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Abstract

Pre-trained models for programming languages have proven their significant values in various code-related tasks, such as code search, code clone detection, and code translation. Currently, most pre-trained models treat a code snippet as a sequence of tokens or only focus on the data flow between code identifiers. However, rich code syntax and hierarchy are ignored which can provide important structure information and semantic rules of codes to help enhance code representations. In addition, although the BERT-based code pre-trained models achieve high performance on many downstream tasks, the native derived sequence representations of BERT are proven to be of low-quality, it performs poorly on code matching and similarity tasks. To address these problems, we propose CLSEBERT, a Contrastive Learning Framework for Syntax Enhanced Code Pre-Trained Model, to deal with various code intelligence tasks. In the pre-training stage, we consider the code syntax and hierarchy contained in the Abstract Syntax Tree (AST) and leverage the contrastive learning to learn noise-invariant code representations. Besides the masked language modeling (MLM), we also introduce two novel pre-training objectives. One is to predict the edges between nodes in the abstract syntax tree, and the other is to predict the types of code tokens. Through extensive experiments on four code intelligence tasks, we successfully show the effectiveness of our proposed model.

Introduction

With the rapid development of the information society, almost every part of human life becomes increasingly inseparable from the support of various software applications, including shopping, education, medicine and travel. According to the data from Evans Data Corporation, the number of software developers reached 23.9 million in 2019, and this number will reach 28.7 million in 2024 (Lu et al. 2021). With the significant increase of complexity and scale in software development, the requirement for code intelligence is highlighted. Code intelligence aims to utilize AI technologies to promote the productivity of software developers, which is becoming increasingly important in both communities of software engineering and artificial intelligence with the growing population of developers (Lu et al. 2021).

Python Code snippet

```python
def add_func(x, y):
    result = x + y
    return result
```

Abstract Syntax Tree

Figure 1: An example of the python code snippet parsing into AST.

The success of Deep Learning in many areas has brought opportunities for code intelligence. Some researchers have designed different neural network models for various code-related tasks, including code search (Gu, Zhang, and Kim 2018), code translation (Chen, Liu, and Song 2018), code clone detection (White et al. 2016), code summarization (Liu et al. 2021), defect detection (Li et al. 2017), code completion (Liu et al. 2020a, 2017), and so on. These models have achieved significant improvements in performance compared with traditional statistical-based methods. However, they often need to be designed specifically and cannot be directly used for other code-related tasks.

Pre-trained models are first pre-trained on a large unsupervised data, then can be fine-tuned using only an additional output layer to produce state-of-the-art results on a wide range of downstream tasks without the need of designing task-specific model architectures. Many pre-trained language models, such as ELMo (Peters et al. 2018), BERT (Devlin et al. 2018), RoBERTa (Liu et al. 2019), XLNet (Yang et al. 2019), ALBERT (Lan et al. 2020) and GPT (Radford et al. 2018), have been proven to achieve significant performance improvements on various natural language
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processing (NLP) tasks. Inspired by these, many researchers in the field of software engineering attempt to utilize source codes for pre-training, with the goal of better dealing with code-related tasks, such as code search, code clone detection, code summarization, and so on (Li et al. 2020; Svyatkovskiy et al. 2020). CodeBERT (Feng et al. 2020) is the first large pre-trained model for different programming languages, which obtains new state-of-the-art results on various code intelligence tasks. CodeBERT regards a source code as a sequence of tokens and is trained with large-scale code functions paired with natural language comments. Graph-CodeBERT (Guo et al. 2021) is developed on the basis of CodeBERT, which uses the data flow in the pre-training stage to capture the relationships between identifiers of the code. They all adopt the Transformer-based neural architecture for pre-training (Vaswani et al. 2017). However, despite their promising results, we would like to argue that they still suffer from two following major limitations:

1. We observe that both of them ignore syntax information and hierarchical structure, which are inherent in the code. As the example shown in Figure 1, a simple python code snippet is parsed into the corresponding Abstract Syntax Tree (AST) by a standard compiler tool. We can see that some extra nodes are introduced, such as parameters, assignment, binary operator, and so on. In addition, a wealth of hierarchical information is included through the connections between nodes. Such syntax information can provide richer code semantic and help to produce better code representations.

