

Enhancing Software Maintenance: A Learning to Rank Approach for Co-changed Method Identification

YIPING JIA, Queen's University, Canada

SAFWAT HASSAN, University of Toronto, Canada

YING ZOU, Queen's University, Canada

With the growing complexity of large-scale software systems, it is challenging to accurately identify all the needed modifications to implement a specific change. Co-changed methods in software engineering refer to methods that frequently change together over time. They are often considered to be closely related, as changes made to one method may also impact the other one. Identifying the *co-change relationships* between methods can help development teams better understand and maintain their systems (e.g., accurately identifying all the needed modifications to implement a specific change). Prior work faces several limitations in identifying co-changed methods, e.g., generating large result sets with high false positive rates. Focusing on the pull-request level, rather than individual commits, offers a more comprehensive view of related changes that may span multiple commits, capturing essential co-change relationships. To address the limitations of existing methods, we propose a learning-to-rank (LtR) approach that combines source code characteristics with code change history to predict and rank likely co-changes at the pull-request level.

Our extensive experiments, conducted on 150 open-source Java projects totaling 41.5 million lines of code and 634,216 pull requests, show that the Random Forest model outperforms other LtR models by 2.5%–12.8% in NDCG@5. It also surpasses baseline methods—including support ranking, file proximity, code clone detection, FCP2Vec, and the StarCoder 2 model—by 4.7%–537.5% in NDCG@5. Models trained on longer historical data (90–180 days) deliver more consistent performance, while prediction accuracy begins to decline after 60 days, suggesting a need for bi-monthly retraining. This approach offers a practical tool for software teams to prioritize co-changed methods, enhancing their ability to manage complex dependencies and maintain software quality.

CCS Concepts: • **Software and its engineering** → **Software evolution**; **Maintaining software**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Software maintenance, Machine Learning for Software Engineering, Software repository mining

ACM Reference Format:

Yiping Jia, Safwat Hassan, and Ying Zou. 2018. Enhancing Software Maintenance: A Learning to Rank Approach for Co-changed Method Identification. *J. ACM* 37, 4, Article 111 (August 2018), 22 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Software systems undergo continuous changes, such as adding new features, fixing defects, and optimizing the code for better performance and quality improvement. During software system evolution, some artifacts in the same software may frequently change together. For example, defect-fixing may require changes to multiple methods in different modules related to the same functionality. The relationship between software artifacts frequently changed simultaneously is known as the “*co-change relationship*” or “*evolutionary coupling*” [21]. The co-change relationship

Authors' addresses: Yiping Jia, yiping.jia@queensu.ca, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada; Safwat Hassan, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, safwat.hassan@utoronto.ca; Ying Zou, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, ying.zou@queensu.ca.

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 the author(s) 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.

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

can occur to artifacts belonging to multiple modules (e.g., classes or packages) even though the modules do not have explicit dependencies. For example, as shown in Figure 1, in project Apache/Shenyu¹, two methods (i.e., the method *execute* in Class *CustomShenyuPlugins* and the method *doFilter* in class *FallbackFilter*) have been both edited together for three times (i.e., through three pull requests) during the project evolution. The two classes containing the two methods are not from the same package and do not share any superclass or interface (i.e., there are no explicit dependencies between the two methods). Therefore, their co-change relationship cannot be detected using code dependencies. Such co-change relationships could remain in developers’ experience and are often not recorded in documentation or the source code [12].

It is critical to detect co-change relationships as it helps developers localize the needed changes without missing any dependencies [44]. Since co-changed methods are likely to be impacted by the same changes, they may need to be tested together to ensure they continue to work correctly. In the literature, identifying co-change relationships has been applied for locating faults, software architecture recovery, and impact analysis [26, 27, 32] using various approaches, such as detecting co-changed clones [20, 23, 24, 31], applying association rules [24, 26, 44], and locating the co-changes in the same commits [12]. However, the existing approaches suffer from the following limitations:

- 1) Detecting co-change relationships among clones overlooks the co-change relationships between non-cloned code, leading to an incomplete understanding of the evolutionary dynamics within the software systems.
- 2) Detecting a large set of co-change relationships using association rules often produces a set of unordered co-changed software artifacts. The result set is often excessively large, leading to a high incidence of false positives [21]. This inefficiency necessitates further prioritization of the result set to provide actionable insights to developers.
- 3) Detecting co-changes at a fine-grained commit level may miss the co-changed methods that might be changed in different commits and then pushed together or merged into the target branch. Moreover, different artifacts can be changed in the same commit coincidentally rather than due to a co-change relationship. Therefore, ranking co-changed artifacts at the pull-request level is more judicious.

To address the aforementioned limitations, we propose an approach that analyzes information extracted from the source code and the version control systems to detect the implicit co-change relationship. Learning to rank (LtR) approach is useful for ranking items by considering several ranking criteria to assess their relevance to a query. To allow developers focus on the most important co-changed methods, our approach LtR models to rank the probability of co-changes on the pull-request level. We conduct experiments on 150 open-source Java projects obtained from GitHub with 41.5 million LOC and 634,216 pull requests. Our work aims to address the following research questions (RQs):

RQ1. What is the performance of our approach to rank co-changed methods? We aim to evaluate the LtR models in retrieving co-change relationships. We compare the performance of different LtR models and want to select the best-performing LtR model on the co-change ranking task. The result indicates that Random Forest (RF) has surpassed the other LtR models by a margin of 2.5%–12.8% in terms of Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (NDCG@5), achieving statistical significance with a p-value less than 0.05 in the Wilcoxon signed-rank test [37].

RQ2. Can our LtR-based approach perform better than baselines? We compare our approach with five baselines (i.e. support ranking, file proximity ranking, clone similarity ranking, FCP2Vec, and StarCoder 2, an open-source Large Language Model). The results show that the random forest LtR ranking schema of our approach outperforms the existing baselines by a margin of 4.7%–537.5% in terms of NDCG@5.

¹<https://github.com/apache/shenyu>

RQ3. What are the important features in building the LtR models? We collect ten different features to build the random forest LtR model, but not all of the features contribute to its prediction power. Understanding the most critical features enables the streamlining of data collection processes by allowing for the elimination of less pertinent features. We analyze the importance of the collected features and find that the occurrence of the co-change history, the similarity of the file path, and the similarity of the authors of the methods play the most important roles in predicting the co-change relationships.

RQ4. How soon can the model reach a consistent and accurate performance in identifying co-change relationships? We aim to find the shortest period for which the data is sufficient to train the model and produce a good performance. The shorter historical data is needed, the more likely such an approach can have fewer obstacles to be applied in practice. We find that the RF model with 90 days of history to label the training data can reach decent prediction power (i.e., the highest measured NDCG@5 being 0.88), and there is no significant difference in its prediction power compared to the RF model with 180 days of history to label the training data. We also noticed that the model with 30 days of history to label the training data shows significantly lower performance than the models with 180 days of training data by a margin of 20.7% when tested on predicting co-changed methods for a 270-day period.

Our work is characterized by the following key contributions:

- 1) We propose a machine learning approach leveraging historical data to identify the co-change relationship between method pairs.
- 2) We evaluate our approach on a large-scale dataset of 150 real projects and make the replication package available².
- 3) Our approach can effectively predict the co-change methods and outperform the baselines by a margin of 4.7%–537.5% in terms of NDCG@5.
- 4) Our work provides insights into the deployment of our approach (e.g., the needed re-training and testing periods to keep the prediction accurate for current data) in a practical environment.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the background of LtR algorithms. Section 3 describes our approach and the experiment setup. Section 4 presents the results of our research questions. Section 5 explores the implications of our approach. Section 6 discusses the threats to the validity of our study. Section 7 summarizes the prior studies and related work in the co-change detection domain. Section 8 concludes our work and discuss the possible future work.

