the adoption of any update of library xstream*, which would have kept the project safe from CVE-2021-39139.

These time-rolling probability estimates are one example of the type of metric that TDT analysis can produce, in benefit of decision-making for security planning in software development.

7 FULL ANALYTICAL ANALYSIS

AT-conversion is best for scalability, and is expected to help planning in production cycles that have predetermined durations. However, when the dependencies involved are very few, it might be feasible and insightful to perform an analytical study of the probability spaces involved.

Consider for instance a situation in which our interest lies in a single dependency ℓ_B of our project ℓ_A , e.g. because ℓ_B manipulates sensitive data and is thus posing the greatest security threat. Say further that ℓ_A has a codebase with less than 100k LoC, so it belongs to the Small/Medium class, while ℓ_B is Large, but both are web-oriented (Remote network).

Let f_A, f_B be the probability density functions of having a CVE published for these libraries instances, as fitted by our steps (S1) and (S2) previously described. Since a vulnerability discovered in either codebase (ours or theirs) is what we are trying to foresee, the problem can be stated as a race condition between the events “CVE released for ℓ_A ” and “...for ℓ_B ”. Let F_{A+B} denote the CDF that describes the fastest of those events, i.e. $F_{A+B}(t)$ is the probability that at time t we have already observed any of them. That can be restated as the complement of having survived (i.e. not having observed any of them) up to time t , which for independent F_A and F_B can be expressed as follows:

$$F_{A+B}(t) = 1 - S_A(t)S_B(t) = 1 - (1 - F_A(t))(1 - F_B(t)). \quad (1)$$




Fig. 14. Probabilities of vulnerability from ℓ_A or ℓ_B , from class Local, for different release dates of the libraries

This convolution of two PDFs generates a probability plane, as the ones shown in figures 13 and 14, whose 45° diagonal cut (viz. time passes equally fast for both libraries) is the PDF of the event “fastest CVE released, for ℓ_A or ℓ_B ”. The benefit of this approach with respect to AT analysis is that it provides the whole PDF shape, not just discrete data for the m time points $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^m$, and therefore local minima and maxima are apparent.

Taking the main diagonal cut of the plane, that intersects the origin (0,0), represents the case in which ℓ_A and ℓ_B were released on the same day. One can also displace that diagonal line horizontally by x_1 days to the right, to consider a situation in which the library instance plotted on the x axis (here, ℓ_A) was released x_1 days earlier. Similarly, displacing the cut vertically by y_1 days upwards represents a release of the other library y_1 days earlier.

These analyses are depicted in Fig. 14, which shows probability density curves that instantiate the PDF convolutions of (Local) libraries ℓ_A and ℓ_B , which were released on different dates in the past:

- the green line that cuts the gradient to the left above the main diagonal represents the case in which ℓ_A (the Small/Medium library) was released 28 days ago, and ℓ_B (the large library) was released 60 days ago;
- the blue line below to the right represents the case in which ℓ_A was released 123 days ago and ℓ_B 14 days ago.

Thus, the convoluted probabilities plane is a versatile solution worth considering when the number of codebases involved is low. While our examples above concern two libraries only, this can be extended to N libraries—at the cost of exponentially-increasing computation power and memory footprint—via the inclusion/exclusion principle as follows:

$$F_{A_1+\dots+A_N}(t) = \sum_{J \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}} (-1)^{|J|+1} |F_{\sum\{A_i | i \in J\}}(t)|.$$

8 DISCUSSION

8.1 Uses of Time Dependency Tree models

Secs. 5 to 7 show how TDTs can be used to forecast the disclosure of security vulnerabilities, by producing estimates of the probability of facing them in the future, anywhere in the dependency tree of a project. However, TDTs are succinct and general models that allow for a much richer variety of security analyses:

- An out-degree count in the nodes—i.e. library instances—can *determine the presence of pervasive dependencies*, whose exploitation poses a threat to large portions of a project *across both libraries and time*. Furthermore, since TDTs offer a minimal representation this is also computationally efficient.

