

# Code Sophistication

## From Code Recommendation to Logic Recommendation

Jessie Galasso  
jessie.galasso-  
carbonnel@umontreal.ca  
Université de Montréal, DIRO  
Canada

Michalis Famelis  
michalis.famelis@umontreal.ca  
Université de Montréal, DIRO  
Canada

Houari Sahraoui  
houari.sahraoui@umontreal.ca  
Université de Montréal, DIRO  
Canada

### ABSTRACT

A typical approach to programming is to first code the main execution scenario, and then focus on filling out alternative behaviors and corner cases. But, almost always, there exist unusual conditions that trigger atypical behaviors, which are hard to predict in program specifications, and are thus often not coded. In this paper, we consider the problem of detecting and recommending such missing behaviors, a task that we call *code sophistication*. Previous research on coding assistants usually focuses on recommending code fragments based on specifications of the intended behavior. In contrast, code sophistication happens in the absence of a specification, aiming to help developers complete the logic of their programs with missing and unspecified behaviors. We outline the research challenges to this problem and present early results showing how program logic can be completed by leveraging code structure and information about the usage of input parameters.

### KEYWORDS

Code sophistication, Code Completion, Automatic Program Repair, Program Synthesis, Code search

### 1 INTRODUCTION

When developing a program to solve a task, developers usually begin by coding typical scenarios, i.e., by implementing the behaviors that should be followed under normal conditions. Subsequently, they concentrate on atypical scenarios (e.g., failures, corner cases) by expanding the program with the appropriate alternative behaviors. Because these atypical scenarios correspond to unusual conditions, they may be omitted from specification documents [41], and are difficult to predict during implementation [48]. Even taking into account testing, such behaviors are difficult to detect as they are rarely triggered during executions [19, 37]. Unsurprisingly, they are one of the largest source of software defects [7, 11, 31, 41]. It is thus crucial to help developers uncover such omitted scenarios and handle them by coding the appropriate corresponding program behaviors. These alternative behaviors may include error handling, variable assignments, early returns or more complex operations.

In this paper, we outline the problem of recommending unspecified behaviors to handle omitted scenarios, which we call *code sophistication*, and present the results of our initial attempt to address it. The goal of code sophistication is to recommend missing parts of a program; we argue that finding missing behaviors cannot be properly handled by existing code recommendation approaches (see Section 2). Such approaches typically rely on the existence of

some kind of specification of what the program should be doing, and use it to suggest appropriate code fragments. But in the case of code sophistication, no specification of the missing behaviors can be assumed. Thus the scope of code sophistication goes beyond offering developers assistance about *how* to code but also assistance about *what* to code to complete the logic of their program. We propose an approach to leverage the knowledge embedded in large repositories of existing code to learn how to complete the logic of programs. We then present a preliminary implementation with promising results that allows using this knowledge to infer potential missing behaviors in new programs.

The paper is organized as follows: We cover related code recommendation techniques in Section 2. We define and motivate the problem of code sophistication, and outline the research directions for addressing it in Section 3. We present our preliminary approach and results in Section 4, and conclude in Section 5.

### 2 RELATED WORK

We can put techniques for assisting developers into completing their programs into four categories: code completion, program synthesis, automatic program repair, and code search. We explain why these techniques do not address code sophistication.

**Code completion** focuses on predicting the end of a token or the next tokens at a particular location in the code by relying on the code already written [2]. Source code language models extracted from large code bases represent probability distributions over sequences of tokens; they were used to predict the next tokens given the previous ones [18, 20, 50], identifiers [5, 30], function-calls [53] or to infer meaningful code units (e.g., method call, binary expression) [39]. Similar methods were used for more advanced predictions, such as API calls [6, 40], sequence of API invocations [44] or even syntactic templates for API usages [38]. Code completion approaches do not rely on some explicit specification of what parts of the code should be recommended. However they usually leverage low level syntactic and lexical features that are not sufficient to infer the logic of a program, much less to complete it, which is the aim of code sophistication. The approach closest to sophistication is the work on inferring syntactic templates [38] but it is restricted to specific API usages.