2 LEARNING TO RANK (LTR) ALGORITHMS

LtR is a Machine Learning (ML) approach designed to train models for ranking items according to their relevance to a query. Unlike traditional classification or regression techniques, which predict independent labels or values, LtR focuses on arranging items, aiming to present the most relevant results to users by taking account of multiple features to derive a ranking schema. LtR is prominent in search-based applications, such as search engines and recommendation systems. LtR helps us recommend only the most relevant items, reducing the likelihood of overwhelming developers with an extensive list of candidates. This approach minimizes distractions and false positives, ensuring developers focus on the most pertinent suggestions. In our study, we employ the LtR algorithms to identify software methods that are most likely to undergo co-changes with a given query method.

The ranking model is trained on a dataset of query-candidate pairs, with the label of the relevance of each candidate to the corresponding query. The model can then make predictions on new query-candidate pairs and rank the candidates

²<https://anonymous.4open.science/r/co-change-replication-F583/README.md>

```

public class CustomShenyuPlugin implements ShenyuPlugin {

    @Override
    public Mono<Void> execute(final ServerWebExchange exchange, final ShenyuPluginChain chain) {
        return chain.execute(exchange);
    }

    @Override
    public int getOrder() {
        return 0;
    }

    @Override
    public String named() {
        return "custom";
    }
}

public class FallbackFilter extends AbstractWebFilter {

    private final DispatcherHandler dispatcherHandler;

    private final Set<String> paths;

    public FallbackFilter(final List<String> paths, final DispatcherHandler dispatcherHandler) {
        this.dispatcherHandler = dispatcherHandler;
        this.paths = new HashSet<>(paths);
    }

    @Override
    protected Mono<Boolean> doMatcher(final ServerWebExchange exchange, final WebFilterChain chain) {
        String path = exchange.getRequest().getURI().getPath();
        return Mono.just(paths.contains(path));
    }

    @Override
    protected Mono<Void> doFilter(final ServerWebExchange exchange) {
        return dispatcherHandler.handle(exchange);
    }
}

```

Fig. 1. An example of the co-change relationship between the method ‘execute’ in class ‘CustomShenyuPlugins’ and the method ‘doFilter’ in class ‘FallbackFilter’ in the ‘Shenyu’ project.

based on their predicted relevance. Different models have different mechanisms to rank the candidates. However, they can be generally categorized into the following three categories:

1) Point-wise ranking: These models predict the relevance of a specific query-candidate pair and rank the candidates according to the relevance score. They typically use a supervised learning approach and can be trained using a variety of algorithms, such as logistic regression or neural networks.

2) Pair-wise ranking: These models compare the relevance of two candidates for a given query. They usually use a binary classification model to select a better one from a pair of candidates. When ranking multiple candidates, the model compares all the combination of candidate pairs and rank the candidates by the number of times a candidate is considered better.

Table 1. The adopted models in our research.

type	model
Point-wise	Linear Regression (LR) [13]
Point-wise	Multiple Additive Regression Trees (MART) [11]
Point-wise	Random Forest (RF) [5]
Pair-wise	RankNet [6]
Pair-wise	LambdaMART [38]
List-wise	Coordinate Ascent [19]
List-wise	AdaRank [40]
List-wise	ListNet [7]




Fig. 2. An overview of the proposed approach.

3) List-wise ranking: These models rank a list of candidates for a given query. They typically use a probabilistic approach, such as the ListNet [7] or ListMLE [39] algorithm, to model the entire list of candidates at once. The models take the entire candidate list as input and output all the scores in a list.

In our research, we investigate eight models that are popularly used in Software Engineering work [34, 42]. The models are listed in Table 1, which consists of three point-wise models, two pair-wise models, and three list-wise models. In our experiment, AdaRank struggles with convergence particularly when optimizing for non-linear measures like NDCG [4, 33, 40]. We decide to omit AdaRank from our analysis.

3 EXPERIMENT SETUP

Figure 2 gives an overview of our approach. We select 150 open-source Java projects from GitHub following established project selection criteria to ensure the generality of our approach. We build a golden dataset for co-change methods based on the number of co-changes between method pairs in history. The golden dataset is subsequently split into training and testing sets for training LtR models. Once trained, these models establish a ranking schema that orders the co-changed methods based on the predicted likelihood of co-changing. The efficacy of the ranking schema is assessed through the analysis of the ranking results to answer the RQs.

3.1 Project selection

We apply the following criteria to select our projects:

1) Open-source Java projects: We examine all open-source Java projects hosted on GitHub. Targeting one programming language and one platform can facilitate our data collection process and make the evaluation result more consistent. Since Java is one of the most popular programming languages in software development [25] and there are various tools

Table 2. Average and 5-number summary of different characteristics of the selected projects.

	Avg.	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	3rd Qu.	Max.
# LOC	276k	3.6K	57.7K	145K	317K	1.9M
# contributors	175	3	81	152	267	4,985
# Pull Requests	4,228	208	1,091	2,299	5,248	30,420
Lifespan (years)	7.2	2.2	5.4	7.2	9.2	13.7

to support the data collection process, we use Java projects as our primary selection. Although we study mainly Java projects, we believe that our approach can be applied to other programming languages.

2) Active repositories: For our analysis, we rely on a substantial period of historical data to accurately label and assess the co-change behaviour. Therefore, we prioritize projects that offer an extensive archive of historical data, and select those that have been active for over two years and updated in the last six months. This criterion helps us identify projects with a depth of information that potentially meets our research requirements.

3) Repositories with merged pull requests: The repository has at least 200 merged pull requests to its default branch. The presence of at least 200 merged pull requests in a repository serves as an indicator that there is sufficient information for our analysis at the pull-request level.

4) Real software systems: The repository represents the development and maintenance of real software systems. GitHub repositories may include personal, toy, and tutorial repositories. We conduct a manual inspection of repositories, including reviewing the README.md file, evaluating the number of contributors, and examining the file organization to ensure they are maintained for software development.

Among the 36k repositories that meet the first three criteria we design, we randomly select 150 subject repositories for the experiments, which is more than the related work [2, 20–24, 31, 43]. We then manually examine the 150 projects to ensure the repositories meet the fourth criterion (i.e., represent actual software systems). Any project found not meeting this criterion is replaced with another randomly selected project, which then undergo the same examination. Descriptive statistics of the selected projects are listed in Table 2, illustrating a wide range of diversity regarding the size and lifespan of the repositories.

3.2 Feature collection

Given a query method M_q and a group of candidate methods $M_C = \{M_{c1}, M_{c2}, \dots, M_{cn}\}$, the LtR models use predictor features of all the query-candidate pairs $\{\{M_q, M_{c1}\}, \{M_q, M_{c2}\}, \dots, \{M_q, M_{cn}\}\}$ to predict the relevance between the query method M_q and the candidates M_C . In this paper, the query and the candidates are all non-test methods that are co-changed by at least one pull request in software projects.

As we study the co-change relationship between a method pair, we suppose that one method in a project is edited and can be passed as a query to the system to identify the co-changed methods. We compare all the other methods in the project and select the top-ranked methods that are most likely to be edited together with the query. The top-ranked methods are predicted to have co-change relationships with the query method.

