

IRJIT: A simple, online, information retrieval approach for just-in-time software defect prediction

Hareem Sahar · Abdul Ali Bangash ·
Abram Hindle · Denilson Barbosa

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract Just-in-Time software defect prediction (JIT-SDP) prevents the introduction of defects into the software by identifying them at commit check-in time. Current defect prediction approaches rely on manually crafted features such as change metrics and involve expensive to train machine learning or deep learning models. These models typically involve extensive training processes that may require significant computational resources and time. These characteristics can pose challenges when attempting to update the models in real-time as new examples become available, potentially impacting their suitability for fast online defect prediction. Furthermore, the reliance on a complex underlying model makes these approaches often less *explainable*, which means the developers cannot understand the reasons behind models' predictions. An approach that is not *explainable* might not be adopted in real-life development environments because of developers' lack of trust in its results. To address these limitations, we propose an approach called IRJIT that employs information retrieval on source code and labels new commits as buggy or clean based on

Hareem Sahar
Department of Computing Science
University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada
E-mail: hareeme@ualberta.ca

Abdul Ali Bangash
Department of Computing Science
Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada
E-mail: abdulali.b@queensu.ca

Abram Hindle
Department of Computing Science
University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada
E-mail: abram.hindle@ualberta.ca

Denilson Barbosa
Department of Computing Science
University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada
E-mail: denilson@ualberta.ca

their similarity to past buggy or clean commits. IRJIT approach is *online* and *explainable* as it can learn from new data without expensive retraining, and developers can see the documents that support a prediction, providing additional context. By evaluating 10 open-source datasets in a within project setting, we show that our approach is up to 23 times faster than the state-of-the-art, offers explainability at the commit and line level, and has comparable performance to the state-of-the-art.

Keywords Defect Prediction, · Just-in-time, · Information Retrieval

1 Introduction

The later a defect is identified in the software development life cycle, the higher its impact and maintenance cost [30]. To identify and prevent defects early on, Just-in-time (JIT) software defect prediction (SDP) [28,19] is proposed to identify risky commits at check-in time. Identifying risky commits at commit-time allows practitioners to dedicate their limited testing resources to review and fix the riskiest commits while the context and changes are still fresh in the authors' minds.

JIT-SDP models are commonly built using machine learning (ML) and deep learning (DL) techniques. Once trained, these models rely on a static understanding of the data distribution they were trained on. However, as we show later, over time, these models can become outdated, resulting in a decline in their performance. Consequently, retraining becomes necessary. Nevertheless, retraining models from the ground up can be a resource-intensive and time-consuming process [47,5]. In practice, these overheads can render such models impractical for JIT-SDP, which is inherently an online learning problem [6, 43].

ML and DL models are not only cost-prohibitive due to the time and resources needed for training but often lack explainability. *Explainability* is a desired property of a prediction model designed to operate in a real life development environment. For a JIT approach to be called *explainable*, the developers shall be able to trace back predictions to their originating documents [10]. An example would be highlighting parts of a change that look similar to a past buggy change. The state-of-the-art JIT-SDP approaches such as DeepJIT [17] and CC2Vec [18] are not explainable because of reliance on a complex underlying learning model such as a deep neural network model.

To address these limitations of prior work, in this paper, we propose IRJIT, a simple, online, and explainable information retrieval (IR) approach for JIT defect identification. IRJIT classifies a new commit into clean or buggy based on its similarity with past commits. To compute similarity, IRJIT exploits BM25 algorithm [42]. For each identified buggy commit, IRJIT also estimates its buggy lines using *term frequency \times inverse document frequency* (tf-idf) term weights [38]. By relying on traditional document indexing using source code token frequencies instead of hand-crafted features such as code change or review metrics [27], we make our approach readily deployable for any project

with an active version control system and an issue tracker. Our approach offers several advantages over recent JIT approaches [17] [18]:

- IRJIT operates in an **online** manner, which means that it can adapt over time by learning from new changes. IRJIT incrementally updates indexes as new commits arrive without undergoing frequent and extensive retraining, which can slow down the overall prediction process. Being able to update online and react promptly to changes is desirable for the adoption of a JIT approach [45]. By reducing the costs associated with retraining models, IRJIT quickly reacts to changes, making it ideal for JIT-SDP.
- IRJIT is **explainable** as it links predictions to their originating documents. It also ranks source code lines of identified buggy commits by riskiness, making it easier for developers to inspect source code documents that were used in prediction and understand why a commit was classified as buggy. These characteristics enhance transparency and increase practitioners’ trust in predictions [10], while potentially simplifying the bug-fixing process.
- IRJIT is **simple** as it operates directly on source code without requiring additional hand-crafted features. It does not rely on complex machine learning or deep learning prediction models. Instead, it draws conclusions by matching current changes against the past source code documents that developers are already familiar with; hence, the results are also simpler to understand.

To establish the strengths and weaknesses of our approach we compare it with a state-of-the-art machine learning (ML) approach JITLine [31]. JITLine is a sophisticated approach that relies on code and review metrics [27] and bag of word tokens. JITLine engages in extensive tuning through SMOTE [9] and Differential Evolution (DE) to directly optimize metrics and word vectors for AUC. We believe that such an approach could delay the *online* prediction process [44][6] and, therefore, may not be suitable to be integrated into the continuous integration pipeline. Lastly, JITLine, despite being more sophisticated than prior approaches, leverages SMOTE to create new training examples, as a consequence of which it cannot retrieve originating commits that can be blamed for a bug. In other words, it cannot explain the predictions by linking to the original documents causing the classification, although it can rank lines by defectiveness.

2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

This paper investigates when and to what extent information retrieval can be helpful in a realistic online JIT-SDP scenario. We answer following Research Questions (RQs) in this paper:

RQ1. Is the CPU run time of IRJIT less than (or equal to) that of a state-of-the-art machine learning approach?

Motivation. For this RQ, cost is measured as CPU run time of building a

model. The cost of using IR methods in JIT-SDP is not thoroughly studied. Additionally, the existing literature does not provide a clear answer regarding the trade-offs between simple versus heavily-trained SDP models. Answering RQ1 builds a clearer understanding of cost differences and allows organizations to allocate their resources more wisely, especially when budgets are limited. The insights could also drive the SDP research towards more cost-effective methods.

RQ2. Does the predictive performance of IRJIT exceed (or remain equal to) the performance of a state-of-the-art machine learning approach?

Motivation. This work introduces a JIT-SDP approach that adapts without retraining. The question arises: How does the simplicity of our approach translate to its performance? Does a straightforward approach hold its ground when compared against a sophisticated model? To answer this, we analyze the predictive performance of our approach and compare it with a machine learning baseline to see if it improves, deteriorates or retains similar predictive performance as the baseline approach. The insights from RQ2 will help stakeholders in choosing between our IR approach and the ML based state-of-the-art approach.

RQ3. For fine grained line level SDP, does IRJIT performance exceed (or remain equal to) that of a state-of-the-art machine learning approach?

Motivation. Fine-grained SDP helps developers identify bugs quickly with less effort. If our approach can predict buggy lines upon commit, it might expedite the bug-fixing process, enhancing the overall software development life cycle. On the other hand, if buggy lines are not ranked on top, developer effort may go to waste, and the bugs may still go unnoticed. Therefore, in this research question, we measure the performance of our approach in terms of correctly ranking bug lines. The contributions of this work include:

- a JIT-SDP approach based on IR to detect buggy commits at commit check-in time;
- an approach to identify associated buggy lines for each identified buggy commit;
- a realistic evaluation of our approach on 10 open-source software defect prediction datasets using various metrics and its comparison with a mature machine learning baseline.

Our replication package is available at https://github.com/Hareem-E-Sahar/eseval_online.

3 Background and Related Work

3.1 JIT-SDP

JIT-SDP emphasizes the identification of risky changes just-in-time, i.e., before they reach repository. Existing JIT approaches detect bugs based on past

information such as change histories [23] or by relating past defects to software metrics [37][19]. CLEVER [29] identifies new defects by comparing new code to known cases of buggy code. It uses a clone detection to improve the accuracy of buggy change identification which was originally based solely on a metric-based model. Kamei *et al.* [19] performed a longitudinal case study on two open-source systems, Openstack and Qt, and found that fluctuations in the properties of fix-inducing changes can impact the performance of JIT models. They also showed that JIT models typically lose power after one year, so they should be updated with more recent data.

