

Perspective of Software Engineering Researchers on Machine Learning Practices Regarding Research, Review, and Education

ANAMARIA MOJICA-HANKE, University of Passau, Germany

DAVID NADER PALACIO, William & Mary, USA

DENYS POSHYVANYK, William & Mary, USA

MARIO LINARES-VÁSQUEZ, Universidad de los Andes, Colombia

STEFFEN HERBOLD, University of Passau, Germany

Context: Machine Learning (ML) significantly impacts Software Engineering (SE), but studies mainly focus on practitioners, neglecting researchers. This overlooks practices and challenges in teaching, researching, or reviewing ML applications in SE.

Objective: This study aims to contribute to the knowledge, about the synergy between ML and SE from the perspective of SE researchers, by providing insights into the practices followed when researching, teaching, and reviewing SE studies that apply ML.

Method: We analyzed SE researchers familiar with ML or who authored SE articles using ML, along with the articles themselves. We examined practices, SE tasks addressed with ML, challenges faced, and reviewers' and educators' perspectives using grounded theory coding and qualitative analysis

Results: We found diverse practices focusing on data collection, model training, and evaluation. Some recommended practices (e.g., hyperparameter tuning) appeared in less than 20% of literature. Common challenges involve data handling, model evaluation (incl. non-functional properties), and involving human expertise in evaluation. Hands-on activities are common in education, though traditional methods persist.

Conclusion: Despite accepted practices in applying ML to SE, significant gaps remain. By enhancing guidelines, adopting diverse teaching methods, and emphasizing underrepresented practices, the SE community can bridge these gaps and advance the field.

CCS Concepts: • **Computing methodologies** → **Machine learning**; • **Software and its engineering**;

Additional Key Words and Phrases: machine learning practices, machine learning challenges

ACM Reference Format:

Anamaria Mojica-Hanke, David Nader Palacio, Denys Poshyvanyk, Mario Linares-Vásquez, and Steffen Herbold. 2018. Perspective of Software Engineering Researchers on Machine Learning Practices Regarding Research, Review, and Education. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 53 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

Authors' Contact Information: [Anamaria Mojica-Hanke](mailto:mojomica01@ads.uni-passau.de), mojomica01@ads.uni-passau.de, University of Passau, Passau, Bayern, Germany; [David Nader Palacio](mailto:danaderpalacios@wm.edu), danaderpalacios@wm.edu, William & Mary, Williamsburg, USA; [Denys Poshyvanyk](mailto:dposhyvanyk@wm.edu), dposhyvanyk@wm.edu, William & Mary, Williamsburg, USA; [Mario Linares-Vásquez](mailto:m.linaresv@uniandes.edu.co), m.linaresv@uniandes.edu.co, Universidad de los Andes, Bogota, Colombia; [Steffen Herbold](mailto:steffen.herbold@uni-passau.de), steffen.herbold@uni-passau.de, University of Passau, Passau, Bayern, Germany.

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

Manuscript submitted to ACM

1

1 Introduction

SE is defined by *IEEE* as “the application of a systematic, disciplined, quantifiable approach to the development, operation, and maintenance of software” [72]. Over time, this discipline has refined, improved, and expanded existing software development, operation, and maintenance approaches. In some of those processes, SE has been influenced by other disciplines. SE has been influenced by **ML**, which has been incorporated into multiple software engineering tasks. For instance, ML has been included in tools for assisting in the coding, evaluation, or test processes in specific tasks such as code completion [40, 90], code review [11], automated testing [13], and monitoring applications performance [35]. This influence is also the case in SE research, in which ML has been used in numerous studies that investigate the applicability, efficiency, or usage of it in SE tasks, such as code completion [56], software testing [18], vulnerabilities detection [54], and code representation/embedding [25]. All in all, ML has influenced SE in many aspects; when this is about the application of ML to SE, it is called Machine Learning for Software Engineering (ML4SE) [e.g., 31, 57]. Complementary to ML4SE, when software engineers use knowledge from their tools, methods, or processes in ML, is coined as Software Engineering for Machine Learning (SE4ML) [e.g., 66, 86].

Other aspects of SE directly impacted by the interaction between SE and ML, are the reviewing process of articles and SE education. First, since SE researchers are using ML in their studies, which are being submitted to multiple SE journals [e.g., 2, 49], conferences [e.g., 5, 24, 48], or workshops [e.g., 1, 6], those submissions should be reviewed by a set of people who have experience and knowledge in both topics (ML and SE). We note that this does not mean that the reviewers may not also require additional expertise, e.g., if non-ML baselines like search-based techniques are used as comparison. Second, ML is being included as part of formal SE and computer science education. For instance, ML is being introduced in the in-person curriculum [e.g., 3, 70, 73, 75–77] and online curriculum degrees [e.g., 71, 74, 94] of the aforementioned programs.

In the past years, the SE community has been trying to understand the synergy between ML and SE, particularly ML4SE, by using different approaches to understand and improve it. These approaches vary from the subjects to be analyzed to the execution plan and the conducted analysis. Some groups of studies used as subjects questions-and-answers communities, like Stack Overflow [4], or version control systems like GitHub [39] to gain insights into trending ML topics [17] and challenges when using ML [e.g., 10, 41, 51] by analyzing the data with different approaches, e.g., manually [41, 51] or by using ML models [17]. Another group of studies focused on using existing research as subjects to understand the SE tasks that have been addressed with ML [57, 97] or the ML or deep learning techniques used [e.g., 57, 97] in those previous studies. Some other studies use the authors’ own experience while researching and using ML or while monitoring students’ projects to gather insights about challenges, issues, or pitfalls [e.g., 14, 64], guidelines/practices [e.g., 14, 19, 64], and best practices [e.g., 101]. Another effort to obtain insights into ML4SE and SE4ML about best practices [e.g., 86, 87], ML stages [e.g., 12], mismatches [e.g., 63], or ML challenges [e.g., 12] is being made by studying researchers, developers, and companies as a complement or not to the aforementioned approaches.

All of the previous work has contributed to the body of knowledge about the interaction between ML and SE. However, to the best of our knowledge, there is no study that takes into account the different perspectives previously mentioned (*i.e.*, researchers, educators, and reviewers) regarding the synergy between ML and SE. In particular, concerning the perspectives of practitioners, as previously mentioned, a significant effort is being made to understand their challenges and practices. Nonetheless, a small number of studies focused on practitioners whose primary role is research in SE and on understanding what is understood as best ML practices for our community (SE). Concerning the educators’ and reviewers’ perspectives, there is no study from the perspective of teaching ML in the SE field or from the perspective

of reviewing SE research that uses ML, even though there is an ever growing body of research on such topics. This indicates that this may both be a valuable data source for understanding practices, but also an interesting study object to understand the current state of practice.

Taking into account the previously mentioned aspects of ML4SE and the current work being done to understand and improve that synergy, we propose a study focused on gaining insights into this synergy between ML and SE. In particular, our goal is to contribute to the previously mentioned body of knowledge with an *exploratory* analysis aimed at analyzing: i) which practices are being declared by SE researchers (*e.g.*, practices reported in SE articles or practices explicitly mentioned by SE researchers); ii) what is considered as a best ML practice by surveying authors of SE research; iii) what are the challenges faced when applying ML in SE by SE researchers that are not located in a single company or the same group of authors; and iv) what is considered important when teaching ML in a SE context, as well as v) what guidelines considered when reviewing applications/usages of ML in SE. Therefore, the contributions of our research are the following:

- SE research articles **commonly use practices related to the training of models and their functional evaluation** (*e.g.*, accuracy), **preparation of data** for evaluation (*e.g.*, train-test split), and report on **how data is collected or re-used**, the **usage of baselines**, and **data cleaning** methods applied. Overall, SE researchers use almost all practices mentioned in the literature, except when it comes to deployment, which is only rarely considered in research articles.
- SE researchers commonly also talk about using hyperparameter tuning, the involvement of human expertise in evaluations, conducting exploratory data analysis, manual validation, considering non-functional aspects, and evaluating models in specific scenarios. While all aspects are also sometimes used in research articles, they are not consistently used ($\leq 20\%$ of research articles). This indicates a **gap between what we consider to be best practices and what is used within research articles**.
- The **challenges** that SE researchers face when applying ML **are mainly data-related** (*e.g.*, data collection, ground truth, data cleaning, data quality, and information leaks). Evaluation beyond accuracy, *e.g.*, of non-functional aspects and involving human experts, is also seen as a major challenge.
- Aspects to consider when reviewing ML in SE research cover a wide range of different aspects (*e.g.*, considering the quality of the process followed, checking the validity of the results). **Guidelines from related fields cover many aspects also seen as relevant for reviewing SE research**. However, we identified several **SE-specific aspects, *e.g.*, assessment of non-functional aspects, qualitative assessments, and involvement of human experts, that are not yet sufficiently covered** by existing guidelines, highlighting the need for specific complementary guidelines for research in the intersection between ML and SE.
- The literature and our study both highlight **hands-on activities as an important method for teaching ML** in a SE context. While the literature focuses almost exclusively on such methods, our expert interviews also indicate that traditional teaching methods (*e.g.*, courses, text resources) are considered to be common as well. We also found that our experts put a high value on non-functional aspects of ML when teaching, *e.g.*, human-centered ML.

The remaining of the article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present the related work. This is followed by Section 3, in which we specify the challenges identified in the related work, which leads to a set of research questions presented in Section 4. This is followed by Section 5, in which we describe our research protocol, including materials,

variables, execution plan, and analysis plan. Next, in Section 6, we present the results, followed by a discussion of the results in Section 7, in which we also present the threats to validity. Finally, we conclude in Section 8.

2 Related work

In this section, we describe previous papers that are related to our report. Previous works have focused on four main topics: i) ML (best) practices [e.g., 14, 101]; ii) challenges in ML [e.g., 19]; iii) aspects that should be considered when teaching ML [e.g., 58, 88]; and iv) aspects that should be considered when reviewing SE research/tools/papers that use ML. Note that these topics are interrelated, and previous work could focus on more than one previously mentioned topic (e.g., literature that discussed challenges and ML practices [e.g., 46, 64, 91]). In particular, the first and second topics are interrelated, so they are presented in a single subsection below.

2.1 ML (Best) Practices and Challenges

Parts of the previous work has focused on ML practices and challenges based on their *own authors' experience or experience in a similar environment* (e.g., *a single company*)¹ while teaching [e.g., 64], doing research [e.g., 14, 19, 64], or applying ML [e.g., 14, 19, 22, 46, 64, 91, 101]. Those studies discuss different practices such as “*keep the first model simple and get the infrastructure right*” [101], “*ensure you have a problem that both can and should be solved by AI*” [46], “*correlated metrics must be mitigated* (e.g., *removed*) *in models*” [91], and monitor that “*data invariants hold in training and serving inputs*” [22]. In addition, some studies also discuss ML challenges such as “*data snooping*” [14], “*label inaccuracy*” [14, 19], “*not engaging with stakeholders*” [19], “*statistical and social bias*” [19], and “*data leakage*” [64]. This shows not only interest in understanding ML practices and challenges but also interest in different aspects/steps required for building an ML-enabled system. This first approach, studies based on authors' experience, allows an in-depth understating of the reasons for identifying practices and challenges since they are based on the authors' experiences. However, the experience could be limited to a specific type of context (e.g., specific types of industries, projects, or research).

Another group of studies lists a set of practices and challenges mainly from *question-and-answering communities* such as Stack Overflow or *version control and collaboration platforms* such as Github. Most of these studies mainly focus on challenges/difficulties and issues encountered and discussed on those platforms, studying challenges in different ML libraries [51], problems with the documentation of ML libraries [43], issues in ML libraries [42], and an overview of ML challenges [10]. Mojica-Hanke et al. [69] also investigated posts in *question-and-answering systems* with the purpose of finding best ML practices discussed by practitioners in ML-related post questions.

A third group of studies discusses ML practices and challenges based on the analysis of *previous publications*. In particular, Watson et al. [97] present a systematic literature review on the use of Deep Learning (DL) in SE, describing the type of SE data used, the SE tasks for which DL was used, how the data was prepared, and the DL models used. In addition, Kotti et al. [57] conducted a tertiary study that analyzed 83 ML4SE secondary studies published between 2009 and 2022. In their analysis, Kotti et al. classified the studies according to the following aspects: the SE task(s) addressed, the SE knowledgeable area covered, and the ML techniques mentioned in the studies, obtaining a set of challenges and actions, for the ML domain, that could be helpful for the industry and researchers in the SE domain.

While previous work has made exhaustive efforts to identify multiple challenges and practices when using ML, with the previously mentioned approaches, using only the last two approaches (*i.e.*, extract or validate the information from

¹By this, we mean that the practices were retrieved only from this single data source. Some studies used external experts to further validate these results, e.g., [14].

a piece of written information in online communities or existing research articles), do not allow a follow-up discussion or inquiries, that helps to have a better understanding of the perspective of the authors or their community. Therefore, since our study wants to understand ML and SE practices from different perspectives, in the following paragraphs, we describe in more detail the studies that enable this kind of interaction (*i.e.*, follow-up, verification, or validation) with ML researchers/practitioners.

Clemmedsson [27] presents a set of ML pitfalls extracted with a literature review; afterward, the pitfalls were validated with four semi-structured interviews with participants from four different financial companies with different levels of ML adoption and experience. As a result, they concluded that the main three pitfalls relate to the lack of experience, data and to the preference of short-term solutions over long term solutions in ML projects.

Serban et al. [86, 87] extracted 37 best ML practices and six SE traditional practices from gray-and-white literature. In which their importance and adoption in developer teams were studied via a survey. They distributed the survey using a snowball strategy, starting with their network, then it was also openly distributed through channels used by practitioners (*e.g.*, Twitter, Medium, and HackerNoon). Subsequently, they analyzed 313 [86] and 42 [87] useful responses in order to understand practices' importance and adoption in development teams. As a result they identified that larger teams tend to adopt more practices [86]. They also identified that practice adoption for trustworthy ML is relatively low, in particular, practices related to assuring the security of ML components [87].

While the two previous studies conducted follow-up surveys [86, 87] and interviews [27], after identifying practices or/and pitfalls in literature, both of them were targeted to a specific audience. In the case of *Serban et al.* [86, 87], they focused on ML practitioners with a developers team, and *Clemmedsson* [27] focused on developers in financial technology companies. In our study, we do not focus on the perspective of practitioners whose main role is being a developer, but on a practitioner who is mainly focused on research. Furthermore, we do not distribute the survey in an open approach (*e.g.*, social networks). We use purposive sampling, joined with a snowballing approach, to control the quality of the responses, as well as the target audience.

Lewis et al. [63] studied mismatches² in ML-enabled systems. For this, they conducted interviews followed up with a survey. *Lewis et al.* identified that most mismatches occurred when an incorrect assumption was made about a trained model and the importance of sharing information about it varies depending on the role. While *Lewis et al.* [63] study the mismatches that occur in the process of building ML-enabled systems from the different role's perspectives, we want to focus on the difficulties faced by researchers in general way (challenges) not only due to miscommunication or lack of information.

Amershi et al. [12] studied ML projects in Microsoft. They executed a semi-structured interviews and open-ended questionnaire that inquired about existing ML practices and challenges in the nine stages (see Table 1) for building a large-ML-enabled system. After the analysis of 551 responses of the questionnaire, they identified that traditional challenges and needs in SE differ from the ones faced on ML applications (*e.g.*, “*versioning the data needed for ML is much more complex and difficult than other types of software engineering* [12]”). On the topic of education, they found that while “education and training” were negatively correlated with personal Artificial Intelligence (AI) experience (*i.e.*, people with less AI experience found education and training to be more important than people with more AI experience), “educating others” was positively correlated with AI experience.

