
CONGRA: Benchmarking Automatic Conflict Resolution

Qingyu Zhang, Liangcai Su, Kai Ye, Chenxiong Qian
The University of Hong Kong

Abstract

Resolving conflicts from merging different software versions is a challenging task. To reduce the overhead of manual merging, researchers develop various program analysis-based tools which only solve specific types of conflicts and have a limited scope of application. With the development of language models, researchers treat conflict code as text, which theoretically allows for addressing almost all types of conflicts. However, the absence of effective conflict difficulty grading methods hinders a comprehensive evaluation of large language models (LLMs), making it difficult to gain a deeper understanding of their limitations. Furthermore, there is a notable lack of large-scale open benchmarks for evaluating the performance of LLMs in automatic conflict resolution. To address these issues, we introduce CONGRA, a **CON**flict-**GRA**ded benchmarking scheme designed to evaluate the performance of software merging tools under varying complexity conflict scenarios. We propose a novel approach to classify conflicts based on code operations and use it to build a large-scale evaluation dataset based on 44,948 conflicts from 34 real-world projects. We evaluate state-of-the-art LLMs on conflict resolution tasks using this dataset. By employing the dataset, we assess the performance of multiple state-of-the-art LLMs and code LLMs, ultimately uncovering two counterintuitive yet insightful phenomena. CONGRA will be released at <https://github.com/HKU-System-Security-Lab/ConGra>.

1 Introduction

Code merging has become a challenging task for developers during project development and maintenance. Git, the most popular version control system (Spinellis [2012]), uses a text-based code-merging mechanism. Despite its efficiency, developers often struggle with manually merging different versions of code when Git fails to resolve conflicts automatically. These conflicts come from text or even the syntax and the functionality of the code from different versions.

To address conflict resolution, researchers leverage program analysis to achieve syntax-error-free code merging (Zhu et al. [2022], Sousa et al. [2018], Larsén et al. [2022], Shen et al. [2019], Apel et al. [2012, 2011]). Based on abstract syntax trees (AST), these tools merge AST vertices and edges to ensure syntax correctness and better merge results. Nevertheless, a conflict is still generated and need to be resolved by developers if the merge of AST nodes fails. With the development of language models and even LLMs, they are now applied to conflict resolution (Dinella et al. [2022], Zhang et al. [2022], Svyatkovskiy et al. [2022], Dong et al. [2023]). Trained on extensive datasets of prior and manually merged codes, these models predict suitable resolution for each conflicting code segment without manual efforts.

However, evaluating the performance of LLMs on conflict resolution tasks is challenging due to the wide variation in conflict difficulty and the lack of effective grading methods to reflect these differences. For example, ConflictBench (Shen and Meng [2024]) classifies conflicts based on the source of conflict-resolved code, such as from either merging candidate versions or newly introduced by

developers. This classification does not accurately reflect the complexity of the conflicts. Additionally, the community lacks comprehensive conflict resolution benchmarks (discussed in §2.4), especially for extreme cases involving long code contexts.

To this end, we introduce CONGRA, which is designed to evaluate code merging tools across a diverse range of merging scenarios and assess their ability to resolve conflicts of varying complexities. We propose a novel approach to construct graded conflict dataset according to conflict’s resolving complexity. We evaluated six state-of-the-art LLMs (three general LLMs and three code LLMs) on CONGRA to assess their abilities to resolve conflict in various merging scenarios. The dataset is constructed using 44,948 conflict cases sourced from 34 large-scale open-source projects written in C, C++, Java, and Python. The results show that LLMs with longer contexts support do not always yield better results compared to models with shorter contexts. Additionally, general LLMs (e.g. LLama3-8B and DeepSeek-V2) outperform specialized code LLMs in automatically resolving conflict. Besides, we will release our datasets and a benchmark at <https://github.com/HKU-System-Security-Lab/ConGra>.

In summary, we made the following contributions:

1. We introduce the first classification approach to generate a complexity-graded conflict dataset. Using this approach, collected conflicts can be classified into seven categories.
2. We release a large-scale graded dataset for conflict resolution benchmarking. which contains 44,948 conflict cases from popular projects written in C, C++, Java, and Python.
3. We conduct the first comprehensive evaluation of LLM’s performance on conflict resolution task, and find two thought-provoking counter-intuitive phenomena.