Figure 1 illustrates an example of one such machine learning based SDP model, trained on the initial 10% project data. The plot reveals a notable decline in the model’s performance over time, a phenomenon known as concept drift in the literature [19,6], which underscores the importance of retraining models to ensure prediction accuracy. This need for regular updates brings into question the costs of retraining. If these costs are high, they could hinder the model’s practical application, emphasizing the necessity for computationally efficient models.

In this context, the contributions of Pornprasit *et al.* are particularly significant. Notably, Pornprasit *et al.* [31] demonstrated that their machine learning model outperforms complex deep learning methods like DeepJIT [17] and CC2Vec [18], which require significant computational resources. Their work addressed another critical shortcoming of deep learning models i.e., their lack of explainability, by ranking risky lines of a commit identified as buggy. The explainability aspect is crucial to JIT models because developers favor simple, explainable, and online models, as highlighted in the survey conducted by Wang *et al.* [45]. Accordingly, our paper focuses on developing a JIT-SDP approach that is cost-effective, and offers explainability by showcasing the historical instances upon which its predictions are based. Our proposed method offers the advantage of being online, eliminating the need for full retraining, making it both a practical and a user-friendly solution for JIT-SDP.

3.2 Online JIT-SDP

Online learning has been extensively studied and applied in recent years [5,43]. It refers to learning from data streams where data arrives continuously and a timely response is required. Strictly speaking, online learning algorithms process each training example once “on arrival” without the need for reprocessing, and maintain a model that reflects the current state to make a prediction at each time step. Tan *et al.* [44] investigated JIT-SDP using batches of training examples arriving over time to update the prediction models. They used resampling techniques to deal with the class-imbalanced data issue and updatable classification to learn over time. They also considered the fact that the labels of training data may arrive much later than the commit time, a concept named verification latency in literature [6]. Cabral *et al.* [6] proposed Oversampling Rate Boosting (ORB) to tackle concept drift (change in the




Fig. 1 Performance evolution of a typical JIT-SDP approach over time showing a declining trend. x-axis shows time step and y-axis shows G-mean values. The model was trained once and the subsequent predictions were made without retraining the model.

proportion of defect-inducing and clean examples) in an online JIT-SDP scenario taking verification latency into account. ORB automatically adjusts the re-sampling rate to tackle class imbalance, which improved its predictive performance over JIT approaches that assume a fixed level of class imbalance. Tabassum *et al.* [43] evaluated ORB in a cross-project (CP) defect prediction setting and showed that CP models trained together on CP and within project (WP) data have a higher performance than WP models trained only on WP data.

3.3 Verification latency in JIT-SDP

Verification latency refers to the fact that the labels of training examples may arrive much later than their input features. Ignoring such delay in an online learning scenario means training models on data that is not available in practice. In JIT-SDP a commit could receive its true label early if a defect

associated to it is quickly found. Alternatively, it can receive label at the end of the waiting time (if the commit is believed to be clean) or after the waiting time (if an example previously considered clean is found to actually be defect-inducing after the waiting time has passed). This waiting time should reflect the time it takes for one to be confident enough that software changes are not defect-inducing. Tan *et al.* [44] introduced this concept and found that ignoring latency could lead to false performance estimates. Cabral *et al.* [6] investigated how long it typically takes for software changes to be revealed as defect-inducing. Later, Tabassum *et al.* [43] and our work followed the same methodology for the evaluation of JIT-SDP.

3.4 Leveraging source code similarity

DeepBugs[32] detects incorrect code by reasoning about identifier names, and training a binary classifier on correct and incorrect examples. We leverage code similarity between past buggy and clean changes to *explain* why a new change is classified as buggy. This line of work is inspired by the success of code search and recommendation engines [26][21] which employ IR techniques. IR-based methods work by matching shared vocabulary between query and corpus documents, and are effective for code retrieval [25][50] and bug localization [34]. Due to the repetitive nature of source code [16], statistical language models can also spot defective code effectively [35,7,39]. Yan *et al.* [48] use several change level features and software naturalness with the n-gram model to localize buggy changes. Their proposed framework ranks buggy lines in order of suspiciousness. In this work, we also estimate the riskiness of the source code lines based on the number of occurrences of buggy tokens in each line.

4 Deployed Workflow

Here we are going to share the story of how IRJIT fits into Ada’s workflow who is a software developer at TechFlow¹. Every day, Ada faces a challenge to ensure that her code commits are defect-free. While comprehensive testing processes and code reviews are a part of TechFlow’s quality control, the idea is to catch potential issues as early as possible, minimizing disruptions and maximizing efficiency. IRJIT is seamlessly integrated into the developers’ workflow using a commit hook, preventing potential defects from sneaking into the codebase, hence making Ada’s life easier. Imagine Ada had just finished writing a feature that involved intricate logic. As she prepared to commit her changes, the newly-integrated JIT prediction model sprang into action. Behind the scenes, the IRJIT model analyzes various aspects of her commit such as the source code changes made to different files in commit. These changes, along with the historical commit data continuously collected by IRJIT, serve as the foundation for the model’s prediction. By analyzing previous commits

¹ It is not a real name

and their labels, the model learns characteristics that make a commit more or less likely to introduce defects. A moment later, a notification popped up, suggesting that there might be a potential issue with Ada’s commit. Intrigued, Ada decided to investigate further by looking at the past changes that matched the new changes, and the ranked buggy lines. She realized that she had missed handling an edge case in her code. Grateful for the timely alert, she made the necessary modifications before proceeding with the commit.

For this scenario to work, IRJIT must be online and update itself in real-time as new commits and defect labels arrive. To accomplish this, IRJIT operates in the background, automatically retrieving data from various sources, including version control and issue-tracking systems. The new commits are placed in a queue and wait for a defect to be linked to them or for a set time period to pass, after which we assume the commit is clean. As Ada’s team fixes bugs that arise post-commit, IRJIT updates its understanding of which commits led to defects. Once IRJIT obtains a new labeled commit, its prediction model is updated incrementally without requiring complete retraining from scratch. This online approach taken by IRJIT ensures that developers’ workflow remains uninterrupted.

As days turned into weeks, Ada, along with her colleagues at TechFlow, found the IRJIT becoming an indispensable part of their workflow. There were moments of affirmation where the model caught potential issues. While the model was not infallible, it allowed Ada and her team to commit code with an added layer of confidence. There were also moments when Ada disagreed with the model’s prediction, and in such cases, Ada could ignore the prediction and still push the commit. This balance between automated insights and human judgment ensured that the tool remained an assistant, not a gatekeeper.

5 IRJIT METHODOLOGY

IRJIT can be integrated into git either through a commit hook [3] or a pull request bot. As soon as a developer pushes a new commit, IRJIT analyzes the new source code changes and compares them against past changes in the project’s version control system. The developer is alerted if IRJIT predicts the new commit is buggy. This way, IRJIT can ensure that bugs are identified and resolved before the changes reach the main branch of the project repository. Figure 2 shows the backend design of IRJIT framework. IRJIT extracts past project commits (Section 5.1) and associated source code changes (Section 5.2). The source code changes are stored into an inverted index for querying (Section 5.3). IRJIT intercepts new commits, queries an index for matches in the indexed corpora, and flags changes that match known buggy changes (Section 5.4). Lastly, for each buggy change, IRJIT ranks source code lines that are part of the change according to their riskiness (Section 5.5).




Fig. 2 An overview of IRJIT operation. IRJIT extracts past changes using SZZ and indexes them using inverted indexes. On arrival of a new commit, IRJIT classifies the commit based on its similarity with the past changes in the index. Finally, IRJIT ranks changed lines according to bugginess.

