

Giving Back: Contributions Congruent to Library Dependency Changes in a Software Ecosystem

Supatsara Wattanakriengkrai, Dong Wang, Raula Gaikovina Kula, Christoph Treude, Patanamon Thongtanunam, Takashi Ishio, and Kenichi Matsumoto

Abstract—Popular adoption of third-party libraries for contemporary software development has led to the creation of large inter-dependency networks, where sustainability issues of a single library can have widespread network effects. Maintainers of these libraries are often overworked, relying on the contributions of volunteers to sustain these libraries. In this work, we measure contributions that are aligned with dependency changes, to understand where they come from (i.e., non-maintainer, client maintainer, library maintainer, and library and client maintainer), analyze whether they contribute to library dormancy (i.e., a lack of activity), and investigate the similarities between these contributions and developers' typical contributions. Hence, we leverage socio-technical techniques to measure the dependency-contribution congruence (DC congruence), i.e., the degree to which contributions align with dependencies. We conduct a large-scale empirical study to measure the DC congruence for the NPM ecosystem using 1.7 million issues, 970 thousand pull requests (PR), and over 5.3 million commits belonging to 107,242 NPM packages. At the ecosystem level, we pinpoint in time peaks of congruence with dependency changes (i.e., 16% DC congruence score). Surprisingly, these contributions came from the ecosystem itself (i.e., non-maintainers of either client and library). At the project level, we find that DC congruence shares a statistically significant relationship with the likelihood of a package becoming dormant. Finally, by comparing source code of contributions, we find that congruent contributions are statistically different to typical contributions. Our work has implications to encourage and sustain contributions, especially to support library maintainers that require dependency changes.

Index Terms—Software Ecosystem, Dependency Changes, NPM ecosystem



1 INTRODUCTION

The adoption of third-party libraries for contemporary software development has led to the emergence of massive library platforms (i.e., package ecosystems) such as NPM for JavaScript¹ which is reported to be relied upon by more than 11 million developers worldwide, and contains more than one million packages [1]. Other examples include the 427,286 Maven libraries for Java Virtual Machine languages,² and the 324,779 PyPI packages for the Python community,³ to name a few. These package ecosystems comprise of a complex inter-connected network of dependencies, where developers adopt many other packages for their work. As an example, NPM packages directly depend on between 5 to 6 other packages in the ecosystem on average [35], [61].

The reliance on other packages in often brittle dependency chains [32] implies that local sustainability issues around individual packages can have widespread network effects [55]. Contributors and maintainers of these packages are often overworked volunteers, who can decide to

stop contributing at any time [46]. Sustained contributions are crucial to be able to respond to breaking changes from elsewhere in the ecosystem or apply critical security patches [64]. In response to recent attacks on open source libraries,⁴ Google has deployed an "Open Source Maintenance Crew", tasked to assist upstream maintainers of critical open-source libraries that are used by major technology vendors, including Microsoft, Google, IBM and Amazon Web Services. Yet, the extent, origins and motivations behind these contributions are unclear.

To gain intuition about the motivations of contributors, we first contacted a few Node.js developers to ask *why they contribute to other NPM packages, i.e., packages which they do not own?* Most of them responded that they contributed because their code depends on those packages, e.g., "I rely on them [other packages] or want to rely on them and need to add/fix something in order to do so." and "When they're broken and need fixing (and it's blocking my work), that's usually when I jump in." One developer also noted that the ultimate goal of making contributions is to support the entire ecosystem: "In my experience with the Open Source world, the line between making contributions to my own projects or to other's becomes diffuse. Everybody is looking for the same: making better systems." These responses motivated us to hypothesize that contributions congruent with dependency changes at the project level, could be aligned and detected at ecosystem level. In other words, we hypothesize that contributions and dependency changes are aligned in a package ecosystem.

- S. Wattanakriengkrai, R. Kula, T. Ishio, and K. Matsumoto are with Nara Institute of Science and Technology, Japan.
E-mail: {wattanakri.supatsara.ws3, raula, ishio, matumoto}@is.naist.jp.
- D. Wang is with Kyushu University, Japan.
E-mail: wang.dong.vt8@is.naist.jp.
- C. Treude and P. Thongtanunam are with the University of Melbourne, Australia.
E-mail: {christoph.treude, patanamon.t}@unimelb.edu.au.

1. <https://www.npmjs.com/>
2. <https://search.maven.org/stats>
3. <https://pypi.org/>

4. Article at <https://www.zdnet.com/article/google-here-comes-our-open-source-maintenance-crew/>

Hence, in this work, we set out to investigate how developer contributions align with package dependencies in an ecosystem. To measure this alignment, we adopt the concept of socio-technical congruence which measures the alignment between task dependencies among people and coordination activities. Borrowing this concept, we measure the dependency-contribution (DC) congruence, i.e., the degree to which the contributions align with dependencies. Through the case of the NPM ecosystem, we conduct a large scale empirical study to examine the DC congruence and the package dormancy using over 5.3 million commits, 1.7 million issues, and 970 thousands pull requests (PRs) belonging to 107,242 packages. We formulate the following research questions.

- **(RQ1)** *How do developer contributions align with their dependencies?* *Motivation:* The motivation for the first research question is to examine the extent of the alignment at the ecosystem level, and confirm our hypothesis. We focus on the following sub-questions: *RQ1a. To what degree do developer contributions align with dependencies?* and *RQ1b. How do different contribution types and dependency changes contribute to DC congruence?* *Results:* The alignment between developer contributions and dependency changes varies over time, with the highest values generally observed in earlier stages of the NPM ecosystem. The peaks we identify in the data correspond to a DC congruence of 0.16, i.e., 16% of the dependency changes receive aligned contributions. These contributions are most aligned with downgrading a dependency, and mainly come from developers that are not maintainers of both the client and library.


- **(RQ2)** *What is the relationship between the DC congruence and the likelihood of packages becoming dormant?* *Motivation:* Since package sustainability heavily relies on contributions [47], we would like to investigate the association between the DC congruence and the package dormancy.

Results: Our survival analysis shows that the various types of DC congruence share an inverse relationship with the likelihood that a package becomes dormant, i.e., the lower the DC congruence, the more likely the package becomes dormant. For instance, packages that received more congruent contributions (i.e., issues) from non-maintainers are less likely to become dormant.


- **(RQ3)** *Do the contributions differ depending on their alignment with dependencies?* *Motivation:* In addition to measuring DC congruence (RQ1 and RQ2), since developers may be motivated to submit aligned contributions based on their dependencies, for RQ3, we would like to confirm the extent to which these contributions differ from their typical contributions. Hence, we conduct a deeper investigation on the similarity of contributions given different types of contributions identified in the first two research questions.

Results: Comparing contribution similarity in terms of source code and file paths, we find statistical differences in source code content of aligned contributions submitted to dependencies when compared to those that are not aligned. In other words, these congruent contributions are not the typical source code submitted by that contributor.


We provide an online appendix, containing datasets and source code related to (a) the ecosystem-level and package-level DC congruence results, (b) the metric data for our survival model analysis, and (c) the file path and source code



(a) Nodes and edges from time period Oct 1 to Dec 31, 2015



(b) Node and Edges from time period Jan 1 to Mar 31, 2016



(c) Removing the developer nodes, we transform Fig. 1b to create the contribution relationships between packages from time period Jan 1 to Mar 31, 2016

Figure 1: Example graph representation of the relationships between contributions and dependencies

similarities between contribution types, which is available at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5677371>.

2 DEPENDENCIES AND CONTRIBUTIONS

In this section, we describe how we measure the DC congruence, i.e., the degree to which contributions align with dependencies as a graph. The graph is temporal, i.e., it is constructed based on a time period.

2.1 A Dependency-Contribution Graph

Figure 1 shows a visual example to illustrate a Dependency-Contribution graph (DC graph) that captures the relationship between contributions and dependencies in the ecosystem. Let $G = (N, E)$ be a directed graph where N represents a set of nodes and E represents a set of edges. N has two types of nodes (i.e., N_{dev} and N_{pkg}), where N_{dev} refers to a developer, while N_{pkg} refers to a software package. N_{dev} has an attribute $\langle \text{userid} \rangle$ where userid is the unique identifier of the developer. N_{pkg} has the attributes $\langle \text{name}, \text{time} \rangle$ where name is the unique name of the package and time is when the package was first created.

Table 1: Classification of contributions by maintainer role to both client and library packages.