- This can be extended to more complex (but still computationally efficient) analyses, such as counting shortest paths to other nodes to cater for transitive dependencies.
- TDTs can be used to *discover single-points-of-failure (SPoFs)*, by performing a reverse-reachability analysis across dependency edges. For example in Fig. 7c, a vulnerability affecting library instance $z_{2.1}$ can compromise simultaneously four versions of the main library ℓ .
 - This is important because several versions of a library coexist, so exploited SPoFs can cause great disruptions. For instance in Fig. 7c, if some vulnerability is disclosed for $z_{2.1}$ and we were using $\ell_{1.0}$ as a dependency, we may consider upgrading to $\ell_{1.1}$ or downgrading to $\ell_{0.9}$, but none of those actions would fix the issue.
- A vulnerability can (and usually does) affect several versions of a library, since the offending lines may remain unchanged from one version to the next. This is captured by TDTs via c-chains and d-matrices, whose study can be used to *measure the health of a development ecosystem*.
 - For example, measuring the portions of c-chains—from popular libraries—that were affected by published vulnerabilities, can serve to assess the security risk of developing code in a specific ecosystem.

8.2 Data and white-box models

The forecasts produced are a progression of the vulnerability-disclosure probabilities faced by a library ℓ in a time window of n days since some date t . For this, our white-box model uses instances of the dependency tree of ℓ . This means that TDTs can be used to study FOSS, or by the project owners of ℓ —our particular examples here study Java libraries from Maven central. We use publication of CVE entries as the “vulnerability disclosures” in our model.

Regarding data and as discussed in Sec. 5.1, optimal clustering depends on information that could lie outside the available features. While this limits the precision of practically-attainable estimators, *more care should be put in avoiding an overfit caused by using too much data*. Sec. 5.1 argues why minimising the variance of data within a cluster is a misguided optimisation approach, that could easily result in overfitting. Another example would be to convolute the prediction, using probability estimates as part of the data to define clusters: this label creep will make the model overfit, and lose its ability to predict well across projects. In general, clusters must be defined from independent data sources.

There are, moreover, practical disadvantages in using all available data to develop a prediction model. Already many of the methods from Table 1 require expert knowledge (in software development and statistics/ML), hours of machine processing, or even human audits. This is unavoidable when the model must analyse the entire codebase of a library, or the commit history of years of team development. In contrast, exploiting the higher-level view provided by the dependency tree yields a good trade-off between fine granularity (*this library instance is dangerous*) and efficient processing (*estimates computed in minutes*).

Automatic procedures can be implemented using the compile tools of the chosen environment, e.g. the Maven or Gradle tools for Java libraries. For instance, the `mvn dependency:tree` command was used in our experimentation to instantiate the `xstream` branch of `jira-core` at time points $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^3$, for which we constructed the dependency trees.

In-house studies can instead leverage project information available in the company’s IDE, which is typically more rich since they operate with code that already compiles. This facilitates the TDT construction task even further, since the time-version information is typically available in the version-control system used. Construction of the AT from the corresponding (instantiated) dependency trees is equivalently approachable.

8.3 Theoretical extensions

On a less technical note, Sec. 3.2 outlined connections between TDTs and literature on attack trees, mostly due to the abundant studies on quantitative analysis of the latter, which aligns well with our purpose of estimating the probabilities of potential attacks from DAG-like attack-oriented models. We are aware of two further directions in which our work can be reinterpreted, that may yield interesting lines of investigation.

The first is *abstract interpretation theory*—see Cousot [15]—where one could set libraries to be the abstractions and library instances their ground terms. That is, given library ℓ spawning a c-chain of library instances $\ell_{v_1} < \ell_{v_2} < \dots < \ell_{v_{n-1}} < \ell_{v_n}$, one can set ℓ to be the abstraction of any ℓ_{v_j} , denoted $\alpha(\ell_{v_j}) = \ell$, and the library instances ℓ_{v_j} to be the ground terms of ℓ , denoted $\gamma(\ell) = \{\ell_{v_j}\}_{j=1}^m$ **. In a more general sense, abstract interpretation theory could be used to define semantics for refinements or abstractions of TDTs, viz. where specific information is added or abstracted away from the base model, thereby yielding different computation algorithms.