5.1 Extracting buggy and clean commits

As a first step, IRJIT requires a corpus of buggy and clean commits to make predictions. To obtain buggy commits from a project’s history IRJIT relies on SZZ algorithm [40,24], which operates on the data available in the version control and issue tracking system. In the first step, the algorithm identifies a defect-fixing commit. A commit is *fixing* if it fixes a defect, i.e., it refers to an issue labeled as *FIXED* in the issue tracking system. In the second step, SZZ traces back through the version control to identify the associated *buggy* commit i.e. the one responsible for inducing the fix. For this purpose, SZZ algorithm leverages *diff* and *annotate/blame* functionality. The *diff* helps identify lines that were changed between a defect-fixing commit and its immediately previous commits. These are the lines that potentially fixed the bug. The *annotate/blame* functionality identifies commits that originally introduced or modified those lines in the past. SZZ flags those original changes as defect-introducing or buggy if the commit was made before filing the issue in project issue tracker. Once algorithm completes its execution, the buggy and fixing commits are identified, but there are other commits that are neither buggy nor fixing, but following prior work [48][49] IRJIT includes those in its analysis. From here onwards, we only use the terms *buggy* and *clean* to refer to commits.

5.2 Extracting source code changes from commits

A commit may involve changes to the source code of multiple files. A *change* refers to a committed code in a single file. Each change consists of several hunks, which is a continuous group of added or deleted lines in each file associated with a given commit [22]. IRJIT extracts hunks using the *git diff* utility and pre-processes them to remove blank lines. The processed source code changes corresponding a single file are stored in JSON format, including essential metadata such as **lines added**, commit hash, file name, and label. Currently, IRJIT collects and uses **lines added** by default because Purushothaman *et al.* [33] suggests that the probability of introducing a bug is higher with the addition of new lines. Hence, only **lines added** field might be enough to spot bugs. Our preliminary experiments ² also showed that analyzing **lines deleted** did not lead to a significant gain in the predictive performance of our model. Therefore, we only use the **lines added** field to build the IRJIT model.

5.3 Indexing past source code changes

To make the classification of a new commit scalable and efficient, IRJIT employs an inverted index, a data structure designed to maintain a terms to documents mapping. In information retrieval tasks, inverted index helps to optimize search and retrieval from a large corpus of documents. To build inverted indexes, IRJIT leverages Elasticsearch, which is a real-time full-text search engine built on top of the Apache Lucene library [1].

The historical source code changes are tokenized and indexed based on user specified settings. As mentioned Section 3.4, prior works employ source code as features for various tasks. IRJIT uses a whitespace tokenizer [14] which is part of our custom camel-case analyzer [13] to tokenize the past source code changes, specifically the **lines added** to a change. It splits the words into tokens when a case change is encountered using a method provided in the Elasticsearch documentation. The choice of a camel-case analyzer was initially influenced by Campbell’s work [8]. However, the final selection was based on the finding that it performs slightly better than other analyzers, such as *simple analyzer* and the *shingle analyzer* ³

In practice, one index per project can serve the purpose of a repository for all prior changes. The index is initially empty, resembling a predictive model that will always predict clean until a buggy commit arrives. It is then updated incrementally by adding changes when they arrive, eliminating the need of re-indexing any previous documents. However, when a software change arrives, it is saved in a queue for an arbitrary amount of time, referred to as the waiting

² https://github.com/Hareem-E-Sahar/eseval_online/tree/main/eseval_timewise_batched/results_commit_level/results_lines_added_deleted_camel

³ https://github.com/Hareem-E-Sahar/eseval_online/tree/main/eseval_timewise_batched/results_commit_level/results_lines_added_shingle

period. This waiting period serves to establish confidence that the change is clean. If a bug is associated with the change during the waiting period, it immediately becomes a buggy example. Otherwise, the change becomes a clean example at the end of the waiting period. IRJIT’s approach empowers developers to query against the new changes right away, unlike existing approaches that necessitate model retraining when new data arrives. The ability to remain online makes IRJIT suitable for repositories of any size.

5.4 Classifying a new commit

5.4.1 Retrieving similar commits

When a new commit arrives to be checked-in to a version control system, IRJIT treats it as a test commit. The camel-case analyzer is used to process the commit, similar to the indexed commits, before classifying it as either buggy or clean. This classification is based on the extent to which the new commit’s changes match with those from past commits. The classification process involves several steps. First, IRJIT extracts source code changes from the new commit. Second, for each extracted change it formulates a query using the `lines added` field from the corresponding change. Third, it executes the query and retrieves matches from the past source code changes. Specifically, IRJIT formulates a *more_like_this* (MLT) query [12], which finds indexed training documents that are “like” a given test document. MLT query utilizes corpus-level and document-level term statistics, i.e., *tf-idf* to compute similarity between a query and documents in the corpus. *tf* represents the frequency that a source code token appears in a specific document, and *idf* represents the universal importance of a source code token for the entire collection of documents. IRJIT utilizes BM25 algorithm[42] to calculate similarity. BM25 is a scoring function that considers term frequencies, document frequencies, and document length to generate a relevance score.

Notably, the query document and the indexed documents are processed using the same analyzers before computing similarity. Although Elasticsearch allows for customization of similarity algorithms, we found the default BM25 algorithm to be adequate for our study. Based on the BM25 similarity results, Elasticsearch returns the top-K most similar training documents for a given test document along with their respective relevance scores.

IRJIT may issue multiple queries for each test commit, depending on the number of changes within that commit. The matching documents from all MLT queries are combined into a set called candidate matches and sorted according to relevance score. The Elasticsearch scoring formula [2] is originally based on *tf-idf* and BM25, but contains adjustments to allow for comparison of scores across different queries [8]. Next, IRJIT’s classifier determines a final label for the test commit.

5.4.2 Determining the label from matches

IRJIT currently implements a K-nearest neighbor (KNN) classifier which classifies a commit as *buggy* or a *clean* based on the majority label of the candidate matches. If the majority of K neighbors are buggy, the test commit is labeled buggy; otherwise, it is considered clean. The choice of K is crucial and can be fine-tuned for each project to optimize performance. Alternatively, the user can provide this value as input. Currently, IRJIT uses a default value of $K = 3$ which was set empirically after experimenting on $K = 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11$.

5.5 Generating a ranking of buggy lines for a commit

If a new change is identified as buggy, IRJIT provides developers with a ranking of modified lines based on their level of bugginess. Prior work [16][35][48] exploits n-gram models to find most entropic source code tokens. However, we adopt a slightly different approach to estimate the buggy tokens, i.e., tokens that contribute towards overall bugginess of the document. We rely on tf-idf term weights obtained while executing *more_like_this* query (Section 5.4.1). These term weights highlight the significance of individual terms when predicting a document as buggy. The terms with highest weight when a document is predicted buggy are considered buggy tokens. These tokens are indicative of potential sources of bugs. After extracting buggy tokens, we rank lines based on the number of occurrences of buggy tokens within each line. Finally, we show the ranked buggy lines to the developer.

6 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

6.1 Dataset

We used a dataset extracted by Cabral *et al.* [6], which contains ten existing open-source projects. The dataset is available at <https://zenodo.org/record/2594681>. The size of the datasets range from 74k to over 1.3m lines of code, and their development periods span from 6 to 14 years. The defect datasets contain commit level metrics proposed by Kamei *et al.* [19] and used to describe a software change. The metrics can be divided into five categories including i) diffusion, ii) size, iii) purpose, iv) history, and v) developer experience. All the datasets were extracted using CommitGuru. Table 1 shows the number of commits, programming language and development period for each project.

6.2 Training and Prediction

JIT-SDP is an online process that involves dealing with commits that arrive continuously over time. Each commit has a software change associated with

Table 1 Details of the studied projects

Projects	#commits	Period	Language
Brackets	17,310	12/2011 - 12/2017	Java script
BroadleafCommerce	14,910	09/2003 - 12/2017	Java
Camel	30,517	03/2007 - 12/2017	Java
Fabric8	13,003	12/2011 - 12/2017	Java
JGroups	18,316	09/2003 - 12/2017	Java
Neutron	19,451	12/2010 - 12/2017	Python
Nova	48,937	08/2010 - 01/2018	Python
Npm	7,892	09/2009 - 11/2017	Java script
Spring-integration	8,691	11/2007 - 01/2018	Java
Tomcat	18,877	03/2006 - 12/2017	Java

it, which allows us to classify the commit as defect-inducing or clean. A time step is assigned to each commit, indicating the order of its arrival based on the author’s timestamp. The model’s predictive performance is measured at a specific time step t by training it on commits received before t and then evaluating it on the commit that arrives at t . During the initial phase of a project, the model predicts a test commit as clean until it encounters a defect-inducing example. Therefore, one must update the model as new commits and their labels become available.