2. Existing BERT-based code pre-trained models also inherit the inherent defects of the BERT-like models, such as the collapse issue of sentence representations, which is proven in several works (Li et al. 2020; Chen and He 2020). As a result, it is sub-optimal to directly apply the native sentence representations of the code pre-trained model to code similarity matching or code retrieval.

To address above limitations, we incorporate abstract syntax trees (AST) of codes and design two new code-related pre-training objectives for pre-training. One is to predict the edges between AST nodes, and the other is to predict the code token types.

We name our method CLSEBERT, Contrastive Learning for Syntax Enhanced code pre-trained model.

The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

1. We leverage the contrastive learning to learn noise-invariant code representations and alleviate the collapse issue of sentence representations in BERT-like code pre-trained models.
2. We conduct comprehensive experiments on four code-related downstream tasks, which demonstrate that CLSEBERT can achieve significant improvements over representative methods.

Related Work

A lot of efforts have been made by researchers on code intelligence tasks (Li et al. 2021; Zhou et al. 2019; Alon et al. 2019; Kim et al. 2020; Lozoya et al. 2021). Generally speaking, we can summarize the existing works into two categories: (1) methods based on task-specific model architectures, and (2) methods based on pre-training.

Methods based on Task-specific Model Architecture

The success of Deep Learning (DL) technologies in various domains has also promoted the development of code intelligence. Many researchers attempt to apply DL for software engineering tasks, such as software defect detection (Li et al. 2017), code translation (Chen, Liu, and Song 2018), code completion (Li et al. 2018), code search (Gu, Zhang, and Kim 2018), and so on. Li et al. (Li et al. 2017) proposed a CNN-based method for software defect detection, leveraging the features captured from ASTs of codes. Chen et al. (Chen, Liu, and Song 2018) presented a tree-to-tree neural network to translate a source tree into a target one for code translation, where an attention mechanism is also utilized. Jian et al. (Li et al. 2018) proposed a pointer mixture network for intelligent code completion. It generates words in the vocabulary through the RNN component, or regenerates OoV words from the local context through a pointer component. Gu et al. (Gu, Zhang, and Kim 2018) proposed a novel deep neural network named CODEnn. They embedded code snippets and paired natural language queries into the same vector space, aiming to learn similar vector representations. White et al. (White et al. 2016) proposed a novel DL-based method for code clone detection, which can automatically link patterns mined at the lexical level with patterns mined at the syntactic level. For code summarization, Liu et al. (Liu et al. 2021) proposed a novel retrieval-augmented mechanism to combine the benefits of both retrieval-based methods and generation-based methods. They also designed an attention-based dynamic graph to complement the static graph representation of the source code, mitigating the limitation of GNNs on capturing global graph structure information.

Methods based on Pre-trained Models

With the remarkable success of pre-trained language models in NLP, many researchers try to introduce pre-trained models to solve code intelligence tasks. Feng et al. (Feng et al. 2020) proposed CodeBERT, a bi-modal pre-trained model trained on massive code functions paired with natural language comments in six programming languages.
They fine-tuned CodeBERT to deal with many code-related downstream tasks, significantly outperforming various task-specific neural models. Guo et al. (Guo et al. 2021) presented GraphCodeBERT on the basis of CodeBERT, introducing data flow and two new pre-training objectives. Compared with CodeBERT, GraphCodeBERT has achieved further performance improvement in many code intelligence tasks. Liu et al. (Liu et al. 2020b) proposed a pre-trained language model for code completion with a Transformer-based neural architecture, named CugLM, which is trained on two massive datasets and with three pre-training objectives, including masked language modeling, next code segment prediction and unidirectional language modeling. Then they fine-tuned CugLM on code completion task. Corder (Bui, Yu, and Jiang 2021) is a work in progress for code retrieval and code summarization tasks. It used a self-supervised learning method trained on large-scale Java codes. It leveraged a set of semantically-preserving transformation operators to generate syntactically different but semantically equivalent code snippets.