Contribution Type	Description	Algorithm
cli&lib-maintain	Contributions from a developer who commits to both client and library packages.	$E_{c-c} = \{N_{pkg.c} \rightarrow N_{pkg.t} \in E_{t1-t2} \mid \exists N_{dev.d}. N_{dev.d} \xrightarrow{c} N_{pkg.c} \wedge N_{dev.d} \xrightarrow{c} N_{pkg.t}\}$
cli-maintain	Contributions from a developer who commits to a client and submits to a library.	$E_{c-s} = \{N_{pkg.c} \rightarrow N_{pkg.t} \in E_{t1-t2} \mid \exists N_{dev.d}. N_{dev.d} \xrightarrow{c} N_{pkg.c} \wedge N_{dev.d} \xrightarrow{s} N_{pkg.t}\}$
lib-maintain	Contributions from a developer who submits to a client and commits to a library.	$E_{s-c} = \{N_{pkg.c} \rightarrow N_{pkg.t} \in E_{t1-t2} \mid \exists N_{dev.d}. N_{dev.d} \xrightarrow{s} N_{pkg.c} \wedge N_{dev.d} \xrightarrow{c} N_{pkg.t}\}$
non-maintain	Contributions from a developer who submits to both client and library packages.	$E_{s-c} = \{N_{pkg.c} \rightarrow N_{pkg.t} \in E_{t1-t2} \mid \exists N_{dev.d}. N_{dev.d} \xrightarrow{s} N_{pkg.c} \wedge N_{dev.d} \xrightarrow{s} N_{pkg.t}\}$

The edges (E) represent the relationships between nodes in terms of contributions and dependencies. Hence, we define two edge types in our graph, i.e., package dependencies and contributions to packages (see details in Sections 2.2 and 2.3). The graph edges have a temporal attribute which provides information when the dependency (or contribution) event occurs. Since the contribution and dependency relationships are dynamic (i.e., changing over time), we capture and analyze these relationships based on a specific period of time. Hence, we defined a temporal graph G_{t1-t2} where $t1$ and $t2$ are between two time points which we capture the contribution and dependency relationships. The temporal graph G_{t1-t2} is formally defined as: $G_{t1-t2} = (N_{t1-t2}, E_{t1-t2})$ where N_{t1-t2} is a set of package and developer nodes that have relationships with others within a period of $t1$ until $t2$, and E_{t1-t2} is a set of edges where the contributions or dependency events (e.g., a dependency change) between the packages in N_{t1-t2} occur during the period of $t1$ until $t2$. It is important to note that for any time-period (i.e., $t1$ to $t2$), a package node must be created before $t1$. This means that any package created in one time period will only be considered in the next time period.

Figure 1 provides illustrative examples of two subsequent time periods (i.e., $G_{Oct2015-Dec2015}$ and $G_{Jan2016-Mar2016}$). Specifically, $G_{Oct2015-Dec2015}$ captures the relationships between nodes in the time period of 1 October until 31 December 2015 which shows that only a developer $N_{dev.x}$ contributed to package $N_{pkg.i}$ and $N_{pkg.j}$, note that $N_{pkg.i}$ depends on $N_{pkg.j}$ and $N_{pkg.k}$, and $N_{pkg.j}$ depends on $N_{pkg.k}$ as shown by the edges in the graph. Then in, $G_{Jan2016-Mar2016}$, developer $N_{dev.x}$ contributed to packages $N_{pkg.i}$ and $N_{pkg.k}$, and another developer $N_{dev.y}$ contributed to $N_{pkg.i}$ and $N_{pkg.j}$.

2.2 Graph Edges: Package Dependencies

Definition 2.2.1 (Edge: $N_{pkg} \rightarrow N_{pkg}$). The first edge type represents dependency relationships between two packages. For example, $N_{pkg.i} \rightarrow N_{pkg.j}$ means that a package $N_{pkg.i}$ uses (i.e., depends on) a package $N_{pkg.j}$, where $N_{pkg.i}$ is a client to the $N_{pkg.j}$ library.

Edge Attributes: Dependency changes. The dependency edge has the attributes $\langle \text{change}, \text{time} \rangle$ which is the current change of the dependency relationship. We capture the edge dependency change within a time period (between $t1 - t2$). It is important to note that the edge of dependency change that occurs in a time period will be kept in the subsequent time periods until a new dependency event

occurs. In other words, the latest dependency change is carried over into the next time period. We categorize the dependency change into four types : (i) is-added, i.e., a dependency has been added to a package, (ii) is-removed, i.e., the dependency has been removed from a package, (iii) is-upgraded, i.e., a dependency version has a been changed to a more recent version of a library, and (iv) is-downgraded, i.e., a dependency version has been changed to an older version of a library.

2.3 Graph Edges: Contributions to Package

Definition 2.3.1 (Edge: $N_{dev} \Rightarrow N_{pkg}$). The second edge type represents the contribution relationship between a developer and a package. For example, $N_{dev.x} \Rightarrow N_{pkg.i}$ means that a developer $N_{dev.x}$ contributes to a package $N_{pkg.i}$.

Edge Attributes: Developer roles. The contribution edge has two attributes $\langle \text{role}, \text{time} \rangle$ where the time is when the contribution was made. The role refers to the access levels of the developer to the package when making a contribution. There are two developer roles: a `committer` (c), who has the ability to merge any submitted contributions, and a `submitter` (s), who can only submit contributions to a package but does not have the permission to merge the contribution.

We now define four types of contributions between packages. When capturing these contribution relationships between packages, as a minimum, we capture developers who made at least two contributions to the two different packages that have a dependency relationship between them. Formally, given a dependency relationship between the client and library packages, we define the types of contribution (see Table 1) as follow: (i) cli&lib-maintain, i.e., contributions from a developer who is a committer to both client and library packages, (ii) cli-maintain, i.e., contributions from a developer who is a committer to a client that submits to a library, (iii) lib-maintain, i.e., contributions from a developer who is a submitter to a client that commits to a library, (iv) non-maintain, i.e., contributions from a developer who is a submitter to both client and library packages. Therefore, the DC graph in Figure 1b can be transformed to the contribution graph in Figure 1c, where $N_{dev.y}$ commits to $N_{pkg.i}$ and $N_{dev.y}$ submits to $N_{pkg.j}$, making these contributions a cli-maintain type.

2.4 Congruence Calculation

To measure the DC congruence, we use the adjacency matrix to capture the contribution and dependency relationships in

a temporal graph $G_{t_1-t_2}$.

Matrix Construction. Based on the contribution and dependency edges, we calculate the congruence at two levels: 1) ecosystem level and 2) package level. Specifically, we construct a contribution matrix (C_E) and a dependency matrix (C_D). We then measure the congruence between the contributions and dependencies based on the definition of socio-technical congruence by Cataldo et al. [7] and Wagstrom et al. [56]. Briefly stated, they defined socio-technical congruence as the match between the coordination requirements established by the dependencies among tasks and the actual coordination activities performed by the developers. We provide a formal definition for each matrix and congruence calculation as shown below.

Definition 2.4.1 (C_D adjacency matrix). The dependency matrix (C_D) of a $G_{t_1-t_2}$ captures the relationships between packages in $N_{t_1-t_2}$ based on the dependency changes in $E_{t_1-t_2}$. The C_D matrix has a size of $|N_{t_1-t_2}| \times |N_{t_1-t_2}|$ where its elements indicate whether there is a dependency relationship between the two packages or not. In other words, $C_D[i, j] = 1$ if there exists an edge $N_{pkg.i} \rightarrow N_{pkg.j} \in E_{t_1-t_2}$, otherwise 0. For example, the graph $G_{Jan2016-Mar2016}$ in Figure 1b has three dependency relationships, i.e., $N_{pkg.i} \rightarrow N_{pkg.j}$, $N_{pkg.i} \rightarrow N_{pkg.k}$, and $N_{pkg.j} \rightarrow N_{pkg.k}$. Hence, the dependency matrix C_D of $G_{Jan2016-Mar2016}$ can be constructed as:

$$\begin{array}{c} N_{pkg.i} \quad N_{pkg.j} \quad N_{pkg.k} \\ \begin{array}{l} N_{pkg.i} \\ N_{pkg.j} \\ N_{pkg.k} \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{array}$$

Furthermore, we calculate the C_D adjacency matrix for each type of dependency change (as described in Section 2.2), resulting in a total of four matrices.