As shown in Figure 2, we collect the predictive features from two different sources: 1) the source code of the project and 2) the edit history from the version control system. The collected features are used as indicators to show the relationship between each method pair and serve as input predictor features for building the model. We have designed

ten features to represent the relationships of a query-candidate pair. The description of the ten features is presented in Table 3. The features are also described as follows:

1) Historical features: We use FinerGit [14] to collect the edit history of all the methods in the project by mining the version control system. FinerGit takes a Git repository as input and generates another repository where every method in the original repository is transformed into a separate file. The generated repository supports all the Git commands so that we can collect the edit history with the Git-log command. The Git-log command enables us to collect the commit ID, the author, and the commit time. We then collect the pull requests associated with each commit using the official GitHub API³, so we can identify all methods modified by the same pull request.

Given a candidate method M_c and a query method M_q , the historical features are defined as follows:

Number of co-changes: is the total number of pull requests where the candidate method M_c is co-changed with the query method M_q .

Authors similarity: Let A_c and A_q represent the sets of authors contribute (i.e., created or modified) to the methods M_c and M_q respectively. The authors similarity is the Jaccard similarity between the two sets of authors A_c and A_q .

2) Static features: We apply static analysis of the latest source code of a project and compute the static relevance features as follows:

Semantic similarity: This feature represents the similarity between the semantic meaning of the two methods. First, we transform the source code of a method, written in the programming language, into a high-dimensional vector with CodeBERT [10]. CodeBERT is a Transformer-based deep learning model. It takes a sequence of lexical tokens, e.g., a piece of code or a short paragraph of natural language, and transforms it into a vector that contains 764 scalar values representing the lexical and semantic meaning of the input. We compute the semantic similarity as the cosine similarity of both vectors transformed from the query method M_q and candidate method M_c .

Path similarity: This feature represents the similarity between the query and candidate methods' file paths. We first split the file paths with the separator "/" and obtain a sequence of tokens. We then compute the similarity between the two paths P_1 and P_2 as follows:

$$\text{Similarity}_{(P_1, P_2)} = \frac{\text{number of total common tokens}_{(P_1, P_2)}}{\max(\text{length of paths}_{(P_1, P_2)})}$$

For example, given the query method with file path "a/b/c" and the candidate with file path "a/d", the similarity between the two file paths is 1/3 because the two paths have one common token, and the maximum length of the paths is three.

Code dependency: This feature represents the calling relationships between the query and candidate methods. We mine the dependency with a tool named Scitool Understand⁴. The value of the feature is the sum of the number of times that the query method and the candidate method call each other.

Hierarchy similarity: This feature is a boolean value, and it is true when the methods M_q and M_c share a common super-class; otherwise, the value is false.

Code clone: We use Nicad [9] to extract the cloned method pairs in the software repository. Nicad is a clone detector that provides reliable and accurate clone detection [31]. Nicad can detect similar code fragments in the source code and gives a similarity score between 0 and 100. We use the default setting for near-miss function clone detection, where the dissimilar threshold is set to 0.3. We use the score directly as the value of the clone feature.

³<https://docs.github.com/en/rest>

⁴<https://www.scitools.com/>

Table 3. Features representing the relationships between a query method M_q and a candidate method M_c .

Feature	DT*	Description
Number of co-changes	N	Number of times the two methods are changed together at the pull-request level.
Authors similarity	N	Fraction of common developers who have contributed to both methods.
Semantic similarity	N	The semantic similarity between the two methods.
Path similarity	N	The directory and file name similarity between the two methods.
Code dependency	N	Presence of dependencies, such as method calls, between the two methods.
Hierarchy similarity	C	Whether the methods share the same superclass.
Code clone	N	Whether the two methods are code clones.
Package similarity	N	The similarity between the packages of the classes.
Argument type similarity	N	The similarity between the types of the arguments.
Argument name similarity	N	The similarity between the names of the arguments.

* **Data Type (DT):** (C) Categorical – (N) Numeric

Package similarity: Similar to the file path similarity, we extract the package of the method from the source code with a regular expression and compute the similarity feature based on the query and the package of the candidate method.

Argument type similarity: This feature represents the similarity between the types of arguments of the query and candidate methods. The value of the feature is the Jaccard similarity [15] between the sets of types defined as the method’s input.

Argument name similarity: Similar to the computing of the argument type similarity, we compute with the Jaccard similarity [15] of the argument names.

3.3 Correlation and redundant analysis

The existence of highly correlated features can prevent us from further analyzing the contribution of each feature to the predictive power of the model. Therefore, we conduct a correlation analysis among all the collected features and eliminate redundant ones.

We use the Spearman rank correlation coefficient [30] to conduct correlation analysis because of its robustness against non-normally distributed data. We compute the Spearman rank correlation coefficient between each pair of features and set 0.7 as a threshold. If there is any pair of features with a correlation coefficient greater than 0.7, we consider them to be redundant and we select only one of them. The correlation analysis shows a high correlation between “*package similarity*” and “*path similarity*”. We decide to eliminate the “*package similarity*” because it is available only in some programming languages, such as Java. Therefore, keeping the “*path similarity*” would not prevent us from generalizing our approach to other programming languages. The other predictor features do not have a highly correlated relationship.

We also perform redundant analysis using the *redun()*⁵ function in R. The redundant analysis finds no additional redundant features beyond those identified through correlation analysis in the dataset.

⁵<https://www.rdocumentation.org/packages/Hmisc/versions/5.1-1/topics/redun>




Fig. 3. **Overview of the data creation pipeline for co-change prediction.** This figure illustrates the pipeline for dataset creation as described in Algorithm 1. The pipeline consists of two main periods: the feature collection period (from t_s to t_d) and the labelling period (from t_d to t_e). During the feature collection period, historical process and static features are extracted for all method pairs in the repository up to t_d . In the labelling period, co-change occurrences between method pairs are calculated as labels.

3.4 Data labelling

In our study, we employ supervised LtR models, which require predefined correct answers (i.e., “labels”) to fulfill the training process. These labels indicate the desired order of documents (i.e., candidate co-changed methods) based on their relevance to the query (i.e., the query method). We determine relevance as the frequency of co-changes between methods in software development history, as outlined in Algorithm 1. Specifically, we label our data based on how often a query method M_q and a candidate method M_c are co-changed in the subsequent six months following the collection of features that describe them. For example, if the query method M_q co-changed five times with method a , ten times with method b , and three times with method c , we label the method pairs $\{M_q, a\}$, $\{M_q, b\}$, and $\{M_q, c\}$ as 5, 10 and 3 respectively. The labeling process is done automatically without human involvement by extracting the historical pull-request information.

3.5 Training and testing data

In real-world scenarios, models are trained with past information and are applied to predict the future behaviour according to the present characteristics. As shown in Figure 3, we construct our predictive features of the training data based on the edit history from the creation of the repository to the point that is 12 months prior to the final recorded commit. This step aligns with the feature extraction described in Algorithm 1. We choose 12 months before the last commit to ensure that we have sufficient data for training and testing purposes. Then the training dataset is labelled based on the number of co-changes during the next six months (i.e., 180 days).

After the model has been trained, it is tested on a separate set where the predictive features are derived from the historical data from the creation of the repository to 6 months (i.e., 180 days) prior to the final recorded commit. The

model tries to predict the candidate methods that are the most likely to be co-changed, and the prediction is compared with the labels based on the co-changes that happened in the last 6 months (i.e., 180 days).

The timeline shown in Figure 3 indicates that the training and testing datasets are not overlapping and are distinct sets of time-sequential data. This approach is common in time-series forecasting or when dealing with data where temporal dynamics are important [8], ensuring that the model is evaluated on data it has not seen during training and providing a measure of how well it can generalize to new, unseen data.