**Program synthesis** is about "*discovering programs that realize user intent expressed in the form of some specifications*" [14]. The latter may be logical specifications, descriptions in natural language, input-output examples or test cases. Early approaches relied on extensive specifications [12], but more recent inductive approaches rather aim at producing generalization from partial specifications [28]. Inductive program synthesis is usually seen as

a search problem, where the goal is to explore the set of programs to find the one corresponding to the provided specification. Approaches based on deep learning extract knowledge from large code bases, for instance to generate domain specific programs based on input/output examples [15, 47]. Other approaches rely on neural machine translation to translate functionality descriptions in natural language into executable code in domain specific languages [55], general purpose languages for API usage sequences [13], or more generalized purpose [32, 54]. **Automatic program repair** is a sub-field of program synthesis defined as "*the transformation of an unacceptable behavior of a program into a acceptable one according to a specification*" [36]. The goal of automatic program repair is to recommend appropriate patches to modify the part of the program responsible of an identified defect. Some approaches use repair templates to address specific classes of defects [4, 24, 33], while others rely on genetic programming and mutations to find appropriate patches [3, 52]. Code Phage [48] is a system transferring correct code from programs passing a set of test cases to programs in which defects were detected. Program synthesis and program repair approaches rely on specifications that characterize the missing behavior, such as test cases and textual descriptions. Code recommendation is then akin to suggesting code fragments implementing an outlined behavior. In other words, it helps developers determine *how* to code for a particular scenario. On the contrary, code sophistication aims to suggest missing conditional paths corresponding to unspecified behaviors, relying only on the program under development. Note that some approaches in automatic program repair generate patches without relying on specifications [4, 17, 51]; however, they only target specific classes of defects.

When facing unfamiliar programming tasks, developers often seek code snippet examples; **code search** aims to suggest such relevant snippets. Most code search approaches are based on information retrieval techniques to find relevant code snippets depending on a query either formulated directly by the developer or inferred from the code [1]. Some approaches focus on recommending specific types of snippets, such as framework usages [21], Java methods [1], exception handling examples [43], auxiliary functionalities [29] or API usages [42], while others are general purpose [22, 23, 25, 35, 45, 49]. Approaches inferring a query from the code can be based on tokens and/or statements similarity [1, 49], structural code features [21, 25, 35, 43], or lexical ones [43]. Code search approaches which are the closest to code sophistication are the ones in which no query is formulated directly and which rely only on the code under development to suggest code fragments. These approaches search for similar fragments and use the provided program as a specification of the intended behavior. In contrast, code sophistication focuses on completing the logic of a program with behaviors that were missed. These behaviors are by definition assumed to be absent from the code. Code search approaches are thus not applicable for sophistication.

### 3 CODE SOPHISTICATION

In this section, we first lay down and motivate the problem of code sophistication. We then give directions for addressing it.

#### 3.1 Definitions and Motivations


The set of behaviors of a program, sometimes referred as the *program's logic*, can be outlined through execution paths, pseudocode, or use cases. Execution paths offer an interesting perspective in our case, because we can think of each path as one behavior, depending on the conditions that delimit in which scenario it is executed [26]. In other words, the choice of an execution path is determined by the program's inputs and the conditions they satisfy. Those inputs may be explicit (e.g., parameters, attributes) or implicit (e.g., time). Each conditional path thus defines how to behave in a scenario circumscribed by the values of the inputs. Common scenarios correspond to combinations of input values that are typically observed, whereas atypical scenarios correspond to uncommon combinations which happen rarely. *Recommending alternative behaviors to handle omitted scenarios can thus be defined as suggesting missing conditional paths targeting specific combinations of input's values.*

In software testing, missing conditional paths are known as a particular class of defects which do not reside in the written code, but in the absence of a particular fragment [37]. Several studies have analyzed bug fixes of large projects and report that missing paths are a particularly abundant class of defects [7, 11, 31, 41], known to be hard to predict and detect. In *The Art of Software Testing* [37], Myers et al. report that exhaustive path testing, a common approach to test the logic of a program, might not uncover errors caused by missing paths. Hemmati showed that indeed the largest category of errors that remain undetected by code coverage criteria are "faults of omission" related to missing conditional paths [19]. Chen et al. studied dormant bugs, i.e., bugs introduced in a version of a system and not reported before after the release of the next version [9]. They found that 52% of dormant bugs are related to corner cases and control flow, while only 11% of the non-dormant bugs concern these categories, suggesting they take longer to be exposed. The reasons for this are that scenarios which are not present in the requirements are difficult to detect due to a lack of "local clues about the omission" [8] or because they necessitate particular conditions to be triggered [41]. These suggest that missing conditional paths indeed correspond to omitted scenarios.