2 Background

2.1 Task Definition of Automatic Merge Conflict Resolution

Git offers multiple strategies to merge code (Atlassian [2022]). The most common and widely-used strategy is the three-way merging strategy (Vinkler [2023]). The fundamental concept behind three-way merging is to locate the most recent common ancestor (O) through the historical commit graph, given two merging candidates (A and B), and to generate the automerged code version (M) based on the difference $A - O$ and the difference $B - O$. Before generating M , Git identifies multiple difference matching triplets $A_i - O_i - B_i$ by comparing $A - O$ and $B - O$. For each difference matching triplet, 1) if $A_i - O_i$ equals $B_i - O_i$, it indicates that both A and B have made identical changes to the same code segment. In this case, the difference block will be applied to M ; 2) if $A_i - O_i$ is empty, but $B_i - O_i$ exists, it suggests that only B has modified this code segment. Consequently, the difference block from B will be applied to M , and vice versa; 3) if $A_i - O_i$ and $B_i - O_i$ are not empty nor equal, it indicates that A and B have made different modifications to the same code segment, resulting in a *conflict* in M . In this paper, we assume that M always contains at least one conflict.

Due to the presence of conflicts, Git-based automated code merging may encounter exceptions, prompting developers to manually address them. Following conflict resolution, developers will release the resolved code version (R). In large projects, merging two versions results in numerous conflicts, involving substantial code modifications. This significantly raises developers’ project maintenance costs (Vale et al. [2021]). To this end, various automatic conflict resolution (ACR) systems have been proposed to mitigate these challenges.

2.2 Program Analysis-based ACR

Program analysis-based ACR (Zhu et al. [2022], Larsén et al. [2022], Sousa et al. [2018], Apel et al. [2011], Shen et al. [2019], Apel et al. [2012]) ensures the syntactic integrity of the merged code by merging on AST. As they implement the three-way merging strategy, conflicts inevitably arise for unmergeable AST nodes, requiring manual intervention.

To assess the performance of program analysis-based ACR, researchers focus on metrics like the number of generated conflicts, the accuracy of resolutions, and resource consumption. However, these tools often lack convincing evaluation datasets and performance comparisons. As shown in Table 1, tools like Spork, SafeMerge, and Mastery (Larsén et al. [2022], Sousa et al. [2018], Zhu et al. [2022]) evaluate all merging scenarios without classification, obscuring performance

Table 1: Evaluation features implemented in 1) program analysis-based ACR (tagged with †); 2) machine learning-based ACR (tagged with ‡); 3) conflict resolution benchmark (tagged with ✕). The symbol "-" means the feature is not applicable to the corresponding work’s evaluation.

Evaluation Features	<i>Feature</i> ₁	<i>Feature</i> ₂	<i>Feature</i> ₃	<i>Feature</i> ₄	<i>Feature</i> ₅	<i>Feature</i> ₆
IntelliMerge†	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗
Spork†	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗
SafeMerge†	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗
FSTMerge†	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗
Mastery†	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗
JDIME†	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗
MergeBERT‡	✗	✗	-	✓	✓	✗
GMerge‡	✗	✗	-	✓	✓	✗
DeepMerge‡	✗	✗	-	✓	✓	✗
MergeGen‡	✗	✗	-	✓	✓	✗
ConflictBench✕	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗
CONGRA ✕	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

*Feature*₁: Classify dataset; *Feature*₂: Assess performance under different graded conflicts; *Feature*₃: Record number of generated conflicts; *Feature*₄: Calculate precision of the generated conflict resolution; *Feature*₅: Calculate accuracy of the generated conflict resolution; *Feature*₆: Assess the whole code similarity instead of using exact string matching.

differences across conflict complexities. JDIME and FSTMerge (Apel et al. [2012, 2011]) separately categorize structural and textual merges, but this is essentially an ablation study, leaving the dataset’s resolving complexity intertwined. IntelliMerge (Shen et al. [2019]) classifies merge scenarios but fails to differentiate these categories in the final evaluation, preventing performance comparisons across scenarios. Additionally, These tools evaluate the quality of generated resolutions by exact string matching with the manual resolution (ground truth). However, this approach is inadequate for measuring code similarity, as it is influenced by programming style and code structure.

2.3 Machine learning-based ACR

Machine learning-based ACR (Zhang et al. [2022], Dong et al. [2023], Svyatkovskiy et al. [2022], Dinella et al. [2022]) leverages a vast number of code merge examples during pre-training and harnesses the language-aware capabilities of machine learning models to understand the intricacies of code merging. Once trained, these models offer resolution suggestions for merge conflicts. They do not rely on the three-way merge strategy, eliminating the need for manual conflict resolution.

Table 1 illustrates the features implemented in machine learning-based ACRs’ evaluation. Machine learning-based ACRs must provide accurate resolutions for all conflicts, underscoring the importance of resolution correctness. Prior research efforts have primarily concentrated on improving two key metrics: precision and accuracy. Accuracy measures the percentage of total conflicts for which these tools produce the correct resolution, while precision indicates the percentage of correct resolutions among all resolution suggestions provided by the tools. By the same token as depicted in §2.2, the matching algorithm between generated resolution and ground truth are exact string matching, which cannot reflect the real code similarity. Furthermore, existing language model-based ACR test datasets also lack classification of merge scenarios based on different complexities, hindering the assessment of model performance across various levels of code merging tasks’ difficulty.