Even though the study conducted by *Amershi et al.* [12] has a broader scope, trying to understand essential aspects inside Microsoft when building ML applications, from different perspectives, it is mainly focused on large-scale ML

²Mismatch: “a problem that occurs in the development, deployment, and operation of an ML-enabled system due to incorrect assumptions made about system elements by different stakeholders (roles): data scientist, software engineer, and operations, that results in a negative consequence” [63]

Table 1. Machine Learning pipeline stages by Amershi *et al.* [12].

ML Pipeline Stage	Description of the ML Pipeline Stages by Amershi <i>et al.</i> [12]
Model Requirements	Designers decide which features are feasible to implement with machine learning and which can be useful for a given existing product or for a new one.
Data Collection	Teams look for and integrate available datasets (<i>e.g.</i> , internal or open source) or collect their own.
Data Cleaning	Involves removing inaccurate or noisy records from the dataset, a common activity to all forms of data science.
Data Labeling	Assigns ground truth labels to each record.
Feature Engineering	Refers to all activities that are performed to extract and select informative features for machine learning models.
Model Training	The chosen models (using the selected features) are trained and tuned on the clean, collected data and their respective labels.
Model Evaluation	The engineers evaluate the output model on tested or safeguard datasets using pre-defined metrics.
Model Deployment	The inference code of the model is deployed.
Model Monitoring	The deployed model is monitored for possible errors during real-world execution.

systems, it was focused on a single company (Microsoft), and the educational perspective is a non-traditional education (*e.g.*, workshops, talks, forums). The insights obtained from this study could differ when trying to understand the relevant aspects of teaching/applying and researching ML in a different environment (*e.g.*, non-large scale ML systems, developers/researchers that work on companies not as large as Microsoft, formal training context).

2.2 Aspects Considered when Reviewing ML in a SE context

When reviewing SE research, general guidelines for reviewers are provided by the journals (*e.g.*, guidelines for Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM) [38] and conferences (*e.g.*, guidelines for the International Conference of Software Engineering (ICSE) [81] in which general instructions are presented to the reviewers, such as searching and evaluating for novelty, relevance, significance, (technical) soundness, quality of writing/presentation, and an appropriate state-of-the-art. Similar criteria are also established in the ML community [*e.g.*, 52, 78], showing the importance of those general aspects when reviewing research. However, often, those concepts are not clear [*e.g.*, 83], and are not focused on the particular challenges, practices, and pitfalls that could be present when applying ML in SE.

When searching for more concrete studies that analyze or describe guidelines when reviewing SE studies, it is possible to find some studies whose main goal is to provide guidelines for SE empirical research [16, 26, 55, 83]. From which two of them [16, 26] are the continuation of the main study [83] and will be described together.

Ralph *et al.* [83] present “a brief public document that communicates expectations for a specific kind of study (*e.g.*, a questionnaire survey)”. In this study, beyond general standards, standards for 18 different kinds of empirical studies are included, such as Action Research, Grounded Theory, Repository Mining, and Data Science. In those standards, ML is included as a tool for different types of studies like Data Science and Repository Mining. However, when ML is identified as a tool in studies for Repository Mining, the reader is redirected to the Data Science guidelines. In those guidelines, attributes, patterns, and anti-patterns are presented when ML is used as a data-centric tool to analyze SE phenomena or artifacts. However, ML4SE can also interact in broader aspects than analyzing phenomena in SE. In

addition, since the practices apply to data-centric analysis methods in general, the practices could be broad, and not focused on punctual problems that ML presents *e.g.*, biasing a model or leaking data.

Regarding the complementary studies of the previous study [83], the first complementary study [16] is the formalization of a tool that allows the creation of a checklist for the standards when writing or reviewing empirical studies. The second complementary study [26] presents a tutorial in which the standards for a specific type of empirical study (Mining Software) are described. And the same comparisons made with the main study applies to them.

Kapoor et al. [55] more than as set of guidelines for reviewing ML studies, provides recommendation on how to conduct and report research that uses ML. The recommendations are a consensus of 19 researchers across multiple fields and covers topics from defining the goal and motivation of the use of ML methods, to how to presents generalizability and limitations of the research, analyzing also aspects such as data preprocessing, quality and leakage; model design; computational reproducibility; and metrics and uncertainty.

2.3 Aspects Considered when Teaching ML in a SE context

We have identified previous works that have studied relevant aspects, practices, or challenges while teaching ML at different levels of education, including from kindergarten to 12th grade (K-12) [*e.g.*, 37, 65, 92, 100], undergraduate [*e.g.*, 8, 47, 85] and master levels [*e.g.*, 8, 88, 95]. However, the education levels from kindergarten to 12th (K-12) are out of our scope. Therefore, in the following, we will discuss only the previous work related to higher education.

Huang and Ma [47] studied the use of teaching ML employing an authentic [45] and active learning [20] tool³ with first-year students of engineering disciplines. Some of the insights identified after conducting a survey with the students are i) the students showed a great interest in learning ML when real-world examples were presented; ii) there was a strong correlation between student's interest in learning ML and their knowledge of machine learning applications in their own discipline; and iii) the students appreciate more lectures on complex topics/tasks after they had executed an assigned ML project, than before the project.

Sahu et al. [85] compared two different methods of teaching ML to junior Electrical Engineering students. The first method consisted of stand-alone workshops, and the second one consisted of hands-on activities side-by-side with regular content. This second method enabled the creation of links between the activities and ML concepts. The evaluation of both methods was done via pre-/post tests and a survey. When analyzing the results, they identified that the second approach was a more effective tool for delivering ML content since it provided context to the problem that the students were solving.

Acquaviva [8] summarizes faced challenges and best practices established during years of teaching ML for the Physical Sciences (*e.g.*, Astronomy, Physics, Chemistry, and Earth Sciences) at the undergraduate and graduate levels. In the article, the author includes practices such as i) using mixed techniques, from traditional lectures to hands-on programming exercises, and ii) having a good set of “*materials is not only important for students, who tend to be resourceful and resilient, but also to widen the pool of instructors that can teach*” the subject. Regarding the challenges, the author presented some persistent ones, such as “*finding effective ways to teach across-discipline concepts, such as uncertainty estimation or interpretability.*”

Van der Vlist et al. [95] used the Embodied Intelligence [*e.g.*, 23, 80] method to teach ML (*i.e.*, the concepts of Q-Learning and neural networks) to master design students by embodying the learning systems into Lego Mindstorm NXT, giving the students something tangible to understand and interact with the system. After conducting the case

³public Google site repository and a course project

studies, the authors concluded that having a tangible machine and a positive association with the tool (Lego) motivated the students. In addition, the authors also concluded that *“the students with less technology affinity successfully completed the course, while the students with more technology affinity excelled towards solving advanced problems.”*

Shouman et al. [88] present a report about experiences from teaching two master practical courses, one introductory and one advanced lecture, with students with different backgrounds. The courses were taught via Zoom and had two phases: a teaching phase and a project phase. The authors evaluated the students’ progress via graded homework and project work, and the feedback from the students was provided via an online survey. This survey consisted of multiple-choice questions in which the students were asked about their ML skills, and the different teaching methods used during the courses; the survey also had two open questions for further feedback. After analyzing the results of the survey and their own experiences, the authors had some learned lessons, such as i) coding tasks based on realistic use-cases are successful methods; ii) live coding (by the instructor or a classmate) contributed to a better learning experience; and iii) Jupyter Notebooks are a flexible environment. However, they can result in the inability to work outside them.

Regarding studies more focused on the relation between SE and AI/ML in an educational setting, some studies analyze different aspects, e.g., the usage of generative tools for SE [99], the integration of AI tools in SE education [30, 96]. Other full studies, have studied teaching AI with a special focus on software engineers/computer scientists at the graduate or the undergraduate level (e.g., [9, 44, 53, 60, 61, 67]). Since we are interested in aspects that should be considered when teaching AI to a SE audience, we will focus on the last group of studies.

Acuna [9] discusses the experience of developing a course that introduces data science to undergraduate and graduate students, covering ML techniques. For the course, they map the Software Engineering Body of Knowledge (SWEBOK) v3 [21] areas to specific topics in their data science course. They conclude that this alignment between SWEBOK and data science domains is feasible and provides a context for SE students to learn concepts.

Lanubile et al. [60, 61] present lessons learned from a hands-on course that covers the end-to-end ML component life cycle (i.e., from model building to production deployment), targeted to students that already have experience in ML and SE. Regarding teaching methodology, they identified that the most helpful methodology to learn for the students was the project-based nature of the course and the team work. In addition, they identified that some of the most useful practices for the students were code versioning and experiment tracking.

Mashkoor et al. [67] designed a graduate-level course for students with mixed backgrounds (i.e., students from AI or SE), with the goal of teaching *“how to employ state-of-the-art SE practices to engineer AI-intensive systems”* [67]. This course included lecture-based instruction, collaborative learning and group projects. The lessons learned presented after the execution of the course include that having interdisciplinary groups work, as well as the hands-on approach from real-world problems and peer learning had a positive effect. In addition, they present that both background groups learned new tools and platforms. They also describe that giving constant and constructive feedback also helps in the learning experience.

Kaestner and Kang [53] created a course for higher education but with a different focus to the previously presented related work, Software Engineering for Artificial Intelligence (SE4AI), in which they were interested in teaching *“how software engineering techniques can be used to build better systems with or around AI components”* [53]. After teaching the course, they formulated a number of recommendations, including finding challenging scenarios for the students to seriously consider the efficiency of the system. The use of practical examples was useful, and real-life use/applications of AI should be considered. There is a lack of tooling for emerging tasks in AI and also for data management in an

educational setting. Note that although this study has the opposite focus SE4AI, in their course they teach concepts and present challenges from both areas (*i.e.*, SE and AI), therefore is relevant for our study.

While most of the previous work in identifying key aspects when teaching ML has executed specific case studies for teaching ML in higher education [*e.g.*, 8, 9, 47, 53, 55, 60, 85, 95] or presents lessons learned based on their own experience during years of teaching [*e.g.*, 8], our approach rely on the experiences of educators that have been teaching ML in different institutions during multiple years. This gives us a broader perspective that is not focused on experiences from a single institution or pair of institutions (*e.g.*, two universities).

3 Research Challenges

In this section, we present the challenges (*CHs*) identified in the related work for each of the topics. Our report is aimed at overcoming four key challenges that software researchers face while working on Machine Learning:

- ***CH₁*: Omitting software researchers perspective from best ML practices.** We are not aware of the current (best) ML practices that software engineering researchers consider, report, or use when applying ML in SE. This is due to the fact that the current state-of-the-art does not focus on SE researchers as the main subjects of study, or if it does, it is not based on a diverse curated set of researchers. In particular:
 - *CH_{1.1}*: We disregard the ML practices that are being used in SE research studies when ML is used as part of them.
 - *CH_{1.2}*: We have an unclear concept of what is considered a “professional procedure that is accepted or prescribed as being correct or most effective” [32] (best practice) when applying ML in SE research.
 - *CH_{1.3}*: We do not have a clear idea of what is considered an ML practice by SE researchers.
- ***CH₂*: We do not have a clear picture of what challenges SE researchers face when applying ML in SE** that is based on a curated and diverse set of researchers.
- ***CH₃*: Reviewing software research concentrated on ML applicability.** We are not familiar with the relevant aspects that should be taken into account when reviewing research that is centered in SE topics that use ML.
- ***CH₄*: Teaching Machine Learning for Software Engineering.** We ignore the relevant aspects that should be taken into account when teaching ML in the specific context of computer science or software engineering programs, *e.g.*, when teaching about ML4SE or SE4ML.

4 Research questions

The goal of this study is to understand different perspectives on ML practices and challenges. In order to achieve these goals, and align with the previous challenges, we investigate the following four research questions:

- ***RQ₁***: *What are the ML practices that are used and declared by SE researchers when using ML?*
 - ***RQ_{1.1}***: *What are the ML practices used in SE research articles?*
 - ***RQ_{1.2}***: *What are the ML best practices declared by the authors of SE research articles?*
 - ***RQ_{1.3}***: *What are the ML practices declared by SE researchers?*
- ***RQ₂***: *What are the difficulties/challenges faced by researchers when applying ML for SE research?*
- ***RQ₃***: *What are the significant aspects that should be considered when reviewing SE research that has used ML?*
- ***RQ₄***: *What are the significant aspects that should be considered when teaching ML from a perspective of SE?*

With this set of questions, as previously mentioned, we want to gain a better understanding of different aspects that should be considered when using ML. In particular, ML practices and challenges faced by SE researchers, reviewers,

and educators. In this sense, the study has a main focus on ML4SE. This is due to the practices and challenges that belong to the ML domain and are being applied in SE. However, our study follows a SE4ML approach as the process of identifying and coding the practices needed to answer the questions comes from the SE domain.

5 Research Protocol

In this section, we define the materials, variables, execution plan, and analysis plan of our research protocol. A general overview of the following steps described in this section is depicted in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1. Research Protocol steps and their relation with the Variables (Var) and the Research Questions (RQs).

5.1 Materials

Our study is mainly based on SE research articles published in A^* conferences from 2011 to 2022 and SE researchers that use ML, which we used to identify suitable subjects.

5.1.1 *Subjects.* We have three groups of subjects in our study:





- 📄 SE research articles.
- 📄 Authors of at least one paper in the complete set of the above-mentioned SE articles (👤).
- 👤 SE researchers that use ML.

📄 **SE research articles.** We search papers that match the query “machine learning” in the ACM digital library and IEEE Explore engines in the period between 2011 and 2022 from the three top A^* SE conferences in the CORE ranking [50], *i.e.*, *ASE*, *FSE*, and *ICSE* (see Fig. 1, step A1). Our rationale for this narrow focus on few, highly ranked conferences is that the selection of research articles for these venues is extremely competitive and the rigor of the review process is well documented, meaning that published research articles should follow what the community deems to be good practices. We note that this does not mean, nor do we intend to imply, that this may not be the case for other venues (*e.g.*, high-impact journals or topical conferences). For this, we execute the following queries while varying the venue and the year (*e.g.*, Venue: ICSE, Year: 2011):



- **ACM Digital Library:** Venue: ICSE '11: Proceedings Of The 33rd International Conference On Software Engineering. Search criteria: [All: "machine learning"] AND [E-Publication Date: (01/01/2011 TO 12/31/2011)]
- **IEEE Explore:** Venue: 2011 33rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE). Search criteria: "machine learning"

In addition to this, we execute additional filtering to reduce the number of possible false positives (*i.e.*, research articles that mention the keywords "machine learning" but do not use it) to analyze. We keep the SE research articles that fulfill the following criteria:

- Research articles with at least 10 pages long.
- Research articles that are not tutorials or keynotes.
- Research articles in which it is mentioned/described at least one of the ML pipeline stages.
- Research articles related to software engineering and SE for ML.