We evaluate our approach in the context of within-project defect prediction [43] setting. We use past data from the same project to build our models, or in other words, each model is trained and tested on the same project. We ensure that our evaluation avoids time-travel [4] by preserving the chronological order of data. This is achieved by making certain that our test data always follows the training data. For a JIT model, it’s essential to adapt online [6, 43], which means learning from new data as soon as it becomes available without the need to retrain on the old data. IRJIT has the ability to update in real time with new data.

6.3 Baseline Approach

Our baseline is a state-of-the-art JIT approach, called JITLine [31] proposed by Pornprasit *et al.*. The approach predicts buggy commits using a ML model built from code change and review properties. To address the data imbalance problem caused by a low percentage of buggy commits, JITLine invents new documents with the help of SMOTE technique that is optimized using a differential evolution algorithm.

We chose JITLine as our baseline because of its predictive performance. It has been shown to outperform several deep-learning approaches such as CC2Vec [18], and DeepJIT [17] as well as an n-gram based approach of Yan *et al.* [48]. To the best of our knowledge there is no approach that has outperformed JITLine yet. JITLine’s replication package provides a Python im-

plementation which we slightly modified to allow evaluation at different time steps.

6.4 Evaluation Metrics

In JIT-SDP, which is an online learning problem, the two most frequently used metrics are Recall and G-mean [6]:

Recall measures the proportion of positive class examples that are correctly classified as positive. It is also called true positive (TP) rate. It is calculated as shown below:

$$Recall = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}$$

G-Mean is the geometric mean of positive accuracy (TP rate) and negative accuracy (TN rate). A good classifier will exhibit high accuracies for both classes, resulting in a high G-mean. G-mean is calculated as shown below:

$$G - mean = \sqrt{\frac{TP}{TP + FN} * \frac{TN}{TN + FP}}$$

For imbalanced learning problems, such as defect prediction, it's recommended to use metrics that are not sensitive to class imbalance, like G-mean. As Wang and Minku [46] suggest, this helps ensure fair evaluations. It is important to note that metrics sensitive to class imbalance, like Precision and F-measure, can lead to inconsistent performance evaluations [15] as class distribution varies across datasets. In other words, the performance measure will change as class distribution changes, even though the underlying performance of the classifier does not. Lastly, the AUC (Area Under the Curve) metric relies on varying the classification decision threshold for separating positive and negative classes in the testing dataset. In other words, calculating AUC requires a set of confusion matrices [46]. Therefore, unlike other measures based on a single confusion matrix, AUC cannot be used as an evaluation metric in online learning without memorizing data. For this reason we do not use AUC in our evaluation.

For the line-level evaluation we use the performance metrics used to evaluate JITLine [31]. **TopK** accuracy measures the ratio of actual buggy lines to the Top K lines. A high ratio suggests that many of the buggy lines are ranked at the top. **Recall@20%LOC** measures the ratio of actual buggy lines that can be found given only top 20% changed lines of code. **Effort@20%Recall** measure the amount of effort made by the developers to identify top20% of buggy lines in a commit. A higher value means that more effort is needed. **Initial False Alarm (IFA)** measures the amount of clean lines of a commit that need to be inspected before identifying an actual buggy line.

6.5 Evaluation methodology

IRJIT uses information, known by time step t only, to predict a commit at t . Correspondingly, our models update in real-time with the recent information available at each time step. The time step is just a sequential number signifying the order in which we receive project data. To predict a commit that arrives at t , the prediction model incorporates all previously labeled training data available by the Unix timestamp corresponding to t . For an online learning problem [43] such as JIT-SDP, this kind of evaluation is more realistic than an 80:20 split. It aims to replay an online setting where changes continuously arrive over time, and predictions are only based on past changes. Consequently, performance estimates align more closely with what developers may encounter in a real-world software development environment.

We ran our experiments 10 times on each project shown in Table 1. We evaluated IRJIT using online procedure recommended by Cabral *et al.* [6], which takes into consideration *verification latency*. A software change qualifies as a training example if a defect is detected in association with it or a predefined waiting period (denoted as 'w') has elapsed, whichever comes first. This waiting period signifies the time required to establish confidence that the change is clean. If no defect is identified for a software change during the waiting period, a training example is generated for the clean class to represent that change. Conversely, a training example is created for the defect-inducing class immediately after discovering a defect. It is worth mentioning that if a defect is found to be associated with a change previously considered clean, then that change is added to the training set as a new defect-inducing training example. These training examples are used to update the online model as soon as they are created. We then test the online model on commit that arrives at t .

The goal of this evaluation is to obtain a comprehensive performance profile for the model, showcasing its capabilities in a genuine online learning scenario where it predicts commits based on all prior data up to each time step. However, when it comes to JITLine evaluation, given the high computational cost associated with retraining the JITLine model, it was not feasible to retrain it at each time step. Therefore, we conducted a *batched* evaluation which was recently used by Cabral *et al.* [5] for JIT-SDP. To carry out *batched* evaluation, we randomly sampled n time steps from all time steps, at which we retrain the *batched* model. In this paper, we use $n = 10$ considering our time budget, which means we update the model (or retrain in case of JITLine) at 10 different time steps.

To evaluate *batched* models, we first update the model using a training set that contains only commits with labels known by t . After training the model, we evaluate it on the commits from the next 100 time steps. As mentioned earlier, our training data is collected while keeping verification latency in account. To ensure a fair comparison between the two approaches, we re-evaluated IRJIT under this *batched* evaluation methodology, allowing us to directly compare its performance with that of JITLine under similar constraints.

6.5.1 RQ1 setup.

The RQ1 is about analyzing the CPU run time of IRJIT and JITLine. We measure the CPU run time in seconds for all evaluations of *online* and *batched* models. Our experiments were run on a machine with Intel® Core™ i7-10610U CPU @ 1.80GHz \times 8 and a 16GB RAM. We do not use a GPU and all our experiments were conducted on CPU only. For JITLine, we only measure the training and evaluation time of the models. For IRJIT, we measure the duration of the entire experiment. This includes the time spent on indexing commits and the time taken to predict incoming commits through querying the indexed data (section 5.4.1). Our aim in doing so is to include the time associated with query execution and search processes in our evaluation. To estimate the run time distribution we repeat our experiment 10 times. As we used the dataset of Cabral *et al.* [6] we also use the waiting period suggested by them, i.e., 90 days.

6.5.2 RQ2 Setup

The RQ2 is about analyzing the machine learning performance of IRJIT and its comparison with baseline. In this experiment, we measure the performance of *online* and *batched* models in terms of G-mean which is a popular metric for online learning problems. For *batched* evaluation, we retrain our models at n randomly picked time steps, where $n = 10$. We ensure that both IRJIT and JITLine models were evaluated on the same time steps.

6.5.3 RQ3 Setup

The RQ3 is about evaluating the performance of fine grained line-level prediction. For this evaluation, we extracted the line-level ground-truth data following JITLine’s methodology. We used PyDriller [41] to obtain the modified or deleted lines of commit and mark those as buggy, and the remaining lines were labeled clean. After collecting data, we rank buggy lines of each predicted buggy commit from a *batched* model. To rank lines we employ the tf-idf term weights or importance score of tokens obtained from Elasticsearch Explain API. The Explain API computes an explanation for a query and a specific document which tells why a specific document matches (or does not match) a query. We parse the Explain API output to identify the tokens that contributed to the prediction of a buggy commit. Once identified, the lines modified in a commit were searched for all the tokens and ranked according to the number of occurrences of distinct tokens found in each line. The ranked lines are then returned to the developer for inspection.

7 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

7.1 RQ1. Cost-effectiveness of IRJIT

This section presents the results of RQ1 which is about the computational cost of IRJIT and JITLine. The Table 2 presents the run time cost comparison of IRJIT online, IRJIT batched and JITLine batched models, whereas Figure 3 provides its visualization. The tiny boxplots for IRJIT implies a narrower range of computational costs for IRJIT. The median computational cost of JITLine consistently surpasses the maximum values of IRJIT, indicating a persistent trend of higher CPU runtime requirements for JITLine across all projects. This data strongly suggests that JITLine is less efficient than IRJIT when it comes to CPU performance.