Definition 2.4.2 (C_E adjacency matrix). The contribution matrix (C_E) of a $G_{t_1-t_2}$ captures the relationship between packages in $N_{t_1-t_2}$ based on the contributions of the associated developers in $E_{t_1-t_2}$. The C_E matrix has a size of $|N_{t_1-t_2}| \times |N_{t_1-t_2}|$ where its elements indicate whether there are contributions between two packages or not. In other words, $C_E[i, j] = 1$ if there exists an edge between any two packages for any developer contribution, otherwise 0. Note that to create the contribution matrix, we use the contribution graph (like in Figure 1c) which is transformed from the DC graph (like Figure 1b) based on the developer roles and dependency relationships. For example, the contribution matrix C_E for the cli-maintain contribution of the graph $G_{Jan2016-Mar2016}$ in Figure 1c can be constructed as:

$$\begin{array}{c} N_{pkg.i} \quad N_{pkg.j} \quad N_{pkg.k} \\ \begin{array}{l} N_{pkg.i} \\ N_{pkg.j} \\ N_{pkg.k} \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{array}$$

where there is a committer ($N_{dev.y}$) of a client package ($N_{pkg.i}$) contributing to a library package ($N_{pkg.j}$). We calculate the C_E adjacency matrix for each type of contribution (as described in Section 2.3), resulting in a total of four matrices.

Definition 2.4.3 (Ecosystem-level DC Congruence). To measure the alignment between contributions and dependencies

of packages at the ecosystem level, we adapt the definition of socio-technical congruence by Cataldo [7] as follows:

$$EcosystemC(G_{t_1-t_2}) = \frac{\Sigma(C_D \wedge C_E)}{\Sigma C_D} \quad (1)$$

In sum, Ecosystem-level DC Congruence is the ratio of dependencies that receive aligned contributions divided by the total number of dependencies in the ecosystem. For example, given $G_{Jan2016-Mar2016}$ in Figure 1b and all the dependency relationships in the graph have a type of "is.added", we want to calculate the DC congruence between dependencies of is.added and cli-maintain contributions. Hence, $\Sigma(C_D \wedge C_E) = 1$ as there is a cli-maintain contribution relationship that matches with the dependency relationship (i.e., $N_{pkg.i} \rightarrow N_{pkg.j}$) between the DC graph (in Figure 1b) and the contribution graph (in Figure 1c). Finally, the DC congruence at the ecosystem level of the graph $G_{Jan2016-Mar2016}$ is $EcosystemC(G_{Jan2016-Mar2016}) = \frac{1}{3} = 0.333$.

DC Congruence Values. For each time period, we construct the matrices (C_D and C_E) for each dependency change (cf. Table 1) and the four contribution types (i.e., cli&lib-maintain, cli-maintain, lib-maintain, and cli&lib-maintain contributions). Hence, for each time period, we calculate a total of 16 values of DC congruence (four C_D matrices multiplied by four C_E matrices).

Definition 2.4.4 (Package-level DC Congruence). To quantify how the congruence related to a package contributed to the congruence value of the whole ecosystem, we also measure congruence of each package (i.e., the congruence at the package level). To do so, we adapt the individualized socio-technical congruence definition of Wagstrom [56] as follows:

$$PkgC(G_{t_1-t_2}, p) = \frac{\Sigma(C_D[p,] \wedge C_E[p,]) + \Sigma(C_D[, p] \wedge C_E[, p])}{\Sigma(C_D[p,]) + \Sigma(C_D[, p])} \quad (2)$$

where p is a package of interest ($N_{pkg.p}$) in the graph $G_{t_1-t_2}$. The numerator calculates the number of dependencies for package p that receive aligned contributions over both the rows and columns for that package. The denominator simply sums up the number of dependencies incident upon package p . For example, given $G_{Jan2016-Mar2016}$ in Figure 1b and all the dependency relationships in the graph have a type of "is.added", we want to calculate the package-level DC congruence of the package $N_{pkg.k}$ between dependencies of is.added and cli&lib-maintain contributions. Hence, $\Sigma(C_D[N_{pkg.k},]) + \Sigma(C_D[, N_{pkg.k}]) = 2$ as the package $N_{pkg.k}$ has two dependency relationships (i.e., $N_{pkg.i} \rightarrow N_{pkg.k}$ and $N_{pkg.j} \rightarrow N_{pkg.k}$), and $\Sigma(C_D[N_{pkg.k},] \wedge C_E[N_{pkg.k},]) + \Sigma(C_D[, N_{pkg.k}] \wedge C_E[, N_{pkg.k}]) = 1$ as there is a cli&lib-maintain contribution relationship that matches with the dependency relationship (i.e., $N_{pkg.i} \rightarrow N_{pkg.k}$) between the DC graph (in Figure 1b) and the contribution graph (in Figure 1c). Finally, the package-level congruence of the package $N_{pkg.k}$ is calculated as follows.

$$PkgC(G_{Jan2016-Mar2016}, N_{pkg.k}) = \frac{1}{2} = 0.5$$

Intuitively, we can interpret the congruence values (0 to 1) as the extent to which contributions align with dependency changes. A high congruence value at the ecosystem

Table 2: Dataset snapshot statistics.

	# N_{pkg}	# PRs	# issues	# commits	# dev
2014	17,859	22,239	55,081	473,591	11,031
2015	57,534	98,975	222,146	1,255,065	46,029
2016	92,748	242,424	427,001	1,415,015	82,991
2017	105,058	186,257	352,411	886,796	96,916
2018	106,815	139,016	267,318	527,252	86,978
2019	107,146	166,588	259,560	428,191	69,285
2020	107,242	115,186	171,435	339,219	43,815
Total	970,685	1,754,952	5,325,129	437,045	

level would indicate that a large number of dependency relationships receive aligned contributions, while a low value would indicate that there is a small number of aligned contributions in the ecosystem. Similarly, at the individual level, a higher congruence value would indicate that a large number of contributions aligned with dependency relationships of that package.

3 DATA PREPARATION

To evaluate our congruence models and answer our RQs, we perform an empirical study on the NPM package ecosystem. We selected the NPM JavaScript ecosystem as it is one of the largest package collections on GitHub, and also has been the focus of recent studies [32], [2], [17]. In this work, we focus on the NPM packages linked to their GitHub repositories, since we will analyze developer contributions (i.e., PRs and issues). Similar to ‘all-the-package-repos’ [23] and Chinthanet et al. [9], we use a listing of NPM packages from the NPM registry and then matched them to repositories available on GitHub. The listing of NPM packages was acquired in Nov. 2020. To collect the required information, we use the GitHub Rest API⁵ to collect PRs, issues, commits, and other metadata (e.g., license type) of the package repositories included in the latest data snapshot. The issues are used to answer RQ1 and RQ2, while the commits are used to answer RQ2 and the PRs are used to answer all RQs. To overcome the GitHub API limit, we use five GitHub tokens that were generated by the first five authors during the collection process. With these tokens, the API rate limit is 25,000 (5,000 * 5) requests per hour. We took one month, from November 1 to November 30, 2020, to acquire all information.

Table 2 provides an overview of the number of NPM packages that have repositories available on GitHub for each year. Overall, the number of NPM packages starts from small (i.e., 17,859 packages), but then reaches over a hundred thousand packages (i.e., 107,242) as of Nov. 2020. Similar to previous work which considered the temporal dimension [40], [5], [42], we split the data of each year into quarters: (Q1) January 1 to March 31, (Q2) April 1 to June 30, (Q3) July 1 to September 30, and (Q4) October 1 to December 31 to establish the temporal intervals of our graph (i.e., $G_{t_1-t_2}$).

Extracting Contributions, Roles and Dependencies

Once the time-intervals were established, we then extract the developer contributions and dependency changes within each quarter. For the contribution activities, we generate the graph nodes by identifying PRs and issues

that occurred during the quarter. To classify the role of the contributor, we use the GitHub Rest API to identify whether or not the developer who submitted a contribution (i.e., a PR or an issue) had committed any prior commits into the main branch of the repository. For the dependencies and their changes, similar to prior work [12], we parse the `package.json` file to extract both development and runtime dependencies for each package during that time-period. To identify the dependency changes during the time-period, we use the PyDriller package⁶ to mine the dependency changes (cf. Table 1) of `package.json` in the Git history. More specifically, we focus on the Modification object provided by the PyDriller to investigate commits to `package.json`.

Calculating Ecosystem-Level DC Congruence (RQ1)

Answering RQ1 involves computing the DC congruence at the ecosystem level. Hence, for all time-periods, we construct C_E and C_D matrices of all the combinations of contribution types against the different dependency changes for PRs and issues separately (see Section 2.4). To ease computational power, we filter out all rows and columns of the C_E and C_D matrices that have only zeros. Since we analyze PRs and issues separately, we generated a total of 32 instances for each quarter, resulting in 864 matrices. We took around 21 days of execution based on two standard computing machines with an Intel Core 2.60GHz, with 40 cores and 252GB of RAM.

Calculating Package-Level DC Congruence (RQ2)

Answering RQ2 involves computing the package-level DC congruence. Using the constructed matrices (before filtering the rows and columns with zeros) from RQ1, we calculate the package-level DC congruences for each time-period. Similar to RQ1, we generated a total of 32 DC congruence values for each package in each quarter. Since the experiment was conducted in parallel with RQ1, the computational time and resources are the same.