This second filtering is done, as previously described, to reduce the number of possible false positives that are analyzed in the following steps in the analysis plan. The first aforementioned criterion is executed automatically with a *Python* script (see Fig. 1, step [A2](#) ), which reads the metadata of the articles and determines the length of each article. The rest of the criteria in this pre-filtering is executed by at least two people per article, and *Krippendorff's alpha* [59] is computed as a coefficient of inter-rater reliability (IRR); see Fig. 1, step [A3](#) . Once we have this *complete sample of pre-filtered research articles* , due to the popularity of the ML topic and in order to have a sample that can be manually analyzed, one-fifth of the research articles is selected with stratified sampling by venue (*e.g.*, *FSE*) and year (*e.g.*, 2011); see Fig. 1, step [A4.1](#) .

We executed a search for over 10 years(2011–2022), executing the queries previously described, obtaining a total of 1398 articles. From this set, we executed the filter of automatic pre-filtering, giving us a set of 1,015 in which we executed the manual round of pre-filtering, obtaining a group of 580 "pre-filtered" research articles. For this pre-filtering process, we had an IRR score of 0.668, which is an agreement level that allows us to keep the data and draw tentative conclusions [59]). To mitigate the risk of noise within our research articles, we further discussed all disagreements between raters to come to a commonly agreed judgment regarding inclusion. With the stratified sampling, we obtained a total of 117 articles.⁴

III! Authors of at least one research article in the complete set of pre-filtered research articles in the SE articles . To identify our first group of SE researchers that uses ML for SE tasks, we sample from the complete list of authors the first and last authors of the complete set of articles identified in the previous subject group (Fig. 1, step [A3](#) ). This is based on the assumption that the first author is the one who contributes the most to a research article. Therefore, they have a better understanding of the research article. In addition, the selection of the last author is based on the assumption that, in many cases, the last author is the principal investigator. After sampling the required authors, we extract the authors' contact information (name and email) using a *Python* script to read the metadata of the research articles. Subsequently, two people look for i) mismatches between names and emails (*i.e.*, the email matches with another author's name); ii) cases where there are different emails per a single author; and iii) empty names or emails (*i.e.*, emails/names are not able to be extracted with the script). In the cases in which the same author has more than one email associated, we choose the more recent one (by using the publication date). Additionally, in the case in which the authors' emails are not present in the research article, we search for the authors' public website. After

⁴one-fifth of 580 is 116, but in order to keep the strata/groups' proportions and doing the corresponding rounding we sampled 117 articles

having the list of SE researchers, we send them a survey inquiring about possible ML best practices that they used in the articles previously identified in the complete set of SE research articles (Fig. 1, step [A4.2](#)), a step that is explained in a follow-up section (Section 5.3).

In the complete set of SE research articles ([☞](#)), we identified 2,792 authors, of which 1,734 were unique,⁵ and on average, each author has written 1.6 articles. Then, we extracted only the first and last authors, which gave us a sample of 829 authors, from which we could identify an email address for 769, which we contacted and sent the survey. From those authors, 58 responded.

SE researchers that use ML. This second group of SE researchers that use ML in their studies is selected with purposive sampling [79] (Fig. 1, step [B1](#)). The participants are academic contacts of the authors, who are influential researchers in the field of Machine Learning for Software Engineering (ML4SE). For this second group of researchers, we send a survey asking for demographic information (Fig. 1, step [B2](#)), and from those who answer, a random sub-sample of a maximum of 20 is selected (Fig. 1, step [B3](#)). Then, a post-hoc interview is conducted with this sub-sample, in which we ask questions related to machine-learning best practices, challenges, and their perspective not only as researchers but also as reviewers and educators. This step, Fig. 1 - step [B4](#), is explained in a follow-up section (Section 5.3).

We contacted a total of 38 influential ML researchers,⁶ from whom 19 responded to the survey. Since the number of respondents was less than 20,⁷ we could not randomly select 20 participants to interview. Therefore, the 19 researchers were contacted to conduct the follow-up interviews. From this, we were able to interview 14 of them.⁸

5.2 Variables

We study seven main variables, depicted in Table 2. This table also shows the relation between each variable and each group of subjects previously defined, and as it can be seen, not all variables are studied (✓) in every subject group. For the Practice variable, we identify three sub-variables: Input, Technique, and Purpose/output, in order to have a deeper understanding of what composes a practice.

5.3 Execution Plan

Once the subjects are identified, as well as the variables studied for each one of them (see Section 5.1.1 and Section 5.2), we collect the data needed for a subsequent step of manually coding the values for all the variables. For this last step, we use procedures from Grounded Theory [89], focusing only on open coding, where concepts and their properties are identified; and axial coding, where connections between the codes are identified. We do not execute selective coding, where a core category is identified since our goal is not to create a theory. This aligns with *Strauss and Corbin* [89], where it is described that a researcher may use only some of its procedures to meet one's research goals. Since we use the codes generated by this manual coding as input for further qualitative analysis, we describe the manual coding as part of the execution plan and not as part of the analysis. In the following paragraphs, we describe how the manual coding is executed, taking into account the different subjects previously described.

⁵If an author appeared multiple times with different names, it is considered as a different author. It can also happen the opposite, two different authors with the same name were considered the same author.

⁶A total of 40 researchers were contacted via email. However, two of the emails were invalid. The researchers were all authors of multiple research articles at highly ranked venues (e.g., TOSEM, TSE, ICSE, FSE, ASE).

⁷20 was the initial number established and submitted as part of the protocol

⁸Of these, 11 were professors or senior researchers in industrial research labs at the time of the interview, and 3 were PhD students in their final year with exceptional track records.








ID	Name	Description			
Var ₁	Practice	The actual application or use of a method [33] used in a ML pipeline.	✓	✓	✓
Var _{1.1}	Input	The input required for the method in order to be executed. For example, the data (including the type) that is needed to train a Random Forest (method). The input can be elements/results of previous steps in the ML pipeline, e.g., cleaned-data, trained model.	✓	✓	✓
Var _{1.2}	Technique	A way of doing something [34]. In particular, it is a way of executing a possible action in the ML pipeline. In other words, the method that is being applied.	✓	✓	✓
Var _{1.3}	Purpose/output	The reason for applying certain techniques which will lead to an output. In our terms, this variable represents the reason (which includes the output) for applying a Technique to a specific Input.	✓	✓	✓
Var ₂	ML pipeline stages	ML stages that are associated to a practice. The possible stages are based on the ML pipeline proposed by Amershi et al. [12]	✓	✓	✓
Var ₃	SE tasks	Software engineering tasks that are addressed using ML.	✓	—	✓
Var ₄	Quality attributes	Properties that a ML-enabled system could have.	—	—	✓
Var ₅	ML challenges	Challenges faced when developing and researching ML including possible difficulties faced when assuring the Quality attributes in a ML system.	—	—	✓
Var ₆	Reviewer's perspective	Important aspects that should be considered when reviewing research articles that use ML.	—	—	✓
Var ₇	Educator's perspective	Aspects and tools that should be considered when teaching ML.	—	—	✓

Table 2. Analyzed variables, including the associated group(s) of subject(s). The group of subjects are represented by the icons, previously defined.  : SE research articles,  : Authors of SE articles,  : SE researchers that use ML.

5.3.1 Manual Coding for the SE articles. This inductive coding [62] process uses as input the sub-sample of articles () and is conducted by a group of seven people (see Fig. 1, step [A5.1](#)). First, the set of articles are distributed between the coders, always guaranteeing that each article is assigned to two taggers. Then, each group of two authors independently code all the possible variables (see Section 5.2) in each of the assigned articles. Subsequently, a third independent author reviews the assigned codes and performs a merge between the two groups of the identified codes. In this case, the merging process is executed with the main purpose of having a complete picture of the possible codes for the variables, e.g., Practice, since one of the coders could miss to identify a code, rather than contradict the other coder. However, since having contradicting codes is possible, the third independent author also reviews the input article and conveys a decision on the codes. This merging process is executed by three of the authors (i.e., mr_{a1} , mr_{a2} , and mr_{a3}). In which one of these authors (mr_{a1}) executes the merging process in all the labeling processes in which she was not involved. The rest of the labeled articles are merged by the other two authors (i.e., mer_{a2} and mer_{a3}), and they merge the labels in which they were not involved (e.g., mer_{a2} merges the labeling in which mer_{a1} and mer_{a3} are involved).

After the three involved authors execute the merging process, we have discussion rounds between two authors for conveying to an initial set of codes that represent the information extracted in the previous labeling process mr_a . Once the initial codes are established, we execute consecutive rounds of axial coding [29, 89] in order to have categories that group the initial codes with similar or related meanings. This coding process enable a subsequent analysis of the variables of interest. Analysis that is explained in Section 5.4. In this process, we executed the the labeling for 117 SE articles.

5.3.2 Survey to the Authors of SE Articles and Manual coding of the Responses. Once the targeted authors are identified (see Section 5.1.1), we distribute a survey^{9,10} with a single open question (Fig. 1, step A4.2), in which we ask them the following question:

“What machine learning best practices have you used in your software engineering research articles, and how often did you apply those practices [Always, Frequent, Sometimes, Never]”.

The main purpose of this open question is to obtain insights about “what is considered a best ML practice” by SE researchers. This implies that we do not go through the articles written by the authors and extract ML practices and ask the authors which ones of the identified practices are considered best practices, nor give them an example of what is a good practice, or answer what we refer to as an ML best practice. While doing this, we also avoid biasing the respondents on what we consider an ML best practice.

To extract the codes from the responses, first, the answers are be skimmed to spot not useful answers (*i.e.*, empty responses or responses that do not relate to ML or that only point to papers). Then, for the remaining answers, in a first approximation of identifying individual practices, we split the responses by line breaks (*i.e.*, enter, \n),¹¹ taking into account of not removing context from each practice. Next, for each line of the valid responses, two authors execute an open coding [29, 89] and axial coding [29, 89] procedure (Fig. 1, step A5.2), allowing the identification of codes and categories for the Practice sub-variables. In the case that the practices are not divided by line breaks, this separation is also done by the coders. Since no structure is be given to the authors about what is a best practice, it could happen that the identified practices only contain one of the Practice sub-variables, and the other sub-variables will be empty.

The survey is sent to the 769 selected authors, from which we received 58 answers. In the first skimming process, we filtered 11 answers as i) they were not related to ML (six responses), ii) they only referred us to external research articles (two answers), iii) they related to ML but did not address the question posed (two answers), and iv) the research article that was a false positive, not filtered in the pre-filtering step (one answer). In particular, for the two answers that were discarded due to the authors referring us to external research articles, we did not continue with an analysis of the articles since, as previously mentioned, we wanted to gain insights about what is considered a best practice (including its structure), and the process of extracting the practices ourselves would break this goal. In addition, during the period in which we conducted the survey, we also received three emails asking for clarifications about what we considered an ML best practice. In these cases, we replied that we could not answer the question since we would bias the answer.



5.3.3 Interview to the SE researchers and Manual Coding of the Responses. Once the targeted researchers are identified, after executing the demographic survey¹² and the random sample of the researchers (see Section 5.1.1) follow-up

⁹For this survey, we did not collect any personal information. An ethics approval was obtained for the Ethics Committee of the University of Passau on 2024-05-10.

¹⁰The question and instructions on how to answer it can be found in the Appendix.

¹¹Based on the indications given on the survey, each line should represent a practice.

¹²Since for this survey we collect personal data, as well as the follow-up interview. This protocol was submitted to an ethics committee.

interviews¹³ are executed; see Fig. 1, step . In the interviews, we ask different questions related to ML best practices, challenges, and perspectives as a reviewer or educator. These interviews are the input for our third process of inductive coding [62]; see Fig. 1, step .

The interview questions are structured in four groups. The first group of questions covers best practices from multiple perspectives, to understand what the researchers consider as best practices and what/why consider to be important. In particular, this first group of questions was an extension of *components of learning* and *learning principles* theory by Abu-Mustafa *et al.* [7]. The second group aims to understand how ML4SE is already impacting education. The third group is regarding the reviewers perspective to understand if there are special concerns when reviewing research on ML for SE. After covering these general aspects, the fourth group follows the structure of the ML pipeline by Amershi *et al.* [12] to understand how the different phases of the ML workflow are executed by the different researchers. Finally, we finish the interview by asking potential follow-up questions.

In order to be able to execute an inductive coding process, we i) record the interviews and ii) generate transcripts of the interviews. We schedule and conduct the meeting via Zoom, a platform that allow us to record the interviews. Before recording the meeting, the required permission to record is requested from the participants. Then, in order to have transcripts that can be coded, we use *Whisper* [82] a tool by OpenAi-Whisper.


For this manual coding, two authors independently code the same 20% of interviews to create a codebook (coding all the variables related to this group of subjects, see Section 5.1.1). This practice has been suggested and used in previous studies [36, 68]. In this process, the two coders meet to discuss their codes to harmonize the code book created up to that point. Since we found after this initial coding that a single coder was sufficient since the coder identified all information also identified by the other coder in the first 3 interviews (21% of the data), the single coder proceeded to code the remaining interviews. Afterward, a second coder double-checked all the results by reading the interviews and checking for the correctness of the assigned codes. Thus, we still had two coders to ensure the reliability of the data but avoided the additional effort of harmonizing the wording of codes.

As previously mentioned, the demographic survey was sent to 38 ML influential researchers, from which 19 responded, and we were able to interview 14 SE influential researchers who use ML. As a result of this process, we have 14 recorded interviews; for each interview, we have an audio file (.m4a), a video file (.mp4), and a chat file (.txt). The audio files were used as input to the *Whisper* [82] tool to generate the required transcript files.

5.4 Analysis Plan

We conduct a qualitative analysis taking as a basis the output of the inductive coding processes previously mentioned. This analysis aim to answer our RQs. In particular, when executing the qualitative analysis, we use only the relevant variables and subjects for each research question (see Fig. 1).

5.4.1 RQ₁ *What are the ML practices that are used and declared by SE researchers when using ML?* To answer this research question, we use the identified codes and categories for the Practice variable in the manual coding with the aim of understanding what is being considered ML (best) practices, from three angles:

- i) Used practices in SE research (**RQ_{1.1}**), by identifying what practices are reported in the SE studies (.
- ii) What SE researchers think is a best ML practice (**RQ_{1.2}**), by analyzing not only the codes and categories but also the existence or not of the different components (sub-variables) of a practice.

¹³The questions of the demographic survey and the script for the interviews can be found in the Appendix.

- iii) SE researchers that use ML (**RQ1.3**), by analyzing the obtained codes and categories in the interviews for the Practice variable.

In addition, for all the sub-research questions, the variable ML pipeline stages complements the perspectives while indicating the stage(s) where the practices are applied. The SE tasks variable provides an additional context of when the practices are being used for **RQ1.1** and **RQ1.3**. Furthermore, since for the third group of subjects (\mathcal{G}_3), we have the opportunity to go deeper and obtain more details, we complement also their perspective (**RQ1.3**) with the codes and categories obtained for the Quality attributes and ML principles. When analyzing the codes and categories, counts of all codes are reported, as well as interesting quotes from the articles, surveys, and interviews.

5.4.2 RQ₂ *What are the difficulties/challenges faced by researchers when applying ML for SE research?* To answer this research question, we use the identified codes and categories for the variables ML challenges and Challenges to ensure quality attributes. Those two variables are relevant for this *RQ* in order to identify the general challenges (ML challenges) that can be found when using ML either for pure research or more application related or to identify challenges to obtain a desired property (Challenges to ensure quality attributes) in an ML-enabled system. When analyzing the codes and categories, counts of all codes are reported, as well as interesting quotes from the interviews.