Furthermore, JITLine’s scalability issues become evident as the dataset size increases. This is clearly illustrated in the plot, where we observe a sharp increase in the height of the boxplot for larger datasets. For instance, when considering the Nova project, there is a notably steeper rise in the height of the bar, underscoring JITLine’s struggle to handle larger datasets effectively. To compute how much IRJIT_{batched} improves over JITLine_{batched} we use the following formula:

$$Improvement = \frac{JITLine_{batched}}{IRJIT_{batched}}$$

Table 2 Mean run time in seconds for all IRJIT and JITLine. Highest values are indicated in bold for each project

Project	IRJIT _{online}	IRJIT _{batched}	JITLine _{batched}	Improve. over JITLine _{batched}
Brackets	5444.29	4107.71	16000.47	4
BroadleafCommerce	3904.26	2973.80	19302.67	6
Camel	7874.40	7043.70	19645.57	3
Fabric8	801.60	1016.03	23182.17	23
JGroups	611.39	607.84	13544.64	22
Neutron	3279.62	2544.35	17173.35	7
Nova	12443.82	12221.37	55909.59	5
Npm	353.32	290.73	4097.68	14
Spring-integration	659.48	779.14	8736.78	11
Tomcat	2057.91	1792.93	15108.53	8

The computational cost of JITLine is between 3 to 23 times greater than that of IRJIT when assessed in comparable conditions, indicating that employing IRJIT could potentially reduce CPU run times by a factor of 3 to 23. To determine if the differences in the computation costs between the approaches are statistically significant or not, we perform pairwise Wilcoxon signed-rank test which is a non-parametric test suitable for paired samples. The *null* hypothesis for the test is that there is no difference between CPU run time of




Fig. 3 Comparing CPU run time cost of IRJIT vs JITLine in seconds.

the two approaches. We set significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. If the p -value is less than the α , we can reject the *null* hypothesis and conclude that there is a statistically significant difference between the pairs. Based on the results of the pairwise Wilcoxon signed-rank tests we were able to reject the *null* hypothesis for comparison between $\text{JITLine}_{batched}$ and $\text{IRJIT}_{batched}$ (p -value = 0.00195) and IRJIT online (p -value = 0.00195). However, we could not reject the *null* hypothesis for IRJIT batched and IRJIT online (p -value = 0.625). This suggests that there is a statistically significant difference between IRJIT and JITLine but not between the two different IRJIT evaluations.

To conclude, while the computation costs of IRJIT online and IRJIT batched do not differ significantly, both of them have significantly different costs compared to JITLine across the projects in the dataset.

RQ1: IRJIT significantly reduces the CPU run time. In fact, when compared to state-of-the-art approach, JITLine , IRJIT saved CPU time between 3 to 23 times. This makes IRJIT a more cost-effective option compared to JITLine .

7.2 RQ2. Commit level performance

This section presents the results of RQ2, which evaluates the machine learning performance of IRJIT. Figure 4 provides a visual representation of the overall G-mean distributions of IRJIT and JITLine *batched* models (see Section 6.5), whereas Figure 5 presents a per project comparison for both approaches. The density plot suggests that IRJIT’s distribution leans towards a unimodal pattern, predominantly centering around a G-mean value of 0.63. IRJIT plot is slightly skewed to the right, indicating a concentration of values around the mode with a tail extending towards the higher values. However, the tail is relatively short, suggesting a lower variability and that the values of G-mean are more consistently close to the mode. In contrast, JITLine’s distribution is bimodal, with a substantial presence of data across a broader range of G-mean values, suggesting a higher level of variability because the values of G-mean are not clustering around a central value. The standard deviation values of IRJIT and JITLine, which are 0.109 and 0.171, respectively, confirm our observation. Nevertheless, the overlapping regions in the distributions hint at situations where both methods offer comparable results. Figure 5 shows the G-mean metric on the y-axis while the x-axis represents the timesteps.

Both IRJIT and JITLine exhibit performance peaks, but they differ in terms of magnitude and frequency. Specifically, IRJIT outperforms JITLine in 6 out of 10 projects, which are shown in bold in Table 3. For the camel and BroadleafCommerce datasets, the performance trajectories of IRJIT and JITLine overlap, making it challenging to differentiate their effectiveness (see Figure 5). For example, in camel, IRJIT undergoes steep declines in performance around time step 100. Similarly, BroadleafCommerce shows a high G-mean in the early time steps before it drops at later time steps. Based on the higher median and mean performance of IRJIT on BroadleafCommerce, we consider it to be a better choice. On the other hand, JITLine emerges superior in 3 projects, specifically nova, neutron, and brackets. Interestingly, these projects are also the ones where JITLine shows steadier results.

To evaluate the statistical significance of the observed differences between IRJIT_{batched} and JITLine_{batched}, we employed the Mann-Whitney test for independent samples. We compared IRJIT_{batched} and JITLine_{batched} per project. We applied Bonferroni Correction to the *alpha* values to correct for multiple comparisons. The results presented in the last column of Table 3 show that we could reject *null* hypothesis for all projects except camel. We further compared the two approaches across all projects using an *alpha* = 0.05. With a *p* - *value* = 0.4439, the results did not allow us to reject the *null* hypothesis, implying no significant performance difference between IRJIT_{batched} and JITLine_{batched} models.

Table 3 also presents the G-mean per project for IRJIT_{online} models. The performance of online models gives an idea of what to expect when using IRJIT in a real-world setting. Although the G-mean values for online models may slightly differ from batched models, it is worth noting that for projects where




Fig. 4 Density plot comparing the G-mean distribution IRJIT_{batched} and JITLine_{batched} evaluation.

IRJIT outperforms JITLine, it does so for both IRJIT_{batched} and IRJIT_{online} models.

7.2.1 Impact of K

As for the KNN classifier we tested the model's performance for different K values. Specifically, we tested for $K = 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11$ and as shown in Figure 6 our results had minor differences in the G-mean for the different K values. It shows that G-mean varies only slightly for different values of K , as shown in Table 4. We do not observe an increase in performance for higher values of K . On the contrary, higher K values resulted in a higher standard deviation. We noticed that $K = 1$ and $K = 3$ had the lowest standard deviation, and hence we chose $K = 3$ as the default value for IRJIT. This decision was made to keep the variability in performance low. By choosing 3 as the default K value, we obtain a prediction based on the unanimous agreement between the top 3 matches, which is presumably more reliable than a single match.




Fig. 5 Commit level performance of IRJIT_{batched} and JITLine_{batched} models across 10 datasets. X-axis represents time steps and Y-axis represents G-mean(↗) performance across time steps.

In conclusion, while no definitive statistical distinction exists between the two methodologies, their performance varies depending on the dataset. While JITLine occasionally excels, IRJIT often matches or surpasses JITLine in certain projects. This variability emphasizes the importance of understanding dataset characteristics, suggesting that relying solely on one method might not always be the best strategy. Further research could shed light on the specific conditions favoring each approach.

Table 3 Five statistic summary of the G-mean of IRJIT and JITLine. IRJIT does better for projects marked in bold. JITLine does better for underlined projects. The p-value column presents results of Mann-Whitney test between IRJIT_{batched} and JITLine_{batched}. Bold p-values mean that null hypothesis was rejected.