Sampling Contributions (RQ3)

Answering RQ3 involves a quantitative analysis of developer contributions. Hence, we drew a statistically representative random sample of 383 developers. Our sample size allows us to generalize conclusions about the ratio of developers to all developers with a confidence level of 95% and a confidence interval of 5%, as suggested by prior work [26] based on the Sample Size Calculator.⁷ To collect the most recent contributions of the sampled developers, we extracted contributions belonging to the most recent quarter. To do so, we first identified the last contribution, i.e., the last submitted PRs in our dataset, and then we extracted all their PRs submitted within that time-period. In the end, we collected 8,938 PRs. Since our approach involves similarity analysis of the source code (at least one `.js` file) and file-path components, we obtained 3,714 (42%) PRs from the 383 developers with the four developer contribution types (see Section 2.3).

4 RESULTS

In this section, we present the results to answer our RQs.

6. <https://github.com/ishepard/pydriller>

7. <https://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>

5. <https://docs.github.com/en/rest>




Figure 2: Ecosystem-level DC congruence over time. The red text indicates quarters in which congruence values are highest.

Table 3: Summary statistics of ecosystem-level DC congruence of contribution types.

Contribution Type	Max	Min	Mean	Median
non-maintain	0.166	0.001	0.030	0.020
cli&lib-maintain	0.095	0.000	0.013	0.006
cli-maintain	0.166	0.000	0.006	0.003
lib-maintain	0.083	0.000	0.003	0.002

4.1 Assistance from the Ecosystem (RQ1)

Approach. To answer RQ1, we analyze the DC congruence in terms of developer contributions and dependency changes. In particular, we address each of the sub-questions as follow: To answer RQ1a: *To what degree do developer contributions align with dependencies?*, we summarize the DC congruence in terms of the distribution by contribution type. To answer RQ1b: *How do different contribution types and dependency changes contribute to DC congruence*, we analyze trends of DC congruence related to different contribution types and dependency changes.

For RQ1b, we use the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient to analyze the correlations between the different dependency changes for each kind of contribution. A correlation between 0 – 0.09 is considered as negligible, 0.1 – 0.39 as weak, 0.4 – 0.69 as moderate, 0.7 – 0.89 as strong, and 0.9 – 1 as very strong. To analyze the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficients, we use the `dataframe.corr()` function of the `pandas` package.⁸

Aligning contributions to their dependencies (RQ1a). Table 3 shows that the congruence between contributions and dependency changes is low (i.e., 0.001 to 0.166) when compared to other social-technical applications, such as aligning coordination and organization architectures [49]. However, relatively, we find that non-maintain contributions that aligned with downgrading dependencies and cli-maintain contributions that aligned with downgrading

dependencies had the highest congruence values (DC congruence of 0.16).

From Figure 2, we find that the highest congruence values occur generally in the second quarter of 2014, followed by the first quarter of 2015. This could be explained by the ecosystem size (17,859 and 57,534 packages in 2014 and 2015 respectively).

Attributes that correlate with the DC congruence (RQ1b)

From Figure 2, we are able to make two observations. First, we find that there is higher congruence with contributions when a dependency is downgraded (see the purple lines in Figure 2). This finding is consistent between all contribution types and between issues and PRs, except for the congruence between lib-maintain PRs and dependency upgrades. The second observation is that the non-maintain contributions are most congruent with dependency changes. This is consistent from both the issue and PRs. This provides evidence that package dependency changes are satisfied by contributions that come from the ecosystem and not the maintainers of either that package or clients.

Table 4 shows evidence that all dependency changes are correlated with each other. Statistically, we tested to find that any dependency changes are moderately to strongly correlated to each other for all contribution types, except for the lib-maintain contributions (is-added to is-downgraded, and is-removed to is-downgraded). We now return to answer RQ1, which we summarize below:

8. <https://pandas.pydata.org/>

Table 4: Correlations between different dependency changes for each type of contribution

Dependency change to Dependency change	non-maintain		cli&lib-maintain		cli-maintain		lib-maintain	
	PR corr. strength	issue corr. strength						
is-added to is-removed	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Very strong	Moderate	Strong
is-added to is-upgraded	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Very strong	Very Strong	Strong	Very strong
is-added to is-downgraded	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Strong	Weak	Weak
is-removed to is-upgraded	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Very strong	Moderate	Strong
is-removed to is-downgraded	Moderate	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Weak	Moderate
is-upgraded to is-downgraded	Strong	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Very Strong	Strong	Moderate	Moderate

Correlation: Negligible is 0 to 0.09, Weak is 0.1 to 0.39, Moderate is 0.4 to 0.69, Strong is 0.7 to 0.89, Very strong is 0.9 to 1.

RQ1 Summary

The alignment between developer contributions and dependency changes varies over time, with the highest values generally observed in earlier stages of the NPM ecosystem. The peaks we identify in the data correspond to a DC congruence of 0.16, i.e., 16% of the dependency changes receive aligned contributions. Furthermore, we show that contributions are most congruent with downgrading a dependency, and mainly come from the ecosystem and not the maintainers of either that package or clients.

4.2 Contribution Congruence and Package’s Dormancy (RQ2)

Approach. To address RQ2, we analyze the relationship between the DC congruence and the likelihood of packages becoming dormant. In particular, we leverage survival analysis techniques which allow us to model the relationship across different time periods. We use a Cox proportional-hazard model (i.e., a commonly-used survival analysis model) [16] to capture the risk of an event (i.e., a package becomes dormant) in relation to factors of interest (e.g., the DC congruence) in the elapsed time.

To do so, we extract the event and the factors for each package in each time period (i.e., a quarter). In our Cox model, the dependent variable is the event that a package becomes dormant at a particular time point. In line with prior work [11], [58], [55], a project is regarded as dormant if it is no longer being maintained or does not have development activity. Specifically, similar to the work of [55], we consider a package as *dormant* in the quarter q if it had an average number of commits less than one for four consecutive quarters (i.e., from the quarter q until the quarter $(q + 3)$). For example, in the first, second, third, and fourth quarters in 2018, a package that has 1, 0, 0, and 1 commits, respectively is considered as *dormant* since the first quarter in 2018 because the average number of commits for four consecutive quarters is $0.5 (\frac{2}{4})$. Note that we exclude packages that have the first commit after October 2019, since their historical data is not sufficient to identify whether the package is dormant or not (i.e., less than four consecutive quarters). As our RQ1 shows that the correlations between different dependency changes for all contribution types vary, it is also possible that these DC congruence may provide various signals to the package dormancy given different dependency changes and contribution types. Thus, for independent variables in our Cox

Table 5: Project characteristics [55] that are used as control variables in our Cox model.

Metric	Description
#Commits	The number of commits occurring in the observed quarter.
#Contributors	The number of GitHub users who have authored commits in the observed quarter.
Core Team Size	The number of GitHub users responsible for 90% of contributions in the observed quarter.
#Issues	The number of issues created in the observed quarter.
#Non-Developer Issue Reporters	The number of GitHub users who did not author any commits but created an issue in the observed quarter.
License Type	The license type that the studied package used in the observed quarter: Strong copy-left (e.g., GPL, Affero), Weak-copy-left (e.g., LGPL, MPL, OPL), or non-copy-left (e.g., Apache, BSD)

model, we use 32 metrics which measure the package-level DC congruence (see Section 3). Since prior work has shown that project characteristics can be associated with the chance of packages becoming dormant [55], we also include six project characteristics (see Table 5) as control variables in our Cox model.

To construct the Cox model, we use a similar approach as Valiev et al. [55], which has the following four steps. First, we perform log-transform on the independent variables with skewed distribution to stabilize the variance and reduce heteroscedasticity, which will improve the model fit. We manually observe the skewness of the distribution using histogram plots. Second, we check for the multicollinearity between independent variables using the variance inflation factor (VIF) test. We remove the variables that have VIF scores above the recommended maximum of 5 [13]. Third, we test the assumption of constant hazard ratios overtime. To do so, we employ graphical diagnostics of Schoenfeld residuals [25]. We observe that Schoenfeld residuals of the remaining variables have a random pattern against time, which implies that the Cox model assumptions are not violated. Finally, we use `coxph` in the R survival package to build a Cox proportional-hazards model.

To analyze the association between each independent variable and the likelihood of a package becoming dormant, we examine the coefficient values and effect sizes of the independent variables. The coefficient values in the Cox model are hazard ratios, where a hazard ratio above 1 implies that a variable is positively associated with the event probability, while a hazard ratio below 1 indicates an inverse association. For the effect size, we perform ANOVA type-II to obtain Log-likelihood Ratio χ^2 (LR χ^2). The larger the LR χ^2 of the variable is, the stronger the relation of the variable to the likelihood of a package becoming dormant.