The second possible connection of this work is with *graph transformations* or *rewriting*—see e.g. [31]—whose attributes could be used to formalise restrictions in TDT evolution. Some examples are: • if a node ℓ is changed from one dependency tree to the next, all its ancestors must either change (to include the updated version of ℓ), or the tree structure must also change (to differentiate those ancestor that keep using the old version of ℓ); • time as an attribute allows to express assumptions such as “dependencies change one at a time, i.e. in two successive time steps of the TDT, at most one leaf version changes”; • CVSS as an attribute may be used to foretell changes in the TDT, e.g. if some node exhibits a critical vulnerability, it should be expected to change (along with its ancestors) in the next step.

9 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We introduced a formal model that yields security-vulnerability forecasts at library level, thus answering RQ1 positively. These forecasts estimate the probability of facing a CVE disclosure in a future time window, and consider the own-code of the affected library as well as any of its dependencies. For that, a white-box model of *time dependency trees* is defined to represent the links between libraries across time (*c-chains* of code evolution) and codebases (library dependencies). Time dependency trees are coupled with empirical data on past-vulnerability releases, to produce generalisable estimators that cover the research gaps identified in the literature. This high-level perspective is a lightweight approach that answers RQ2, as we show with an empirical demonstration on 1255 CVEs and 768 Java libraries.

Future directions

As introduced in this work, time dependency trees are highly-versatile tools to model the evolution of software in time, and measure its quantitative implications. While this work details how they can be used for vulnerability forecasting, Sec. 8.1 suggests how TDTs can be employed to detect red-flag library instances—that pose major security risks in a software project—and generate metrics of the security health in a development ecosystem. On top of that, we foresee some technical extensions that could be easier to exploit for future research:

- A d-matrix can contain (parallel) c-chains that originate from the same codebase, such as Apache Tomcat versions 8.5 and 9.0. Our current model treats them as independent codebases—one could also collapse them as a single c-chain and measure how does this affect the probability predictions in concrete cases.
- A replication study of our empirical demonstration on a different programming language, or even a different set of Java libraries, could serve as indication of how general are the code features chosen to define our four clusters.

**This satisfies the Galois connection since $\alpha(\gamma(\ell)) = \ell$, and $\gamma(\alpha(\ell_{v_j})) \ni \ell_{v_j}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m$.

- (Avoiding overfitting and label creep) the dataset of features used for clustering could be extended, e.g. code update frequency and technical-leverage, to study which features produce the best forecasts according to past evidence.
- Similarly, using different ML methods to clusterise the dataset (e.g. principal component analysis, or uniform manifold approximation and projection), or to improve the data fitting (e.g. via transformers or large language models), are directions worth exploring [23, 63].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially supported by the European Union under the MSCA grant 101067199 *ProSVED*, and NextGenerationEU projects D53D23008400006 *Smartitude* funded under MUR PRIN 2022 and PE00000014 *SERICS* funded under MUR PNRR, and HORIZON Europe 101120393 *Sec4AI4Sec* (<https://www.sec4ai4sec-project.eu/>). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or The European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