Algorithm 1 Dataset Creation for Method Co-change Identification

```

1: Input:
2:    $t_s$  (repository creation time),
3:    $t_d$  (end of feature collection period and the start of labelling period),
4:    $t_e$  (end of labelling period)
5: Output: Dataset for co-change prediction
6:  $M \leftarrow$  all methods in the repository at time  $t_d$  ▷  $M$ : set of all methods
7: Collect edit history for each method  $m \in M$  from  $t_s$  to  $t_e$ 
8:  $M_{\text{valid}} \leftarrow M \setminus \{\text{test methods, methods with no edit history}\}$  ▷  $M_{\text{valid}}$ : valid methods with edit history
9: Initialize dataset  $D \leftarrow \emptyset$  ▷  $D$ : co-change identification dataset
10: for each method  $m_q \in M_{\text{valid}}$  do ▷  $m_q$ : query method
11:   Create a ranking list for  $m_q$ 
12:    $M_{\text{candidate}} \leftarrow M_{\text{valid}} \setminus \{m_q\}$  ▷  $M_{\text{candidate}}$ : candidate methods
13:   for each method  $m_c \in M_{\text{candidate}}$  do ▷  $m_c$ : a single candidate method
14:     Add the pair  $(m_q, m_c)$  to the ranking list
15:     Calculate historical process features for the pair  $(m_q, m_c)$  from  $t_s$  to  $t_d$ 
16:     Calculate code features for the pair  $(m_q, m_c)$  at time  $t_d$ 
17:     Label the pair  $(m_q, m_c)$  with co-change occurrence between  $t_d$  and  $t_e$ 
18:   end for
19:   Add the ranking list for  $m_q$  to the dataset  $D$ 
20: end for
21: Exclude ranking lists where all labels (i.e., co-change occurrence) are 0
▷ Results will be 0/0 and thus not meaningful

```

4 RESULTS

4.1 RQ1: What is the performance of our approach to rank co-changed methods?

4.1.1 Motivation. Identifying the co-change relationships between methods can help the development teams better understand and maintain their systems. However, existing work identifying the co-changed methods has different limitations (e.g., overlooking the co-change relationships between non-cloned code and identifying co-changes that occurred only in the same commits). To address the aforementioned limitations, we propose applying LtR models to identify a small set of methods with the highest probability of being co-changed on the pull-request level. In RQ1, we aim to understand the performance of our approach in identifying the co-changed methods.

4.1.2 Approach. We collect the features from the subject projects as described in Section 3. We train and evaluate the seven models listed in Table 1 using the LtR framework RankLib⁶. To evaluate the predictive power of the ranking

⁶<https://sourceforge.net/p/lemur/wiki/RankLib/>

Table 4. The performance of the studied LtR models using the NDCG@k metric with k equals to 1, 3, 5, and 10.

type	Model	k=1		k=3		k=5		k=10	
		mean	median	mean	median	mean	median	mean	median
Point-wise	Linear Regression (LR)	0.7848	0.8304	0.8192	0.8695	0.8350	0.8880	0.8578	0.9043
Point-wise	MART	0.6794	0.7868	0.7446	0.8111	0.7751	0.8668	0.8024	0.8750
Point-wise	Random Forest (RF)	0.7889	0.8850	0.8324	0.8989	0.8394	0.9106	0.8681	0.9308
Pair-wise	RankNet	0.5969	0.7667	0.6937	0.8252	0.7075	0.8074	0.7314	0.8464
Pair-wise	LambdaMART	0.7013	0.7961	0.7724	0.8395	0.7949	0.8595	0.8182	0.8758
List-wise	Coordinate Ascent	0.7236	0.8424	0.7530	0.8652	0.7329	0.8495	0.7414	0.8826
List-wise	ListNet	0.6529	0.7727	0.6750	0.8063	0.7062	0.8143	0.7459	0.8471

models, we use the Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain at position k (NDCG@k) metric [16]. NDCG is a well-adapted evaluation metric to measure the overall ranking quality of a model [36]. The calculation of NDCG is based on the premise that highly relevant items appearing lower in a search result list should be penalized. NDCG is calculated as follows:

$$NDCG@k = \frac{DCG@k}{IDCG@k}$$

where k specifies the number of top positions to consider; DCG@k (Discounted Cumulative Gain) measures the usefulness of the document based on its position in the result list (lower positions are penalized); and IDCG@k is the best possible (ideal) DCG given the query. The calculation of DCG@k is given by the following formula:

$$DCG@k = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{2^{rel_i} - 1}{\log_2(i + 1)}$$

where rel_i is the relevance score of the i^{th} item in the ranked list and k is the number of items in the list.

NDCG@k ranges from 0 to 1, where a score of 1 indicates that the predicted ranking perfectly aligns with the relevance scores, and a score of 0 indicates that no relevant items are present in the top-k results. NDCG@k is widely used in the evaluation of ranking systems because it accounts for both the relevance of items and their position in the ranking [36]. We chose NDCG for our relevance scores because it effectively handles scalar labels, accommodating varying levels of relevance that other metrics treat as binary. Furthermore, NDCG rewards rankings that place highly relevant items at the top, making it more sensitive to ranking quality than metrics like Top-k accuracy, Recall, or MRR [16][35]. NDCG@k can also be adjusted to different values of k, enabling comparison across varying ranking lengths to determine the most effective configuration. In our analysis, we evaluate the model's performance using k values of 1, 3, 5, and 10.

To comprehensively assess our models' performance, we perform evaluations on each subject project individually by calculating the mean NDCG@k for all query methods. After determining the performance metrics for each project, we compute the mean and median scores over all the projects.

Furthermore, we want to explore the relationship between the performance and three key metrics of the projects: the number of lines of code (LOC), the number of contributors, and the project's lifespan. For each feature, we divide the projects into 3 groups: 1) the lowest 25%, 2) median 50%, and 3) the highest 25%. Then, we compare the performance of the model in different groups.

4.1.3 Results. The Random Forests (RF) model achieves the highest performance of 0.91 NDCG@5 and outperforms other LtR models by a margin of 2.5%–12.8% in terms of NDCG@5. Based on the data presented in




Fig. 4. The performance of the RF model grouped by different characteristics of the studied projects.

Table 4, it is evident that the Random Forests (RF) model outperforms other LtR models across different values of k (i.e., 1, 3, 5, and 10). The RF performance indicates its effectiveness in ranking tasks compared to alternatives like LR, MART, RankNet, LambdaMART, AdaRank (which notably failed to converge in most projects), Coordinate Ascent, and ListNet. Furthermore, we apply the Wilcoxon signed-rank test [37], a non-parametric test used to compare paired samples to determine whether their population mean ranks differ. This test is particularly suited to our experiment as it does not assume normality. The result confirms the statistical significance of these results, with a p -value less than 0.05. The statistical analysis underscores the robustness of RF in providing more accurate and reliable rankings in comparison to other models evaluated in our study. Hence, we use RF as the selected model in the next RQs.

The RF model achieves the highest performance of 0.8885 NDCG@5 in identifying the co-changed methods in medium-size and short-term projects. Figure 4 shows the performance of the RF model with respect to different characteristics of the studied projects. We observe performance improvements in RF models as the value of k increases from 1 to 10. We also find that the RF model achieves higher performance in identifying the co-changed methods in the medium-size projects compared to small-size and large-size projects. The RF performance decreases as the project lifetime increases. We conduct the Wilcoxon signed-rank test to compare the RF model performance across different project characteristics. The results indicate that, overall, there is no significant difference in model performance among the groups, with the exception that long-term projects exhibit a significantly lower performance compared to young projects. This might be attributed to using the entire project history to generate code features, where older historical data could lower the performance of the model.