5.4.3 RQ₃ *What are the important aspects that should be considered when reviewing research that has used ML in SE?* For answering this research question, we use the identified codes and categories for the Reviewer's perspective variable. With these codes, we are able to analyze possible relevant elements and characteristics that should be considered when reviewing a study that uses ML in the SE community. When analyzing the codes and categories, counts of all codes are reported, as well as interesting quotes from the interviews.




5.4.4 RQ₄ *What are the important aspects that should be considered when teaching ML from a perspective of SE?* To answer this research question, we use the identified codes and categories for the Educator's perspective variable. With these codes, we will be able to analyze possible relevant tools and characteristics that should be considered when teaching ML in an SE university context, since we interview SE educators who teach at the university level. When analyzing the codes and categories, counts of all codes are reported, as well as interesting quotes from the interviews.

5.5 Deviations from pre-registered protocol

This study protocol was pre-registered, *i.e.*, underwent a review before the execution of the study. During the study, we modified the following aspects with respect to the original protocol.

- We had two variables related to challenges, *i.e.*, ML Challenges and Challenges to ensure quality attributes. We have merged them into a single variable, *i.e.*, ML Challenges, because the coding showed that the results are overlapping.
- We planned to collect information regarding machine learning principles, *e.g.*, Occam's razor, from the interviews. While we also collected this data, there are only three mentions of such principles within our data, preventing a meaningful analysis. Consequently, we dropped this variable.
- The coding of the interviews was initially planned to be conducted by a single rater after coding 20% of the data if Krippendorff's α [59] is above 80%. We deviated from this to ensure a higher quality of the data: instead of only coding 20% with two people, the remaining 80% were also fully double-checked by a second person to ensure consistently agreed data quality for all of the *interview* data. This deviation increased the effort, but also raised the quality of the *interview* data.

6 Results

During the open-coding of the different subjects, *i.e.*, the  *SE research articles*, the  *survey responses from authors of SE articles*, and the transcripts from the  *interviews of the SE researchers that use ML*, some of the collected data needed to be dropped to ensure a consistent quality of our data (see Table 3).

- 11 survey responses were dropped because they did not respond to the question asked (see 5.3.2).
- 7 research articles were dropped because they were false positives, *e.g.*, because they only mentioned ML but did not study it.




The following results are with reference to the data after removing these invalid data points, *i.e.*, the percentages and totals do not consider the dropped data.

All results are published online in our replication kit.¹⁴

6.1 General Statistics

The coding process yielded 4,107 initial codes extracted from the three subjects across the eight variables (see Table 4). Subsequently, we harmonized the codes (*e.g.*, removing differences in wording), resulting in a total of 3,057 codes. While some variables retained the initial numbers of codes throughout the process (*i.e.*, Var₃-Var₇), as different codes represented different semantic aspects, others (*i.e.*, Var_{1,1}-Var₂) exhibited a reduction in the number of codes. The subsequent axial coding leads to a strong reduction in the counts, *i.e.*, many codes belong to the same category, *e.g.*, different variants of splitting data for for evaluation. This strong reduction is visible across all variables.

As can be seen in Table 4, during the coding process, the variables Var_{1,1} - Var_{1,3} have the highest number of different codes. This is partially because these variables were coded across the three subjects and the expressiveness of the natural language (*i.e.*, an idea can be expressed in multiple ways). However, this also already highlights the many different practices that SE researchers apply. In contrast, the variables ML pipeline stage (Var₂) encodes a specific, small set of concepts and, therefore, less codes.

In addition, during the open-coding, we observed that the  *surveys* had a peculiarity that is not shared with the other two subjects. The practices variables (Var_{1,1} -Var_{1,3}) during the open-coding of the  *research articles* and  *interviews* were coded with the full context of the article or the *interview's* script, respectively. For the surveys this was not possible, due to the short answer that lacked a broader context (*e.g.*, SVM, Adversarial ML, or Hyperparameter tuning). The mean length of useful characters (*i.e.*, text without punctuations and numbers) of a *survey line* (practice) is 53.7 characters, which drops to 44.9 characters when we omit the indicated frequency (*e.g.*, [Always]). This is an artifact of our use of a free-text field, where we believe that most respondents answered in a short manner to save time. Due to this, we discuss the results for the surveys independent from the results of the research articles and interviews, even though we report their numbers together.

Another aspect that we consider during the analysis is the smaller sample size of the interviews: since we have only 14 data points, we cannot expect that all research topics are covered in equal breadth as within the research articles. Similarly, single responses from interviews have a larger impact on the overall ratio of responses coded in a certain manner than for articles: each *interview* makes up 7%, while an article only accounts for 0.9% of the data. We account for this, when analyzing how common the codes for practices are across these data sources.

¹⁴Replication kit: <https://github.com/aieng-lab/Replication-kit-Perspective-of-SE-Researchers-on-ML-Practices> - long-term archive on Zenodo will be created for the final version of the article.

Table 3. Number of subjects available for the study and actual number of subjects coded.

Subject	Initial Subjects	Coded Subjects	Avg. Length/duration
📄 SE research articles	117	110	48.6 min.
👤! Authors of SE articles	58	47	11.95 Pp.
👤🔗 SE researchers that use ML	14	14	259.06 chars

Table 4. Number of codes and categories in the open coding process (*i.e.*, from initial codes to categories).

Variable	Initial Codes	After Harmonizing	Axial Coding Categories
Var _{1.1} Input	597	365	49
Var _{1.2} Technique	1,843	1,457	176
Var _{1.3} Purpose/output	1,293	866	72
Var ₂ ML pipeline stage	14	10	10
Var ₃ SE tasks	118	118	10
Var ₄ Quality attributes	36	36	9
Var ₅ ML Challenges	89	89	16
Var ₆ Reviewer’s perspective	71	71	21
Var ₇ Educator’s perspective	42	42	14

In the following subsections, we will present the statistics per category in the 📄 *research articles* and 👤🔗 *interviews*. For the variables Var_{1.1} –Var₂, the statistics that are presented are normalized counts per category per subjects (*e.g.*, *data* appears 100% in *interviews*, means that the *data* category appeared in all 14 interviews). For the rest of the variables (Var₃ –Var₇), we present the normalized number of appearances in general (*i.e.*, counts/total of subjects). The reason of this, is because the first three variables are asked for all the three subjects, therefore are coded, for the rest of the variables, except for variable Var₂, are only present for the 👤🔗 *interviews* (see Table 2).

Due to the high number of categories and the resulting size of the result tables and figures, all supporting data appendix of the paper.

6.2 Results for RQ₁: What are the ML Practices that are Used and Declared by SE Researchers when Using ML?

We now report the results for the ML practices, *i.e.*, the inputs, techniques, and purposes that we obtained from our subjects. Then, we proceed to report additional data to put this into context in terms of the ML stages that were considered, the SE tasks, and the quality attributes considered.

6.2.1 Var_{1.1}: Input. For this variable, we identified that the the most common inputs, as expected, are related to data which is the case for for both *interviews* and *research articles*. Specifically, the data used for evaluating the ML system, such as *data (ground truth) + results (output)* (👤🔗 =78%, 📄 =85%) and *results (metrics)* (👤🔗 =64%, 📄 =50%). Other types of inputs that can be seen in both subjects are the usage of *code data*, but with a higher prevalence in *interviews* than in the *research articles* (👤🔗 =92%, 📄 =48%). We also observe a high prevalence of using *textual data*, *i.e.*, data in written form that is not only code (👤🔗 =35%, 📄 =41%). In addition, we identified that the *research articles* are more specific with respect to the type of data and models used. The *interviews* discuss this in a more abstract manner, leading to all interviews mentioning practices that use *model(s)* and *data* as input. In contrast, for the *research articles*, these general

categories apply only to 31% and 40% of the *research articles*, respectively, but there are many more detailed categories like *data (numeric)* or *deep learning models* to account for this difference. We also found two categories that are common in *interviews* but not in *research articles*: *unverified labels* ($\mathbb{A} = 42\%$, $\mathbb{B} = 5\%$), and *the problem to be solved* ($\mathbb{A} = 50\%$, $\mathbb{B} = 1\%$).

We have also identified less often used inputs where the categories appear in less than 15% of the subjects. In particular, for the *research articles*, we have many corner cases of categories that are used in less than 3% of the *research articles*, related to a specific type of data, such as *time-series* data, *incident* related data, *categorical* data, and *provided statistics* of an existent data set. In the case of the *interviews*, we also have corner cases in which the categories appear in less than 8% (*i.e.*, a single interview), related to the usage of *metadata*, *unstructured* data and *multi-modal* data (*i.e.*, without specification of data modalities). Other corner cases that are present in both subjects are the usage of *image data*, *screenshots*, *embeddings*, *model activations*, *tabular data*, and *biometric* data as input for a practice in which the related categories appear less than 15% in both subjects.

6.2.2 Var_{1.2}: Technique of Practices. We identified that for the *research articles* *computing accuracy metrics* is the category that appears the most ($\mathbb{A} = 28\%$, $\mathbb{B} = 65\%$), followed by the usage of *deep learning models* ($\mathbb{A} = 57\%$, $\mathbb{B} = 40\%$) and *statistical learning models* ($\mathbb{A} = 28\%$, $\mathbb{B} = 42\%$). Notably, all three are also common in the *interviews*, but here, deep learning is more relevant. We believe this can be attributed to the recent rise in the use of deep learning. Other categories that appear in at least 30% of *research articles* and 42% of *interviews* are the usages of *collaborative knowledge sources*, *splitting data* into subsets (*e.g.*, training and test), and the usage of *existing datasets*.

In addition, we also noticed that *research articles* are typically more specific than *interviews*, regarding some processes that are executed in the ML pipeline. In particular, in *research articles* there is more details when the comparisons with baselines are made, describing the type of baseline models that are being used (*e.g.*, *non ML baselines* (25%), *deep learning baselines* (21%), and *statistical baselines* (17%)). The *interviews* mentioned only the comparison with baselines without further details (21%). This specificity can also be seen in categories that relate to data representations (*e.g.*, usage of embeddings). For example, while different types of non-contextual embeddings appear in *research articles* (*Word2Vec* variant or *use bag-of-words/n-gram*), such distinctions were not made during the *interviews*. Other categories, such as *contextual* embeddings and the general usage of *embeddings*, appear in less than 15% for both subjects.

Regarding the most common categories in the *interviews*, we noticed a focus on categories that relate to the origin of the data and are more relevant in comparison to the *research articles*. In particular, *collecting own data* ($\mathbb{A} = 71\%$, $\mathbb{B} = 30\%$) and the usage of *existing datasets* ($\mathbb{A} = 64\%$, $\mathbb{B} = 12\%$). Another category that appears in almost all the *interviews* but only one-fifth of the *research articles* is *hyperparameter tuning* ($\mathbb{A} = 85\%$, $\mathbb{B} = 20\%$). This is also the case for *evaluating the models in specific scenarios*. This pattern, categories that are common in *interviews* (>40%) and less common in *research articles* (<20%), can also be seen in the categories *involvement of human expertise* during the evaluation of the models, *performing exploratory data analysis*, *manual validation*, *considering specific aspects while labeling*, *auto-labeling* and *training a model*, *removing duplicates*. In addition, qualitative data analysis was mentioned in about one-third of the *interviews* but is rarely used in the *research articles* ($\mathbb{A} = 35\%$, $\mathbb{B} = 5\%$).

Another stark contrast between the *interviews* and the *research articles* relates to *analyzing the problem* ($\mathbb{A} = 92\%$, $\mathbb{B} < 1\%$). This can also be seen with other categories that relate to the problem to be solved, such as *selecting the model based on the problem*, *using ML*, *selecting an approach for evaluating a model*, or *collecting or cleaning data* based on the problem, where the percentage in the *research articles* is always less than 2% and in the *interviews* is greater than 20%. However, this does not automatically mean that authors of *research articles* do not use these techniques, but it could

also mean that they are implicitly assumed and not explicitly reported (e.g., the importance of the problem). Since our coding process only considered explicit statements, this would explain this difference in contrast to other aspects that are usually specifically described in *research articles* (e.g., data collection, training process, and model evaluation).

We believe that similar considerations can be made for other categories as well, even though the differences are less pronounced. The usage of concrete *SE tools* (e.g., code parsers) or *existing tools* (e.g., TensorFlow) is often not part of the text of *research articles*, but rather of replication packages, which were not considered in our study. Moreover, *research articles* typically rather focus on what is being done without explaining why alternative solutions were not considered, explaining differences regarding not using certain techniques. Similarly, when data is re-used, *research articles* often implicitly assume a high quality of data sets without specifically stating this.

In addition, we identified 28 techniques that were not part of any of the *research articles* but were mentioned in the *interviews*. These techniques were mostly on a relatively high level of abstraction (e.g., *select models*, *conduct sanity checks*, *use machine learning*) and were mentioned in at most 35% of the interviews. However, there are also interesting corner cases, e.g., *considering ethical aspects*, using *A/B testing*, and using *model monitoring*.

Besides the already mentioned categories, we also identified some corner cases that appear in less than 20% for both subjects: data manipulation (e.g., *tokenize by words*), how models are evaluated (e.g., *ablation study*, *changing the model* or the *data* used), the *usage of visualizations*, usage of formal concepts (e.g., *use formal data representations*, *formal proofs*), specific types of data preprocessing (e.g., *graph preprocessing*), specific types of metric used (e.g., *model-specific metrics*, *efficiency-cost metrics*), and interpreting the model (e.g., *use explainable AI*).

6.2.3 Var_{1,3}: Purpose. For this variable, the most frequent category is the *evaluation of functional attributes* of the model (👤=85%, 📄=86%). We note that this category includes the evaluation of the accuracy. In contrast, the *evaluation of non-functional aspects* appears in only about one-fifth of the data (👤=23%, 📄=21%). The second most common practice for *research articles* is *data collection*, which is also mentioned by almost all the interviewees (👤=92%, 📄=62%). The third most common category in *research articles* is *comparing against others*, but this was not that common in *interviews* (👤=14%, 📄=47%). Other common aspects in both *research articles* and *interviews* are *embedding data* (👤=28%, 📄=28%) and *splitting data* (👤=28%, 📄=22%).

When analyzing the *interviews*, we could identify that the results often align with previously analyzed variables. In particular, we identified that one of the main focuses of the interviews is *to understand the requirements and possible solutions* (👤=100%, 📄=4%). As mentioned before, this could also be explained by the *research articles* assuming that this is implicitly already done by proposing a solution for commonly known use cases without stating this explicitly. Another aspect that also aligns with the previous variables is the importance of labeling as a purpose in the *interviews*. This can be seen with the appearance of codes such as *to label instances* and *to validate and correct labels* in at least 50% of them, compared with less than 18% in *research articles*. This is likely because data is often rather re-used than collected in *research articles*. The other aspects that are also aligned with previous insights are the stronger focus on human involvement in the evaluation of the model, i.e., *to evaluate model(s) with human judges* (👤=64%, 📄=4%), the consideration of specific scenarios, i.e., *to evaluate model(s) in specific scenario* (👤=50%, 📄=3%), and using *hyperparameter tuning* (👤=78%, 📄=24%).

There are also several new aspects that are more prevalent in the interviews, in comparison to the *research articles*: *extracting and building features*, *handling bias*, *understanding the data*, and *ensuring data quality* with a percentage of appearances between 70%–95% in *interviews*, but only in less than 25% of the *research articles*. The *reproducibility* of the results and the *understanding of the model* are two key aspects that were also highlighted for about half of the

interviews, but they were present in only about 20% of the *research articles*. Furthermore, the experts also frequently highlighted that it is just in general important *to follow practices*.