To sum up, the literature provides evidence that missing conditional paths corresponding to omitted scenarios are one of the most occurring class of defects found in software projects, and are particularly difficult to detect by both manual and automated software testing approaches. Detecting and patching missing behaviors is thus an important and challenging issue. In addition, we showed in Section 2 that existing code recommendation approaches, while providing valuable avenues to investigate, are not sufficient to recommend missing behaviors in the general case. In what follows, we provide directions for addressing this problem.

#### 3.2 Toward Logic Recommendation

We hypothesize that knowledge about programs' logic can be derived from available code in large project repositories. More specifically, we aim at learning *sophistication patterns* from recurring code changes across project histories. We consider that commits adding conditional paths, as illustrated in the Python method in Fig. 1 (a), are good candidates to learn sophistication patterns. Such patterns



**Figure 1: Processing a commit's method<sup>1</sup> to detect extension points (level 1) and characterize missing behaviors (level 2).**

should characterize *alternative behaviors* (i.e., what should be added) and their *context* (i.e., where and when it should be added).

To achieve generalizability of sophistication patterns across different projects and domains, it is necessary to work with high level characterization of behaviors, independent from implementation concerns. For example, consider two applications, one for the reserving travel tickets, one for banking. The reservation application tests if the date of departure is before the date of return; the banking application tests if the amount of money to be withdrawn exceeds the bank balance. Despite having domain specific implementations, these behaviors are logically similar: they both raise an error if one input value is superior to another. Their characterization must be at a sufficient level of abstraction to reflect this similarity.

Because a program's logic pertains to its structure, leveraging *structural information* is crucial to depict the context of alternative behaviors. We are currently investigating the use of structural representations of the code, notably the control flow graph (CFG). A CFG is a graph representing the flow (directed edges) between the statements (nodes) of a program, portraying its different execution paths, as shown in Fig. 1 (b) for the same Python method. The nodes and edges in green represent the path added in the commit. Predicate nodes have two outgoing edges and divide their ingoing path into two paths which depend on a condition. Adding a new path in a program entails adding a predicate node in its corresponding CFG: thus, we consider that each edge of a CFG is a potential *extension point*, on which a predicate node can be added to divide the current path and add an alternative behavior. In Fig 1 (b), we can see that the added predicate node (represented by an hexagon) splits the edge coming from the first node to insert a new path: this edge is an extension point. Also, because the executed behaviors depend on the inputs of the program, we hypothesize that conditional paths may depend on the *usage of inputs* through the program, and we take these usages into account when describing the context in sophistication patterns.

Based on these assumptions, we outline the problem of recommending missing behaviors as three levels of increasing complexity. (*Level 1:*) Suggest possible extension points in a program. Extension points show where the current control flow should be diverted when a certain condition is met to introduce a new behavior. (*Level 2:*) Given an extension point in the program, suggest a high level description characterizing the potentially missing behavior. Instead of suggesting code fragments representing specific implementation of a behavior, recommended solutions must rather characterize this behavior with a sufficient level of abstraction to be independent of domain specific implementation concerns. (*Level 3:*) Given an extension point and a characterization of the missing behavior, suggest code templates of proposed implementations of the missing behavior.

## 4 IMPLEMENTATION AND VALIDATION

We propose a preliminary implementation of a code sophistication, based on Graph Convolutional Networks. We present early results for Levels 1 and 2: detecting potential extension points and characterizing missing behaviors. Figure 1 presents an overview of the proposed approach.