The RF model outperforms the other LtR models with an average NDCG@5 score of 0.84 on the studied projects. The RF model achieves the highest performance in identifying the co-changed methods in medium-size and short-term projects.

4.2 RQ2: Can our LtR-based approach perform better than baselines?

4.2.1 Motivation. Prior work uses code-clone and association rules techniques to rank the co-changed methods on the commit level. To our knowledge, our study is the first attempt to apply ML technique (i.e., LtR techniques) for ordering co-change methods on a pull-request level. This situation leads us to face a lack of existing benchmarks for comparison.

In this RQ, we compare our method with five baselines. By comparing the results of the proposed approach to existing baselines, we aim to determine whether our approach is a significant improvement over the existing methods.

4.2.2 Approach. Given a changed method M_q and a group of candidate methods M_C , the five baselines are defined as follows:

- 1) Support ranking:** orders the co-change candidates M_C of a query method M_q based on the number of times that the candidate co-change in the past with the query method M_q . The baseline is based on association rules from HistoRank [21].
- 2) File proximity ranking:** ranks the candidates M_C by their file path proximity to the query method M_q . The file path proximity is the distance between the file entities in the file system tree. Files with the same file proximity are ranked by their support ranking. The baseline is based on association rules from HistoRank [21].
- 3) Using a code clone tool:** This approach use NiCad clone-detector [9] as a co-change detector used by Mondal et al. [20, 23]. It ranks the candidate methods M_C by the code similarity score given by the NiCad clone detector [9].
- 4) FCP2Vec:** This approach uses Word2Vec to encode file paths into vectors and applies k-NN to retrieve the top k nearest candidates with the highest probability of co-changes[1]. To adapt it for method-level prediction used in our work, we append the method name to the file name.
- 5) StarCoder 2:** We implement a point-wise LTR model that utilizes the open-source LLM, StarCoder 2, with 16B parameters and 16-bit precision[18]. StarCoder2 is particularly well-suited for this task as it has been pre-trained on a wide range of programming languages, enabling it to understand both the syntax and deeper structural patterns in code[18]. The model takes the source code of the query method M_q and candidate method M_c as input and predicts a float between 0 and 1, representing the probability of co-change. An example prompt and the corresponding predictions are listed in Fig. 5. Candidates are then ranked based on their predicted probabilities. Due to limitations in computing resources, we applied this baseline to 45 randomly selected projects from our dataset, comprising over 2.4 million method pairs in total.

In the baselines, the co-change methods are identified at the commit and file levels, whereas our work is based on pull-request levels. We adopt the baselines and re-implement them at the pull-request level.

4.2.3 Results. **Our approach shows a significant improvement in predicting the co-changed methods over five established baselines by a margin of 4.7%–573.5% in terms of NDCG@5.** The comparison between the baselines is shown in Table 5. We find that our approach outperforms the baseline approaches, with a 10.2% difference in NDCG@1, a 7.9% difference in NDCG@3, a 4.7% difference in NDCG@5, and a 4.3% difference in NDCG@10 compared to the best-performing baseline, support ranking. We also conduct the Wilcoxon signed-rank test to determine the significance of the differences between our approach and the baseline approaches in performance. The results show that our approach is significantly better than the baselines.

We observe that the differences between our approach and the baseline approaches increase as the value of k decreases. This result indicates that our approach is more powerful than baselines in making precise predictions for the small number of the selected candidate methods k.

The support ranking approach achieves the best performance in the baseline approaches. The support ranking reaches a relatively good performance as the support ranking has the same definition as the labels (i.e., the support ranking and the labels measure the number of co-changes between the query method M_q and the candidate method M_c in the training and testing periods respectively). File proximity ranking and clone ranking have a limited ability to detect co-changes, achieving NDCG@5 scores of 0.64 and 0.12, respectively.



Fig. 5. Example Prompt and Prediction for StarCoder2

The clone detector can hardly predict accurate co-changes because the number of detected clone pairs is very small compared to the number of all candidate entities. Additionally, we run the experiment on 45 projects containing over 2.4 million pairs of methods, with each pair taking around 2.5 seconds to process on an NVIDIA A100 graphics card with 80GB of Graphics RAM. The significant time required for the LLM-based approach further highlights its limitations, making it a less efficient choice for large-scale evaluations.

Our approach shows a significant improvement in performance over five established baselines by a margin of 4.7%–573.5% in terms of NDCG@5, particularly when the number of recommendations (i.e., k) is smaller.

Table 5. Comparison of our approach with baselines.

k	RF Model	Baseline	Mean	Difference	Significance
1	0.7898	Support	0.7166	10.2%	*
		File Proximity	0.5487	43.9%	**
		Code Clone	0.0014	57528.6%	**
		FCP2Vec	0.4025	96.2%	**
		StarCoder 2	0.5294	49.2%	**
3	0.8330	Support	0.7720	7.9%	*
		File Proximity	0.6073	37.2%	**
		Code Clone	0.0847	883.8%	**
		FCP2Vec	0.4483	85.8%	**
		StarCoder 2	0.5630	48.0%	**
5	0.8399	Support	0.8023	4.7%	*
		File Proximity	0.6364	32.0%	**
		Code Clone	0.1247	573.5%	**
		FCP2Vec	0.4620	81.8%	**
		StarCoder 2	0.5951	41.1%	**
10	0.8684	Support	0.8328	4.3%	*
		File Proximity	0.6729	29.1%	**
		Code Clone	0.1958	343.6%	**
		FCP2Vec	0.5264	65.0%	**
		StarCoder 2	0.6004	44.6%	**

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.005$

4.3 RQ3: What are the important features in building the LtR models?

4.3.1 Motivation. It is important to understand the features (e.g., path similarity and author similarity) that would influence the predictive ranking the most. Such insights improve the interpretability of our model, which helps development teams better understand and rely on our predictions. In addition, understanding the most important features can assist practitioners in better prioritizing their efforts by focusing on collecting and analyzing such features. Hence, in this RQ, we analyze the importance of the studied features in building the LtR models.

4.3.2 Approach. Permutation importance is a technique used to evaluate the importance of each feature in a machine-learning model. The basic idea behind permutation importance is to randomly shuffle the values of a feature, and then observe the decrease in the performance of the model. The larger the decrease in performance, the more important the feature is considered to be [5].

We calculate the permutation importance of each of the collected features and compare their importance. The permutation importance is calculated by training a model on the original dataset. Then, shuffling the values of a specific

Table 6. The permutation importance of the studied features.

Feature	Importance
Number of co-changes	0.3844
Path similarity	0.0539
Authors similarity	0.0392
Code dependency	0.0082
Hierarchy similarity	0.0043
Clone similarity	0.0010
Argument type similarity	0.0010
Semantic similarity	0.0008
Argument name similarity	-0.0007

feature and re-evaluating the performance of the model on the shuffled data. The difference in performance between the model trained on the original data and the model trained on the shuffled data is the permutation importance of that feature. For simplicity, we limit our evaluation of feature importance to the setting where $k = 5$. We choose $k=5$ as it provides a balanced choice among the experimented K values (i.e., 1,3,5 and 10) with a reasonable number for the recommendation of co-changes.