REFERENCES

- [1] ACM 2020. *Artifact Review and Badging*. Retrieved 29.03.2024 from <https://www.acm.org/publications/policies/artifact-review-and-badging-current>
- [2] Junaid Akram and Ping Luo. 2021. SQVDT: A scalable quantitative vulnerability detection technique for source code security assessment. *Software: Practice and Experience* 51, 2 (2021), 294–318. <https://doi.org/10.1002/spe.2905>
- [3] Manar Alohalay and Hassan Takabi. 2017. When Do Changes Induce Software Vulnerabilities?. In *CIC*. IEEE, 59–66. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CIC.2017.00020>
- [4] Henrique Alves, Balduino Fonseca, and Nuno Antunes. 2016. Software Metrics and Security Vulnerabilities: Dataset and Exploratory Study. In *EDCC*. IEEE, 37–44. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EDCC.2016.34>
- [5] Florian Arnold, Dennis Guck, Rajesh Kumar, and Mariële Stoeltinga. 2015. Sequential and Parallel Attack Tree Modelling. In *SAFECOMP (LNCS, Vol. 9338)*. Springer International Publishing, 291–299. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-24249-1_25
- [6] Florian Arnold, Holger Hermanns, Reza Pulungan, and Mariële Stoeltinga. 2014. Time-Dependent Analysis of Attacks. In *POST (LNCS, Vol. 8414)*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 285–305. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-54792-8_16
- [7] Lingfeng Bao, Xin Xia, Ahmed E. Hassan, and Xiaohu Yang. 2022. V-SZZ: Automatic Identification of Version Ranges Affected by CVE Vulnerabilities. In *ICSE*. ACM, 2352–2364. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3510003.3510113>
- [8] Zeki Bilgin, Mehmet Akif Ersoy, Elif Ustundag Soykan, Emrah Tomur, Pinar Çomak, and Leyli Karaçay. 2020. Vulnerability Prediction From Source Code Using Machine Learning. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 150672–150684. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3016774>
- [9] Amiangshu Bosu, Jeffrey C. Carver, Munawar Hafiz, Patrick Hillely, and Derek Janni. 2014. Identifying the Characteristics of Vulnerable Code Changes: An Empirical Study. In *FSE*. ACM, 257–268. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2635868.2635880>
- [10] Carlos E. Budde, Ranindya Paramitha, and Fabio Massacci. 2024. *Forecasting the risk of software choices: A model to foretell security vulnerabilities from library dependencies and source code evolution (experimental reproduction package)*. Zenodo. <https://zenodo.org/records/10895796?token=eyJhbGciOiJIUzUxMiIsImhhbmhhdCI6MTcxMTc0OTM5MiwiZXhwIjoxNzIzNTkzNTk5fQ.eyJpZCI6Ijg5MmJiMzA5LT15MzZmMmNGI0My05ZWZkLWUyOWYzNmZiOGFkYSIsImRhGEiOnt9L3JyY5kb20iOiI4ZDcxMDY4ZGRmYzkwYWYwFjQ4OGM1MjA1M2Q3ZjZkOCJ9.mzvKRPFfIoA7SyAF9QkIB4kRRxJydl1iiMri6FpJCCbVV8R0o0EazN5TtqAJql0NpxkwllNlvTyosgN6CXnWlMg>
- [11] Marco Carvalho, Jared DeMott, Richard Ford, and David A. Wheeler. 2014. Heartbleed 101. *IEEE Security & Privacy* 12, 4 (2014), 63–67. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2014.66>
- [12] Saikat Chakraborty, Rahul Krishna, Yangruibo Ding, and Baishakhi Ray. 2021. Deep Learning based Vulnerability Detection: Are We There Yet. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 48, 9 (2021), 3280–3296. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2021.3087402>
- [13] Istehad Chowdhury and Mohammad Zulkernine. 2011. Using complexity, coupling, and cohesion metrics as early indicators of vulnerabilities. *Journal of Systems Architecture* 57, 3 (2011), 294–313. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sysarc.2010.06.003>
- [14] CISA, NSA, FBI, ACSC, CCCS, CERT NZ, NCSC-NZ, NCSC-UK, BSI, NCSC-NL, NCSC-NO, NUKIB, INCD, KISA, NISC-JP, JPCERT/CC, CSA, and CSIRTAMERICAS. 2023. *Shifting the Balance of Cybersecurity Risk: Principles and Approaches for Secure by Design Software*. <https://www.cisa.gov/resources-tools/resources/secure-by-design>
- [15] P. Cousot. 2021. *Principles of Abstract Interpretation*. MIT Press.
- [16] CyberSecAct 2019. *Regulation EU 2019/88 (Cybersecurity Act)*. Retrieved 13.02.2024 from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2019/881/oj>
- [17] Stanislav Dashevskiy, Achim D. Brucker, and Fabio Massacci. 2018. On the Effort for Security Maintenance of Open Source Components. In *WEIS*. 34 pages. <https://www.brucker.ch/bibliography/abstract/dashevskiy.ea-foss-efforts-2018>