2.4 Conflict Resolution Benchmarks

ConflictBench (Shen and Meng [2024]) is the only benchmark for software code merging evaluation to date. It categorizes merging scenarios by resolution types and uses three metrics with an exact string matching algorithm to evaluate merging tools. However, as shown in Table 1, its classification strategy doesn’t fully capture the complexity of merging scenarios. For example, conflicts can be resolved by retaining all edits from *A* or *B*, or by introducing new edits. ConflictBench categorizes these into three groups, but the complexity boundaries between them are often blurred. Additionally,

ConflictBench’s datasets include only 180 merging cases, and further classification limits the data volume in each category, potentially leading to inaccurate evaluation results.

3 Benchmarking Pipeline

3.1 Overview




Figure 1: Benchmarking pipeline overview.

Figure 1 provides an overview of CONGRA’s benchmarking pipeline. CONGRA starts with collecting open-source projects’ historical merging scenarios with conflict from Github. After the raw dataset is constructed, CONGRA further colors the conflict snippets with code operations which are extracted via a lightweight but powerful syntax tree level analysis. These conflicts then are classified into various categories based on the code operations taken in the conflict code block to construct CONGRA dataset. Then, we collect the conflict along with its context to construct the prompt for LLMs. Finally, LLMs will respond to the query and provide conflict resolution suggestions. The results will be assessed by CONGRA’s evaluation metrics.

3.2 Coloring

Firstly, analyzing conflict code snippets is challenging because the snippets in M generated by Git are often fragmented and can contain any part or format of code. Existing program analysis tools (Lattner and Adve [2004], Wang and Shoshitaishvili [2017], Lam et al. [2011]) cannot handle these incomplete snippets syntactically or semantically. To address this, CONGRA applies M ’s modifications from A and B separately to generate two merged files (M_a and M_b). This approach applies all the difference blocks from either A or B , allowing for code analysis of the conflicting snippets by recording the text ranges and analyzing the whole code from M_a and M_b .

Secondly, for the benchmarking pipeline, automating code complexity assessment must use the lightest code analysis. Traditional program analysis requires a strict program context, including the project environment and necessary compilation settings, which are hard to preserve in datasets. Additionally, program analysis tools perform data flow or control flow analysis (Chess and McGraw [2004], Nielson et al. [2015]), consuming significant resources, especially for large-scale datasets. CONGRA addresses this through code operation abstraction. It extracts the operations of conflicting code fragments from M_a and M_b to reflect code complexity. Since CONGRA’s analysis involves only lexical and grammatical analysis without deeper compilation or context dependency, it achieves efficient benchmarking.

Given M_a , M_b and respective conflict-related code ranges, CONGRA extracts code operations from these conflict-related code blocks in the coloring phase. CONGRA first leverages tree_sitter (Brunsfeld [2024]), a lightweight multi-language code parsing framework, to convert plain text code into a syntax tree that is suitable for analysis. We pre-define types of code operations based on the node of the syntax tree. These code operations are arranged in ascending order of priority as shown below:

1. **Composite Type Definition (CTD):** Definition of composite types, e.g. the definition of class and the definition of struct in C++ language.
2. **Function Body Definition (FBD):** Definition of the function body content. Any modification to the function body is included in this operation.
3. **Function Prototype Definition (FPD):** Definition of function prototype, i.e. function name, return value type and parameter list.

4. **Language-Specific Operations (LSO):** Operations related to language features, such as macro definitions in C/C++ and the introduction of third-party libraries in Python.
5. **Commenting (CMT):** Developers’ comments on the code.
6. **Variable Declaration (VD):** Declaration of all variables. These variables refers to global variables, local variables, and member variables defined in composite types.

These code operations have different priorities, and operations with higher priorities can override operations with lower priorities. For instance, the modification of a local variable name in a function body can belong to both function body definition and variable declaration. To this end, CONGRA will give priority to variable declaration as the result of code operation extraction. After analyzing each syntax tree node, CONGRA only retains code operations related to the conflicting code area, and generates code operation lists for the two versions of the code, namely P_a and P_b . These code operations serve as the basis for conflict classification in the subsequent stage.

3.3 Classifier

Given P_a and P_b , CONGRA traverses each pair of conflicting code blocks in A and B and classifies the conflicts according to the following conditions. For each pair of A ’s conflict and B ’s conflict (i.e., P_{ai} in P_a and P_{bi} in P_b):

1. **Text conflict:** At least one of P_{ai} and P_{bi} contains CMT. Figure 2a presents a text conflict example.
2. **Functional conflict:** At least one of P_{ai} and P_{bi} contains FBD. Figure 2b presents a functional conflict example.
3. **Syntax conflict:** Respectively construct operations sets based on P_{ai} and P_{bi} (denoted as S_a and S_b) with only remaining CTD, FPD, LSO, and VD. Finally, the difference between S_a and S_b is not empty. Figure 2c presents a syntax conflict example.