4.3.3 Results. The number of co-changes is the most important feature, with feature importance 0.38. Path similarity and author similarity also positively influence the model’s performance, with feature importance of 0.05 and 0.04, respectively. Table 6 shows the importance of the studied features. We find that the number of co-changes feature is the dominant one among all the studied features. The model trained on the dataset where the number of co-changes is shuffled reached only 0.4692 NDCG@5, showing that the feature has 0.3844 permutation importance. The rest of the features are not as important as the number of co-changes. However, we observe that the studied features still contribute positively to the prediction power of the model. We also notice that path similarity and authors similarity features are also important to the model. We notice that the argument name similarity feature has a negative impact on the prediction power of the model.

Code similarity features (i.e., code clone and semantic similarity) have low importance in predicting the co-changed methods. We find that the importance of clone similarity is 0.001 which is lower than our expectation. Although clone detection is found to be a good indicator of co-change relationships as in prior work[20, 24], the number of positively detected clones is too small compared to the total amount of methods in our subject systems. Hence, the clone similarity does not play an important role in detecting the co-change relationships. The impact of the semantic similarity of the method is also low (i.e., 0.0008). It is possible that the CodeBERT model requires fine-tuning to be adapted to our method. Another possibility is that measuring the cosine similarity between the vector embeddings of the query method M_q and the candidate method M_c does not accurately identify the semantic similarity of the methods.

The number of co-changes emerges as the most important feature, with path similarity and authors similarity also positively influencing the model’s predictive ability. Other features have limited impact, with the argument name similarity feature negatively affecting predictions.




Fig. 6. The performance of the RF model with different periods for creating the training and testing labels.

4.4 RQ4: How soon can the model reach a consistent and accurate performance?

4.4.1 Motivation. In the previous RQs, we used 180 days (i.e., 6 months) of edit history to create the training labels and 180 days to create the testing labels, as shown in Figure 3. However, the selection of 180 days may not be the best choice for all projects. The choice of the periods to label the data can be influenced by the projects' updating pace and lifespan. More specifically, if the training data is extracted from a long period of history, the model might be trained on obsolete data, leading to inaccurate predictions. On the other hand, training the LtR models with a short period of history may not provide enough characteristics about the nature of the co-changed methods which leads to inaccurate predictions. In this RQ, we aim to understand how the recency of the training data and period of the training and testing data affect the performance of the model. Therefore, we want to suggest to the practitioners the most suitable period for using the model before it comes necessary to retrain the model with more up-to-date data to maintain the high performance of the model.

4.4.2 Approach. In our experiment for this RQ, we alter the periods to label the training and testing data to test the performance of the RF model with different setups of periods. Given our time constraints, we focus on a random sample of 30 projects for our analysis in this RQ. For each project, we try different combinations of periods as follows, resulting in a total of 30 different setups:

- Period to label the training data: 30, 90, 180 days
- Period to label the testing data: 5, 10, 20, 30, 60, 90, 120, 150, 180, 270

We use the Wilcoxon signed-rank test with a significance level of 0.05 to determine whether the performance of the model in different settings differs significantly.

4.4.3 Results. The performance of the RF model begins to decline after 60 days, suggesting a need to retrain models bi-monthly (i.e., 60 days) for optimal results. Figure 6 shows the performance of the RF model with different periods for creating the training and testing labels. We find that the performance of the model on five days of testing data is unstable because there is not enough data in the testing dataset to provide an accurate evaluation of the performance. The models with different training periods reach a relatively high performance after there are enough testing data, and the high performance of the models starts to drop after the testing period reaches 60 days. After 60 days, the models lose their prediction power gradually.

Models trained over longer periods (90 and 180 days) exhibit higher and more stable performance compared to the models trained with a 30-day training period. We find that the models with 90-day and 180-day training periods perform better than the model with a 30-day training period, with no statistically significant difference in predictive power between the 90-day and 180-day models. When evaluated with 270 days of testing data, the model with 180-day training data outperforms the model with 30-day training data by a margin of 20.7%, and this difference is statistically significant with a p-value less than 0.05. Moreover, the model with a 30-day training period is less stable, as it fails to generate any training data in some projects, resulting in a performance of zero. This instability makes the model with a 30-day training period unreliable, as it cannot be used on certain projects. In our experiments, this issue primarily occurred with the model using a 30-day training period.

Models trained over longer periods (90 and 180 days) exhibit higher, more stable performance compared to a 30-day training period. The performance of the model begins to decline after 60 days of the testing period, suggesting a need to retrain models bi-monthly for optimal results.

5 IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Implications for developers

Developers can use the proposed approach to avoid bugs and errors during development. Our approach can increase the developers' awareness of co-changed methods and recommend the methods for developers to inspect. If two methods tend to change together frequently, changing one method without considering the impact on the other method could introduce bugs and errors.

Developers can use the proposed approach to improve the quality of code. If developers identify co-changed methods that are tightly coupled, they may consider refactoring the code to reduce the coupling and improve the maintainability of the code. By understanding co-changed methods, developers can design more modular and maintainable code that could put the frequently co-changed methods in the same file or packages, making the code less prone to bugs and errors. For example, they may be able to identify methods that have a high degree of coupling and decouple them to improve the overall quality of the code.

The proposed approach enhances developers' understanding of code relationships. By identifying co-changed methods at PR, our approach enhances the understanding of code relationships, helps developers to better plan and implement changes (e.g., assign the co-changed methods to the same developers), reducing the risk of overlooking necessary modifications that might lead to defects or unstable code at the commit-level.

5.2 Implications for code reviewers and testers

Code reviewers can use the proposed approach as a tool to identify potential side-effects or dependencies between methods. If two methods are frequently co-changed, it may indicate that they have a high degree of coupling, and changes to one method may have unintended consequences on the other method.

Testers can use the proposed approach to prioritize or select the tests. If one method is changed, it is more likely that the methods that have a co-change relationship with the changed method can be impacted. Testers can select tests that cover all the impacted methods and their interactions.

6 THREATS TO VALIDITY

In evaluating our approach across 150 open-source projects, we recognize several potential threats to the validity of our findings. These threats are categorized into two main types: external validity threats and internal validity threats.

External Threats: Although 150 projects are generally more than the existing studies, it still can be insufficient to generalize our experiment results to all the Java software projects. However, we tried to counter this threat by selecting a relatively large number of projects and ensuring the diversity of the selected projects on size, lifespan, and number of contributors. In our experiment, we only applied our experiment on the software projects that are written in Java and we did not consider projects on other Version Control Systems than GitHub. Java is one of the most popular programming languages, and GitHub is one of the most popular code-hosting platforms. This popularity means there are many open-source projects available for study, making the results relevant to a wide range of developers and organizations. Moreover, focusing on only one programming language can help us have a consistent feature extraction procedure that reduces the variant of the result.

Internal Threats: The approach of employing CodeBERT to transform methods into vectors for the subsequent calculation of cosine similarity may oversimplify the complex nature of semantic similarity among methods. This simplification could potentially compromise the accuracy of our semantic similarity assessments. In RQ4, we try to find the ideal length of periods to label the dataset. The set-ups of using how much data to label the dataset we explored are not continuous and are selected by our experience. Although the results of the experiment give us many insights on the selection of labelling time period for training and testing models, it is relatively coarse-grained. Moreover, assigning relevance based on historical changes could bias the results towards frequently modified methods, regardless of their actual relevance, representing a threat to validity.

7 RELATED WORK

In this section, we review the studies related to the usage of co-change relationships in software engineering and the studies on detecting co-change relationships in software projects.