### 4.1 Collecting and Encoding Data

The change history of a software project is an important indicator of the defects which were uncovered and fixed by developers. To gather information about patterns of program logic completion, we focused on commits adding conditional statements, as they can show where a developer added a conditional path that was missing [41]. We analyzed all commits in the history of 250 Github projects written in Python, for a total of 1.2M commits, and extract methods in which an `if` statement block was added, as illustrated in Fig. 1 (a). To leverage structural information in the extracted methods, we construct their control flow graph (CFG), as shown in Fig.1 (b). In each CFG, we removed the nodes corresponding to the added path (Fig 1 (c)): the pruned CFG thus corresponds to the CFG of the method before the commit. We keep track of the

<sup>1</sup>Original commit: <https://github.com/3b1b/manim/commit/a9f620e2508cf9de4f5a405449673d4d50804d80>

edge corresponding to the extension point (represented in orange in Fig 1 (c)), as well as the statements present in the path added by the commit (here an Assign and a Call). Finally, we annotate each node of the CFG with the usage of the inputs, as illustrated in Fig 1 (d). We considered two types of inputs: the method’s parameters and the attributes used in its body. In our example, the method has two inputs: the parameter point and the attribute self.points. We characterize the usage of inputs by the type of statements in which they appear. In the middle node of Fig. 1 (c), self.points is used in Assign and Subscript statements, and point in an Assign statement. The Return statement of the bottom node does not use any input. For each method, we thus have a CFG annotated with the usage of inputs, where one of its edges is identified as an extension point, associated with the statements from the removed path.

## 4.2 Implementation of Learning Models

For the two experiments we built classification models taking, as input, a CFG annotated with input usages. We used the StellarGraph library [10] to build the graph classification models based on the graph convolutional layers from Kipf and Welling [27]. Because we aim to represent an edge of the graph, we divide the CFG in two parts (before and after the tagged edge, representing the structured inputs’ usage before and after the extension point, as shown in Fig 1 (d)) and feed the models with these two sub-graphs.

To **detect extension points** (level 1), we trained a binary classifier to detect if an edge of a given CFG is an extension point. For positive examples, we used the extracted graphs for which we know the edge on which a path was added. For negative examples, we mined methods for which commits added lines that do not correspond to new paths. We created the same annotated CFGs, but with edges which did not correspond to extension points. We evaluate the model with the following metrics: accuracy, precision, recall, F1 measure and area under the curve (AUC). The AUC score measures the probability that our classifier will rank an edge corresponding to an extension point higher than an edge which does not.

To **characterize the missing behavior** (level 2), we trained a multi-label classifier to identify the types of statements that should be used in the behavior to be added at a given extension point. We selected 8 recurring types of statements as defined in the Python AST module<sup>2</sup> as our classes – Return, Assign, AugAssign, Raise, If, Call, Subscript and BinOp – and labeled each method with the statements appearing in the commit added lines. We compared the results with two state-of-the-art models for code completion in Python, GraphCodeBERT [16] and CodeGPT [34]. Because these two models do not suggest types of statements, we generate for each method the same number of tokens added in the commit. We then extracted the types of statements from the models’ suggestions to obtain a baseline for comparison. We evaluate the three models with the following metrics: AUC, macro and micro F1, and Hamming loss. AUC scores, in the multilabel case, represent an average of the AUC of each class. Macro F1 is the average of F1 measure for each class, while micro F1 is the F1 measure computed on all examples and for all classes. The Hamming loss represents how many times a pair edge-label is misclassified: the lower the loss the better.

<sup>2</sup><https://docs.python.org/3/library/ast>, accessed in July 2021

Accuracy	AUC	Precision	Recall	F1
.730	.817	.727	.717	.721

**Table 1: Results for the detection of extension points.**

Metrics	CC(CodeGPT)	CC(GraphCodeBERT)	CS
AUC	.564	.561	<b>.750</b>
Macro F1	.309	.072	<b>.358</b>
Micro F1	.333	.095	<b>.397</b>
Hamming loss	.308	.264	<b>.237</b>

**Table 2: Results for the characterization of behaviors.**

## 4.3 Results

For the two experiments, we performed a 5-fold cross validation: the presented results are the averages for the 5 folds. Table 1 presents the results for the model detecting extension points. A classifier is often considered suitable if its AUC score is above 0.7 [46]. Table 2 compares the results obtained with the two state-of-the-art models for code completion (denoted CC) and our multilabel classifier for code sophistication (denoted CS). We can see that our model provides better results than the two baselines.