Table 6 shows that our Cox proportional-hazard model achieves an adjusted R^2 of 30.7%, suggesting that the goodness-of-fit of our model is acceptable as the model is supposed to be explanatory and not for prediction [41].

Table 6: Survival analysis statistics

NPM Ecosystem Survival Analysis response: dormant = TRUE $R^2 = 30.7\%$				
			Coeffs (Err.)	LR Chisq
Number of commits			0.98 (<0.01)***	5437.5***
Log number of contributors			7.85 (0.01)***	23699.3***
Log number of non-developer issues			0.68 (0.01)***	4781.0***
Core size of the team			0.14 (0.02)***	13378.8***
Strong copy-left license (vs none)			0.88 (0.02)***	839.3***
Weak copy-left license (vs none)			0.69 (0.03)***	
Non-copy-left license (vs none)			0.82 (<0.01)***	
Contribution Type	Dependency Change	Type	Coeffs (Err.)	LR Chisq
non-maintain	is-added	issue	1.33 (0.32)	0.7
non-maintain	is-removed	issue	0.92 (0.15)	0.3
non-maintain	is-downgraded	issue	1.26 (0.21)	1.1
non-maintain	is-upgraded	issue	0.67 (0.08)***	24.0***
cli-maintain	is-added	issue	0.82 (0.18)	1.2
cli-maintain	is-removed	issue	0.62 (0.29)	3.1
cli-maintain	is-downgraded	issue	0.77 (0.45)	0.4
cli-maintain	is-upgraded	issue	0.66 (0.16)**	7.6**
lib-maintain	is-added	issue	0.64 (0.27)	3.1
lib-maintain	is-removed	issue	1.33 (0.32)	0.7
lib-maintain	is-downgraded	issue	0.71 (0.58)	0.4
non-maintain	is-added	PR	0.95 (0.14)	0.2
non-maintain	is-removed	PR	0.99 (0.18)	0.0
non-maintain	is-downgraded	PR	0.51 (0.24)**	7.1**
non-maintain	is-upgraded	PR	0.87 (0.09)	1.5
cli&lib-maintain	is-added	PR	0.87 (0.07)	3.9*
cli&lib-maintain	is-removed	PR	1.31 (0.10)***	6.3*
cli&lib-maintain	is-downgraded	PR	0.60 (0.19)**	8.0**
cli&lib-maintain	is-upgraded	PR	0.98 (0.05)	0.1
cli-maintain	is-added	PR	1.27 (0.26)	0.8
cli-maintain	is-removed	PR	1.27 (0.37)	0.4
cli-maintain	is-downgraded	PR	0.79 (0.58)	0.2
cli-maintain	is-upgraded	PR	1.08 (0.21)	0.1
lib-maintain	is-added	PR	0.97 (0.38)	0.0
lib-maintain	is-removed	PR	0.49 (0.51)	1.9
lib-maintain	is-downgraded	PR	0.14 (1.37)	2.8
lib-maintain	is-upgraded	PR	0.42 (0.20)***	22.0***

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001

#Issues, is-added and cli&lib-maintain and issue, is-downgraded and cli&lib-maintain and issue, is-removed and cli&lib-maintain and issue, is-upgraded and cli&lib-maintain and issue, and is-upgraded and lib-maintain and issue are removed during VIF analysis.

Association between the contribution congruence and the chance of packages becoming dormant. We found that six congruence-related variables are significantly associated with the likelihood of a package becoming dormant in our Cox model, i.e., *is-removed* and *cli&lib-maintain* and PR, *is-downgraded* and *cli&lib-maintain* and PR, *is-downgraded* and *non-maintain* and PR, *is-upgraded* and *cli-maintain* and issue, *is-upgraded* and *lib-maintain* and PR, and *is-upgraded* and *non-maintain* and issue. Among these six variables, *is-upgraded* and *lib-maintain* and PR and *is-upgraded* and *non-maintain* and issue have the largest LR χ^2 values (see Table 6). Their coefficient values also indicate an inverse association with the likelihood of a package becoming dormant. In other words, the coefficient value of *is-upgraded* and *lib-maintain* and PR indicates that the higher the number of lib-maintain PRs that are aligned with a dependency upgrade, the lower the likelihood that a package becomes dormant. Similarly, the coefficient value of *is-upgraded* and *non-maintain* and issue indicates that the higher the number of non-maintain issues that are aligned with a dependency upgrade, the lower the likelihood that a package becomes dormant. The coefficient values of *is-upgraded* and *lib-maintain* and PR, *is-downgraded* and *non-maintain* and PR, and *is-upgraded* and *cli-maintain* and issue also show the same direction of the association. These results suggest that a package is less likely to become dormant if the contributions (i.e., PRs and issues) are aligned with the events of upgrading or downgrading dependen-

cies.

RQ2 Summary

Our survival analysis shows that the different types of DC congruence share an inverse association with the likelihood of a package becoming dormant. For instance, the higher the number of issues from specific types (i.e., non-maintain, cli-maintain) that are aligned with a dependency upgrade, the lower the likelihood that a package becomes dormant.

4.3 Similarities between Contributions (RQ3)

Approach. To answer RQ3, we investigate whether the type of aligned contributions submitted to dependencies are the same as other contributions by analyzing the source code similarity and file location similarity. Hence, we focus on client contributions (i.e., cli-maintain), comparing against contributions from the ecosystem (i.e., non-maintain), and then the rest of maintainer contributions (i.e., cli&lib-maintain and lib-maintain). We compute similarity based on two common methods to compare the content of PRs, which is (i) source code and (ii) file path similarity [57], [38], [29]. More specifically, we use the source code similarity to measure whether the two contributions share similar source code; and use the file path similarity to measure whether the two contributions modify similar components. From our sample, we compare the similarities between PRs of the same contribution type of a developer. As a PR may modify multiple files, we compare all components (i.e., source code lines and file paths).

Our source code similarity measure is based on the Jaccard index of tokens which approximates the edit distance between two PRs [53]. Following the analysis of repeated bug fixes [63], to compare a pair of PRs, we take only added lines by the PRs into account. Formally, for any PR (p), the source code similarity is defined as follows:

$$SourceCodeSim(p_1, p_2) = \frac{|trigrams(p_1) \cap trigrams(p_2)|}{|trigrams(p_1) \cup trigrams(p_2)|} \quad (3)$$

where $trigrams(p)$ is a multiset of trigrams (3-grams) of source code tokens extracted from all source code lines added by a PR (p). A higher similarity indicates that a larger amount of source code is shared. The similarity is an extension of file similarity defined by Ishio et al. [28] for PRs. This measure has been widely adapted in various software engineering studies [28], [31], [60] and less affected by moved code in a PR, compared with other measures. On that same note, we apply the file location-based model that is used in typical code review recommendations [51], [62], [57] to compute file path similarity that is defined as follows:

$$StringSim_{LCx}(f_1, f_2) = \frac{LCx(f_1, f_2)}{\max(\text{Length}(f_1), \text{Length}(f_2))}$$

where the $LCx(f_1, f_2)$ function has a parameter to specify how to compare file path components f_1 and f_2 . Four different comparison techniques, i.e., Longest Common Prefix (LCP), Longest Common Suffix (LCS), Longest Common Substring (LCSubstr), and Longest Common Subsequence




Figure 3: Comparisons of contribution types. (ns: no significance, **: p-value < 0.01, ***: p-value < 0.001, ****: p-value < 0.0001)

Table 7: Statistical comparisons of contribution types.

	Source Code	File Path
cli-maintain vs (cli&lib-maintain and lib-maintain)	Small	Negligible
non-maintain vs (cli&lib-maintain and lib-maintain)	Negligible	Medium
cli-maintain vs non-maintain	Small	Medium

Effect size: Negligible $|\delta| < 0.147$, Small $0.147 \leq |\delta| < 0.33$, Medium $0.33 \leq |\delta| < 0.474$, Large $0.474 \leq |\delta|$

(LCSubseq) are used in the LCx function. The comparison function value is normalized by the maximum length of each file path in f_1 and f_2 , i.e., the number of file path components. To calculate the file path similarity between two PRs, we do a pairwise comparison of all file paths in the two PRs and then summarize these by taking the average score. Since we use four different comparison techniques, four similarity scores between two PRs are retrieved and we also summarize these by taking the average score. A higher similarity indicates that a larger amount of components are shared in the PRs.

Once we compute the similarity between PRs in each contribution types (i.e., cli-maintain, non-maintain, and cli&lib-maintain and lib-maintain), we now analyze whether the similarity of the cli-maintain contributions is different from the similarity of the other contributions. To visualize this, we will use a box-plot to show the distributions of similarities between PRs in each of the contribution types.