- [18] Dongdong Du, Xingzhang Ren, Yupeng Wu, Jien Chen, Wei Ye, Jinan Sun, Xiangyu Xi, Qing Gao, and Shikun Zhang. 2018. Refining Traceability Links Between Vulnerability and Software Component in a Vulnerability Knowledge Graph. In *ICWE (LNCS, Vol. 10845)*. Springer, 33–49. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91662-0_3
- [19] EUCC 2024. *Cybersecurity — security requirements for ICT product certification*. Retrieved 13.02.2024 from https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/have-your-say/initiatives/13382-Cybersecurity-security-requirements-for-ICT-product-certification_en
- [20] Barbara Fila and Wojciech Widel. 2019. Efficient Attack-Defense Tree Analysis using Pareto Attribute Domains. In *CSF*. 200–215. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CSF.2019.00021>
- [21] Sundarakrishnan Ganesh, Tobias Ohlsson, and Francis Palma. 2021. Predicting Security Vulnerabilities using Source Code Metrics. In *SweDS*. IEEE, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SweDS53855.2021.9638301>
- [22] Seyed Mohammad Ghaffarian and Hamid Reza Shahriari. 2017. Software Vulnerability Analysis and Discovery Using Machine-Learning and Data-Mining Techniques: A Survey. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 50, 4 (2017), 36 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3092566>
- [23] Nate Gruver, Marc Finzi, Shikai Qiu, and Andrew G. Wilson. 2023. Large Language Models Are Zero-Shot Time Series Forecasters. In *NeurIPS*, Vol. 36. Curran Associates, Inc., 19622–19635. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2206.04038>
- [24] Joseph Hejderup, Arie van Deursen, and Georgios Gousios. 2018. Software Ecosystem Call Graph for Dependency Management. In *ICSE-NIER*. ACM, 101–104. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3183399.3183417>
- [25] Daan Hommersom, Antonino Sabetta, Bonaventura Coppola, and Damian A. Tamburri. 2021. Automated Mapping of Vulnerability Advisories onto their Fix Commits in Open Source Repositories. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2103.13375.pdf>
- [26] Nasif Imtiaz, Seaver Thorn, and Laurie Williams. 2021. A Comparative Study of Vulnerability Reporting by Software Composition Analysis Tools. In *ESEM*. ACM, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3475716.3475769>
- [27] Jay Jacobs, Sasha Romanosky, Octavian Suci, Benjamin Edwards, and Armin Sarabi. 2023. Enhancing Vulnerability Prioritization: Data-Driven Exploit Predictions with Community-Driven Insights. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.14172>
- [28] Ravi Jhavar, Barbara Kordy, Sjouke Mauw, Saša Radimirović, and Rolando Trujillo-Rasua. 2015. Attack Trees with Sequential Conjunction. In *SEC (IFIPACT, Vol. 455)*. Springer International Publishing, 339–353. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18467-8_23
- [29] Hakan Kekül, Burhan Ergen, and Halil Arslan. 2021. A multiclass hybrid approach to estimating software vulnerability vectors and severity score. *Journal of Information Security and Applications* 63 (2021), 103028. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jisa.2021.103028>
- [30] Seulbae Kim, Seunghoon Woo, Heejo Lee, and Hakjoo Oh. 2017. VUDDY: A Scalable Approach for Vulnerable Code Clone Discovery. In *SP*. IEEE, 595–614. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2017.62>
- [31] Barbara König, Dennis Nolte, Julia Padberg, and Arend Rensink. 2018. *A Tutorial on Graph Transformation*. Springer International Publishing, 83–104. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75396-6_5