In both cases, we have encouraging results suggesting that a) knowledge about programs’ logic can be learned from code repositories and b) structural code information and input’s usage are adequate to identify extension points and characterize missing behaviors, without relying on specifications.

## 5 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We defined and motivate the problem of code sophistication, i.e., completing programs with missing behaviors that were neither specified nor predicted. We discussed how existing code recommendation approaches are not suitable for this problem and proposed an approach to recommending appropriate behaviors that relies on knowledge learned from large code repositories. We presented early results demonstrating we could detect extension points and characterize missing behaviors by learning from the structure and the usage of inputs from commits adding conditional paths.

Our next steps are to study in detail the added lines in the commits of our dataset to provide a characterization of the missing alternative behaviors, with descriptions independent from implementation and domain concerns. This knowledge is crucial to better understand what parts of program logic we should aim to infer for code sophistication. We are currently investigating the approaches used for related tasks, especially code completion and code search, with the goal of adapting and extending the more relevant ones to recommend alternative behaviors and code templates (*Level 3*). This will help us further determine which code properties are decisive to detect and infer missing behaviors. In the long term, we aim to study how code sophistication could be efficiently carried out by recommendation systems to successfully assist developers into handling omitted scenarios.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Lei Ai, Zhiqiu Huang, Weiwei Li, Yu Zhou, and Yaoshen Yu. 2019. Sensory: Leveraging code statement sequence information for code snippets recommendation. In *43rd Ann. Computer Software and Applications Conference*, Vol. 1. IEEE, 27–36.
- [2] Miltiadis Allamanis, Earl T Barr, Premkumar Devanbu, and Charles Sutton. 2018. A survey of machine learning for big code and naturalness. *ACM Computing*