Moreover, we also identified some corner cases and notable aspects while analyzing these categories. Crucially, *statistical significance* is only a concern for about 15% of *research articles* and was only discussed within one *interview*. In addition, some aspects were only mentioned in the *interviews*, but not observed in any of the *research articles* (i.e., *to monitor model(s)*), or in only a single article (i.e., *to handle concept drift, to deploy a model*). Other corner cases specifically refer to the improvements that the articles were targeting, e.g., *to reduce complexity, post process the output*.

6.2.4 Var_2 : ML Stages. For this variable, we cannot conduct a meaningful analysis between the *research articles* and *interviews*. The reason for this is that the interviews were designed to mention each stage described by Amershi *et al.* [12] explicitly. The only cases where there is no data for a stage in an *interview* were when the interviewees explicitly mentioned that they do not do *Feature Engineering* (1 *interview*), *Data Labeling* (2 *interviews*), *Model Deployment* (4 *interviews*), or *Model Monitoring* model (11 *interviews*).

For the *research articles*, we note that *Model Monitoring* is not considered at all and that *Model Deployment* is only considered in 2,7%. *Model Requirements* is also only present in 13,6% of the *research articles*. This aligns well with our prior results, where this also was not mentioned. Also in line with our results is that *Model Evaluation* and *Model Training* are common and present in more than 95% of the *research articles*. We also manually checked the *research articles* that did not conduct training or evaluation. In three cases, the *research articles* did not train a model and only compared existent models for a specific purpose (e.g., testing if models were reproducible). In four cases, the training phase was mentioned, but no clear practices were obtained due to the short description of it or because it was not clear to the taggers what exactly was done. For *Model Evaluation*, two *research articles* were about approaches for deep learning models, and the evaluation was the assessment of the tool that was not using ML and not the evaluation of the deep learning models. For two other *research articles*, the evaluation phase was mentioned in the *research articles*. However, the taggers did not identify any explicit practices.

When coding the data for the *research articles*, we deviated from the definition of the *Data Cleaning* stage from Amershi *et al.* [12] to include techniques regarding the understanding of the data, under the assumption that understanding of the data is a precursor for cleaning. We also decided to add generic data transformations to *Data Cleaning* (e.g., normalization) instead of to *Feature Engineering*. This was done to ensure that *Feature Engineering* is only about the conscious modeling of features for specific aspects and not just transformations of existing information. Again, the overall frequencies align well with the frequencies we observe for specific techniques in the previous sections.

Finally, we added the stage *Other* to cover SE and research considerations that cannot be associated with any specific stage, e.g., ethical considerations, whether ML is required to solve a problem, transparency on how research is done, and how to make results more reproducible.

6.2.5 Var_3 : SE Tasks. While the SE tasks are not directly related to our RQs, it helps us to understand for which research topics our results for the *research articles* are representative. Please note that we did not analyze this for the interviews due to the small sample size, which precludes a meaningful distribution. Since we do not compare, we report the counts directly.

The axial coding of the SE tasks grouped the codes based on the phase in the software engineering process. The most common phase is *testing* (44 *research articles*), with tasks like “bug localization”, “test prioritization”, and “developers’ perception of software quality”. Additionally, there were 12 *research articles* that directly consider the *testing of machine learning*, with tasks like “deep learning testing” and “XAI for ML testing”. This is followed by the *implementation* (26

research articles), with tasks such as “code source competitive generation”, “automated error feedback”, and “comment generation”. *management* activities were also common (18 *research articles*), with tasks like “incident linking” and “bug report classification”. The rest of the SE tasks relate to software representation, *i.e.*, how code is represented/embedded (6 subjects), requirements (4 subjects), maintenance implementation of ML, team/developer aspects with 2 subjects, and others with only 1 subject.

6.2.6 *Var₄: Quality Attributes*. With this variable, we take a closer look at the quality considerations discussed during the interviews. As expected, considerations about functional aspects (incl. accuracy) were common (71%). However, there was also a strong focus on non-functional properties: reliability, security, privacy, usability, explainability, interpretability, and fairness were all mentioned by at least 21% of the experts we interviewed. Resource utilization and process metrics were also mentioned but by at most 2 participants.

6.2.7 *Insights from the Survey*. As we explained above, the survey answers were overall very short and, therefore, yielded limited insights, which precluded a detailed comparison of frequencies. Nevertheless, the results show us clearly what the first things are that come to SE researchers’ minds, when they are asked about machine learning best practices, without biasing them through any additional information. The data for *Var_{1.1}* (Input) shows that such practices are either about *data*, *models*, or *results*. The techniques are more insightful. Here, *cross validation*, *hyperparameter tuning*, and *using deep learning* are most common (20%-30%). These are followed by aspects like *running multiple experiments*, *considering specific scenarios for evaluations*, *splitting data*, *using statistical learning*, and *handling data imbalance*. While the percentages are lower, the trend that these are most common aligns well with the interviews, supporting their representativeness, even though the survey was intentionally brief and did not even define the meaning of practices.

6.3 Results for RQ₂: What are the Difficulties/Challenges Faced by Researchers when Applying ML for SE Research?

For the second research question, we have only one variable to consider, *i.e.*, *Var₅* (Challenges), that was collected using the *interviews*. We identified six common challenges. The most frequently mentioned challenge is getting the right *data* (64%). Almost as frequent is the challenge of *knowing how to evaluate the model and getting a correct ground truth* (57%). Thus, not only is data a problem in general but ground truth data is also seen as an additional challenge. Additionally, how to best evaluate models even if data is available is seen as a problem (*e.g.*, due to the weak correctness assumption) and because it is difficult to involve human expertise in model evaluations. The interviewees also mentioned that having enough computational resources is becoming challenging and that the speed of innovation makes it difficult to keep up with technology (50%).

In 42% of the interviews, three additional challenges were mentioned. *Conducting studies that involve humans* is seen as difficult due to the subjectivity of humans as well as the costs and difficulty involved in finding a representative sample. The *interpretability and trustworthiness* of the model highlight that the powerful capabilities of ML come at a price, *i.e.*, that we had difficulty understanding why a model behaves in a certain way, which in turn makes it hard to trust the model (*e.g.*, in the medical domain). The *reproducibility and deployability* is also seen as a challenge, as the randomness of training processes and difficulties with sharing models, data, or even deployments must be resolved.

How to *select models* (28%), including considerations regarding model size, how to fine-tune, and how to balance computational time, are also concerns that are raised. This is related to a general challenge regarding the *lack of technology* that facilitates this, *e.g.*, for managing data and implementing specialized models.

Finally, there are also challenges that were mentioned only in at most 14% of interviews: how to make a model *fair*, *model governance*, challenges *intrinsic to the problem* to be solved, *security*, *privacy*, *efficiency in response time*, and *lack of knowledge*.

6.4 Results for RQ₃: What are the Important Aspects that Should be Considered when Reviewing Research that has Used ML in SE?

The data for the third research question was collected during the *interviews* and encoded in Var₆ (Reviewers' Perspective). We identified two categories that appear in 50% of the interviews. The first one shows that the lack of coverage of some areas (*e.g.*, the usage of multi-modal data, debugging, and licensing issues) is a concern that reviewers consider, though it is unclear if this affects their judgment regarding such contributions. The second prominent concern is that the reviewers carefully consider the *metrics* used, including specifications from the *interviews* such as "when metrics are presented, how they are computed should be clarified" or "the usage of just precision and recall is a mistake". This aligns well with the *evaluation of the models*, mentioned in 42% of the interviews. This considers evaluation from a broader perspective, including aspects such as "recognizing the importance of qualitative analysis" and "the inclusion of necessary baselines".




About one-third of the interviewees (35%) mention ensuring *fairness* within models, the *methodology* applied (incl. how justifications and experiment execution), as well as how *usable and suitable for practice* the models are. Of similar importance and mentioned in 28% of the *interviews* are avoiding common mistakes that negatively impact *the integrity of the data*, *errors*, *when selecting a model* (*e.g.*, not exploring hyperparameters), the *reproducibility and replicability* of the results, and the *analysis of the results*, *e.g.*, result tables and if the contributions are clear.

Less often mentioned concerns are checking how comparisons between models are made and the limitations of the approaches (14%). Finally, several aspects were mentioned in only one of the interviews, *i.e.*, looking at *feature engineering* process, checking for *errors during the description of the process*, *not having clear usability*, *errors while describing the limitations*, *errors while doing feature engineering*, the *lack of guidelines*, or a possible *lack of expertise in ML*.

6.5 Results for RQ₄: What are the Important Aspects that Should be Considered when Teaching ML from a Perspective of SE?

We report the results for this research question based on our insights regarding Var₇ (Educators' Perspective) from the *interviews*. The most common strategies are *experimental learning* (64%) combined with learning from *textual sources* (50%), like books, blogs, and papers. Thus, educators focus on students making their own experiences and learning content on their own from textual descriptions. Other teaching methods such as *classical courses* (28%), or *non-classical courses* such as online courses (21%), and *peer learning* (14%), as well as using classical *physical tools* like blackboards (7%) were also mentioned. Our results also show insights regarding which content is considered important: *quality attributes* and *possible issues with ML* are mentioned in 28% of the interviews, 14% consider *result comparisons* or *real examples*, *using pipelines*, *analyzing existing machine learning code*, or *considering the ML use beyond SE* are less common and were only mentioned in a single *interview* (7%). Finally, 21% mentioned that ML should be *human-centered* and that this is also a part of their teaching.



7 Discussion

We now discuss our results in a broader context. First, we interpret the differences we found between our subjects, *i.e.*,  *research articles*,  *interviews*, and the  *surveys*. Then, we compare what we found with the state of the art regarding best practices, challenges, reviewing, and education.

7.1 Comparison Between ML Practices Identified In Research Articles, Interviews, and Surveys

Our results show that both analyzing *research articles* and interviewing researchers can yield a large amount of best practices on how to use machine learning in software engineering. We also observe a large overlap of practices, *e.g.*, evaluating the function performance, the types of models used, data sources, and data splitting strategies. For these overlapping categories, our results indicate that the main difference when studying such practices is on the level of abstraction. *Research articles* report details regarding how to apply specific practices as part of explaining methods in a reproducible manner, making them especially suitable to elicit knowledge about practices regarding data cleaning, feature engineering, model training, and model evaluation. The interviews are often more abstract and rather yield high-level concerns for these stages. However, interviews often discuss requirements on models, which are typically neglected in *research articles*. With our less structured survey, we found similar information as within the interviews, though the level of abstraction is again a lot higher. We attribute this to participants in interviews being more committed in terms of time they invest in comparison to participants in online surveys.

However, we also noted strong differences between what we found in the *interviews* and what we actually observed in the *research articles*. Some of these practices are related to achieving high-quality results, *i.e.*, through hyperparameter tuning and data exploration (incl. understanding the data, ensuring its quality, and handling biases). Other aspects more common in *interviews* are rather related to how results should be assessed, *e.g.*, through the involvement of human expertise and the consideration of specific evaluation scenarios. We note that these aspects were not only mentioned when discussing ML practices within the *interviews*, but also when the reviewer perspective was considered. We believe this shows that the work at the intersection of ML is still maturing, *i.e.*, our community is aware of some practices that should be used and aspects that should be considered, but they are not yet being used consistently.

The data source (*i.e.*, research articles or experts) has a strong impact on what can be learned about ML practices. While the practices collected in  *research articles* give more details in stages like Model Training and Model Evaluation, practices collected in  *interviews* provide a broader perspective of the ML process, from the understanding of the problem to be solved, to Model Monitoring. **Some best practices are often mentioned, but less often followed, indicating a gap between what is said to be done in research and how research is actually done.**

7.2 Comparison to the State of the Art

7.2.1 RQ1 Practices. While analyzing the related work regarding practices, we noticed that different levels of granularity have been used to study the use of ML practices in SE. Some studies, such as those presented by Serban *et al.* [86, 87], present short, explicit, and actionable practices. Other studies present the practices in a lengthy manner, *i.e.*, the practice is immersed in a paragraph that presents a guide or a recommendation, such as the study presented by Amershi *et al.* [12] or Arp *et al.* [14]. Others also analyze parts of the practices, *i.e.*, what kind of inputs, what kind of ML algorithms

or for what are they being used in SE (e.g., [86, 97]). Due to this, we cannot conduct a one-to-one comparison between the literature and our work. However, we can make a general comparison of the category of practices identified.

The input for practices was only specifically considered by two studies [86, 97]. Our results shows that *code data* is the most common data type are consistent with Watson *et al.* [97]. Serban *et al.* [86] does not distinguish between code and other textual data, though we note that they also find that textual data (presumably including code) is commonly used. The literature does not consider other inputs (e.g., images, screenshots), nor specific aspects of the data (e.g., whether the data is verified or labeled), nor do they consider data inputs such as results and models. In this, our analysis of *research articles* goes far beyond what has been established in the literature to date.

In general, the literature typically did not distinguish between the input, technique, and purpose. Hence, we now compare our results $\text{Var}_{1,1} - \text{Var}_{1,3}$ at the same time. Nevertheless, we note that some studies have classified the practices into groups with a general purpose [14, 15, 86], e.g., Serban *et al.* classified the practices into six different classes. However, these groups are too broad and cannot be directly compared to our categories.

Our frequent practices, both from the *interviews* and *research articles*, were also already covered by the literature, e.g., the use of *metrics* for classification tasks aligns with results from Watson *et al.* [97], who actually also finds this in a similar quantity, i.e., of 74% *research articles*. Of the frequent practices, *using baselines* were also studied in previous work (e.g., [14, 64, 97, 101]), in a general way [14, 64, 101] or identifying the different types of baselines based on their origin [97], e.g., benchmark, industry, own baselines.

Interestingly, practices that were frequent in *interviews*, but not in *research articles*, were all also already considered in prior work. The clearest case for this was *hyperparameter tuning*, where we identified it in about 20% of the *research articles*, but it was a common practice for the interviewees, about 80%. This practice has been researched by almost all the studies mentioned in the related work as a practice or as a reason, if not done properly, for a pitfall [12, 14, 19, 64, 86, 97]. *Human expertise* for the evaluation of the models is also supported by previous studies such as the study by Lones *et al.* [64] and Amershi *et al.* [12], which highlight the importance of the domain expertise that humans provide when evaluating a model for the systems in which the ML component is being executed. The importance of practices related to *understanding the problem* is a common topic in previous work [14, 19, 64, 101]. Similarly, *manual label validation* was investigated by previous studies (e.g., [14, 27, 86, 87]), and indicated that the labels should be verified or a rigorous labeling process should also be designed. *Performing exploratory data analysis* is also considered in multiple earlier works (e.g., [19, 64, 97]).

The practices with lower frequencies in both *interviews* and *research articles* were also already discussed in parts of the literature. For example, Watson *et al.* [97] explore different types of preprocessing techniques, e.g., tokenization, embeddings, and vector representations. Other studies describe the importance of ensuring data quality, data cleaning, feature engineering, and sanity checking [64, 86].