**Approach**

In this section, we will present the details of CLSEBERT. The different views of CLSEBERT is illustrated in Figure 3.

**Model Architecture**

We follow BERT, and leverage multi-layer bidirectional Transformer (Vaswani et al. 2017) as the model backbone. CLSEBERT is trained on CodeSearchNet dataset, same as CodeBERT, to support a wide range of code intelligence tasks. We also take the AST of the code as part of the input to the model, which provides an AST token sequence with depth-first traversal. Figure 2 shows the part of AST sequence obtained from the AST in Figure 1 and the solid green lines represent edges between AST nodes. The prediction of these edges are designed as a pre-training objective, which will be demonstrated in detail in the next sub-section.

In Figure 3(a), given a natural language comment \( w = \{w_1, w_2, ..., w_{|w|}\} \), corresponding source code \( c = \{c_1, c_2, ..., c_{|c|}\} \) and the AST sequence \( a = \{a_1, a_2, ..., a_{|a|}\} \), we set the input as the concatenate of the comment, source code and the AST sequence. Finally, the input \( x = \{(\text{CLS}), w, \text{SEP}, c, \text{SEP}, a, \text{SEP}\} \), where [CLS] is a special token, short for "CLAssification", appearing at the beginning of the input sequence. The final hidden state corresponding to [CLS] is utilized to represent the entire sequence for classification task. The [SEP] is a special token to split two kinds of sub-sequences.

The embedding of each token in \( x \) is the sum of corresponding token and position embeddings. CLSEBERT adopts L-layer bidirectional Transformer (Vaswani et al. 2017) to encode the input vectors into contextual representations \( H_l = \text{Transformer}(H_{l-1}) \), \( l \in [1, L] \). The propagation rule of each Transformer layer is defined as follows:

\[
S_l = \text{LN}(\text{MHA}(H_{l-1}) + H_{l-1}) \\
H_l = \text{LN}(\text{FFN}(S_l) + S_l)
\]

where LN denotes a layer normalization operation, MHA represents a multi-headed self-attention mechanism, and FFN indicates a two layers feed forward network. \( S_l \) denotes the output of the \( l \)-th Transformer.

The details of a multi-headed self-attention (MHA) in the \( l \)-th Transformer layer is defined by:

\[
Q_i = H_{l-1}W^Q \quad K_i = H_{l-1}W^K \quad V_i = H_{l-1}W^V \\
head_i = \text{Softmax} \left( \frac{Q_iK_i^T}{\sqrt{d_k}} \right)V_i \\
\hat{S}_l = \text{Concat}(\head_1, \head_2, ..., \head_n)W^Q
\]

where the output of the previous layer \( H_{l-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{|x| \times d_h} \) is linearly projected to query (Q), key (K) and value (V) matrices via three learnable weight matrices \( W^Q, W^K, W^V \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h \times d_k} \), respectively. \( d_h \) is the hidden size, \( d_k \) is the dimension of a head, \( n \) indicates the number of heads, \( W^Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d_l \times d_k} \). After concatenating the feature vectors of all heads, \( \hat{S}_l \) is obtained, which represents the output of a multi-headed self-attention in the \( l \)-th Transformer layer.

**Pre-training Objectives**

To train the CLSEBERT, we adopt three pre-training objectives, aiming to improve code representations. The first one is the masked language modeling (MLM), which is commonly used in many BERT-like pre-trained models. The second objective is the edge prediction between AST nodes, which is used to capture more structural information from ASTs of source codes. The last objective is the code token type prediction, which is used to predict token types of source codes.