- Surveys (CSUR)* 51, 4 (2018), 1–37.
- [3] Andrea Arcuri. 2011. Evolutionary repair of faulty software. *Applied soft computing* 11, 4 (2011), 3494–3514.
  - [4] Johannes Bader, Andrew Scott, Michael Pradel, and Satish Chandra. 2019. Getafix: Learning to fix bugs automatically. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 3, OOPSLA (2019), 1–27.
  - [5] Avishkar Bhoopchand, Tim Rocktäschel, Earl Barr, and Sebastian Riedel. 2016. Learning python code suggestion with a sparse pointer network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.08307* (2016).
  - [6] Marcel Bruch, Martin Monperrus, and Mira Mezini. 2009. Learning from examples to improve code completion systems. In *Proceedings of the 7th joint meeting of the European software engineering conference and the ACM SIGSOFT symposium on the foundations of software engineering*. 213–222.
  - [7] Ray-Yaung Chang, Andy Podgurski, and Jiong Yang. 2007. Finding what’s not there: a new approach to revealing neglected conditions in software. In *Proc. of the 2007 international symposium on Software testing and analysis*. 163–173.
  - [8] Ray-Yaung Chang, Andy Podgurski, and Jiong Yang. 2008. Discovering neglected conditions in software by mining dependence graphs. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 34, 5 (2008), 579–596.
  - [9] Tse-Hsun Chen, Meiyappan Nagappan, Emad Shihab, and Ahmed E Hassan. 2014. An empirical study of dormant bugs. In *Proceedings of the 11th Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories*. 82–91.
  - [10] CSIRO’s Data61. 2018. StellarGraph Machine Learning Library. <https://github.com/stellargraph/stellargraph>.
  - [11] Joao A Duraes and Henrique S Madeira. 2006. Emulation of software faults: A field data study and a practical approach. *Ieee transactions on software engineering* 32, 11 (2006), 849–867.
  - [12] Cordell Green. 1981. Application of theorem proving to problem solving. In *Readings in Artificial Intelligence*. Elsevier, 202–222.
  - [13] Xiaodong Gu, Hongyu Zhang, Dongmei Zhang, and Sunghun Kim. 2016. Deep API learning. In *Proceedings of the 2016 24th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Foundations of Software Engineering*. 631–642.
  - [14] Sumit Gulwani. 2010. Dimensions in program synthesis. In *12th Int. ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and practice of declarative programming*. 13–24.
  - [15] Sumit Gulwani, William R Harris, and Rishabh Singh. 2012. Spreadsheet data manipulation using examples. *Commun. ACM* 55, 8 (2012), 97–105.
  - [16] Daya Guo, Shuo Ren, Shuai Lu, Zhangyin Feng, Duyu Tang, Shujie Liu, Long Zhou, Nan Duan, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Shengyu Fu, et al. 2020. Graphcodebert: Pre-training code representations with data flow. *arXiv:2009.08366* (2020).
  - [17] Hideaki Hata, Emad Shihab, and Graham Neubig. 2018. Learning to generate corrective patches using neural machine translation. *arXiv:1812.07170* (2018).
  - [18] Vincent J Hellendoorn and Premkumar Devanbu. 2017. Are deep neural networks the best choice for modeling source code?. In *Proceedings of the 2017 11th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering*. 763–773.
  - [19] Hadi Hemmati. 2015. How effective are code coverage criteria?. In *2015 International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability and Security*. IEEE, 151–156.
  - [20] Abram Hindle, Earl T Barr, Mark Gabel, Zhendong Su, and Premkumar Devanbu. 2016. On the naturalness of software. *Commun. ACM* 59, 5 (2016), 122–131.
  - [21] Reid Holmes and Gail C Murphy. 2005. Using structural context to recommend source code examples. In *27th Int. Conf. on Software engineering*. 117–125.
  - [22] He Jiang, Liming Nie, Zeyi Sun, Zhilei Ren, Weiqiang Kong, Tao Zhang, and Xiapu Luo. 2016. Rosf: Leveraging information retrieval and supervised learning for recommending code snippets. *Trans. on Services Computing* 12 (2016), 34–46.
  - [23] Renhe Jiang, Zhengzhao Chen, Zejun Zhang, Yu Pei, Minxue Pan, and Tian Zhang. 2018. Semantics-based code search using input/output examples. In *18th Int. Working Conf. on Source Code Analysis and Manipulation (SCAM)*. IEEE, 92–102.
  - [24] Dongsun Kim, Jaechang Nam, Jaewoo Song, and Sunghun Kim. 2013. Automatic patch generation learned from human-written patches. In *2013 35th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 802–811.
  - [25] Kisub Kim, Dongsun Kim, Tegawendé F Bissyandé, Eunjong Choi, Li Li, Jacques Klein, and Yves Le Traon. 2018. FaCoY: a code-to-code search engine. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 946–957.
  - [26] James C King. 1976. Symbolic execution and program testing. *Commun. ACM* 19, 7 (1976), 385–394.
  - [27] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2016. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907* (2016).
  - [28] Emanuel Kitzelmann. 2009. Inductive programming: A survey of program synthesis techniques. In *International workshop on approaches and applications of inductive programming*. Springer, 50–73.
  - [29] Otávio Augusto Lazzarini Lemos, Sushil Bajracharya, Joel Ossher, Paulo Cesar Masiero, and Cristina Lopes. 2011. A test-driven approach to code search and its application to the reuse of auxiliary functionality. *Information and Software Technology* 53, 4 (2011), 294–306.
  - [30] Jian Li, Yue Wang, Michael R Lyu, and Irwin King. 2017. Code completion with neural attention and pointer networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.09573* (2017).