In some cases, our level of practices are on a higher level of detail, e.g., for *data manipulation* aspects, like collecting own data, using existing datasets, cleaning data, filtering data, and feature selection have also been studied in previous work [64, 97], but our results provide more details regarding these practices. Similarly, our fine-grained resolution of practices allows us to distinguish between practices for statistical ML and deep learning. To the best of our knowledge, no prior work has made this distinction directly.

On the other hand, the literature also includes some aspects that we have not covered, i.e., practices regarding deployment [14, 22, 86], teamwork [12, 86], and how to conduct research [64]. For the latter two, this is not surprising because such aspects are typically not discussed in *research articles*, nor were questions in this regard part of our

interviews. The lack of deployment practices is due to the fact that our sample simply did not include articles that deployed models in the wild. Overall, we have two takeaways from this comparison with the state-of-the-art regarding **RQ1**.

- i) Our work covers most of the practices discussed in the literature, suggesting that the approach of combining analysis of *research articles* with *interviews* is effective in identifying best practices. Moreover, through this approach, we identified the most comprehensive view of practices in the literature, although we have a blind spot for understudied topics such as deployment.
- ii) The often-mentioned but less-often followed best practices that we observed in the *interviews* are all already part of the existing literature on best practices, further reinforcing that there seems to be a gap between what we know about best practices and what we do.

7.2.2 RQ2 Challenges. The most frequently identified category includes challenges related to data, which are also frequently mentioned by previous work [10, 14, 19, 51, 63, 64, 91], and encompass different aspects such as data collection and having enough data [12, 19], data leakage and data snooping [14, 64], and aspects related to data cleaning and manipulation in general [10, 27, 51, 91]. Other types of challenges related to data management, but are not covered by the challenges identified in our study, relate to challenges that encompass an operational environment, like the challenges identified by studies that also analyze the ML more in-depth in a production environment [27, 58, 63] e.g., miscommunications on which data version is used in the training or evaluation process [63] or the inclusion of new data [58]. Most of the other challenges were also considered in a similar manner in the literature, though typically not as broadly as concerns related to data, e.g., regarding the interpretation of ML models, causing pitfalls (e.g., [91]), reproducibility and model deployment (e.g., [10, 91]), selecting a model (e.g., [14, 51, 64, 91]), lack of technology (e.g., [12, 51]), problem intrinsic challenges (e.g., [14, 19, 64]), lack of knowledge (e.g., [27, 58]), security (e.g., [14]), fairness (e.g., [12]), and privacy challenges (e.g., [15]). This indicates that our interviews were representative and that our experts were knowledgeable regarding the challenges of using ML.

Moreover, our experts partially went beyond the already reported challenges from the literature. For *ground truth and evaluation* of the models, despite of being also present in previous studies, our interviewees had a different focus. Previous studies present the challenges related to the evaluation encompassing different topics such as “how to execute evaluation” [91], e.g., cross validation; “how is the model compared to baselines [14, 19], e.g., “compare with suitable baselines”; or selecting the proper metrics [19]. However, our work identified additional challenges, i.e., i) building a ground truth, an be sure that it is correct, and 2) the complexity of testing ML models due to their approximate nature.

Similarly, for challenges related to *resources needed/used*, the related work presents a more operational perspective on the availability of the resources across the different stages of the ML life cycle (e.g., [15, 58, 63]). In contrast, our expert also highlight that e.g., “have access to computational resources in academia” is an additional problem for researchers, as well as “keeping up to date with the technology” due to the fast-paced innovation.

Further, our experts highlight an aspect that was neglected by prior studies on ML challenges: the human-centered perspective. Our interviews showed that this is indeed an important aspect because concerns like finding a representative population that evaluates a tool and dealing with the subjectivity of human evaluations, as well as the costs associated with recruitment, are important for a holistic perspective.

However, we note that our study, which focused on involving researchers, has blind spots when it comes to challenges specific to the operation of ML systems or their development in the industry. Studies that focus on this direction identified additional challenges in this regard (e.g., [15, 58, 63, 86, 91]). Similarly, through this focus, we were also not

able to identify challenges that result from differences between communities, like the ones identified by Kotti *et al.* [57], in which the main focus of the study are challenges that are presented to the ML community from the SE community.

Dealing with data (incl. data collection, ground truth data, data cleaning, ensuring data quality, and preventing information leaks) are most commonly seen as the main challenge for ML in SE, though thorough evaluations that consider not only functional aspects (*e.g.*, accuracy), but also non-function aspects and the involvement of humans in the evaluation are also seen as difficult.

7.2.3 **RQ₃ Reviewer’s perspective.** Our results mostly overlap with common recommendations from the literature. Many aspects that are mentioned (*e.g.*, *process and methodology, description of the data sources and manipulation, data integrity and contamination, model selection, and metrics, conclusions of the research, reproducibility*) are also discussed in the literature as patterns to be followed [55, 83]. Interestingly, the literature also sometimes directly recommends practices to follow [55], together with such recommendations. In our work, practices were a separate consideration, but this shows that studying the reviewer’s perspective is closely aligned with considerations regarding what is a best practice and is often hard to distinguish.

For the *metrics*, our *interviews* go beyond the recommended practices. While for previous studies is important to justify the suitability of a metric for the specific problem [55, 83], our experts also highlighted the usage of different quality attributes and the inclusion of metrics that are being used by the community. Aligned with this, our experts also describe the importance of reviewing the evaluation process of the model and not only the description of the process [55, 83] or the inclusion of baselines (*e.g.*, [55]), but also the importance of usage of qualitative and quantitative analysis of the results, to have a more complete evaluation and understanding of the model. Related to this, our experts also mentioned additional evaluation criteria, *i.e.*, that a use case is described and that fairness characteristics are considered. Both aspects are not yet part of the guidelines we found in the literature. Moreover, we note that while there is a big overlap between our experts and the literature, there are also concerns that were not covered in our interview, *e.g.*, data selection and data description [55, 83].

Finally, we observe that the experts in our *interviews* also mentioned some general observations that are not directly actionable advice, but that may be important for the SE community to consider. These aspects include the observation that some research areas are not as well covered as others, *e.g.*, licensing issues related to models or reverse engineering; also, they believe we have a *lack of guidelines* (*e.g.*, for doing prompting engineering) and also that we may have *lack of expertise* for ML niche areas. The last point may be (at least partially) related to a recent editorial, in which the editorial board of a large SE journal frames which aspects of research in the intersection of ML and SE are suitable for a SE venue [93].

We already have very good guidelines in the literature [55, 83], but some aspects still require consideration, *e.g.*, regarding qualitative analysis or non-function properties like fairness. Moreover, there are concerns regarding the expertise of SE researchers for reviewing papers using ML.

7.2.4 **RQ₄ Educators’ perspectives.** The most common category identified from the educators’ perspective was *experiential learning*, which includes all possible activities where students learned through their own experience or through the experience of others. This means that activities such as developing a project or hands-on activities are also included. This category is commonly studied by the related work [8, 9, 47, 53, 60, 67, 85, 88], in which the designed courses or the experience in regular lectures include the execution of project or real-world applications. Using real-life examples was

not often mentioned specifically mentioned by our experts, but is frequent in the literature (e.g., [47, 53, 60, 67, 85]). This could be related to the fact that in most of the aforementioned studies, the use of real-world examples was linked to practical activities. In our study, real-life examples were often mentioned together with challenges (see Section 7.2.2), so it is possible that this was not specifically mentioned for education as the topic was already discussed. We note that in two studies on education, real-world examples were also used as a separate challenge [47, 53]. In the literature, these experimental learning methods are typically combined with *peer-learning* [53, 60, 67, 88], e.g., group work or students given feedback to each other. However, this additional as experimental learning was only mentioned in two of our interviews (14%).

Other teaching methods, i.e., *classical courses* (e.g., seminars, regular university lectures), *non-classical courses* (e.g., online courses), and *text learning resources* were all mentioned frequently in our interviews, especially text learning. These were not considered in the related work. A possible explanation is that the related work focuses on novel teaching concepts that can replace or extend such a course and textbook-style learning.

We also observed differences regarding special considerations with respect to the content being taught between the literature and our expert interviews. Our experts mentioned aspects like *quality attributes*, *ML as a human-centered technology*, and *showing common issues and gaps*. In contrast, the literature rather considered the inclusion of state of the art *ML tools*, e.g., for data management and tracking of experiments [53, 60, 67, 88, 95]. However, we note that we did not specifically ask for topics on such a granular level. Other considerations from the literature are also *how to give feedback to students* [67] and getting students interested in ML tasks [47, 53]. This indicates that, on the one hand, the literature should possibly explore more aspects regarding ML education (e.g., quality attributes and human-centered technologies). On the other hand, ML education from a SE perspective is still evolving, and educators may not be aware of all the new concepts and ideas that are being developed. This is in contrast to other teaching aspects that are more stable (e.g., software design, software testing, software processes).

Hands-on teaching with experimental learning is most common, though our interviews also highlight that many people are still using traditional teaching methods like courses and text resources.

7.3 Threats to Validity

We report the threats to the validity of our work following the classification by [28] suggested for software engineering by [98]. Additionally, we discuss the reliability as suggested by [84].

7.3.1 Construct Validity. The first major threat to the construct of our work is the assumption that research articles, interviews, and surveys are suitable sources for eliciting information about ML best practices from SE researchers. For research articles, we believe that such a threat is negligible, as research articles have to declare what is done in their methods sections. For interviews and surveys, this depends on the subject selection. In our interviews, we target known experts through a purposive sample, i.e., researchers who frequently participate in program committees of high-level conferences, who are (partially) on editorial boards of highly-ranked journals, and who published themselves at these venues on topics in the intersection of ML and SE. Consequently, we believe our assumption that these are good sources of information on best practices is reasonable. For the surveys, the subjects were collected from research articles at influential venues, i.e., from researchers who managed to apply practices in such a manner, that their work passed the rigorous peer-review processes. Again, we believe that this is a suitable indicator that these are suitable sources to mitigate this threat.

The second major threat to our construct is how we collect data from these sources. We structured the data collection through well-defined variables to guide the data collection process in mitigating threats regarding which information is collected. For the collection of data from the research articles, all taggers were provided with spreadsheets that contained detailed guidance regarding each variable, *i.e.*, how it should be collected and coded. To further reduce the risk of missing information, all research articles were considered by two authors. For the interviews, we followed a detailed script that ensured complete coverage of both the ML pipeline and our variables. The construct of the survey through a single question has the threat that it is too simple to elicit detailed knowledge about ML practices. This threat also manifested in our data and led to a limited usefulness of the survey data. However, any additional structuring that would still allow for a quick completion of the survey (*e.g.*, checkboxes for pre-defined practices) would bias the results. Additional structuring of the survey, *e.g.*, through multiple free-text fields, one for each pipeline stage, would have biased the results as some participants may have added practices that they never used to not leave fields empty and also likely have reduced the rate of responses, due to the additional effort. Finally, we decided to give none of the human subjects a definition for what constitutes a (best) practice. This introduces the risk that aspects unrelated to practices are described. However, based on our data, this did not happen.

Our construct underwent rigorous peer review prior to the execution of the study through pre-registration, further mitigating the above risk through the early involvement of external expertise.

7.3.2 Internal Validity. We do not see major concerns about the internal validity of our work. The results we report are derived directly from the data. The conclusion that there is a gap between what is said in the interviews and what we observe in the data is directly supported by this.

7.3.3 External Validity. While we want to identify the different perspectives about ML, including challenges and practices when applying ML, our selection of subjects may introduce bias due to the studied time frame for the SE articles and the authors of these SE research articles, the focus on few, highly-ranked SE venues, and the purposive sample for SE influential researchers. Our approach may exclude relevant aspects that are not considered in the studies analyzed during the established time frame, the perspective of SE researchers that were not first or last authors in the studied research articles or with different level of experience than the ones selected in the purposive sample, we may also miss practices that are not present in English literature. Therefore, we cannot claim that we identified all practices nor that results regarding the prevalence generalize to all contexts. We mitigate this threat by considering a large scope, *i.e.*, 110 research articles published between 2011-2023 at top SE conferences, incl. the authors of these research articles and the deep expertise of the interview participants. We further note that our comparison with related work showed large overlaps, supporting the expertise of our subjects.

7.3.4 Reliability. Our study heavily relied on human expertise, which threatens the reliability of our work, *i.e.*, it is possible that the involvement of different taggers would lead to different results. To mitigate these threats, we provided documentation to everybody involved regarding what exactly to do. Additionally, we build in quality checks through the data collection and analysis pipeline to reduce the reliance on the expertise of a single person: i) all research articles that were candidates for inclusion were checked by two researchers and disagreements were discussed; ii) all research articles were tagged by two independent researchers; iii) the merging of the data from the two researchers was conducted by a third researcher, who also double checked the correctness in case of diverging codes (missing on one side or contradictions); iv) all harmonization of codes and all axial categorizations were checked by at least two authors; and v) all data for the interviews was double checked by an author, that was neither involved in the interviews, nor in

the coding of the interviews. Additionally, the protocol we followed to ensure this reliability underwent rigorous peer review prior to the execution of the study through pre-registration, with the goal of identifying possible weaknesses in our procedure early.

8 Conclusion

Within this study, we increase our understanding of what practices are used when ML is applied in an SE context. We found that SE researchers use a wide range of practices, covering almost all the best practices identified in the previous literature. The most common were practices directly related to the core of a machine learning pipeline, *i.e.*, training a model and the computation of accuracy metrics, as well as aspects related to collecting and splitting data. We also found a gap regarding the prevalence of some techniques that are deemed ubiquitously important in both the literature as well as in our expert interviews. Especially hyperparameter tuning is always mentioned as a best practice but was only used in 20% of the research articles we considered. Similarly, human involvement in evaluation, manual data validation, or exploratory data analysis are typically mentioned as best practices, but not always used. When it comes to challenges, SE researchers consider it especially challenging to deal with data (collection, quality, processing), but evaluation is also a commonly mentioned challenge, especially involving humans. We found that these considerations are very similar to reviewing ML/SE work, where our expert interviews aligned well with already existing guidelines. However, we identified several aspects that either require updates to existing guidelines or additional guidelines for this context, *e.g.*, regarding the evaluation of non-functional quality attributes. When SE researchers are involved in teaching activities that involve ML, they typically rely on experimental, hands-on work, which aligns well with the literature. However, traditional teaching methods, like courses and text sources are also mentioned as relevant methods. The focus of SE researchers seems to go beyond what is currently considered in the literature, as human involvement and non-functional properties are also seen as important during teaching.

Our work opens many possible venues for future work. On the one hand, we demonstrated that studying a large sample of research articles augmented with expert interviews is a good method to collect a broad selection of practices, with the exception being practices regarding deployment, because this is typically not considered by researchers. Future work could investigate why deployments are not studied more often and ideally develop countermeasures to ensure that more research addresses this important activity. Similar considerations can also be made for techniques that are deemed important, but not often used. We need to better ensure that hyperparameters are tuned and determine why we do not involve human subjects more often in the evaluation of our work, even though this is deemed critical. Similarly, we should develop concrete practices that incorporate the assessment of non-functional quality attributes in the evaluation of ML models, such that this becomes as common as measuring accuracy. Review guidelines should be updated to incorporate that and mitigate concerns regarding lack of expertise. Finally, we want to highlight the stunningly low presence of statistical methods in many research articles. They were also not often mentioned in interviews and are missing from many guidelines and sets of best practices. We need to investigate why this is the case and improve guidelines, the state of practice, and the sets of best practices, to ensure that our research is based on sound methods.