**Masked Language Modeling (MLM)**

Given a datapoint of NL-PL-AST triplet \( (x) \) as the input, we randomly select 15% of tokens from natural language, corresponding source code and AST sequence. Following the same settings in (Devlin et al. 2018), we replace 80% of them with [MASK] tokens, 10% with random tokens, and the remaining 10% unchanged. The purpose of MLM objective is to predict the original tokens from these sampled tokens, which has been proven effective in some previous works (Devlin et al. 2018, Liu et al. 2019, Feng et al. 2020). In particular, predicting masked AST tokens from the AST sequence can enable the model to capture more syntax information. The MLM loss function is defined as follows:

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{MLM}} = - \sum_{i}^{V} \sum_{j}^{M} y_{ij}^{\text{MLM}} \log p_{ij}^{\text{MLM}}
\]
where $w^m$, $e^m$, $a^m$ represents a random set of masked tokens for NL, PL and AST, respectively ($M = w^m \cup e^m \cup a^m$). $V$ represents the vocabulary size, $y_i^{MLM}$ denotes the label of the masked token $i$ and $p_i^{MLM}$ indicates the predicted result of the token $i$.

**AST Node Edge Prediction (NEP)** When converting an AST to a sequence, some structural information will be lost. In order to better retain the structural information of ASTs, we design an edge prediction objective for AST nodes. Specifically, we randomly select 30% (by default) of nodes $N_s$ in the AST. Take the random example in Figure 1 there is an edge between tokens $x$ and token $binary\_operator$, and there is no edge between token $x$ and token $+$. Formally, the loss function of this pre-training objective is defined as:

$$L_{NEP} = - \sum_{i,j \in N_s} [y_{i,j}^{NEP} \log p_{i,j}^{NEP} + (1 - y_{i,j}^{NEP}) \log (1 - p_{i,j}^{NEP})]$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

where $y_{i,j}^{NEP}$ is 1 if there is an edge between node $i$ and $j$, otherwise $p_{i,j}^{NEP} = 0$. $p_{i,j}^{NEP}$ is the probability of whether there is an edge between the $i$-th and $j$-th nodes, which is calculated by dot product using representations of two nodes from CLSEBERT. A sigmoid activation function is utilized to constrain the value of $p_{i,j}^{NEP}$ within the range of 0 to 1.

**Code Token Type Prediction (TTP)** We observe that different tokens in the code have different types. Taking the expression $a = "a"$ as an example, the type of the first $a$ is "identifier", while the type of the second "a" is "string". The phenomenon that the same character has different types is common in codes. This observation further suggests the significance of taking code token type into account for obtaining better code representations. Due to the importance of identifiers in the source code, we simply divide the code token types into identifier or non-identifier. In Figure 3(a), identifier and non-identifier are represented by 1 and 0, respectively. The loss function of code token type prediction task is similar to equation 7, which is defined as follows:

$$L_{TTP} = - \sum_{i \in C} [y_i^{TTP} \log p_i^{TTP} + (1 - y_i^{TTP}) \log (1 - p_i^{TTP})]$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where $p_i^{TTP}$ indicates the predicted result, $y_i^{TTP}$ is the label of the type of the $i$-th code token.

**Contrastive Learning in CLSEBERT (CL)** We introduce the contrastive learning into our code pre-trained model to achieve noise-invariant code representations. Figure 3(b) shows the process of producing the positive pair, which consists of three steps:

- Firstly, we add noises to the NL-PL-AST sequence. We adopt a simple operator, which reverses the position of identifiers in the source code, we simply divide the code token types into identifier or non-identifier. In Figure 3(a), identifier and non-identifier are represented by 1 and 0, respectively. The loss function of code token type prediction task is similar to equation 7, which is defined as follows:

$$L_{TTP} = - \sum_{i \in C} [y_i^{TTP} \log p_i^{TTP} + (1 - y_i^{TTP}) \log (1 - p_i^{TTP})]$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where $p_i^{TTP}$ indicates the predicted result, $y_i^{TTP}$ is the label of the type of the $i$-th code token.