- [32] Barbara Kordy, Ludovic Piètre-Cambacédès, and Patrick Schweitzer. 2014. DAG-based attack and defense modeling: Don’t miss the forest for the attack trees. *Computer Science Review* 13-14 (2014), 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosrev.2014.07.001>
- [33] Raula Gaikovina Kula, Daniel M. German, Ali Ouni, Takashi Ishio, and Katsuro Inoue. 2018. Do developers update their library dependencies? *Empirical Software Engineering* 23, 1 (2018), 384–417. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-017-9521-5>
- [34] David Last. 2016. Forecasting Zero-Day Vulnerabilities. In *CISRC*. ACM, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2897795.2897813>
- [35] Éireann Leverett, Matilda Rhode, and Adam Wedgbury. 2022. Vulnerability Forecasting: Theory and Practice. *Digital Threats* 3, 4 (2022), 42:1–42:27. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3492328>
- [36] Hongzhe Li, Hyuckmin Kwon, Jonghoon Kwon, and Heejo Lee. 2014. A Scalable Approach for Vulnerability Discovery Based on Security Patches. In *ATIS (CCIS, Vol. 490)*. Springer, 109–122. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-45670-5_11
- [37] Qiang Li, Jinke Song, Dawei Tan, Haining Wang, and Jiqiang Liu. 2021. PDGraph: A Large-Scale Empirical Study on Project Dependency of Security Vulnerabilities. In *DSN*. IEEE, 161–173. <https://doi.org/10.1109/DSN48987.2021.00031>
- [38] Yi Li, Aashish Yadavally, Jiaying Zhang, Shaohua Wang, and Tien N. Nguyen. 2023. Commit-Level, Neural Vulnerability Detection and Assessment. In *FSE*. ACM, 1024–1036. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3611643.3616346>
- [39] Chengwei Liu, Sen Chen, Lingling Fan, Bihuan Chen, Yang Liu, and Xin Peng. 2022. Demystifying the vulnerability propagation and its evolution via dependency trees in the NPM ecosystem. In *ICSE*. ACM, 672–684. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3510003.3510142>
- [40] Milan Lopuhaä-Zwakenberg, Carlos E. Budde, and Mariëlle Stoelinga. 2023. Efficient and Generic Algorithms for Quantitative Attack Tree Analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 20, 5 (2023), 4169–4187. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TDSC.2022.3215752>
- [41] Fabio Massacci. 2024. The Holy Grail of Vulnerability Predictions. *IEEE Security & Privacy* 22, 1 (2024), 4–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSEC.2023.3333936>
- [42] Fabio Massacci and Viet Hung Nguyen. 2014. An Empirical Methodology to Evaluate Vulnerability Discovery Models. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 40, 12 (2014), 1147–1162. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2014.2354037>
- [43] Fabio Massacci and Ivan Pashchenko. 2021. Technical Leverage: Dependencies Are a Mixed Blessing. *IEEE Security & Privacy* 19, 3 (2021), 58–62. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSEC.2021.3065627>
- [44] Fabio Massacci and Ivan Pashchenko. 2021. Technical Leverage in a Software Ecosystem: Development Opportunities and Security Risks. In *ICSE*. ACM, 1386–1397. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE43902.2021.00125>
- [45] Andrew Meneely, Harshavardhan Srinivasan, Ayemi Musa, Alberto Rodriguez Tejeda, Matthew Mokary, and Brian Spates. 2013. When a Patch Goes Bad: Exploring the Properties of Vulnerability-Contributing Commits. In *ESEM*. IEEE, 65–74. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ESEM.2013.19>