References

- [1] 2022. The ICSE 23 Workshop on Cloud Intelligence /AIOps. <https://cloudintelligenceworkshop.org/CFP.html>
- [2] 2023. Empirical Software Engineering Journal. <https://www.springer.com/journal/10664/updates/19597712>
- [3] 2023. Instituto de Ciências Matemáticas e de Computação, Bacharelado em Ciências de Computação. <https://uspdigital.usp.br/jupiterweb/listarGradeCurricular?codcg=55&codcur=55041&codhab=0&tipo=N>
- [4] 2023. Stack overflow. <https://stackoverflow.com/>

- [5] ESEC/FSE 2023. 2022. ESEC/FSE 2023 - research papers - ESEC/FSE 2023. <https://2023.esec-fse.org/track/fse-2023-research-papers>
- [6] A-test2023. 2022. The workshop will be held in Kirchberg, Luxembourg. <https://a-test.org/>
- [7] Yaser S Abu-Mostafa, Malik Magdon-Ismail, and Hsuan-Tien Lin. [n. d.]. Learning from data - A short course. <https://amlbook.com/>
- [8] Viviana Acquaviva. 2022. Teaching Machine Learning for the Physical Sciences: A summary of lessons learned and challenges. In *Proceedings of the Second Teaching Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence Workshop*. PMLR, 35–39.
- [9] Ruben Acuña. 2023. Developing a Data Science Course to Support Software Engineering Students. In *2023 IEEE 35th International Conference on Software Engineering Education and Training (CSEE&T)*. IEEE, 127–131.
- [10] M. Alshangiti, H. Sapkota, P. K. Murukannaiah, X. Liu, and Q. Yu. 2019. Why is Developing Machine Learning Applications Challenging? A Study on Stack Overflow Posts. In *2019 ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement (ESEM)*. 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ESEM.2019.8870187>
- [11] Amazon. 2023. *codeguru*. <https://aws.amazon.com/codeguru/>
- [12] Saleema Amershi, Andrew Begel, Christian Bird, Robert DeLine, Harald Gall, Ece Kamar, Nachiappan Nagappan, Besmira Nushi, and Thomas Zimmermann. 2019. Software engineering for machine learning: A case study. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice (ICSE-SEIP)*. IEEE, 291–300.
- [13] Applitools. 2023. *Applitools (V.1)*. <https://applitools.com/>
- [14] Daniel Arp, Erwin Quiring, Feargus Pendlebury, Alexander Warnecke, Christian Wressnegger, Lorenzo Cavallaro, and Konrad Rieck. 2022. Dos and Don'ts of Machine Learning in Computer Security. In *Proc. of USENIX Security Symposium*.
- [15] Anders Arpteg, Björn Brinne, Luka Crmkovic-Friis, and Jan Bosch. 2018. Software Engineering Challenges of Deep Learning. In *2018 44th Euromicro Conference on Software Engineering and Advanced Applications (SEAA)*. 50–59. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SEAA.2018.00018>
- [16] Arham Arshad, Taher Ghaleb, and Paul Ralph. 2021. Towards a More Structured Peer Review Process with Empirical Standards. In *Evaluation and Assessment in Software Engineering*. 353–358.
- [17] Abdul Ali Bangash, Hareem Sahar, Shaiful Chowdhury, Alexander William Wong, Abram Hindle, and Karim Ali. 2019. What do developers know about machine learning: a study of ml discussions on stackoverflow. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 16th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. IEEE, 260–264.
- [18] Antonia Bertolino, Antonio Guerriero, Breno Miranda, Roberto Pietrantuono, and Stefano Russo. 2020. Learning-to-rank vs ranking-to-learn: Strategies for regression testing in continuous integration. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1–12.
- [19] Stella Biderman and Walter J Scheirer. 2020. Pitfalls in machine learning research: Reexamining the development cycle. (2020).
- [20] Charles C Bonwell and James A Eison. 1991. *Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom*. 1991 ASHE-ERIC higher education reports. ERIC.
- [21] Pierre Bourque. 2014. <https://ieeecs-media.computer.org/media/education/swebok/swebok-v3.pdf>
- [22] Eric Breck, Shanqing Cai, Eric Nielsen, Michael Salib, and D Sculley. 2017. The ML test score: A rubric for ML production readiness and technical debt reduction. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. IEEE, 1123–1132.
- [23] Rodney A Brooks. 1991. Intelligence without representation. *Artificial intelligence* 47, 1-3 (1991), 139–159.
- [24] CAIN2023. 2022. Cain 2023 - Papers - Cain 2023. <https://conf.researchr.org/track/cain-2023/cain-2023-call-for-papers>
- [25] Saikat Chakraborty, Toufique Ahmed, Yangruibo Ding, Premkumar T. Devanbu, and Baishakhi Ray. 2022. NatGen: Generative Pre-Training by “naturalizing” Source Code. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE 2022)*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3540250.3549162>
- [26] Preetha Chatterjee, Tushar Sharma, and Paul Ralph. 2022. Empirical standards for repository mining. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories*. 142–143.
- [27] Elin Clemmedsson. 2018. *Identifying Pitfalls in Machine Learning Implementation Projects - A Case Study of Four Technology-Intensive Organizations*. MA Thesis. Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), SE-100 44 STOCKHOLM.
- [28] Thomas D Cook, Donald Thomas Campbell, and Arles Day. 1979. *Quasi-experimentation: Design & analysis issues for field settings*. Vol. 351. Houghton Mifflin Boston.
- [29] Juliet Corbin et al. 1990. Basics of qualitative research grounded theory procedures and techniques. (1990).
- [30] Marian Daun and Jennifer Brings. 2023. How ChatGPT will change software engineering education. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education V. 1*. 110–116.
- [31] Davide Dell’Anna, Fatma Başak Aydemir, and Fabiano Dalpiaz. 2023. Evaluating classifiers in SE research: the ECSE pipeline and two replication studies. *Empirical Software Engineering* 28, 1 (2023), 3.
- [32] Oxford English Dictionary. 2023. best practice, n. https://oed.com/dictionary/best-practce_n
- [33] Oxford English Dictionary. 2023. practice, n. <https://oed.com/view/Entry/149226?rkey=GK6Iqx&result=1&isAdvanced=false>
- [34] Oxford English Dictionary. 2023. technique. <https://oed.com/view/Entry/198458?redirectedFrom=technique>
- [35] Dynatrace LLC. 2023. *dynatrace - Davis (V.1)*. <https://www.dynatrace.com/platform/aiops/>
- [36] Glen H Elder, Eliza K Pavalko, and Elizabeth Colerick Clipp. 1993. *Working with archival data: Studying lives*. Vol. 88. Sage.
- [37] Hanya Elhashemy, Harold Abelson, and Tilman Michaeli. 2024. Adapting Computational Skills for AI Integration. In *2024 36th International Conference on Software Engineering Education and Training (CSEE&T)*. IEEE, 1–5.

- [38] Association for Computing Machinery. 2023. ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology Reviewers: ACM Digital Library. <https://dl.acm.org/journal/tosem/reviewers#iagfr>
- [39] github. 2020. GitHub. <https://github.com/>
- [40] Github and OpenAI. 2023. *GitHub copilot (V.1.100.0.0)*. <https://github.com/features/copilot/>
- [41] Alaleh Hamidi, Giuliano Antoniol, Foutse Khomh, Massimiliano Di Penta, and Mohammad Hamidi. 2021. Towards understanding developers' machine-learning challenges: A multi-language study on stack overflow. In *2021 IEEE 21st International Working Conference on Source Code Analysis and Manipulation (SCAM)*. IEEE, 58–69.
- [42] Junxiao Han, Emad Shihab, Zhiyuan Wan, Shuiguang Deng, and Xin Xia. 2020. What do Programmers Discuss about Deep Learning Frameworks. *Empirical Software Engineering* 25 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-020-09819-6>
- [43] Y. Hashemi, M. Nayebi, and G. Antoniol. 2020. Documentation of Machine Learning Software. In *2020 IEEE 27th International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*. 666–667. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SANER48275.2020.9054844>
- [44] Petra Heck and Gerard Schouten. 2021. Lessons learned from educating AI engineers. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 1st Workshop on AI Engineering-Software Engineering for AI (WAIN)*. IEEE, 1–4.
- [45] Jan Herrington. 2005. *Authentic learning environments in higher education*. IGI Global.
- [46] Angela Horneman, Andrew Mellinger, and Ipek Ozkaya. 2020. *AI Engineering: 11 Foundational Practices*. Technical Report. Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh United States.
- [47] Lei Huang and Kuo-Sheng Ma. 2018. Introducing Machine Learning to First-year Undergraduate Engineering Students Through an Authentic and Active Learning Labware. In *2018 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE)*. 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE.2018.8659308>
- [48] ICSE2024. 2023. <https://conf.researchr.org/track/icse-2024/icse-2024-research-track>
- [49] IEEE202. 202AD. CSDL: IEEE Computer Society. <https://www.computer.org/csdl/journal/ts>
- [50] CORE INC. 2023. Core Rankings Portal. <https://www.core.edu.au/conference-portal>
- [51] M. J. Islam, H. Nguyen, Rangeet Pan, and H. Rajan. 2019. What Do Developers Ask About ML Libraries? A Large-scale Study Using Stack Overflow. *ArXiv abs/1906.11940* (2019).
- [52] Devon Journal of Machine Learning Research. 2023. Guidelines for JMLR reviewers. <https://www.jmlr.org/reviewer-guide.html>
- [53] Christian Kaestner and Eunsuk Kang. 2020. Teaching software engineering for AI-enabled systems. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering Education and Training*. 45–48.
- [54] Misha Kakkar, Sarika Jain, Abhay Bansal, and PS Grover. 2021. Combining data preprocessing methods with imputation techniques for software defect prediction. In *Research Anthology on Recent Trends, Tools, and Implications of Computer Programming*. IGI Global, 1792–1811.
- [55] Sayash Kapoor, Emily M Cantrell, Kenny Peng, Thanh Hien Pham, Christopher A Bail, Odd Erik Gundersen, Jake M Hofman, Jessica Hullman, Michael A Lones, Momin M Malik, et al. 2024. REFORMS: Consensus-based Recommendations for Machine-learning-based Science. *Science Advances* 10, 18 (2024), eadk3452.
- [56] Seohyun Kim, Jinman Zhao, Yuchi Tian, and Satish Chandra. 2021. Code prediction by feeding trees to transformers. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 150–162.
- [57] Zoe Kotti, Rafaila Galanopoulou, and Diomidis Spinellis. 2023. Machine learning for software engineering: A tertiary study. *Comput. Surveys* 55, 12 (2023), 1–39.
- [58] Dominik Kreuzberger, Niklas Kühl, and Sebastian Hirschl. 2023. Machine learning operations (mlops): Overview, definition, and architecture. In *IEEE access*, Vol. 11. IEEE, 31866–31879.
- [59] Klaus Krippendorff. 2004. *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Sage publications.
- [60] Filippo Lanubile, Silverio Martínez-Fernández, and Luigi Quaranta. 2023. Teaching MLOps in higher education through project-based learning. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering Education and Training (ICSE-SEET)*. IEEE, 95–100.
- [61] Filippo Lanubile, Silverio Martínez-Fernández, and Luigi Quaranta. 2023. Training future ML engineers: a project-based course on MLOps. *IEEE software* (2023).
- [62] Nicole Leach Sankofa. 2022. Transformativist measurement development methodology: A mixed methods approach to scale construction. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 16, 3 (2022), 307–327.
- [63] Grace A. Lewis, Stephany Bellomo, and Ipek Ozkaya. 2021. Characterizing and Detecting Mismatch in Machine-Learning-Enabled Systems. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 1st Workshop on AI Engineering - Software Engineering for AI (WAIN)*. 133–140. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WAIN52551.2021.00028>
- [64] Michael A Lones. 2024. Avoiding common machine learning pitfalls. *Patterns* 5, 10 (2024).
- [65] Livia S Marques, Christiane Gresse von Wangenheim, and Jean CR Hauck. 2020. Teaching machine learning in school: A systematic mapping of the state of the art. *Informatics in Education* (2020), 283–321.
- [66] Silverio Martínez-Fernández, Justus Bogner, Xavier Franch, Marc Oriol, Julien Siebert, Adam Trendowicz, Anna Maria Vollmer, and Stefan Wagner. 2022. Software engineering for AI-based systems: a survey. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)* 31, 2 (2022), 1–59.
- [67] Atif Mashkooor, Wesley Klewerton Guez Assuncao, and Alexander Egedy. 2023. Teaching Engineering of AI-Intensive Systems. *IEEE Software* (2023).
- [68] Peter Mayer, Yixin Zou, Florian Schaub, and Adam J Aviv. 2021. " Now I'm a bit {angry:}" Individuals' Awareness, Perception, and Responses to Data Breaches that Affected Them. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*. 393–410.