- Secondly, we take $s_1$ and $s_2$ as the inputs of multi-layer Transformer encoders same as in Figure 3. Then we can obtain the representations of two augmented sequences $H_1 = \text{Transformer}(s_1)$ and $H_2 = \text{Transformer}(s_2)$. We take representations of their [CLS] tokens $h_{[CLS]}$ as feature vectors of sequences.
Next, we adopt an extra neural network projection head \( f(.) \) acting on \( h_{[CLS]} \), which can be a simple one-layer MLP with 768 neural units. The probability of agreement \( p_{CL}^{CL} \) is calculated by the dot product following a sigmoid function using the representations of \( g_1 \) and \( g_2 \).

In the pre-training stage, we input two parallel batches \( b_1 \) and \( b_2 \) into CLSEBERT at the same time. Figure 3(c) shows the view in two parallel batches. Finally, the batch \( b_1 \) contains final feature representations of original sequences, and the batch \( b_2 \) contains final feature representations of converted sequences. The feature vectors \( g_1 \) and \( g_2 \) form the positive pair. The feature vector \( g_1 \) and other feature vectors in \( b_1 \) and \( b_2 \) constitute a number of negative pairs.

The contrastive learning loss is defined as:

\[
L_{CL} = - \sum_i \sum_j [y_{i,j}^CL \ln p_{i,j}^{CL} + (1 - y_{i,j}^CL) \ln (1 - p_{i,j}^{CL})]
\]  

(9)

where \( i \) and \( j \) denote the indices of samples, \( y_{i,j}^CL \) denotes the label of a pair of sequences \((i, j)\), returns 1 when \( i \) and \( j \) are a positive pair, returns 0 otherwise.

Finally, the overall loss function in TreeCodeBERT is as follows:

\[
L_{loss} = L_{MLM} + L_{NEP} + L_{TTP} + L_{CL} + \lambda \| \Theta \|^2
\]  

(10)

where \( \Theta \) contains all trainable parameters in the model. \( \lambda \) is the \( L_2 \) regularization coefficient, which is used to prevent overfitting.

**Experiments**

We pre-train CLSEBERT and fine-tune it on four downstream tasks, including code clone detection, code defect detection, natural language code search and code translation.

**Experimental Settings**

**Dataset for Pre-training.** For fair comparison, we pre-train CLSEBERT on the CodeSearchNet dataset (Husain et al. 2019), which is the same as used by CodeBERT. CodeSearchNet dataset contains 2.1M bimodal datapoints (code functions paired with natural language documents) and 6.4M unimodal codes across six programming languages (Ruby, Javascript, Go, Python, Java, Php).

**Dataset for Fine-tuning.** We utilize CodeXGLUE (Lu et al. 2021) provided public dataset and corresponding training-validation-test splits to complete all tasks. In addition, to evaluate the performance of our model on different programming languages (Ruby, Javascript, Go, Python, Java, Php), we also conduct the natural language code search task using the dataset provided in (Guo et al. 2021).

**Pre-training Settings.** We train CLSEBERT using Transformer with 12 layers, 768 dimensional hidden states and 12 attention heads same as BERT. CLSEBERT is trained on 8 NVIDIA Tesla V100 with 32GB memory. The lengths of sequences containing special tokens in NL, PL and AST are set to 96, 160 and 256, respectively. The batch size is set to 128. The learning rate is set to 1e-4. We use an Adam optimizer to optimize the parameters in the model. Finally, the model is trained with 110K steps. All experiments are implemented by the deep learning library PyTorch\(^3\).

**Code Clone Detection**

Code clone detection task is to identify the existence of code clone issue by measuring the similarity between two code snippets. We fine tune CLSEBERT on BigCloneBench (Svajlenko et al. 2014) dataset and POJ-104 (Mou et al. 2016) dataset. In the BigCloneBench dataset, given two code snippets, the task is to determine whether these two codes are semantically similar, 1 stands for semantic equivalence and 0 for others. Models are evaluated by Precision, Recall and F1-score.