Figure 2: Examples of text, syntax, and functional conflicts

Considering that the syntax among languages varies, the benchmarking of CONGRA only focuses on syntax problems caused by missing declarations or definitions which will occur in all programming languages. Since the classifier of CONGRA adopts the whitelist mode, the correctness of the classification results can be guaranteed. As one conflict may be classified into multiple categories, CONGRA supports seven classifications, i.e., all permutations of text, syntax, and functional conflict.

3.4 Generate Resolutions

In this section, we present how to obtain merge conflict resolution solutions using LLMs, as depicted in Figure 3. Here, we describe the specific steps as follows: (1) Step 1: Acquire the merge conflict and its context. Merge conflict refers to the current improvements and incoming changes. We select the previous and subsequent text at the conflict location as the context. (2) Step 2: Construct the prompt. We employ the thought-chain method to create the prompt, with the specific content provided in the Appendix A. To avoid outputting redundant context, we offer an example for LLMs to reference. (3) Step 3: Check the input. Since LLMs can only support a limited context length, we utilize the corresponding tokenizer to process the prompt. If the number of tokens surpasses the LLMs’ maximum input length, revert to Step 1 and reduce the context’s lines. (4) Step 4: Query LLMs and obtain the resolution. We input the prompt to LLMs to receive answers, and extract the relevant code block as the final generated resolution, ensuring a logically coherent and standardized format.




Figure 3: The process of generating resolutions by LLMs.

4 Graded Conflicts Dataset

We target on the well-known open-source projects in Github. Our target selection criteria is that the project should contain 10K+ lines of code and historical commits on main branch. This is because a larger code base and a more active development history can help generate conflicts with multiple complexities. Upon generating the datasets, we first traverse the historical commits of each project and reproduce each merge process through Git merge. When the merge fails, we record the conflicting file, namely M , and extract A , B , O and R from the commit graph. Finally, we utilize the coloring and classifier introduced in §3 to classify all the collected cases. In summary, we collected data from 34 open-source projects on GitHub: 14 written in C/C++, 11 in Java, and 9 in Python. We gathered 23,334 conflict files encompassing 44,948 conflict scenarios classified in 7 complexity types as shown in Figure 4. The statistics on the length (in lines of code) of all conflicts and their corresponding manual resolutions are presented in Figure 5. More visualizations of CONGRA are shown in Appendix F.




Figure 4: Venn diagrams for conflict types.




Figure 5: Average length of different types of conflicts. T for Text, S for Syntax, F for Functional.

5 Benchmarking for Auto-Conflict Resolutoin

5.1 Benchmakring Settings

Evaluation Metric. We choose the accuracy and precision of generated resolutions as the key metrics in our evaluation. Accuracy is the percentage of generated resolutions that match the ground truth to the total number of conflicts. Precision refers to the percentage of generated resolutions that match ground truth to all generated resolutions. We use the combination of normalized edit distance, winnowing, and cosine semantic similarity (Ristad and Yianilos [1998], Schleimer et al. [2003], Rahutomo et al. [2012]) as the code-matching standard (i.e., ES, WS, and SS). For a generated resolution, CONGRA regards the resolution matches the ground truth when at least one of the above values greater than 80%.

Benchmarked Models. As depicted in Figure 5, CONGRA exhibits a substantial number of conflict instances, characterized by their contextual information. Consequently, we opt for LLMs that are capable of accommodating long contexts as our benchmarked models. These language models, supporting over 8K tokens, comprise three general language models (*Llama3-8B*¹, *DeepSeek-V2*²(DeepSeek-AI et al. [2024]), *GLM-3-turbo*³) and three code language models (*CodeLlama-7B*(Roziere et al. [2023]), *CodeLlama-34B*(Roziere et al. [2023]), *DeepSeek-Coder*(Guo et al. [2024])).

Experiment Settings. We set the temperature coefficient uniformly at 0.7 to fully ensure the creativity of LLMs in the experiments. For each conflict, we take at most the previous 100 lines and the following 100 lines of text as context, and decrement line by line until the number of tokens is lower than the maximum context length supported by LLMs. In addition, for each conflict that does not correctly obtain the model output, we will repeat the experiment up to 10 times, otherwise it will be regarded as an unprocessable case. For open-source models, we use vLLM(Kwon et al. [2023] as the backend for model deployment and conduct experiments based on 6 × NVIDIA A800 80GB GPUs.