Approach	Project	Min	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max	p-value
all projects	IRJIT _{batched}	0.00	0.53	0.61	0.60	0.67	0.86	> 0.05
	JITLine _{batched}	0.00	0.46	0.60	0.60	0.70	1.00	
	IRJIT _{online}	0.00	0.58	0.61	0.60	0.64	0.84	
<u>Neutron</u>	IRJIT _{batched}	0.00	0.60	0.61	0.59	0.63	0.66	< 0.005
	JITLine _{batched}	0.88	0.89	0.90	0.90	0.91	1.00	
	IRJIT _{online}	0.50	0.58	0.59	0.59	0.60	0.69	
Tomcat	IRJIT _{batched}	0.61	0.70	0.71	0.74	0.77	0.86	< 0.005
	JITLine _{batched}	0.43	0.61	0.66	0.62	0.68	0.69	
	IRJIT _{online}	0.63	0.65	0.66	0.67	0.69	0.84	
<u>Nova</u>	IRJIT _{batched}	0.51	0.53	0.56	0.55	0.57	0.67	< 0.005
	JITLine _{batched}	0.67	0.68	0.68	0.69	0.69	0.85	
	IRJIT _{online}	0.20	0.57	0.611	0.59	0.62	0.62	
BroadleafCommerce	IRJIT _{batched}	0.52	0.60	0.62	0.61	0.63	0.64	< 0.005
	JITLine _{batched}	0.55	0.56	0.58	0.59	0.60	0.82	
	IRJIT _{online}	0.00	0.60	0.61	0.62	0.61	0.78	
Fabric8	IRJIT _{batched}	0.00	0.51	0.67	0.59	0.71	0.72	< 0.005
	JITLine _{batched}	0.25	0.31	0.37	0.37	0.40	1.00	
	IRJIT _{online}	0.00	0.56	0.58	0.57	0.59	0.66	
JGroups	IRJIT _{batched}	0.35	0.61	0.62	0.61	0.62	0.66	< 0.005
	JITLine _{batched}	0.00	0.46	0.48	0.45	0.48	0.50	
	IRJIT _{online}	0.00	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.61	0.62	
Spring-integration	IRJIT _{batched}	0.00	0.59	0.64	0.58	0.66	0.68	< 0.005
	JITLine _{batched}	0.33	0.41	0.52	0.48	0.54	0.65	
	IRJIT _{online}	0.00	0.62	0.65	0.63	0.66	0.68	
Camel	IRJIT _{batched}	0.57	0.66	0.70	0.69	0.72	0.74	> 0.005
	JITLine _{batched}	0.66	0.79	0.70	0.70	0.71	0.75	
	IRJIT _{online}	0.57	0.63	0.64	0.64	0.66	0.73	
Npm	IRJIT _{batched}	0.48	0.52	0.53	0.54	0.54	0.69	< 0.005
	JITLine _{batched}	0.00	0.35	0.37	0.38	0.42	0.51	
	IRJIT _{online}	0.00	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.53	0.80	
<u>Brackets</u>	IRJIT _{batched}	0.35	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.49	< 0.005
	JITLine _{batched}	0.64	0.69	0.71	0.71	0.72	0.75	
	IRJIT _{online}	0.27	0.53	0.54	0.53	0.54	0.56	

Table 4 Mean, median and standard deviation(SD) in G-mean across different values of K

K	1	3	5	7	9	11
Median	0.62	0.61	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.60
Mean	0.62	0.60	0.59	0.58	0.57	0.56
SD	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.09

RQ2: IRJIT shows a competitive predictive performance at commit level. IRJIT surpasses JITLine in 6 out of 10 projects with a statistically significant difference whereas JITLine surpasses IRJIT in 3 out of 10 projects.




Fig. 6 Commit level performance of IRJIT_{online} models for different values of K. The x-axis represents time step and y-axis is G-mean(\nearrow) performance across time steps.

7.3 RQ3. Line level performance

This section presents the results of RQ3 which evaluates line-level prediction performance of IRJIT. Previously, in Section 5.5, we explained how tf-idf term weights obtained from the Elasticsearch Explain API [11] were used to rank buggy lines. After ranking lines we compute four line-level evaluation metrics described in section 6.4. This remainder of this section presents the results of our line-level evaluation. All four line-level metrics except IFA range from 0 to 1. To remain consistent with JITLine, we use the top 10 lines to compute Top-K accuracy. The median Top-10 accuracy of IRJIT and JITLine is 0.64 and 0.61 respectively. A high ratio suggests that many of the buggy lines are ranked at the top. As shown in Figure 7 IRJIT has a higher median top-k accuracy in 4 out of 10 projects suggesting a higher performance than JITLine. Moreover, IRJIT has a more consistent accuracy across projects, as




Fig. 7 Comparing line level performance of $\text{IRJIT}_{\text{batched}}$ and $\text{JITLine}_{\text{batched}}$ across 10 datasets using Top-K accuracy(↗)

indicated by its relatively smaller interquartile range. JITLine exhibits more variability in its accuracy, especially for fabric8, npm and neutron. The overall variability for JITLine measured using standard deviation is 0.30, which is higher than that of IRJIT (0.26). Both approaches have outliers, but they are more pronounced in the case of JITLine, suggesting that while JITLine might work exceptionally well for specific datasets, it might not be as effective for others because its performance deviates significantly from the typical range.

A significant portion of defects in a software application can often be traced back to a relatively small portion of the codebase. We use Recall@20%Effort to measure the ratio of actual buggy lines that can be found given only top 20% changed lines of code. Figure 8 shows that Recall@20%Effort for both approaches is between 0.25 and 0.35 for most projects. Our approach can identify buggy lines with a median Recall@20%Effort of 0.22 which is 19% higher than JITLine. This suggests IRJIT can rank more buggy lines among the top 20% of lines.

Effort@20%Recall measure the amount of effort made by the developers to identify top20% of buggy lines in a commit. A higher value means that more effort is needed. Overall, IRJIT requires 11% less amount of effort than the baseline approach in order to find the same amount of actual defective lines. Figure 9 presents Effort@20%Recall for each project. We observe that JITLine has higher median Effort@20%Recall values and a broader spread than IRJIT




Fig. 8 Comparing line level performance of $\text{IRJIT}_{\text{batched}}$ and $\text{JITLine}_{\text{batched}}$ across 10 datasets using $\text{Recall@20\%Effort}(\nearrow)$

in most projects. This suggests that developers using JITLine will spend more effort to find the actual 20% defective lines of a defective commit. JITLine’s effort varies more drastically from one project to another and the outliers are much more prominent in some projects than others, such as neutron and fabric8, again signifying the extra effort required to achieve 20% recall.

Initial False Alarm (IFA) measures the amount of clean lines of a commit that need to be inspected before identifying an actual buggy line. The median IFA for both approaches is 0 indicating that a buggy line is always ranked as the top location. However, as shown in Figure 10, IRJIT has a slightly lower IFA for some projects. It indicates that buggy lines are always ranked at the top so developers need to inspect fewer clean lines until finding the first actual defective line for a given commit. JITLine not only has a higher IFA but also more pronounced outliers, making it particularly well-suited for some contexts but less effective in others. To confirm if the observed differences between any of the metrics were statistically significant or not we conducted Mann-Whitney test. We found that the differences between top-k and IFA are not statistically significant ($p\text{-value} = 0.241$ and $p\text{-value} = 0.996$), but those between Recall@20\%Effort and Effort@20\%Recall ($p\text{-value} = 1.265e-10$ and $p\text{-value} = 2.49e-11$) are significant.




Fig. 9 Comparing line level performance of $\text{IRJIT}_{\text{batched}}$ and $\text{JITLine}_{\text{batched}}$ across 10 datasets using $\text{Effort@20\%Recall}(\setminus_{\lambda})$




Fig. 10 Comparing line level performance of $\text{IRJIT}_{\text{batched}}$ and $\text{JITLine}_{\text{batched}}$ across 10 datasets using $\text{IFA}(\setminus_{\lambda})$

RQ3: IRJIT is better than JITLine for two line-level metrics: Effort@20%Recall and Recall@20%Effort. The Mann-Whitney test confirms that the observed differences are statistically significant. In terms of Top-k accuracy and IFA, both approaches are similar. However, IRJIT has a relatively consistent performance compared to JITLine which is more variable.

8 DISCUSSION

Our study indicates that while sophisticated machine learning models might be more effective in certain contexts, their efficiency in real-time or rapidly changing environments is still in question. Given that not all organizations or researchers have access to the computational power or other resources required to train complex models, simple approaches are the way forward. Our study shows that IRJIT can balance between performance and cost in such scenarios, democratizing access to JIT models for a broader audience. A key advantage of IRJIT is that it offers explainability at two distinct levels. At the commit level, it provides context of the predictions by directly linking to the contributing documents i.e., commits that contributed to the prediction. At line level, it ranks buggy lines of an identified buggy commit, guiding developers to dedicate their limited effort in certain parts of the code for identifying bugs.