- [46] Andrew Meneely and Laurie Williams. 2010. Strengthening the Empirical Analysis of the Relationship between Linus' Law and Software Security. In *ESEM*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1852786.1852798>
- [47] Viet Hung Nguyen, Stanislav Dashevskiy, and Fabio Massacci. 2016. An automatic method for assessing the versions affected by a vulnerability. *Empirical Software Engineering* 21, 6 (2016), 2268–2297. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-015-9408-2>
- [48] Shengyi Pan, Lingfeng Bao, Xin Xia, David Lo, and Shanping Li. 2023. Fine-grained Commit-level Vulnerability Type Prediction by CWE Tree Structure. In *ICSE*. ACM, 957–969. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00088>
- [49] Ranindya Paramitha, Yuan Feng, Fabio Massacci, and Carlos E. Budde. 2024. Cross-ecosystem categorization: A manual-curation protocol for the categorization of Java Maven libraries along Python PyPI Topics. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2403.06300>
- [50] Emanuel Parzen. 1962. On Estimation of a Probability Density Function and Mode. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 33, 3 (1962), 1065–1076. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177704472>
- [51] Ivan Pashchenko, Henrik Plate, Serena Elisa Ponta, Antonino Sabetta, and Fabio Massacci. 2018. Vulnerable Open Source Dependencies: Counting Those That Matter. In *ESEM*. ACM, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3239235.3268920>
- [52] Ivan Pashchenko, Henrik Plate, Serena Elisa Ponta, Antonino Sabetta, and Fabio Massacci. 2022. Vuln4Real: A Methodology for Counting Actually Vulnerable Dependencies. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 48, 5 (2022), 1592–1609. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2020.3025443>
- [53] Mike Pittenger. 2016. *Open Source Security Analysis: The State of Open Source Security in Commercial Applications*. Technical Report. Black Duck Software. <https://www.vojtechruzicka.com/bf4dd32d5823c258c319cced38727dce/OSSARreport.pdf>
- [54] Gede Artha Azriadi Prana, Abhishek Sharma, Lwin Khin Shar, Darius Foo, Andrew E. Santosa, Asankhaya Sharma, and David Lo. 2021. Out of sight, out of mind? How vulnerable dependencies affect open-source projects. *Empirical Software Engineering* 26, 4 (2021), 34 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-021-09959-3>
- [55] Tom Preston-Werner. 2013. *Semantic Versioning 2.0.0*. <https://semver.org/spec/v2.0.0.html> Creative Commons License.
- [56] Murray Rosenblatt. 1956. Remarks on Some Nonparametric Estimates of a Density Function. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 27, 3 (1956), 832–837. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177728190>
- [57] Yaman Roumani, Joseph K. Nwankpa, and Yazan F. Roumani. 2015. Time series modeling of vulnerabilities. *Computers & Security* 51 (2015), 32–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2015.03.003>
- [58] Skipper Seabold and Josef Perktold. 2010. statsmodels: Econometric and statistical modeling with python. In *9th Python in Science Conference*.
- [59] Nahid Shahmehri, Amel Mammam, Edgardo Montes de Oca, David Byers, Ana Cavalli, Shanai Ardi, and Willy Jimenez. 2012. An advanced approach for modeling and detecting software vulnerabilities. *Information and Software Technology* 54, 9 (2012), 997–1013. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2012.03.004>
- [60] Yonghee Shin, Andrew Meneely, Laurie Williams, and Jason A. Osborne. 2011. Evaluating Complexity, Code Churn, and Developer Activity Metrics as Indicators of Software Vulnerabilities. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 37, 6 (2011), 772–787. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2010.81>
- [61] SnykDB 2022. *Snyk vulnerability DB*. Retrieved 04.08.2021 from <https://snyk.io/vuln>