5.2 Benchmark Results and Analysis

Table 2: Benchmark Result on Python and Java.

Model	Context Length	PYTHON					JAVA				
		Accuracy	Precision	ES	WS	SS	Accuracy	Precision	ES	WS	SS
LLama3-8B	8K	75.82	77.45	0.71	0.36	0.66	82.93	83.00	0.75	0.42	0.67
DeepSeek-V2	32K	75.07	75.53	0.67	0.53	0.83	84.38	84.40	0.74	0.61	0.84
GLM-3-turbo	128K	57.05	57.31	0.53	0.33	0.70	62.52	64.75	0.58	0.38	0.74
CodeLlama-7B	16K	50.68	59.92	0.55	0.41	0.76	73.61	73.66	0.67	0.51	0.79
CodeLlama-34B	16K	61.47	62.34	0.61	0.30	0.63	70.82	71.03	0.66	0.40	0.70
DeepSeek-Coder	16K	56.49	57.31	0.55	0.41	0.76	74.52	74.6	0.67	0.53	0.82

Table 3: Benchmark Result on C and C++.

Model	Context Length	C					C++				
		Accuracy	Precision	ES	WS	SS	Accuracy	Precision	ES	WS	SS
LLama3-8B	8K	72.45	73.11	0.64	0.36	0.69	78.13	79.22	0.71	0.38	0.70
DeepSeek-V2	32K	54.42	71.06	0.61	0.45	0.79	70.86	77.31	0.69	0.53	0.83
GLM-3-turbo	128K	58.86	60.32	0.52	0.30	0.70	64.10	64.13	0.57	0.32	0.70
CodeLlama-7B	16K	59.09	60.55	0.52	0.35	0.73	64.28	64.9	0.58	0.38	0.75
CodeLlama-34B	16K	67.75	68.23	0.61	0.26	0.63	69.83	70.39	0.66	0.29	0.63
DeepSeek-Coder	16K	62.36	62.72	0.54	0.38	0.77	62.33	62.9	0.57	0.39	0.78

5.2.1 Overall Performance

In this section, we present a comprehensive evaluation of advanced LLMs on our proposed CONGRA dataset. The experimental results can be found in Tables 2 and 3. Upon careful comparison, we draw the following observations: (1) LLMs with longer context support do not always yield optimal results. GLM-3-Turbo, which supports a 128K context, is generally outperformed by LLama3-8B, which only supports an 8K context, with the exception of semantic similarity. For instance, in Python

¹<https://llama.meta.com/llama3/>

²We are using their official API service, which supports a context of 32K tokens instead of 128K.

³<https://open.bigmodel.cn/dev/api#glm-3-turbo>

and Java, the Precision metric for GLM-3-Turbo is nearly 20% lower than that of LLama3-8B. We speculate that this may result from LLMs with ultra-long context support not being sufficiently trained on merge conflict datasets, hindering their ability to effectively extract valuable information from the context to suggest merge resolutions. (2) Code LLMs do not appear to demonstrate a distinct advantage. Notably, LLama3-8B and DeepSeek-V2 surpass Code LLMs in Precision across all four languages. We attribute this to two factors: (i) general models are in fact trained on extensive code repositories, so their code comprehension capabilities are not significantly inferior to Code LLMs. (ii) Elements within conflicts such as comments and variable names contribute a plethora of semantic information, extending beyond mere code understanding, which presents a challenge for Code LLMs. (3) Both LLama3-8B and DeepSeek-V2 prove to be well-suited for automatic conflict resolution.




Figure 6: Heatmap on precision of LLMs and types. T for Text, S for Syntax, F for Functional.

5.2.2 The Impact of Conflict Type

Furthermore, we investigate the performance of LLMs under different conflict types. Based on Section 3.3, we consider seven conflict types, namely Text, Syntax, Functional conflicts, and their combinations. The results are visualized in Figure 6. In Figure 6, the closer the result is to blue, the better the model performs; the closer it is to green, the worse the model performs.

For LLMs, a simpler conflict does not necessarily mean it is easier to handle. This is actually a counterintuitive phenomenon. Specifically, for most models and languages (e.g., Python, C/C++), LLMs exhibit better performance on the most complex conflicts (i.e., F+S+T) and poorer performance on the simplest conflicts (i.e., F, S, and T). In the context of text conflicts, the performance of LLMs on different samples can be ranked as follows: T+F+S > T+F ≈ T+S > T. We believe that this occurs because, for LLMs, the simpler the samples within the conflict area (such as type T), the less effective guidance information the conflict can provide, causing LLMs to produce conservative answers. For example, when the conflict involves a comment, LLMs tend to preserve as much information as possible from both branches a and b. In contrast, the more complex the conflict area, the clearer the direction for conflict resolution. In summary, LLMs need to extract more valuable guidance information from the conflict area itself to improve their performance. Notice that in Figure 6, the precision of F in Java is relatively higher. This is due to Java’s encapsulation. To hide "sensitive" member variables of a class from users, these variables are often declared as private, and the class must provide public *get* and *set* methods to access and update these values. Consequently, these getter and setter methods are simple in terms of functionality. Since most of the F conflicts in the Java dataset arise from the rewriting of these encapsulated methods, the LLMs can easily infer the resolutions, resulting in high precision.