To statistically confirm the differences in the three contribution types, we use the Kruskal-Wallis H test [33]. This is a non-parametric statistical test to use when comparing two or more than two types. We test the null hypothesis that ‘two different types have similar contributions.’ We also measure the effect size using Cliff’s δ , a non-parametric effect size measure [10]. Effect size is analyzed as follows: (1) $|\delta| < 0.147$ as Negligible, (2) $0.147 \leq |\delta| < 0.33$ as Small, (3) $0.33 \leq |\delta| < 0.474$ as Medium, or (4) $0.474 \leq |\delta|$ as Large. We use the cliffsDelta⁹ package to analyze Cliff’s δ .

Similarities/differences between client contributions and other contributions. Figure 3 shows that overall the similarities of contents of PRs in terms of the source code and

file paths are relatively low (i.e., scores of 0.01 to 0.17). This could be explained by our method to aggregate all source code and file paths for comparison, which is different to typical file-level similarity comparison techniques [44]. Relatively, we see that the file path similarity is higher than the source code similarity.

In terms of statistical significance, from Figure 3, we make three key observations. First, file path content between cli&lib-maintain and lib-maintain and non-maintain contributions are different. Second, we find differences in the source code content between cli-maintain and other contributions. This suggests that the content of aligned contributions submitted to packages that developers depend on may differ from the other contributions made to either their own packages or other packages. Conversely, we find that there is no significant difference in the source code between cli&lib-maintain and lib-maintain and non-maintain contributions, which suggests that developers may be submitting similar code, regardless of whether they are maintaining packages or not. Confirming statistical significance, we show that the effect size ranges from negligible to medium strength as shown in Table 7.

RQ3 Summary

Comparing contribution similarity in terms of source code and file paths, we find statistical differences in source code content of aligned contributions submitted to dependencies when compared to those that are not aligned. In other words, congruent contributions are not typical contributions by that contributor.

5 DISCUSSION

We now discuss our results, implications, and threats to validity.

5.1 Peaks of DC Congruence and Global Events

The results in RQ1 (i.e., Figure 2) show that DC congruence is changing over time. Interestingly, we find that the official NPM blog¹⁰ showed two dependency events that may correlate with the observed peaks. It is also important to note that we do not aim to draw a causal relationship, but only observe correlations.

- *June, 2015 - NPM 3 is released.* According the NPM blog,¹¹ the release has a notable breaking change when migrating to NPM version 3. According to our DC congruence values in Figure 2, we see the peak changes in the non-maintain contribution and dependency remove congruence (i.e., 0.019 for issues and 0.013 for PRs), and cli-maintain contribution and dependency downgrade congruence (i.e., 0.031 for issues and 0.027 for PRs).

- *March 2016 - Left-pad incident.* NPM attracted press attention after a package called `left-pad`, which many popular JavaScript packages depended on, was unpublished. It caused widespread disruption, leading NPM to change its

10. Available at <https://blog.npmjs.org/>

11. <https://blog.npmjs.org/post/122450408965/npm-weekly-20-npm-3-is-here-ish.html>

9. <https://github.com/neilernst/cliffsDelta>

policies regarding unpublishing packages. According to our DC congruence values in Figure 2, we see peak changes in the non-maintain contribution and dependency downgrade congruence (i.e., 0.103 for issues and 0.086 for PRs), and non-maintain contribution and dependency upgrade congruence (i.e., 0.051 for issues and 0.037 for PRs).

5.2 Implications

Package developers: You should welcome contributions from the ecosystem and offer them ways to get involved. RQ1 results suggest that contributions that align with dependency changes come from the ecosystem itself, many of them not having any self-interest (i.e., relying on these packages). The results of our survival analysis in RQ2 show that a package that received contributions aligned with the dependency changes is less likely to become dormant, which implies that packages are indeed dependent on the ecosystem support. RQ3 shows that cli-maintain contributions differ in source code content when compared to developers' typical contributions. These findings underline the important role of the ecosystem.

Package users: You might have to contribute to packages you are using to reduce the risks of packages becoming dormant (in multiple possible ways). In our RQ2, we found that a large number of packages become dormant in the early stages, with more than 90% of packages becoming inactive until the end-time of our study. Taking into account that contributions aligned with dependencies share a relationship with the likelihood of a package becoming dormant, we encourage package users to take any opportunity to contribute back to packages that they depend on.

Currently there is numerous tools to assist with awareness of when a new version of an existing dependency is available (bots like dependabot¹²), however, making users aware of raised issues, and potential threats (such as vulnerabilities) to their dependency may cause these users to assist. Furthermore, the results of RQ3 show that aligned contributions submitted to dependencies are different in source code, which confirms our hypothesis and indicates that package users might be willing to go out of their way to assist with the dependency that they rely on.

Researchers: Ecosystem-level is important, do not put all contributions into the same bucket when analyzing open source contributions. Our results highlight the important relationship between dependencies in an ecosystem and contributions. Researchers interested in studying characteristics of open-source developers, e.g., motivation [22] or success [52], should consider whether or not the contribution is from the ecosystem. This also applies to researchers working on helping newcomers make their first contribution in open source projects. Several approaches have been proposed to help newcomers find good first issues, e.g., Tan et al. [50]. These approaches generally ignore the relationship of a newcomer to the repository that contains the issues.

Ecosystem Governance: We suggest that policies and good governance is needed to help ecosystem members. Our results suggest that contributions congruent with dependency changes are from other packages that belong

to the same ecosystem, suggesting that it may impact on ecosystem health, resilience, and governance. This points to implications such as implementing collective support into existing policies and governance. Examples include ecosystem guidelines for maintainers and users¹³. Particularly, RQ2 results indicated that a package is less likely to become dormant if contributions are aligned with dependencies. One example of challenges in the relationship between ecosystem members that depend on each other is illustrated by the following quote: '... maintainers have been working sleeplessly on mitigation measures; fixes, docs, CVE, replies to inquiries, etc. Yet nothing is stopping people to bash us, for work we aren't paid for, for a feature we all dislike yet needed to keep due to backward compatibility concerns ...'¹⁴ One strategy to prevent member packages from becoming dormant, is to promote explicit best practices and some ecosystem-wide policies that encourage members contribute to each other. One example is how the NPM ecosystem has a global blog and central vulnerability advisory¹⁵, to provide a global awareness of ecosystem threats.

5.3 Threats to Validity

Internal Validity - We discuss five threats to internal validity. The first threat is the correctness of techniques used in our mining task. We use the listed dependencies and version numbers as defined in the package.json meta-file. Since we based our mining techniques on prior work, we are confident that our results are replicable. The second threat is related to the constructed matrices for measuring the DC congruence. Since we pioneer the investigation of DC congruence, we constructed binary matrices in this study. We will calculate weight matrices, e.g., a matrix captures the number of contributions (issues and PRs) to investigate the impacts of contributions on the DC congruence, in future work. The third threat is related to the results derived from the survival model. Although we observe association between explanatory and dependent variables, we cannot infer causal effect of explanatory variables. Thus, future in-depth qualitative analysis or experimental studies are needed. The fourth threat is related to the factors used in our survival model. Other factors might also influence the chance of packages becoming dormant. Since our factors are based on Valiev et al. [55], we are confident in the factors used in our study. Finally, tool selection has its threats, as different tools and techniques may lead to different results (e.g., Jaccard index for the source code similarity calculation and the statistical testing). Our approach involves the use of Pydriller and GitHub Rest API. We are confident in our results, since all employed tools and techniques are those that have been used in prior work and are well-known in the software engineering community.

External Validity - The main threat to external validity is the generalizability of our results to other package

13. NPM ecosystem governance <https://github.com/nodejs/package-maintenance/blob/main/Governance.md>

14. <https://twitter.com/yazicivo/status/1469349956880408583?lang=en>

15. <https://docs.github.com/en/code-security/supply-chain-security/managing-vulnerabilities-in-your-projects-dependencies/browsing-security-vulnerabilities-in-the-github-advisory-database>

12. <https://github.com/dependabot>

ecosystems. Since the NPM ecosystem is the largest package ecosystem, we believe that our model and measurements could easily be applied to other ecosystems that have similar package management systems, such as PyPI for Python and Maven for Java. We will explore this in future work.