- [69] Anamaria Mojica-Hanke, Andrea Bayona, Mario Linares-Vásquez, Steffen Herbold, and Fabio A. González. 2023. What are the Machine Learning best practices reported by practitioners on Stack Exchange? arXiv:2301.10516 [cs.SE]
- [70] University of Cape Town. 2023. Computer science courses: University of Cape Town. <https://sit.uct.ac.za/our-degrees-undergraduates-bsc-degrees/computer-science-courses#CSC1010H>
- [71] University of Colorado Boulder and Coursera. 2023. Academics - master of science in computer science boulder. <https://www.coursera.org/degrees/ms-computer-science-boulder/academics>
- [72] The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. 1990. *IEEE Standard Glossary of Software Engineering Terminology: IEEE Std 610.12-1990*. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers.
- [73] Graduate School of Information Science and The University of Tokyo Technology. 2019. Information on course registration, school credits and other procedures: Education: Graduate School of Information Science and Technology, the University of Tokyo. https://www.i.u-tokyo.ac.jp/edu/proced/index_e.shtml
- [74] University of London and Coursera. 2023. BSC Computer Science Curriculum and programme length. <https://www.coursera.org/degrees/bachelor-of-science-computer-science-london/academics>
- [75] The University of Melbourne. 2023. Master of software engineering - The University of Melbourne. <https://study.unimelb.edu.au/find/courses/graduate/master-of-software-engineering/what-will-i-study/#sample-plans>
- [76] University of Oxford. [n. d.]. Computer science. <https://www.ox.ac.uk/admissions/undergraduate/courses/course-listing/computer-science>
- [77] Massachusetts Institute of Technology. 2022. Computer Science and Engineering (course 6-3). <http://catalog.mit.edu/degree-charts/computer-science-engineering-course-6-3/>
- [78] Fortieth International Conference on Machine Learning. 2023. ICML 2023 reviewer tutorial. <https://icml.cc/Conferences/2023/ReviewerTutorial>
- [79] Michael Quinn Patton. 2014. *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*. Sage publications.
- [80] Rolf Pfeifer and Josh Bongard. 2006. *How the body shapes the way we think: a new view of intelligence*. MIT press.
- [81] Lori Pollock and Massimiliano Di Penta. 2023. ICSE 2023 Review Process and Guidelines-Short.
- [82] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Tao Xu, Greg Brockman, Christine McLeavey, and Ilya Sutskever. 2023. Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 28492–28518.
- [83] Paul Ralph, Nauman bin Ali, Sebastian Baltes, Domenico Bianculli, Jessica Diaz, Yvonne Dittrich, Neil Ernst, Michael Felderer, Robert Feldt, Antonio Filieri, Breno Bernard Nicolau de França, Carlo Alberto Fúria, Greg Gay, Nicolas Gold, Daniel Graziotin, Pinjia He, Rashina Hoda, Natalia Juristo, Barbara Kitchenham, Valentina Lenarduzzi, Jorge Martínez, Jorge Melegati, Daniel Mendez, Tim Menzies, Jefferson Moller, Dietmar Pfahl, Romain Robbes, Daniel Russo, Nyyti Saarimäki, Federica Sarro, Davide Taibi, Janet Siegmund, Diomidis Spinellis, Miroslaw Staron, Klaas Stol, Margaret-Anne Storey, Davide Taibi, Damian Tamburri, Marco Torchiano, Christoph Treude, Burak Turhan, Xiaofeng Wang, and Sira Vegas. 2021. Empirical Standards for Software Engineering Research. arXiv:2010.03525 [cs.SE]
- [84] Per Runeson and Martin Höst. 2009. Guidelines for conducting and reporting case study research in software engineering. *Empirical Software Engineering* 14, 2 (2009), 131–164.
- [85] Chinmay Sahu, Blaine Ayotte, and Mahesh K. Banavar. 2021. Integrating machine learning concepts into undergraduate classes. In *2021 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE)*. 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE49875.2021.9637283>
- [86] Alex Serban, Koen van der Blom, Holger Hoos, and Joost Visser. 2020. Adoption and effects of software engineering best practices in machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement (ESEM)*. 1–12.
- [87] Alex Serban, Koen van der Blom, Holger Hoos, and Joost Visser. 2021. Practices for engineering trustworthy machine learning applications. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 1st Workshop on AI engineering-software engineering for AI (WAIN)*. IEEE, 97–100.
- [88] Omar Shouman, Simon Fuchs, and Holger Wittges. 2022. Experiences from teaching practical machine learning courses to master’s students with mixed backgrounds. In *Proceedings of the Second Teaching Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence Workshop*. PMLR, 62–67.
- [89] A Strauss and J Corbin. 1998. *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques.*, 2nd edn.(Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA), (1998).
- [90] Tabnine. 2023. *tabnine (V. 3.6.08)*. <https://www.tabnine.com/>
- [91] Chakkrit Tantithamthavorn and Ahmed E Hassan. 2018. An experience report on defect modelling in practice: Pitfalls and challenges. In *Proceedings of the 40th international conference on software engineering: Software engineering in practice*. 286–295.
- [92] Matti Tedre, Tapani Toivonen, Juho Kahila, Henriikka Vartiainen, Teemu Valtonen, Ilkka Jormanainen, and Arnold Pears. 2021. Teaching machine learning in K–12 classroom: Pedagogical and technological trajectories for artificial intelligence education. *IEEE access* 9 (2021), 110558–110572.
- [93] Sebastian Uchitel, Marsha Chechik, Massimiliano Di Penta, Bram Adams, Nazareno Aguirre, Gabriele Bavota, Domenico Bianculli, Kelly Blincoe, Ana Cavalcanti, Yvonne Dittrich, Filomena Ferrucci, Rashina Hoda, LiGuo Huang, David Lo, Michael R. Lyu, Lei Ma, Jonathan I. Maletic, Leonardo Mariani, Collin McMillan, Tim Menzies, Martin Monperrus, Ana Moreno, Nachiappan Nagappan, Liliana Pasquale, Patrizio Pelliccione, Michael Pradel, Rahul Purandare, Sukyoung Ryu, Mehrdad Sabetzadeh, Alexander Serebrenik, Jun Sun, Kla Tantithamthavorn, Christoph Treude, Manuel Wimmer, Yingfei Xiong, Tao Yue, Andy Zaidman, Tao Zhang, and Hao Zhong. 2024. Scoping Software Engineering for AI: The TSE Perspective. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 50, 11 (2024), 2709–2711. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2024.3470368>
- [94] Arizona State University and Coursera. 2023. Curriculum and course information: ASU MCS. <https://www.coursera.org/degrees/master-of-computer-science-asu/academics>

- [95] Bram Van Der Vlist, Rick Van De Westelaken, Christoph Bartneck, Jun Hu, Rene Ahn, Emilia Barakova, Frank Delbressine, and Loe Feijs. 2008. Teaching machine learning to design students. In *Technologies for E-Learning and Digital Entertainment: Third International Conference, Edutainment 2008 Nanjing, China, June 25-27, 2008 Proceedings 3*. Springer, 206–217.
- [96] Michael Vierhauser, Iris Groher, Tobias Antensteiner, and Clemens Sauerwein. 2024. Towards Integrating Emerging AI Applications in SE Education. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.18062* (2024).
- [97] Cody Watson, Nathan Cooper, David Nader Palacio, Kevin Moran, and Denys Poshyvanyk. 2022. A Systematic Literature Review on the Use of Deep Learning in Software Engineering Research. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)* 31, 2 (2022), 1–58.
- [98] Claes Wohlin, Per Runeson, Martin Höst, Magnus C. Ohlsson, Björn Regnell, and Anders Wesslen. 2012. *Experimentation in Software Engineering*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated.
- [99] Mounika Yabaku and Sofia Ouhbi. 2024. University Students’ Perception and Expectations of Generative AI Tools for Software Engineering. In *2024 36th International Conference on Software Engineering Education and Training (CSEE&T)*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [100] S Ziglar. 2022. Teaching machine learning in k-12 computing education: Potential and pitfalls. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.11034* (2022).
- [101] Martin Zinkevich. 2021. Rules of machine learning: Best Practices for ML Engineering. <https://developers.google.com/machine-learning/guides/rules-of-ml>

A Supplementary material for the Execution Plan with the SE Authors

In this section of the Appendix, we provide the relevant information for the supplementary material used to survey the authors of the identified Software Engineering (SE) research papers using Machine Learning (ML). We sent emails to the authors asking them to answer the following question based on a subset of the identified papers in which they were authors, which was presented in the email.

Question: *What machine learning best practices have you used in your software engineering research papers, and how often did you apply those practices (Always, Frequent, Sometimes, Never)?*

Instruction given bellow the question:

Please write each practice in a new line:

- Good practice [how often]

B Supplementary material for the Execution Plan with SE Researchers

In this section of the Appendix, we provide the relevant information for the supplementary material used to survey and interview the Software Engineering (SE) researchers that have used Machine Learning (ML).

B.1 Demographic Survey Questions

We collected and report demographic data about our interview participants. This data is not reported within this article, but can be accessed in our online appendix. For simplicity, we present each question following the conventions below: multiple choice question with a single answer (○), multiple choice question with multiple answers (□), open question with a text field for answering (*Text Field*), questions with a numeric field with accepted answers between 0 and 100 (#). In addition, if clarifications or instructions were provided for a question, they will be presented after the question in italics between parentheses.

- i) *How many years of experience in software development do you have?* #
- ii) *How many papers have you published related to ML? (ML: Machine Learning)* #
- iii) *How many papers have you published related to SE without involving ML? (ML: Machine Learning, SE: Software Engineering)* #
- iv) *How many papers have you published related to ML4SE? (ML: Machine Learning, SE: Software Engineering, ML4SE: ML for SE)* #

- v) How many papers have you published related to SE4ML? (ML: Machine Learning, SE: Software Engineering, SE4ML: SE for ML)
- vi) What venues (journals/conferences) do you tend/prefer to publish in? (Please, separate each venue with a comma (,))
- vii) How would you describe your primary role?
 - Researcher (academics) Researcher (industrial)
 - Applied Scientist Tester Project Manager DevOps Engineer
 - Programmer Project Lead IT Manager Other
- viii) What is your highest level of education?
 - Did not graduate from high school Some college High school
 - Bachelors' degree Master's degree Doctoral degree Other
- ix) Which programming languages have you frequently used in past project(s)? (If more than an additional language is added, please split them with ";")
 - C/C++ C# Java Javascript
 - Julia Python R Rust
 - Dart Kotlin Other
- x) Which types of Learning approaches have you used?
 - Supervised Semi-supervised Reinforcement learning
 - Unsupervised Other
- xi) What types of ML tasks have you used?
 - Regression Clustering Machine translation
 - Object detection Transcription Anomaly detection
 - Other
- xii) What types of systems have you developed involving ML?
 - Operating systems Server side Mobile applications
 - Middleware Desktop applications Web applications
 - Databases Recommender systems
 - Development tools (compilers, prog.languages, etc.) Other
- xiii) Have you primarily worked on open-source or closed-source projects?
 - Open-source only Closed-source only Open and closed-source
- xiv) For which domains (e.g., banking or healthcare) have you developed applications/systems? (List them next separated by coma (,))
- xv) Do you have a background in machine learning? (Formal (college classes, degree, certification) or informal (self-learning or other training)?)
 - Yes, formal Yes, informal No
- xvi) Do you have a background in software engineering research? (Formal (college classes, degree, certification) or informal (self-learning or other training)?)
 - Yes, formal Yes, informal No
- xvii) When researching software engineering, do you keep track of your approaches/ models + dataset?. Which versioning systems have you used (e.g., CML, DVC, Git)?
 - Yes No

xviii) *How often did you release or help release a new major version of ML models over the past two years? Please give your best estimate.*

- Never Annually Quarterly Monthly More frequently

xix) *Which country/countries are you and/or your organization based in?*

B.2 Interview Questions

i) Best Practices and Protocols

- What do you consider as a best practice?
- Which process, guidelines, or pipelines you follow when employing ML in SE?
- What do you consider are the “must” practices or protocols you use or implement in your research/papers?
- Which are the most recurrent challenges when using ML for SE in any of the ML workflow stages?
- Which practices do you use from each ML pipeline stage?
- How did you employ the components of learning to guide your ML model design? [Abu-Mustafa, 2012]
- Do you take into consideration any of the learning principles (e.g., data snooping, Occam’s razor, or sampling bias)? [Abu-Mustafa, 2012]
- Which quality attributes are important for SE systems that use ML? » **ANSW1**
- Do you have any particular difficulties/challenges when building an ML-enabled system to ensure **ANSW1** attributes?

ii) Education

- What educational resources have you employed to perform ML4SE? (e.g., tools, languages, books, etc..)
- How do you learn ML4SE?
- How do you educate your students to enable ML4SE?
- How do you promote **ANSW1** when teaching about ML4SE?

iii) Reviewer’s Perspective

- What issues have you observed when reviewing papers?
- What ML4SE areas are not being covered in conference reviews?
- As a reviewer, have you seen that the **ANSW1** attributes are being addressed?

iv) ML Workflow Stages (*Amershi et al.*)

- Model Requirements
 - What was the rationale of selecting or proposing an ML model you have utilized in your papers?
- Data Collection
 - Do you collect your own data, use previous datasets, or both? How do you select data/datasets?
 - Which data collection strategies or protocols you employ in your studies?
 - How do you promote **ANSW1** when collecting data for ML-enabled systems?
- Data Cleaning
 - Which pipelines do you employ to address data exploration?
 - How do you perform data cleaning?
 - How do you handle exploratory analysis in your studies?
 - How important are exploratory analyses for data cleaning?
 - How do you promote **ANSW1** when cleaning data in ML-enabled systems?
- Data Labeling (if applicable)

- Which data labeling protocols do you use for your supervised tasks?
 - How do you promote **ANSW1** when labeling data for ML-enabled systems?
 - Feature Engineering
 - Which feature engineering methods you have employed?
 - How do you promote **ANSW1** when selecting and building features in ML-enabled systems?
 - Model Training
 - What frameworks have you employed for model training?
 - How do you parameterize your models?
 - How do you promote **ANSW1** when training models in ML-enabled systems?
 - Model Evaluation
 - How do you evaluate or validate your ML models?
 - Do you employ any measurements to control for bias?
 - Do you use any interpretability technique to guide your evaluation?
 - How are measurements aligned to study RQs, goals, or business objectives?
 - How do you promote **ANSW1** when evaluating ML-enabled systems?
 - Model Deployment
 - How do you do promote **ANSW1** when deploying ML-enabled systems?
 - Model Monitoring
 - Do you employ any measurements to handle concept drift?
 - How do you monitor models during operation (*e.g.*, user studies, industry projects, production)?
 - How do you promote **ANSW1** when monitoring ML-enabled systems?
- v) Potential Follow-up Questions

C Supplementary Material for the Results of the Open Coding

C.1 Codes associated to the ML practices




Fig. 2. Percentage of subjects (i.e., papers, interviewees, and surveys) in which each *input category* appears. The figure displays the first half of the *input codes*, organized by the subject *papers* appearance.




Fig. 3. Percentage of subjects (i.e., papers, interviewees, and surveys) in which each *input category* appears. The figure displays the second half of the *input codes*, organized by the subject *papers* appearance.




Fig. 4. Percentage of subjects (i.e., papers, interviewees, and surveys) in which each *technique category* appears. The figure displays approximately the first sixth of the *technique codes*, organized by the subject *papers* appearance.




Fig. 5. Percentage of subjects (i.e., papers, interviewees, and surveys) in which each *technique category* appears. The figure displays approximately the second sixth of the *technique codes*, organized by the subject *papers* appearance.




Fig. 6. Percentage of subjects (i.e., papers, interviewees, and surveys) in which each *technique category* appears. The figure displays approximately the third sixth of the *technique codes*, organized by the subject *papers* appearance.




Fig. 7. Percentage of subjects (i.e., papers, interviewees, and surveys) in which each *technique category* appears. The figure displays approximately the fourth sixth of the *technique codes*, organized by the subject *papers* appearance.




Fig. 8. Percentage of subjects (i.e., papers, interviewees, and surveys) in which each *technique category* appears. The figure displays approximately the fifth sixth of the *technique codes*, organized by the subject *papers* appearance.




Fig. 9. Percentage of subjects (i.e., papers, interviewees, and surveys) in which each *technique category* appears. The figure displays approximately the last sixth of the *technique codes*, organized by the subject *papers* appearance.




Fig. 10. Percentage of subjects (i.e., papers, interviewees, and surveys) in which each *purpose/output category* appears. The figure displays approximately the first third of the *purpose/output codes*, organized by the subject *papers* appearance.




Fig. 11. Percentage of subjects (i.e., papers, interviewees, and surveys) in which each *purpose/output category* appears. The figure displays approximately the second third of the *purpose/output codes*, organized by the subject *papers* appearance.




Fig. 12. Percentage of subjects (i.e., papers, interviewees, and surveys) in which each *purpose/output category* appears. The figure displays approximately the last third of the *purpose/output codes*, organized by the subject *papers* appearance.

C.2 Categories associated to the ML Stage




Fig. 13. Percentage of subjects (i.e., papers, interviewees, and surveys) in which each *ML stage category* appears.

C.3 Categories associated to the SE Tasks




Fig. 14. Percentage of interviews in which each *SE task category* appears.




Fig. 15. Percentage of papers in which each *SE task category* appears.

C.4 Codes associated to the Quality attributes




Fig. 16. Percentage of interviews in which each *quality attribute category* appears.

C.5 Codes associated to the ML Challenges




Fig. 17. Percentage of interviews in which each *challenge category* appears.

C.6 Codes associated to the Reviewer's perspective




Fig. 18. Percentage of interviews in which each *reviewers' perspective category* appears.

C.7 Codes associated to the Educator’s perspective




Fig. 19. Percentage of interviews in which each *educators' perspective category* appears.

Received XXX; revised XXX; accepted XXX