5.3 The Role of Context

In the vast majority of cases, LLMs without conflict context information significantly outperform those with context information. As observed in Figure 7, the red and gray solid circles almost entirely encompass their corresponding dashed circles, with only a few exceptions. We analyze this phenomenon from two perspectives: (1) the context understanding capability of large language models. Although existing LLMs have undergone extensive training on code data, this does not necessarily imply that they can effectively extract useful information from the rich context for automatic conflict resolution. (2) The choice of context. In our experiments, we provided the most basic context information. However, it is possible that the adjacent context does not supply crucial information for resolving conflicts and instead introduces a significant amount of noise. As a result, selecting the appropriate context for automatic conflict resolution may be a valuable research direction to explore.




Figure 7: The impact of contextual information on Precision.

6 Discussion

Limitation. The conflict classification strategy in §3 ensures correct classification but may fail to identify the exact category of a conflict due to advanced language usage. For example, the use of template class definitions in C++ (Vandevoorde and Josuttis [2002]) prevents `tree_sitter` (Brunsfield [2024]) from capturing the type used as the template argument during instantiation. Consequently, a conflict that should be classified as "syntax" may be regarded as "non-syntax." We will continue to refine CONGRA's classification in future work.

Societal Impacts. Our work alerts the software engineering and machine learning communities to the problem of code merging, without obvious negative societal impact.

7 Conclusion

We propose CONGRA, a complexity-graded conflict benchmarking system. CONGRA implements a highly efficient and accurate conflict classification algorithm to construct a complexity-graded conflict dataset, which is used to evaluate the performance of merging tools under various conflict scenarios. CONGRA utilizes three code matching metrics of different granularities and combines them to calculate the accuracy and precision of auto-generated resolutions. We evaluate six LLMs on CONGRA, and the results show that LLMs with longer context support often perform worse than those with shorter context support, and general LLMs outperform specialized code LLMs in precision.

References

- Alex Aiken. Moss: A system for detecting software similarity. <https://theory.stanford.edu/~aiken/moss/>, 2022. Accessed: 2024-Jun.
- Sven Apel, Jörg Liebig, Benjamin Brandl, Christian Lengauer, and Christian Kästner. Semistructured merge: rethinking merge in revision control systems. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGSOFT symposium and the 13th European conference on Foundations of software engineering*, pages 190–200, 2011.
- Sven Apel, Olaf Leßenich, and Christian Lengauer. Structured merge with auto-tuning: balancing precision and performance. In *Proceedings of the 27th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, pages 120–129, 2012.
- Atlassian. Git merge. <https://www.atlassian.com/git/tutorials/using-branches/git-merge>, 2022. Accessed: 2023-Oct.
- Max Brunsfeld. Tree-sitter. <https://tree-sitter.github.io/tree-sitter/>, 2024. Accessed: 2024-June.
- Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. Static analysis for security. *IEEE security & privacy*, 2(6):76–79, 2004.
- DeepSeek-AI, Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bin Wang, Bingxuan Wang, Bo Liu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Hanwei Xu, Hao Yang, Haowei Zhang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Li, Hui Qu, J. L. Cai, Jian Liang, Jianzhong Guo, Jiaqi Ni, Jiashi Li, Jin Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junxiao Song, Kai Dong, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Liang Zhao, Liyue Zhang, Meng Li, Miaojun Wang, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peiyi Wang, Peng Zhang, Qihao Zhu, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruiqi Ge, Ruizhe Pan, Runxin Xu, Ruyi Chen, S. S. Li, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shaoqing Wu, Shengfeng Ye, Shirong Ma, Shiyu Wang, Shuang Zhou, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Size Zheng, T. Wang, Tian Pei, Tian Yuan, Tianyu Sun, W. L. Xiao, Wangding Zeng, Wei An, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wentao Zhang, X. Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xianzu Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingkai Yu, Xinnan Song, Xinyi Zhou, Xinyu Yang, Xuan Lu, Xuecheng Su, Y. Wu, Y. K. Li, Y. X. Wei, Y. X. Zhu, Yanhong Xu, Yanping Huang, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Li, Yaohui Wang, Yi Zheng, Yichao Zhang, Yiliang Xiong, Yilong Zhao, Ying He, Ying Tang, Yishi Piao, Yixin Dong, Yixuan Tan, Yiyuan Liu, Yongji Wang, Yongqiang Guo, Yuchen Zhu, Yudian Wang, Yuheng Zou, Yukun Zha, Yunxian Ma, Yuting Yan, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Z. Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhen Huang, Zhen Zhang, Zhenda Xie, Zhewen Hao, Zhihong Shao, Zhiniu Wen, Zhipeng Xu, Zhongyu Zhang, Zhuoshu Li, Zihan Wang, Zihui Gu, Zilin Li, and Ziwei Xie. Deepseek-v2: A strong, economical, and efficient mixture-of-experts language model, 2024.
- Elizabeth Dinella, Todd Mytkowicz, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Christian Bird, Mayur Naik, and Shuvendu Lahiri. Deepmerge: Learning to merge programs. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 49(4):1599–1614, 2022.
- Jinhao Dong, Qihao Zhu, Zeyu Sun, Yiling Lou, and Dan Hao. Merge conflict resolution: Classification or generation? In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 1652–1663. IEEE, 2023.
- Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Y. Wu, YK Li, et al. Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming—the rise of code intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196*, 2024.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, 2023.