- [62] Jonathan Spring, Eric Hatleback, Allen Householder, Art Manion, and Deana Shick. 2021. Time to Change the CVSS? *IEEE Security & Privacy* 19, 2 (2021), 74–78. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSEC.2020.3044475>
- [63] Benjamin Steenhoek, Hongyang Gao, and Wei Le. 2024. Dataflow Analysis-Inspired Deep Learning for Efficient Vulnerability Detection. In *ICSE*. ACM, Article 16. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597503.3623345>
- [64] Kazi Zakia Sultana, Vaibhav Anu, and Tai-Yin Chong. 2021. Using software metrics for predicting vulnerable classes and methods in Java projects: A machine learning approach. *Journal of Software: Evolution and Process* 33, 3 (2021), e2303. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smr.2303>
- [65] Kazi Zakia Sultana, Ajay Deo, and Byron J. Williams. 2017. Correlation Analysis among Java Nano-Patterns and Software Vulnerabilities. In *HASE*. IEEE, 69–76. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HASE.2017.18>
- [66] Kazi Zakia Sultana and Byron J. Williams. 2017. Evaluating micro patterns and software metrics in vulnerability prediction. In *SoftwareMining*. IEEE, 40–47. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SOFTWAREMINING.2017.8100852>
- [67] Jiamou Sun, Jieshan Chen, Zhenchang Xing, Qinghua Lu, Xiwei S. Xu, and Liming Zhu. 2024. Where is it? Tracing the Vulnerability-relevant Files from Vulnerability Reports. In *ICSE*. ACM.
- [68] Jiamou Sun, Zhenchang Xing, Qinghua Lu, Xiwei Xu, Liming Zhu, Thong Hoang, and Dehai Zhao. 2023. Silent Vulnerable Dependency Alert Prediction with Vulnerability Key Aspect Explanation. In *ICSE*. ACM, 970–982. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00089>
- [69] Tomcat. *Apache Tomcat Versions*. Retrieved 28.01.2022 from <https://tomcat.apache.org/whichversion.html>
- [70] Huanting Wang, Zhanyong Tang, Shin Hwei Tan, Jie Wang, Yuzhe Liu, Hejun Fang, Chunwei Xia, and Zheng Wang. 2024. Combining Structured Static Code Information and Dynamic Symbolic Traces for Software Vulnerability Prediction. In *ICSE*. ACM.
- [71] Bozhi Wu, Shangqing Liu, Yang Xiao, Zhiming Li, Jun Sun, and Shang-Wei Lin. 2023. Learning Program Semantics for Vulnerability Detection via Vulnerability-Specific Inter-procedural Slicing. In *FSE*. ACM, 1371–1383. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3611643.3616351>
- [72] Emrah Yasasin, Julian Prester, Gerit Wagner, and Guido Schryen. 2020. Forecasting IT security vulnerabilities – An empirical analysis. *Computers & Security* 88 (2020), 24 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2019.101610>
- [73] Bin Yuan, Yifan Lu, Yilin Fang, Yueming Wu, Deqing Zou, Zhen Li, Zhi Li, and Hai Jin. 2023. Enhancing Deep Learning-based Vulnerability Detection by Building Behavior Graph Model. In *ICSE*. ACM, 2262–2274. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00190>

A LITERATURE SEARCH

Search string used in the Scopus database to retrieve works relevant to our studies:

```
TITLE-ABS-KEY( ( security OR cybersecurity OR cyber-security ) AND ( vulnerability OR vulnerabilities ) AND ( metric OR java OR project ) AND ( update OR version OR release ) ) AND PUBYEAR > 2007 AND PUBYEAR < 2024 AND ( LIMIT-TO( SUBJAREA, "COMP" ) OR LIMIT-TO( SUBJAREA, "ENGI" ) ) AND ( LIMIT-TO( EXACTKEYWORD, "Java Programming Language" ) OR LIMIT-TO( EXACTKEYWORD, "Security Vulnerabilities" ) OR LIMIT-TO( EXACTKEYWORD, "Open Source Software" ) OR LIMIT-TO( EXACTKEYWORD, "Software Security" ) OR LIMIT-TO( EXACTKEYWORD, "Computer Software" ) )
```

This produced 118 results in Scopus, which we added to those listed in the survey by Ghaffarian and Shahriari [22], in our search for works that introduce methods or models to discover or predict vulnerabilities in code, including correlation studies between project metrics, and number and severity of vulnerabilities. The results of this search are discussed in Sec. 3.1, and graphically categorised in Table 1.