The IRJIT model is online and was trained only on within project data. The model initially predicts clean until it sees buggy examples. Tabassum *et al.* showed that cross project data was helpful in the initial phase of the project when there was no or little within project training data available. Future studies may include cross project data to improve model accuracy. We subjected IRJIT to rigorous testing on extensive codebases, including prominent projects, such as nova and camel, to validate IRJIT’s practicality and effectiveness when applied to projects with substantial codebases. Furthermore, it is worth noting that our experiments were conducted on a machine with modest computing resources. This underscores the versatility and practical applicability of IRJIT in various environments, demonstrating that it can deliver valuable results even without high-end hardware.

8.1 Implications

Researchers should focus on designing simple approaches for JIT-SDP. Our findings reveal that in terms of performance, IRJIT closely rivals a state-of-the-art machine learning approach. However, what sets IRJIT apart is its inherent simplicity compared to JITLine. IRJIT relies solely on source code changes which are readily available in the project’s source code repository. It uses basic IR techniques that can be replicated with ease, even by individuals with limited expertise, thereby enhancing the accessibility of IR-JIT. Our study demonstrates that IR-based methods are competitive out of

the box, suggesting that further tuning and using them in combination with other project-specific features (e.g., metrics) can bridge the performance gaps.

Researchers should evaluate JIT approaches taking verification latency into account. Based on RQ1, our study further emphasizes that, when deciding which JIT-SDP approach to adopt, it is important to investigate them taking verification latency into account. Prior studies often relied on the traditional 80:20 split for the JIT evaluation. Following recent work [6, 43], we conduct an evaluation at different points in time while taking verification latency into account. Through this evaluation, we emphasize two crucial points: 1) defect prediction approaches exhibit varying performance over time, and 2) some approaches may be impractical for resource-constrained real-world development settings. Therefore, we advocate for research that aligns with the practical needs and constraints faced by developers in the field. Future defect prediction studies should adopt evaluation methodologies that accurately reflect the real-world application of JIT prediction from a development perspective.

Researchers must ensure that their JIT approach is suitable for online deployment and does not require considerable retraining. In general, JIT approaches with lower computational cost are better suited for seamless online deployment because they do not slow down the agile development. Our work demonstrates the practicality of IRJIT, which operates online without necessitating model tuning or retraining. Instead, it incrementally updates indexes as new commits arrive, making it highly adaptive and scalable. In contrast, the baseline approach, JITLine, relies on resource-intensive retraining involving techniques like SMOTE and DE. Consequently, JITLine is computationally more expensive for online deployment and potentially slows down the overall prediction process. However, different projects and requirements may warrant different approaches. It is worth noting that the choice between IRJIT and JITLine may vary depending on specific project requirements and available resources. While IRJIT prioritizes efficiency and adaptability, JITLine might offer superior performance on certain datasets. Developers with ample resources and a strong emphasis on model accuracy may opt for JITLine over IRJIT.

8.2 Limitations and Opportunities for Future Work

8.2.1 Reliance on SZZ

We rely on SZZ algorithm to obtain the ground truth dataset for evaluation. We as part of the software engineering community are aware of the shortcomings of SZZ algorithm that it only identifies large defects that get reported to the issue tracking system and therefore are important enough to be fixed. Other kinds of datasets such as ManySStuBs4J [20] are not widely available so we rely on a dataset extracted with the help of SZZ. In the area of defect prediction, researchers commonly rely on SZZ e.g., it was used to extract the

datasets in recent JIT studies [49,31,6,43]. We therefore think that it is out of the scope of our paper to design a new way of identifying buggy commits. Instead, we implore the software engineering community to come together and take up the challenge of improving the accuracy of SZZ algorithm or propose new ways of identifying representative buggy commits.

8.2.2 Usability of Explanations

JITLine uses SMOTE to invent documents making it harder to trace back to the original documents involved in commit-level prediction. For line-level prediction, JITLine trains a local LIME model [36], which adds additional cost on top of the original model. IRJIT improves upon JITLine by eliminating the need for two different models. It uses a single IR model to identify a buggy commit and rank its lines by defectiveness. A commit flagged by IRJIT would have a concrete, context relevant example. However, we have not conducted a user study to evaluate the usefulness of IRJIT explanations. In future work, we plan to evaluate this aspect of our study through a user study.

9 Threats to Validity

Here we discuss threats that impact the credibility and generalization of our findings. The choice of datasets used for evaluation should be representative of typical software projects, or sampling bias is introduced, affecting the *internal validity* of results. However, we counteract the sampling bias by using an existing dataset, which includes ten diverse projects encompassing three popular programming languages and multiple domains. Moreover, our datasets' different sizes and complexities also ensure that our findings are not restricted to certain types of projects, hence improving the *external validity*.

The choice of features or information retrieval methods may influence the effectiveness of IRJIT. Currently, IRJIT collects and uses `lines added` by default because the probability of introducing a bug is higher with the addition of new lines, as suggested by Purushothaman *et al.* [33], and hence spotting bugs might be easier with only `lines added` field. Variations in hyper-parameter settings of the IRJIT model can impact results. Robust hyperparameter tuning is necessary to minimize this threat. We tested IRJIT on different values of K in the range 1 to 11.

The *conclusion validity* of a study is affected by the choice of performance metrics because that affects how we measure the success of an approach. Following, several prior works, we decided to use G-mean because it is the most widely accepted metric in online learning. Using multiple metrics or considering alternative measures can provide a more comprehensive assessment. Therefore, at the line level, we use JITLine's proposed metrics. Furthermore, we optimized JITLine for G-mean instead of AUC to keep the comparison between the two approaches consistent. Our study also assumes a verification latency waiting period of 90 days which means a commit becomes a training example

after 90 days from commit time have passed. However, projects that are not frequently modified may require longer waiting period to obtain confidence on the label of committed software changes.

10 Conclusion

This study investigated JIT-SDP in a realistic online learning scenario using 10 open-source datasets. We showed that a state-of-the-art approach JITLine, due to its expensive training process, is cost-prohibitive in an online JIT-SDP setting. To address this problem, we propose IRJIT, an information retrieval approach for defect prediction that relies on incremental model updates. Our approach saves the run time cost by 3% to 23% against a sophisticated ML baseline, JITLine. It also achieves a competitive G-mean performance at the commit level that surpasses JITLine, in 6 out of 10 projects. Notably, IRJIT achieves JITLine level performance in an online setting without using SMOTE. IRJIT is explainable, as it makes predictions by linking current changes to historical buggy changes, allowing developers to benefit from the rich context inherent in the evolution of the codebase. It also ranks the changed lines by riskiness, making it easier for developers to identify bugs with minimal effort. The line-level evaluation shows that IRJIT has a more consistent (less variable) performance than JITLine, although both approaches were not far apart. Our study implies that if practitioners want to save time and obtain predictions in real-time, then IRJIT is a good option as it provides competitive performance with much lower run time compared to JITLine. Moreover, as IRJIT operates directly on the source code without needing additional hand-crafted features, it saves computational resources and time, leading to faster predictions. In a future study we will incorporate additional open-source projects and will compare different online JIT-SDP approaches with IRJIT.

Data Availability Statement

The dataset used in evaluation, the source code to evaluate approaches and the R scripts to plot the graphs for this study are available at:
https://github.com/Hareem-E-Sahar/eseval_online

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors of this article declared that they have no conflict of interest.