- Patrick Lam, Eric Bodden, Ondrej Lhoták, and Laurie Hendren. The soot framework for java program analysis: a retrospective. In *Cetus Users and Compiler Infrastructure Workshop (CETUS 2011)*, volume 15, 2011.
- Simon Larsén, Jean-Rémy Falleri, Benoit Baudry, and Martin Monperrus. Spork: Structured merge for java with formatting preservation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 49(1):64–83, 2022.
- Chris Lattner and Vikram Adve. Llvm: A compilation framework for lifelong program analysis & transformation. In *International symposium on code generation and optimization, 2004. CGO 2004.*, pages 75–86. IEEE, 2004.
- Inc. NetEase Youdao. Bcembedding: Bilingual and crosslingual embedding for rag. <https://github.com/netease-youdao/BCEmbedding>, 2023.
- Flemming Nielson, Hanne R Nielson, and Chris Hankin. *Principles of program analysis*. springer, 2015.
- Faisal Rahutomo, Teruaki Kitasuka, Masayoshi Aritsugi, et al. Semantic cosine similarity. In *The 7th international student conference on advanced science and technology ICAST*, volume 4, page 1. University of Seoul South Korea, 2012.
- Eric Sven Ristad and Peter N Yianilos. Learning string-edit distance. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 20(5):522–532, 1998.
- Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*, 2023.
- Saul Schleimer, Daniel S Wilkerson, and Alex Aiken. Winnowing: local algorithms for document fingerprinting. In *Proceedings of the 2003 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*, pages 76–85, 2003.
- Bo Shen, Wei Zhang, Haiyan Zhao, Guangtai Liang, Zhi Jin, and Qianxiang Wang. Intelligmerge: a refactoring-aware software merging technique. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 3(OOPSLA):1–28, 2019.
- Bowen Shen and Na Meng. Conflictbench: A benchmark to evaluate software merge tools. *Journal of Systems and Software*, page 112084, 2024.
- Marcelo Sousa, Isil Dillig, and Shuvendu K Lahiri. Verified three-way program merge. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 2(OOPSLA):1–29, 2018.
- Diomidis Spinellis. Git. *IEEE software*, 29(3):100–101, 2012.
- Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Sarah Fakhoury, Negar Ghorbani, Todd Mytkowicz, Elizabeth Dinella, Christian Bird, Jinu Jang, Neel Sundaresan, and Shuvendu K Lahiri. Program merge conflict resolution via neural transformers. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 822–833, 2022.
- Gustavo Vale, Claus Hunsen, Eduardo Figueiredo, and Sven Apel. Challenges of resolving merge conflicts: A mining and survey study. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 48(12):4964–4985, 2021.
- David Vandevoorde and Nicolai M Josuttis. *C++ templates: the complete guide*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2002.
- Alexis Määttä Vinkler. The magic of 3-way merge. <https://blog.git-init.com/the-magic-of-3-way-merge/>, 2023. Accessed: 2023-Oct.
- Fish Wang and Yan Shoshitaishvili. Angr-the next generation of binary analysis. In *2017 IEEE Cybersecurity Development (SecDev)*, pages 8–9. IEEE, 2017.

Jialu Zhang, Todd Mytkowicz, Mike Kaufman, Ruzica Piskac, and Shuvendu K Lahiri. Using pre-trained language models to resolve textual and semantic merge conflicts (experience paper). In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, pages 77–88, 2022.