6 RELATED WORK

Socio-Technical Congruence (STC). Cataldo et al. [8] pioneered the concept of socio-technical congruence (STC), the match between task dependencies among people and coordination activities performed by individuals. Their follow-up studies (Cataldo et al. [7], Cataldo and Herbsleb [6]) then investigated software quality and development productivity. Further studies also presented STC measures from different perspectives. For instance, Valetto et al. [54] proposed a measure of STC in the view of network analysis, while Kwan et al. [36] measured weight STC and the impact of STC on software build success (Kwan et al. [37]). Additionally, Wagstrom et al. [56] measured individualized STC. Other studies then measured STC from other perspectives such as dependencies, knowledge, and resources [30], global software development [43], and for file-level analysis [66] and [39]. *Different from these studies*, we formulate the time-based ecosystem-level DC congruence, adapting the STC measure proposed by Cataldo et al. [8]. Further, we analyze the time-based package-level DC congruence, making an adjustment on the STC measure proposed by Wagstrom et al. [56].

Package Dependency Changes. The research community has carried out a large body of research on understanding the large networks of software package dependencies. Some studies focused on a single ecosystem, focusing on the updating and lags within that ecosystem. For instance, Wittern et al [61] analyzed a subset of NPM packages, focusing on the evolution of characteristics such as their dependencies and update frequency. Abdalkareem et al. [2] also empirically analyzed “trivial” NPM packages, to suggest that depending on trivial packages can be useful and risk-free if they are well implemented and tested. Zerouali et al . [65] analyzed the package update practices and technical lag to show a strong presence of technical lag caused by the specific use of dependency constraints. Recent studies include understanding the lag when updating security vulnerabilities [9] and dependency downgrades [12] for the NPM ecosystem. There are works that studied other ecosystems. Robbes et al. [45] showed that a number of API changes caused by deprecation can have a large impact on the Pharo ecosystem. Blincoc et al. [4] proposed a new method for detecting technical dependencies between projects on GitHub and IBM. Bavota et al. [3] studied Apache projects to discover that a client project tends to upgrade a dependency only when substantial changes (e.g., new features) are available. Kula et al . [34] revealed that affected developers are not likely to respond to a security advisory for Maven libraries, while Wang et al. [59] revealed that developers need convincing and fine-grained information for the migration decision. Most recently, He et al. [27] proposed a framework for quantifying dependency changes and library migrations based on version control data using Java projects.

Other studies focused on analyzing multiple ecosystems, comparing the different attributes between them. Decan et al . [17] showed the comparison of dependency evolution and issue from three different ecosystems. Similarly, Kikas et al. [32], studied the dependency network structure and evolution of the JavaScript, Ruby, and Rust ecosystems. Dietrich et al. [20] studied how developers declare dependencies across 17 different package managers. Stringer et al. [48] analyzed technical lag across 14 package managers and discovered that technical lag is prevalent across package managers but preventable by using semantic versioning based declaration ranges. *Differently, in our work*, we focus on how developer contributions align with dependency changes at the ecosystem level, our motivation is different, as we explore how dependency changes correlate with a package becoming dormant.

Sustainability of Software Ecosystem As with prior work [14], we view software ecosystems as socio-technical networks consisting of technical components (software packages) and social components (communities of developers) that maintain the technical components. Sustainability is particular visible in the complex and often brittle dependency chains in OSS package ecosystems like NPM, PyPI, and CRAN [18]. Other studies have studied sustainability for R [21], Ruby [15], Python [55], and NPM [19]. Through a longitudinal empirical study of Cargo’s dependency network, Golzadeh [24] revealed that dependencies to a project lead to active involvement in that project. However, the effect of DC congruence from different types of contributions on the ecosystem sustainability is still unknown. *Different to these studies*, we take a quantitative approach to investigate the relationship between the DC congruence and the likelihood of packages becoming dormant.

7 CONCLUSION

This work investigates how developers whose code depends on other packages in the NPM ecosystem, submit contributions to assist these packages. Borrowing socio-technical techniques, we were able to measure the congruence between these aligned contributions, and changes in dependencies for the ecosystem. Results indicate that packages indeed rely on the ecosystem for contributions, and that these aligned contributions share a relationship with the likelihood of a package becoming dormant, suggesting that the alignment between contributions and dependency changes could be used as an indicator of package dormancy. Moreover, the aligned contributions submitted to dependencies differ from developers’ typical contributions. Our results show that developers do depend on the ecosystem, and should be encouraged to support packages that they depend on.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work is supported by Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) KAKENHI Grant Numbers 20K19774 and 20H05706. P. Thongtanunam was partially supported by the Australian Research Council’s Discovery Early Career Researcher Award (DECRA) funding scheme (DE210101091).

REFERENCES

- [1] “npm,” <https://www.npmjs.com/>, (Accessed on 05/16/2021).
- [2] R. Abdalkareem, O. Nourry, S. Wehaibi, S. Mujahid, and E. Shihab, “Why do developers use trivial packages? an empirical case study on npm,” in *Proceedings of the 2017 11th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2017, p. 385–395.
- [3] G. Bavota, G. Canfora, M. Di Penta, R. Oliveto, and S. Panichella, “How the apache community upgrades dependencies: An evolutionary study,” *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 20, no. 5, p. 1275–1317, 2015.
- [4] K. Blincoe, F. Harrison, N. Kaur, and D. Damian, “Reference coupling: An exploration of inter-project technical dependencies and their characteristics within large software ecosystems,” *Information and Software Technology*, vol. 110, pp. 174–189, 2019.
- [5] C. Brindescu, I. Ahmed, C. Jensen, and A. Sarma, “An empirical investigation into merge conflicts and their effect on software quality,” *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 25, no. 1, p. 562–590, 2020.
- [6] M. Cataldo and J. D. Herbsleb, “Coordination breakdowns and their impact on development productivity and software failures,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, pp. 343–360, 2013.
- [7] M. Cataldo, J. D. Herbsleb, and K. M. Carley, “Socio-technical congruence: A framework for assessing the impact of technical and work dependencies on software development productivity,” in *Proceedings of the Second ACM-IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement*, 2008, p. 2–11.
- [8] M. Cataldo, P. A. Wagstrom, J. D. Herbsleb, and K. M. Carley, “Identification of coordination requirements: Implications for the design of collaboration and awareness tools,” in *Proceedings of the 2006 20th Anniversary Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, 2006, p. 353–362.
- [9] B. Chinthanet, R. G. Kula, S. McIntosh, T. Ishio, A. Ihara, and K. Matsumoto, “Lags in the release, adoption, and propagation of npm vulnerability fixes,” *Empirical Software Engineering*, pp. 1–28, 2021.
- [10] N. Cliff, “Dominance statistics: Ordinal analyses to answer ordinal questions,” *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 114, pp. 494–509, 1993.
- [11] J. Coelho and M. T. Valente, “Why modern open source projects fail,” in *Proceedings of the 2017 11th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2017, pp. 186–196.
- [12] F. R. Cogo, G. A. Oliva, and A. E. Hassan, “An empirical study of dependency downgrades in the npm ecosystem,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, pp. 1–1, 2019.
- [13] J. Cohen, P. Cohen, S. G. West, and L. S. Aiken, “Applied multiple regression,” *Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 1983.
- [14] E. Constantinou and T. Mens, “An empirical comparison of developer retention in the rubygems and npm software ecosystems,” vol. 13, p. 101–115, 2017.
- [15] —, “Socio-technical evolution of the ruby ecosystem in github,” *2017 IEEE 24th International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering*, pp. 34–44, 2017.
- [16] D. R. Cox and D. Oakes, *Analysis of survival data*. CRC Press, 1984.
- [17] A. Decan, T. Mens, and M. Claes, “An empirical comparison of dependency issues in oss packaging ecosystems,” in *2017 IEEE 24th International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering*, 2017, pp. 2–12.
- [18] A. Decan, T. Mens, and P. Grosjean, “An empirical comparison of dependency network evolution in seven software packaging ecosystems,” *Empirical Software Engineering*, 2019.
- [19] T. Dey, Y. Ma, and A. Mockus, “Patterns of effort contribution and demand and user classification based on participation patterns in npm ecosystem,” 2019, p. 36–45.
- [20] J. Dietrich, D. Pearce, J. Stringer, A. Tahir, and K. Blincoe, “Dependency versioning in the wild,” in *2019 IEEE/ACM 16th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories*, 2019, pp. 349–359.
- [21] D. M. German, B. Adams, and A. E. Hassan, “The evolution of the r software ecosystem,” in *2013 17th European Conference on Software Maintenance and Reengineering*, 2013, pp. 243–252.
- [22] M. Gerosa, I. Wiese, B. Trinkenreich, G. Link, G. Robles, C. Treude, I. Steinmacher, and A. Sarma, “The shifting sands of motivation: Revisiting what drives contributors in open source,” in *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2021, pp. 1046–1058.
- [23] GitHub - nice-registry/all-the-package-repos, “Normalized repository urls for every package in the npm registry, updated daily.” <https://github.com/nice-registry/all-the-package-repos>, 2017, (Accessed on 08/28/2021).
- [24] M. Golzadeh, “Analysing socio-technical congruence in the package dependency network of cargo,” in *Proceedings of the 2019 27th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 08 2019.
- [25] P. M. Grambsch and T. M. Therneau, “Proportional hazards tests and diagnostics based on weighted residuals,” *Biometrika*, pp. 515–526, 1994.
- [26] H. Hata, C. Treude, R. Kula, and T. Ishio, “9.6 million links in source code comments: Purpose, evolution, and decay,” in *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2019, pp. 1211–1221.
- [27] H. He, R. He, H. Gu, and M. Zhou, “A large-scale empirical study on java library migrations: Prevalence, trends, and rationales,” in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2021, p. 478–490.
- [28] T. Ishio, Y. Sakaguchi, K. Ito, and K. Inoue, “Source file set search for clone-and-own reuse analysis,” in *2017 IEEE/ACM 14th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories*, 2017, pp. 257–268.
- [29] J. Jiang, D. Lo, J. Zheng, X. Xia, Y. Yang, and L. Zhang, “Who should make decision on this pull request? analyzing time-decaying relationships and file similarities for integrator prediction,” *Journal of Systems and Software*, vol. 154, pp. 196–210, 2019.
- [30] L. Jiang, K. Carley, and A. Eberlein, “Assessing team performance from a socio-technical congruence perspective,” *2012 International Conference on Software and System Process, ICSSP 2012 - Proceedings*, 2012.
- [31] M. A. C. Jiffriya, M. A. C. A. Jahan, and R. G. Ragel, “Plagiarism detection on electronic text based assignments using vector space model,” in *7th International Conference on Information and Automation for Sustainability*, 2014, pp. 1–5.
- [32] R. Kikas, G. Gousios, M. Dumas, and D. Pfahl, “Structure and evolution of package dependency networks,” in *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories*, 2017, p. 102–112.
- [33] W. H. Kruskal and W. A. Wallis, “Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pp. 583–621, 1952.
- [34] R. G. Kula, D. M. German, A. Ouni, T. Ishio, and K. Inoue, “Do developers update their library dependencies?” *Empirical Software Engineering*, pp. 384–417, 2018.
- [35] R. G. Kula, A. Ouni, D. M. German, and K. Inoue, “On the impact of micro-packages: An empirical study of the npm javascript ecosystem,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.04638*, 2017.
- [36] I. Kwan, A. Schröter, and D. Damian, “A weighted congruence measure,” in *2nd International Workshop on Socio-Technical Congruence*, 2009, pp. 1–10.
- [37] I. Kwan, A. Schroter, and D. Damian, “Does socio-technical congruence have an effect on software build success? a study of coordination in a software project,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, pp. 307–324, 2011.
- [38] Z. Li, Y. Yu, T. Wang, G. Yin, X. jun Mao, and H. Wang, “Detecting duplicate contributions in pull-based model combining textual and change similarities,” *Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, vol. 36, pp. 191–206, 2021.
- [39] W. Mauerer, M. Joblin, D. Tamburri, C. Paradis, R. Kazman, and S. Apel, “In search of socio-technical congruence: A large-scale longitudinal study,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, pp. 1–1, 2019.
- [40] E. Mirsaeeedi and P. C. Rigby, “Mitigating turnover with code review recommendation: Balancing expertise, workload, and knowledge distribution,” in *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2020, p. 1183–1195.
- [41] F. Moksony, “Small is beautiful: The use and interpretation of r2 in social research,” *Szociologiai Szemle*, pp. 130–138, 01 1999.
- [42] M. Nassif and M. Robillard, “Revisiting turnover-induced knowledge loss in software projects,” in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution*, 2017, pp. 261–272.
- [43] J. Portillo-Rodríguez, “An agent architecture with which to improve coordination and communication in global software engineering,” *University of Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real, Spain*, 2013.
- [44] C. Ragkhitwetsagul, J. Krinke, and D. Clark, “A comparison of code similarity analysers,” *Empirical Software Engineering*, pp. 2464–2519, 2018.
- [45] R. Robbes, M. Lungu, and D. Röthlisberger, “How do developers react to api deprecation? the case of a smalltalk ecosystem,” in