7.1 Exploiting Co-Change Relationships in Software Engineering

Accurately detecting the co-change relationships in software projects becomes a crucial endeavour. Previous research has investigated the application of co-change relationships to enhance fault localization techniques using co-change relationships [28, 29, 41]. The co-change relationships allow developers to figure out what might need to be checked or fixed when making changes to the software [26]. The relationships help in predicting future changes, improving change impact analysis, enhancing code quality and maintenance, and reducing the risk of bugs [44].

7.2 Identifying Co-Change Relationships

Many related works aim to detect the co-change relations in software systems [2, 3, 17, 20, 21, 24, 31]. The evolutionary couplings are explored among the code clones [20, 23, 24, 31]. For example, Svajlenko et al. [31] examine the efficacy of clone detectors in detecting evolutionary couplings in their work and concluded that these detectors are capable of uncovering some evolutionary couplings in software projects. Mondal et al. introduce a ranking schema specifically for evolutionary couplings in micro-clones. Different from the aforementioned work, our work aims to identify co-change methods regardless of clones.

Association rules are used to detect co-change relationships by predicting the evolutionary couplings [24, 26, 44]. However, the set of software artifacts obtained by association rules is unordered, relatively large and contains many false positives [21]. It is essential to prioritize the detection results to provide more informative suggestions to the developers.

Prior work [20, 24] consider two entities to have a co-change relationship if they are changed together in the same commit. However, such a co-changed relationship definition can introduce noisy and false positive labels, especially regarding a fine-grained commit level. For example, when two methods can be edited in the same commit only once in many months, they are labelled as positive but do not essentially have a co-change relationship.

A recent study [21] ranks the co-changed candidates by dynamically selecting the best ranking mechanism. The proposed approach evaluates the ranking mechanisms with the last revision of the code and ranks the current revision by the selected mechanism. However, this dynamic approach does not combine different ranking mechanisms and cannot select multiple features simultaneously. In our work, we want to propose an approach that applies machine learning algorithms to use an optimal combination of the multiple features mined from the software to identify co-change methods.

FCP2Vec [1] uses Word2Vec to vectorize file paths and k-nearest neighbours (k-NN) to identify the most relevant co-changing files based on similarities between the vectors. This approach is fast and easy to adopt. However, it only utilizes the file path and file name for vectorization, which limits the amount of information considered, resulting in performance that is not highly optimized for more complex co-change relationships.

8 CONCLUSION

To help practitioners identify the co-changed methods in a software project, we propose an approach that combines the static features of the source code and the edit history data using LtR models to recommend the most relevant co-changed methods in the pull-request level.

To assess the proposed approach, we conduct a large-scale experiment on 150 open-source projects. We find that the RF model is the best-performing model, reaching 0.8394 NDCG@5. The most important feature of identifying co-change methods is the number of co-changes in history. Our approach significantly outperforms all five baselines by 4.7%, 32%, 573.5%, 81.8%, and 41.1%, respectively. Finally, we find that the model with long training periods (i.e., 90 and 180 days) achieves better performance. The prediction power of the models starts to drop after 60 days of testing data. Therefore it is recommended to retrain the models every two months.

In the future, we aim to generalize our approach to support languages other than Java. Furthermore, we aim to integrate our approach to Version Control Systems by developing an Integrated Development Environment (IDE) plugin.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hamdi Abdurhman Ahmed and Jihwan Lee. 2023. FCP2Vec: Deep Learning-Based Approach to Software Change Prediction by Learning Co-Changing Patterns from Changelogs. *Applied Sciences* 13, 11 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.3390/app13116453>
- [2] Abdulkareem Alali, Brian Bartman, Christian D. Newman, and Jonathan I. Maletic. 2013. A preliminary investigation of using age and distance measures in the detection of evolutionary couplings. In *2013 10th Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. 169–172. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSR.2013.6624024>
- [3] Abdulkareem Alali, Brian Bartman, Christian D. Newman, and Jonathan I. Maletic. 2013. A preliminary investigation of using age and distance measures in the detection of evolutionary couplings. *2013 10th Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)* (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1109/msr.2013.6624024>
- [4] Oscar Alejo, Juan M Fernández-Luna, Juan F Huete, and Ramiro Pérez-Vázquez. 2010. Direct optimization of evaluation measures in learning to rank using particle swarm. In *2010 Workshops on Database and Expert Systems Applications*. IEEE, 42–46.
- [5] L. Breiman. 2001. Random Forests. *Machine Learning* 45 (10 2001), 5–32. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010950718922>
- [6] Chris Burges, Tal Shaked, Erin Renshaw, Ari Lazier, Matt Deeds, Nicole Hamilton, and Greg Hullender. 2005. Learning to rank using gradient descent. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning*. 89–96.
- [7] Zhe Cao, Tao Qin, Tie-Yan Liu, Ming-Feng Tsai, and Hang Li. 2007. Learning to Rank: From Pairwise Approach to Listwise Approach. *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Machine Learning* 227, 129–136. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1273496.1273513>
- [8] Vitor Cerqueira, Luis Torgo, and Igor Mozetič. 2020. Evaluating time series forecasting models: An empirical study on performance estimation methods. *Machine Learning* 109, 11 (2020), 1997–2028.
- [9] James R Cordy and Chanchal K Roy. 2011. The NiCad clone detector. In *2011 IEEE 19th International Conference on Program Comprehension*. IEEE, 219–220.
- [10] Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Xiaocheng Feng, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Bing Qin, Ting Liu, Daxin Jiang, and Ming Zhou. 2020. CodeBERT: A Pre-Trained Model for Programming and Natural Languages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2002.08155>
- [11] Jerome Friedman. 2000. Greedy Function Approximation: A Gradient Boosting Machine. *The Annals of Statistics* 29 (11 2000). <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1013203451>
- [12] H. Gall, K. Hajek, and M. Jazayeri. 1998. Detection of logical coupling based on product release history. In *Proceedings. International Conference on Software Maintenance (Cat. No. 98CB36272)*. 190–198. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSM.1998.738508>
- [13] Francis Galton. 1886. Regression towards mediocrity in hereditary stature. *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 15 (1886), 246–263.
- [14] Yoshiki Higo, Shinpei Hayashi, and Shinji Kusumoto. 2020. On tracking Java methods with Git mechanisms. *Journal of Systems and Software* 165 (2020), 110571. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2020.110571>
- [15] Paul Jaccard. 1901. Etude de la distribution florale dans une portion des Alpes et du Jura. *Bulletin de la Societe Vaudoise des Sciences Naturelles* 37 (01 1901), 547–579. <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-266450>
- [16] Kalervo Järvelin and Jaana Kekäläinen. 2000. IR evaluation methods for retrieving highly relevant documents. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (Athens, Greece) (SIGIR '00)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 41–48. <https://doi.org/10.1145/345508.345545>
- [17] Huzefa Kagdi, Malcom Gethers, Denys Poshyvanyk, and Michael L. Collard. 2010. Blending Conceptual and Evolutionary Couplings to Support Change Impact Analysis in Source Code. In *2010 17th Working Conference on Reverse Engineering*. 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WCRE.2010.21>
- [18] Anton Lozhkov, Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Federico Cassano, Joel Lamy-Poirier, Nouamane Tazi, Ao Tang, Dmytro Pykhtar, Jiawei Liu, Yuxiang Wei, Tianyang Liu, Max Tian, Denis Kocetkov, Arthur Zucker, Younes Belkada, Zijian Wang, Qian Liu, Dmitry Abulkhanov, Indraneil Paul, Zhuang Li, Wen-Ding Li, Megan Risdal, Jia Li, Jian Zhu, Terry Yue Zhuo, Evgenii Zheltonozhskii, Nii Osae Osae Dade, Wenhao Yu, Lucas Krauß, Naman Jain, Yixuan Su, Xuanli He, Manan Dey, Edoardo Abati, Yekun Chai, Niklas Muennighoff, Xiangru Tang, Muhtasham Oblokulov, Christopher Akiki, Marc Marone, Chenghao Mou, Mayank Mishra, Alex Gu, Binyuan Hui, Tri Dao, Armel Zebaze, Olivier Dehaene, Nicolas Patry, Canwen Xu, Julian McAuley, Han Hu, Torsten Scholak, Sebastien Paquet, Jennifer Robinson, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Nicolas Chapados, Mostofa Patwary, Nima Tajbakhsh, Yacine Jernite, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Lingming Zhang, Sean Hughes, Thomas Wolf, Arjun Guha, Leandro von Werra, and Harm de Vries. 2024. StarCoder 2 and The Stack v2: The Next Generation. [arXiv:2402.19173 \[cs.SE\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.19173) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.19173>
- [19] D. Metzler and W.B. Croft. 2007. Linear feature-based models for information retrieval. *Inf. Retr.* 16 (01 2007), 1–23.
- [20] Manishankar Mondal, Banani Roy, Chanchal K. Roy, and Kevin A. Schneider. 2019. Ranking Co-Change Candidates of Micro-Clones. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual International Conference on Computer Science and Software Engineering (Toronto, Ontario, Canada) (CASCON '19)*. IBM Corp., USA, 244–253.
- [21] Manishankar Mondal, Banani Roy, Chanchal K. Roy, and Kevin A. Schneider. 2020. HistoRank: History-Based Ranking of Co-change Candidates. In *2020 IEEE 27th International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*. 240–250. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SANER48275.2020.9054869>
- [22] Manishankar Mondal, Chanchal K. Roy, and Kevin A. Schneider. 2013. Improving the detection accuracy of evolutionary coupling. In *2013 21st International Conference on Program Comprehension (ICPC)*. 223–226. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICPC.2013.6613853>