**Table 1: Results on the clone detection task.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>BigCloneBench</th>
<th>POJ-104</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoBERTa</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CodeBERT</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>0.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraphCodeBERT</td>
<td><strong>0.973</strong></td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLSEBERT</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td><strong>0.977</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\)https://pytorch.org/

**Table 2: Results on the defect detection task.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BiLSTM</td>
<td>0.5937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TextCNN</td>
<td>0.6069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoBERTa</td>
<td>0.6105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CodeBERT</td>
<td>0.6208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>code2vec</td>
<td>0.6248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraphCodeBERT</td>
<td>0.6321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLSEBERT</td>
<td><strong>0.6450</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Results on the natural language code search task evaluating with MRR score, using the AdvTest dataset introduced in (Lu et al. 2021) and CodeSearch dataset introduced in (Guo et al. 2021). The baseline results are reported from (Lu et al. 2021) and (Guo et al. 2021).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BiRNN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SelfAtt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoBERTa</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>0.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoBERTa(code)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CodeBERT</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraphCodeBERT</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>0.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLSEBERT</td>
<td><strong>0.383</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.722</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.677</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.913</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.724</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.723</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.678</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.740</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Results on the code translation task with BLEU, Accuracy and CodeBLEU score, using CodeTrans dataset introduced in (Lu et al. 2021). The baseline results are reported from (Lu et al. 2021) and (Guo et al. 2021).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Java → C# BLEU</th>
<th>Java → C# Accuracy</th>
<th>C# → Java BLEU</th>
<th>C# → Java CodeBLEU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naive copy</td>
<td>18.54</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBSMT</td>
<td>43.53</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>42.71</td>
<td>40.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformer</td>
<td>55.84</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>63.74</td>
<td>50.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoBERTa(code)</td>
<td>77.46</td>
<td>56.10</td>
<td>83.07</td>
<td>71.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CodeBERT</td>
<td>79.92</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td><strong>85.10</strong></td>
<td>72.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraphCodeBERT</td>
<td>80.58</td>
<td>59.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLSEBERT</td>
<td><strong>80.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.40</strong></td>
<td>84.85</td>
<td><strong>76.52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Code Defect Detection**

Given a source code, the code defect detection task is to identify whether it is an insecure code that may attack software systems, such as resource leaks, use-after-free vulnerabilities and DDoS attack. It can be regarded as a binary classification task, where 1 stands for insecure code and 0 for secure code. We evaluate all models on Defects4J dataset (C language) provided by (Zhou et al. 2019), using the Accuracy score as the evaluation metric.

The experimental results are shown in Table 2. We choose several models for comparisons, including bidirectional recurrent neural network (BiLSTM), convolutional neural network (TextCNN), RoBERTa, CodeBERT, code2vec (Coimbra et al. 2021) and GraphCodeBERT. The baseline results are reported from (Lu et al. 2021). In the code defect detection task, various selected methods have achieved high performance, such as CodeBERT, code2vec and GraphCodeBERT, while CLSEBERT outperforms all of them. It is worth mentioning that pre-training data of all pre-trained models does not contain C language, and our model has achieved the best performance, which shows the stronger capability of our model.

**Natural Language Code Search**

Natural language code search task is to match the most semantically relevant code functions through natural language query sentences. We use AdvTest dataset provided by (Lu et al. 2021). In addition, in order to evaluate the performances of all models on different programming languages, we also adopt another dataset extracted from CodeSearchNet (Husain et al. 2019) introduced in (Guo et al. 2021), including six programming languages (Ruby, Javascript, Go, Python, Java, Php). These two datasets have different data preprocessing and retrieval settings. We adopt the Mean Reciprocal Rank (MRR) to evaluate the performances of all code search methods.