References

1. Apache: Apache lucene library. URL <https://lucene.apache.org/core/>
2. Apache: Lucene scoring formula. URL https://lucene.apache.org/core/3_5_0/scoring.html

3. Atlassian: Commit hooks. URL <https://www.atlassian.com/git/tutorials/git-hooks>
4. Bangash, A.A., Sahar, H., Hindle, A., Ali, K.: On the time-based conclusion stability of cross-project defect prediction models. *Empirical Software Engineering* **25**(6), 5047–5083 (2020)
5. Cabral, G.G., Minku, L.L., Oliveira, A.L., Pessoa, D.A., Tabassum, S.: An investigation of online and offline learning models for online just-in-time software defect prediction. *Empirical Software Engineering* **28**(5), 1–35 (2023)
6. Cabral, G.G., Minku, L.L., Shihab, E., Mujahid, S.: Class imbalance evolution and verification latency in just-in-time software defect prediction. In: 2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE), pp. 666–676. IEEE (2019)
7. Campbell, J.C., Hindle, A., Amaral, J.N.: Syntax errors just aren’t natural: improving error reporting with language models. In: Proceedings of the 11th Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories, pp. 252–261 (2014)
8. Campbell, J.C., Santos, E.A., Hindle, A.: The unreasonable effectiveness of traditional information retrieval in crash report deduplication pp. 269–280 (2016)
9. Chawla, N.V., Bowyer, K.W., Hall, L.O., Kegelmeyer, W.P.: Smote: synthetic minority over-sampling technique. *Journal of artificial intelligence research* **16**, 321–357 (2002)
10. Dam, H.K., Tran, T., Ghose, A.: Explainable software analytics. In: Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Software Engineering: New Ideas and Emerging Results, pp. 53–56 (2018)
11. Elasticsearch: Explain api. URL <https://www.elastic.co/guide/en/elasticsearch/reference/current/search-explain.html>
12. Elasticsearch: More like this. URL <https://www.elastic.co/guide/en/elasticsearch/reference/current/query-dsl-mlt-query.html>
13. Elasticsearch: Pattern analyzer. URL <https://www.elastic.co/guide/en/elasticsearch/reference/current/analysis-pattern-analyzer.html>
14. Elasticsearch: Whitespace tokenizer. URL <https://www.elastic.co/guide/en/elasticsearch/reference/current/analysis-whitespace-tokenizer.html>
15. He, H., Garcia, E.A.: Learning from imbalanced data. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering* **21**(9), 1263–1284 (2009)
16. Hindle, A., Barr, E.T., Su, Z., Gabel, M., Devanbu, P.: On the naturalness of software pp. 837–847 (2012)
17. Hoang, T., Dam, H.K., Kamei, Y., Lo, D., Ubayashi, N.: Deepjit: an end-to-end deep learning framework for just-in-time defect prediction. In: 2019 IEEE/ACM 16th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR), pp. 34–45. IEEE (2019)
18. Hoang, T., Kang, H.J., Lo, D., Lawall, J.: Cc2vec: Distributed representations of code changes. In: Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering, pp. 518–529 (2020)
19. Kamei, Y., Shihab, E., Adams, B., Hassan, A.E., Mockus, A., Sinha, A., Ubayashi, N.: A large-scale empirical study of just-in-time quality assurance. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* **39**(6), 757–773 (2012)
20. Karampatsis, R.M., Sutton, C.: How often do single-statement bugs occur? the manysstubs4j dataset. In: Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories, pp. 573–577 (2020)
21. Kim, K., Kim, D., Bissyandé, T.F., Choi, E., Li, L., Klein, J., Traon, Y.L.: FaCoY: a code-to-code search engine. In: Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Software Engineering, pp. 946–957 (2018)
22. Kim, S., Pan, K., Whitehead Jr, E.J.: Memories of bug fixes pp. 35–45 (2006)
23. Kim, S., Whitehead, E.J., Zhang, Y.: Classifying software changes: Clean or buggy? *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* **34**(2), 181–196 (2008)
24. Kim, S., Zimmermann, T., Pan, K., James Jr, E., et al.: Automatic identification of bug-introducing changes pp. 81–90 (2006)
25. Linstead, E., Bajracharya, S., Ngo, T., Rigor, P., Lopes, C., Baldi, P.: Sourcerer: mining and searching internet-scale software repositories. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* **18**(2), 300–336 (2009)
26. Luan, S., Yang, D., Barnaby, C., Sen, K., Chandra, S.: Aroma: Code recommendation via structural code search. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* **3**(OOPSLA), 1–28 (2019)

27. McIntosh, S., Kamei, Y.: Are fix-inducing changes a moving target? a longitudinal case study of just-in-time defect prediction. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* **44**(5), 412–428 (2017)
28. Mockus, A., Weiss, D.M.: Predicting risk of software changes. *Bell Labs Technical Journal* **5**(2), 169–180 (2000)
29. Nayrolles, M., Hamou-Lhadj, A.: Clever: combining code metrics with clone detection for just-in-time fault prevention and resolution in large industrial projects. In: *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories*, pp. 153–164 (2018)
30. Planning, S.: *The economic impacts of inadequate infrastructure for software testing*. National Institute of Standards and Technology (2002)
31. Pornprasit, C., Tantithamthavorn, C.K.: Jitline: A simpler, better, faster, finer-grained just-in-time defect prediction. In: *2021 IEEE/ACM 18th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*, pp. 369–379. IEEE (2021)
32. Pradel, M., Sen, K.: DeepBugs: a learning approach to name-based bug detection. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* **2**(OOPSLA), 1–25 (2018)
33. Purushothaman, R., Perry, D.E.: Toward understanding the rhetoric of small source code changes. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* **31**(6), 511–526 (2005)
34. Rahman, M.M., Roy, C.K.: Improving ir-based bug localization with context-aware query reformulation. In: *Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM joint meeting on European software engineering conference and symposium on the foundations of software engineering*, pp. 621–632 (2018)
35. Ray, B., Hellendoorn, V., Godhane, S., Tu, Z., Bacchelli, A., Devanbu, P.: On the “naturalness” of buggy code. In: *2016 IEEE/ACM 38th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pp. 428–439. IEEE (2016)
36. Ribeiro, M.T., Singh, S., Guestrin, C.: ” why should i trust you?” explaining the predictions of any classifier. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pp. 1135–1144 (2016)
37. Rosen, C., Grawi, B., Shihab, E.: Commit guru: analytics and risk prediction of software commits. In: *Proceedings of the 2015 10th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering*, pp. 966–969 (2015)
38. Salton, G., Waldstein, R.K.: Term relevance weights in on-line information retrieval. *Information Processing & Management* **14**(1), 29–35 (1978)
39. Santos, E.A., Campbell, J.C., Patel, D., Hindle, A., Amaral, J.N.: Syntax and sensibility: Using language models to detect and correct syntax errors. In: *2018 IEEE 25th International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*, pp. 311–322. IEEE (2018)
40. Śliwerski, J., Zimmermann, T., Zeller, A.: When do changes induce fixes? *ACM sigsoft software engineering notes* **30**(4), 1–5 (2005)
41. Spadini, D., Aniche, M., Bacchelli, A.: Pydriller: Python framework for mining software repositories. In: *Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM Joint meeting on european software engineering conference and symposium on the foundations of software engineering*, pp. 908–911 (2018)
42. Stephen E. Robertson, K.S.J.: Okapi bm25 algorithm. URL https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Okapi_BM25
43. Tabassum, S., Minku, L.L., Feng, D., Cabral, G.G., Song, L.: An investigation of cross-project learning in online just-in-time software defect prediction. In: *2020 IEEE/ACM 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pp. 554–565. IEEE (2020)
44. Tan, M., Tan, L., Dara, S., Mayeux, C.: Online defect prediction for imbalanced data. In: *2015 IEEE/ACM 37th IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering*, vol. 2, pp. 99–108. IEEE (2015)
45. Wan, Z., Xia, X., Hassan, A.E., Lo, D., Yin, J., Yang, X.: Perceptions, expectations, and challenges in defect prediction. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* **46**(11), 1241–1266 (2018)
46. Wang, S., Minku, L.L., Yao, X.: A systematic study of online class imbalance learning with concept drift. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* **29**(10), 4802–4821 (2018)

-
47. Wu, Y., Dobriban, E., Davidson, S.: Deltagrad: Rapid retraining of machine learning models. In: International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 10355–10366. PMLR (2020)
 48. Yan, M., Xia, X., Fan, Y., Hassan, A.E., Lo, D., Li, S.: Just-in-time defect identification and localization: A two-phase framework. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (2020)
 49. Zeng, Z., Zhang, Y., Zhang, H., Zhang, L.: Deep just-in-time defect prediction: how far are we? pp. 427–438 (2021)
 50. Zhou, S., Shen, B., Zhong, H.: Lancer: Your code tell me what you need. In: 2019 34th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE), pp. 1202–1205. IEEE (2019)