- [23] Manishankar Mondal, Chanchal K. Roy, and Kevin A. Schneider. 2014. Prediction and Ranking of Co-Change Candidates for Clones. In *Proceedings of the 11th Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories* (Hyderabad, India) (MSR 2014). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 32–41. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2597073.2597104>
- [24] Md Nadim, Manishankar Mondal, Chanchal K Roy, and Kevin A Schneider. 2022. Evaluating the performance of clone detection tools in detecting cloned co-change candidates. *Journal of Systems and Software* 187 (2022), 111229.
- [25] Sleiman Rabah, Jiang Li, Mingzhi Liu, and Yuanwei Lai. 2010. Comparative Studies of 10 Programming Languages within 10 Diverse Criteria – a Team 7 COMP6411-S10 Term Report. arXiv:1009.0305 [cs.PL]
- [26] Thomas Rolfsnes, Stefano Di Alesio, Razieh Behjati, Leon Moonen, and Dave W. Binkley. 2016. Generalizing the Analysis of Evolutionary Coupling for Software Change Impact Analysis. In *2016 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution, and Reengineering (SANER)*, Vol. 1. 201–212. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SANER.2016.101>
- [27] Abdullah Saydemir, Muhammed Esad Simitcioglu, and Hasan Sozer. 2021. On the Use of Evolutionary Coupling for Software Architecture Recovery. In *2021 15th Turkish National Software Engineering Symposium (UYMS)*. 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/UYMS54260.2021.9659761>
- [28] Jeongju Sohn and Mike Papadakis. 2022. CEMENT: On the Use of Evolutionary Coupling Between Tests and Code Units. A Case Study on Fault Localization. In *2022 IEEE 33rd International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering (ISSRE)*. 133–144. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISSRE55969.2022.00023>
- [29] Jeongju Sohn and Mike Papadakis. 2022. Using Evolutionary Coupling to Establish Relevance Links Between Tests and Code Units. A case study on fault localization. arXiv:2203.11343 [cs.SE]
- [30] Charles Spearman. 1961. The proof and measurement of association between two things. (1961).
- [31] Jeffrey Svajlenko and Chanchal K. Roy. 2014. Evaluating Modern Clone Detection Tools. In *2014 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution*. 321–330. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSME.2014.54>
- [32] Chakkrit Tantithamthavorn, Akinori Ihara, and Ken-Ichi Matsumoto. 2013. Using Co-change Histories to Improve Bug Localization Performance. In *2013 14th ACIS International Conference on Software Engineering, Artificial Intelligence, Networking and Parallel/Distributed Computing*. 543–548. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SNPD.2013.92>
- [33] Hamed Valizadegan, Rong Jin, Ruofei Zhang, and Jianchang Mao. 2009. Learning to Rank by Optimizing NDCG Measure. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Y. Bengio, D. Schuurmans, J. Lafferty, C. Williams, and A. Culotta (Eds.), Vol. 22. Curran Associates, Inc. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2009/file/b3967a0e938dc2a6340e258630febd5a-Paper.pdf>
- [34] Feng Wang, Jinxiao Huang, and Yutao Ma. 2018. A Top-k Learning to Rank Approach to Cross-Project Software Defect Prediction. In *2018 25th Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference (APSEC)*. 335–344. <https://doi.org/10.1109/APSEC.2018.00048>
- [35] Yining Wang, Liwei Wang, Yuanzhi Li, Di He, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2013. A theoretical analysis of NDCG type ranking measures. In *Conference on learning theory*. PMLR, 25–54.
- [36] Yining Wang, Liwei Wang, Yuanzhi Li, Di He, Tie-Yan Liu, and Wei Chen. 2013. A Theoretical Analysis of NDCG Type Ranking Measures. arXiv:1304.6480 [cs.LG]
- [37] Frank Wilcoxon. 1945. Individual Comparisons by Ranking Methods. *Biometrics Bulletin* 1, 6 (1945), 80–83. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3001968>
- [38] Qiang Wu, Christopher Burges, Krysta Svore, and Jianfeng Gao. 2010. Adapting boosting for information retrieval measures. *Inf. Retr.* 13 (06 2010), 254–270. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10791-009-9112-1>
- [39] Fen Xia, Tie-Yan Liu, Jue Wang, Wensheng Zhang, and Hang Li. 2008. Listwise approach to learning to rank: theory and algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*. 1192–1199.
- [40] Jun Xu and Hang Li. 2007. AdaRank: A Boosting Algorithm for Information Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Amsterdam, The Netherlands) (SIGIR '07). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 391–398. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1277741.1277809>
- [41] Yan Zheng, Zan Wang, Xiangyu Fan, Xiang Chen, and Zijiang Yang. 2018. Localizing multiple software faults based on evolution algorithm. *Journal of Systems and Software* 139 (2018), 107–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2018.02.001>
- [42] Jiangang Zhu, Beijun Shen, and Fanghuai Hu. 2015. A Learning to Rank Framework for Developer Recommendation in Software Crowdsourcing. In *2015 Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference (APSEC)*. 285–292. <https://doi.org/10.1109/APSEC.2015.50>
- [43] T. Zimmermann, P. Weisgerber, S. Diehl, and A. Zeller. 2004. Mining version histories to guide software changes. In *Proceedings. 26th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 563–572. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2004.1317478>
- [44] Thomas Zimmermann, Peter Weisgerber, Stephan Diehl, and Andreas Zeller. 2004. Mining Version Histories to Guide Software Changes. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '04)*. IEEE Computer Society, USA, 563–572.

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009