Table 3 summarizes the results on different datasets. Numerous methods are chosen for comparisons, including bag-of-words (NBow), convolutional neural network (CNN) (Kim 2014), bidirectional recurrent neural network (BiRNN) (Cho et al. 2014), and self-attention (SelfAtt) (Vaswani et al. 2017). RoBERTa (code) is pre-trained only on code. The baseline results on the AdvTest dataset are reported from (Lu et al. 2021). We leverage the checkpoint of GraphCodeBERT, and run the same evaluation script to obtain the result of GraphCodeBERT on AdvTest dataset. The baseline results on the CodeSearch dataset are all reported from (Guo et al. 2021). We can observe that our proposed model CLSEBERT can consistently outperform all representative methods on different datasets and different programming languages.

**Code Translation**

Code translation is used to translate the code in one programming language to the code in another one. We adopt the CodeTrans dataset provided by (Lu et al. 2021) and (Chen, Liu, and Song 2018), which contains the mutual translation
of Java and C#. Given a piece of Java (C#) code, the task is to translate the code into C# (Java) version. Models are evaluated by BLEU and Accuracy (exactly match) and CodeBLEU (Lu et al. 2021) scores.

Table 5 shows the experimental results of all methods. **Naive copy** means copying the source code as the translation result. **PBSMT** (Koehn, Och, and Marcu 2003) is a statistical machine translation method based on phrase. We set the same number of hidden size and layers as CLSECodeBERT for the Transformer [Vaswani et al. 2017] method. For BERT-like pre-trained models, we leverage the pre-trained model to initialize the encoder, and randomly initialize the parameters of the decoder (6-layer Transformer) and source-to-target attention for the translation task. Frankly speaking, BERT-like pre-trained models are not suitable for generation tasks, but even so, CLSEBERT still surpasses all methods and achieve the best performance. Although CLSEBERT has not been pre-trained on the C# language, there is a significant syntactic and semantic similarities between Java and C#. The syntax knowledge incorporated in the pre-training process makes CLSEBERT obtain better performance than RoBERTa (code), CodeBERT and GraphCodeBERT.

### Ablation Study

Furthermore, in order to understand how each component contributes to the overall performance of our proposed pre-trained model, including AST token sequence, AST node edge prediction objective, code token type prediction objective and contrastive learning, we perform an ablation analysis on the natural language code search on the dataset introduced in [Guo et al. 2021], shown in Table 5. We also use the MRR to evaluate the performance on six programming languages. In (1), we incorporate the AST sequences into the pre-trained model. In (2), we introduce the AST Node Edge Prediction (NEP) objective into the pre-training process to capture more structural information of ASTs. In (3), we introduce the code Token Type Prediction (TTP) objective into the pre-training process to capture more code semantic information. In (4), we introduce the Contrastive Learning (CL) to learn noise-invariant code representations. In (5), we combine all designed components together to observe the final performance.

From the results shown in Table 5, we have some observations. Adding AST information into the pre-training model brings a significant performance improvement as shown in (1), which demonstrates the effectiveness of incorporating ASTs for code pre-training. In (2), by integrating AST node edge prediction objective into the pre-training stage, the performance obtains further improvements, which shows the effectiveness of incorporating more structural information into the code representation. In (3), we predict the types of code tokens, which achieves better results. In (4), when adding contrastive learning into the pre-training process, the overall performance improves from 71.0% to 73.7% compared with (1), which reveals the importance of learning noise-invariant code representations, especially for matching task in this case. Finally, when combining all proposed components into the pre-trained model, CLSEBERT obtains further improvements in its average performance.

### Conclusion and Future Work

This paper presented a novel pre-trained model for programming language, named CLSEBERT, which leverages rich code syntax and hierarchy in ASTs to learn better code representations. Specifically, we proposed two new code-related pre-training objectives, aiming to capture more code information. One is to predict the edges between AST nodes, and the other is to predict the types of code tokens. In addition, we also utilized contrastive learning to learn better representations from the unlabeled data in a self-supervised fashion. Comprehensive experiments on four code intelligence tasks, including the code clone detection, code defect detection, natural language code search and code translation have successfully demonstrated CLSEBERT can outperform various representative methods.

As part of our future work, with the aim to improve the productivity in software development, we plan to explore more effective strategies to capture features of codes.
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