- Proceedings of the ACM SIGSOFT 20th International Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2012.
- [46] G. Robles and J. M. Gonzalez-Barahona, "Contributor turnover in libre software projects," in *IFIP International Conference on Open Source Systems*. Springer, 2006, pp. 273–286.
- [47] I. Samoladas, L. Angelis, and I. Stamelos, "Survival analysis on the duration of open source projects," *Information and Software Technology*, vol. 52, no. 9, p. 902–922, 2010.
- [48] J. Stringer, A. Tahir, K. Blincoe, and J. Dietrich, "Technical lag of dependencies in major package managers," in *Proceedings of the 27th Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference*, 2020, pp. 228–237.
- [49] M. Syeed and I. Hammouda, "Socio-Technical congruence in OSS Projects: Exploring Conway's law in FreeBSD OSS evolution," 2013.
- [50] X. Tan, M. Zhou, and Z. Sun, "A first look at good first issues on github," in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2020, p. 398–409.
- [51] P. Thongtanunam, C. Tantithamthavorn, R. G. Kula, N. Yoshida, H. Iida, and K.-i. Matsumoto, "Who should review my code? a file location-based code-reviewer recommendation approach for modern code review," in *2015 IEEE 22nd International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution, and Reengineering*, 2015, pp. 141–150.
- [52] B. Trinkenreich, M. Guizani, I. Wiese, T. Conte, M. Gerosa, A. Sarma, and I. Steinmacher, "The pot of gold at the end of the rainbow: What is success for open source contributors?" *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.08789*, 2021.
- [53] E. Ukkonen, "Approximate string-matching with q-grams and maximal matches," *Theoretical Computer Science*, pp. 191–211, 1992.
- [54] G. Valetto, M. Helander, K. Ehrlich, S. Chulani, M. Wegman, and C. Williams, "Using software repositories to investigate socio-technical congruence in development projects," in *4th International Workshop on Mining Software Repositories*, 2007, pp. 25–25.
- [55] M. Valiev, B. Vasilescu, and J. Herbsleb, "Ecosystem-level determinants of sustained activity in open-source projects: A case study of the pypi ecosystem," in *Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2018, p. 644–655.
- [56] P. Wagstrom, J. D. Herbsleb, and K. M. Carley, "Communication, team performance, and the individual: Bridging technical dependencies," *Academy of Management Proceedings*, vol. 2010, no. 1, pp. 1–7, 2010.
- [57] D. Wang, R. G. Kula, T. Ishio, and K. Matsumoto, "Automatic patch linkage detection in code review using textual content and file location features," *Information and Software Technology*, 2021.
- [58] J. Wang, "Survival factors for free open source software projects: A multi-stage perspective," *European Management Journal*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 352–371, 2012.
- [59] Y. Wang, B. Chen, K. Huang, B. Shi, C. jian Xu, X. Peng, Y. Liu, and Y. Wu, "An empirical study of usages, updates and risks of third-party libraries in java projects," *2020 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution*, pp. 35–45, 2020.
- [60] Y. Win and T. Masada, "Exploring technical phrase frames from research paper titles," in *2015 IEEE 29th International Conference on Advanced Information Networking and Applications Workshops*, 2015, pp. 558–563.
- [61] E. Wittern, P. Suter, and S. Rajagopalan, "A look at the dynamics of the javascript package ecosystem," in *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories*, 2016, pp. 351–361.
- [62] Y. Yu, H. Wang, G. Yin, and T. Wang, "Reviewer recommendation for pull-requests in github: What can we learn from code review and bug assignment?" *Information and Software Technology*, pp. 204–218, 2016.
- [63] R. Yue, N. Meng, and Q. Wang, "A characterization study of repeated bug fixes," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution*, 2017, pp. 422–432.
- [64] R. E. Zapata, R. G. Kula, B. Chinthanet, T. Ishio, K. Matsumoto, and A. Ihara, "Towards smoother library migrations: A look at vulnerable dependency migrations at function level for npm javascript packages," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution*, 2018, pp. 559–563.
- [65] A. Zerouali, E. Constantinou, T. Mens, G. Robles, and J. Gonzalez-Barahona, "An empirical analysis of technical lag in npm package dependencies," in *New Opportunities for Software Reuse*, 2018, pp. 95–110.
- [66] W. Zhang, S.-C. Cheung, Z. Chen, Y. Zhou, and B. Luo, "File-level socio-technical congruence and its relationship with bug proneness in oss projects," *Journal of Systems and Software*, pp. 21–40, 2019.