  - [31] Zhenmin Li, Lin Tan, Xuanhui Wang, Shan Lu, Yuanxuan Zhou, and Chengxiang Zhai. 2006. Have things changed now? An empirical study of bug characteristics in modern open source software. In *Proceedings of the 1st workshop on Architectural and system support for improving software dependability*. 25–33.
  - [32] Wang Ling, Phil Blunsom, Edward Grefenstette, Karl Moritz Hermann, Tomás Kociský, Fumin Wang, and Andrew W. Senior. 2016. Latent Predictor Networks for Code Generation. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2016*.
  - [33] Fan Long and Martin Rinard. 2015. Staged program repair with condition synthesis. In *10th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering*. 166–178.
  - [34] Shuai Lu, Daya Guo, Shuo Ren, Junjie Huang, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Ambrosio Blanco, Colin Clement, Dawn Drain, Daxin Jiang, Duyu Tang, et al. 2021. CodeXGLUE: A Machine Learning Benchmark Dataset for Code Understanding and Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04664* (2021).
  - [35] Sifei Luan, Di Yang, Celeste Barnaby, Koushik Sen, and Satish Chandra. 2019. Aroma: Code recommendation via structural code search. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 3, OOPSLA (2019), 1–28.
  - [36] Martin Monperrus. 2018. Automatic software repair: a bibliography. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 51, 1 (2018), 1–24.
  - [37] Glenford J Myers, Corey Sandler, and Tom Badgett. 2011. *The art of software testing*. John Wiley & Sons.
  - [38] Anh Tuan Nguyen and Tien N Nguyen. 2015. Graph-based statistical language model for code. In *37th Int. Conf. on Software Engineering*. Vol. 1. IEEE, 858–868.
  - [39] Tung Thanh Nguyen, Anh Tuan Nguyen, Hoan Anh Nguyen, and Tien N Nguyen. 2013. A statistical semantic language model for source code. In *Proceedings of the 9th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering*. 532–542.
  - [40] Sebastian Proksch, Johannes Lerch, and Mira Mezini. 2015. Intelligent code completion with Bayesian networks. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)* 25, 1 (2015), 1–31.
  - [41] Shruti Raghavan, Rosanne Rohana, David Leon, Andy Podgurski, and Vinay Augustine. 2004. Dex: A semantic-graph differencing tool for studying changes in large code bases. In *20th Int. Conf. on Software Maintenance*. IEEE, 188–197.
  - [42] Mukund Raghothaman, Yi Wei, and Youssef Hamadi. 2016. Swim: Synthesizing what i mean-code search and idiomatic snippet synthesis. In *2016 IEEE/ACM 38th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 357–367.
  - [43] Mohammad Masudur Rahman and Chanchal K Roy. 2014. On the use of context in recommending exception handling code examples. In *2014 IEEE 14th International Working Conference on Source Code Analysis and Manipulation*. IEEE, 285–294.
  - [44] Veselin Raychev, Martin Vechev, and Eran Yahav. 2014. Code completion with statistical language models. In *Proceedings of the 35th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. 419–428.
  - [45] Steven P Reiss. 2009. Semantics-based code search. In *2009 IEEE 31st International Conference on Software Engineering*. IEEE, 243–253.
  - [46] Daniele Romano and Martin Pinzger. 2011. Using source code metrics to predict change-prone java interfaces. In *2011 27th IEEE international conference on software maintenance (ICSM)*. IEEE, 303–312.
  - [47] Reed Scott and N Freitas. 2015. Neural programmer-interpreters. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
  - [48] Stelios Sidiropoulos-Douskos, Eric Lahtinen, Fan Long, and Martin Rinard. 2015. Automatic error elimination by horizontal code transfer across multiple applications. In *Proceedings of the 36th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. 43–54.
  - [49] Watanabe Takuya and Hidehiko Masuhara. 2011. A spontaneous code recommendation tool based on associative search. In *Proc. of the 3rd International Workshop on search-driven development: Users, infrastructure, tools, and evaluation*. 17–20.
  - [50] Zhaopeng Tu, Zhendong Su, and Premkumar Devanbu. 2014. On the localness of software. In *22nd Int. Symp. on Foundations of Software Engineering*. 269–280.
  - [51] Michele Tufano, Cody Watson, Gabriele Bavota, Massimiliano Di Penta, Martin White, and Denys Poshyvanyk. 2019. An empirical study on learning bug-fixing patches in the wild via neural machine translation. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)* 28, 4 (2019), 1–29.
  - [52] Westley Weimer, ThanhVu Nguyen, Claire Le Goues, and Stephanie Forrest. 2009. Automatically finding patches using genetic programming. In *2009 IEEE 31st International Conference on Software Engineering*. IEEE, 364–374.
  - [53] Martin Weyssow, Houari Sahraoui, Benoit Frénay, and Benoit Vanderose. 2020. Combining Code Embedding with Static Analysis for Function-Call Completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.03731* (2020).
  - [54] Pengcheng Yin and Graham Neubig. 2017. A Syntactic Neural Model for General-Purpose Code Generation. In *55th Ann. Meet. of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Regina Barzilay and Min-Yen Kan (Eds.). ACL, 440–450.
  - [55] Victor Zhong, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2017. Seq2sql: Generating structured queries from natural language using reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.00103* (2017).