Fengmin Zhu, Xingyu Xie, Dongyu Feng, Na Meng, and Fei He. Mastery: Shifted-code-aware structured merging. In *International Symposium on Dependable Software Engineering: Theories, Tools, and Applications*, pages 70–87. Springer, 2022.

A Prompt

```
[System]
You are an expert in code merge conflicts, providing the merged code based on the conflict and its context.

[User]
Please provide the merged code based on the specified conflict and its context.
Please provide the merged code following the chain of thought:
1. Understand the cause of the conflict: Examine the conflicting code and its context to understand why the conflict occurred.
2. Decide how to merge: Based on the functionality and logic of the code, determine which changes should be kept or how the changes from both sides can be combined.
3. Provide the merged code, using "{language}" as the beginning and "" as the end of the merged code.
You only need to output the resolution of the conflict without providing any context.
For example,
Conflict Context is:
```python
def quick_sort(arr):
 <<<<<< a
 if len(arr) <= 1:
 return arr
 else:
 pivot = arr[0]
 left = [x for x in arr[1:] if x < pivot]
 right = [x for x in arr[1:] if x >= pivot]
 return quick_sort(left) + [pivot] + quick_sort(right)
 =====
 n = len(arr)
 for i in range(n):
 for j in range(0, n-i-1):
 if arr[j] > arr[j+1]:
 arr[j], arr[j+1] = arr[j+1], arr[j]
 >>>>> b
 return arr
...
Conflict is:
```python
    <<<<<< a
    if len(arr) <= 1:
        return arr
    else:
        pivot = arr[0]
        left = [x for x in arr[1:] if x < pivot]
        right = [x for x in arr[1:] if x >= pivot]
        return quick_sort(left) + [pivot] + quick_sort(right)
    =====
    n = len(arr)
    for i in range(n):
        for j in range(0, n-i-1):
            if arr[j] > arr[j+1]:
                arr[j], arr[j+1] = arr[j+1], arr[j]
    >>>>> b
...
You need to output:
```python
 if len(arr) <= 1:
 return arr
 else:
 pivot = arr[0]
 left = [x for x in arr[1:] if x < pivot]
 right = [x for x in arr[1:] if x >= pivot]
 return quick_sort(left) + [pivot] + quick_sort(right)
...
Here is the context related to the conflict:
```{language}
{conflict_context}
```
Here is the conflict that needs to be resolved:
```{language}
{conflict_text}
```
```

Figure 8: Prompt

## B Demo Case

### B.1 Conflict

Listing 1: Demo 1: text conflict

```
1 <<<<<< a
2 padding: Int, or tuple of 3 ints, or tuple of 3 tuples of 2 ints.
```

```

3 - If int: the same symmetric padding is applied to depth, height,
4 and width.
5 - If tuple of 3 ints: interpreted as three different symmetric
6 padding values for depth, height, and width:
7 '(symmetric_dim1_pad, symmetric_dim2_pad, symmetric_dim3_pad)'.
8 - If tuple of 3 tuples of 2 ints: interpreted as
9 '((left_dim1_pad, right_dim1_pad), (left_dim2_pad,
10 right_dim2_pad), (left_dim3_pad, right_dim3_pad))'.
11 data_format: A string, one of "channels_last" (default) or
12 "channels_first". The ordering of the dimensions in the inputs.
13 "channels_last" corresponds to inputs with shape
14 '(batch_size, spatial_dim1, spatial_dim2, spatial_dim3, channels)'
15 while "channels_first" corresponds to inputs with shape
16 '(batch_size, channels, spatial_dim1, spatial_dim2, spatial_dim3)'.
17 When unspecified, uses 'image_data_format' value found in your Keras
18 config file at '~/.keras/keras.json' (if exists). Defaults to
19 "channels_last".
20 =====
21 padding: Int, or tuple of 3 ints, or tuple of 3 tuples of 2 ints.
22 - If int: the same symmetric padding
23 is applied to height and width.
24 - If tuple of 3 ints:
25 interpreted as two different
26 symmetric padding values for height and width:
27 '(symmetric_dim1_pad, symmetric_dim2_pad, symmetric_dim3_pad)'.
28 - If tuple of 3 tuples of 2 ints:
29 interpreted as
30 '((left_dim1_pad, right_dim1_pad), (left_dim2_pad,
31 right_dim2_pad), (left_dim3_pad, right_dim3_pad))'
32 data_format: A string,
33 one of 'channels_last' (default) or 'channels_first'.
34 The ordering of the dimensions in the inputs.
35 'channels_last' corresponds to inputs with shape
36 '(batch_size, spatial_dim1, spatial_dim2, spatial_dim3, channels)'
37 while 'channels_first' corresponds to inputs with shape
38 '(batch_size, channels, spatial_dim1, spatial_dim2, spatial_dim3)'.
39 It defaults to the 'image_data_format' value found in your
40 Keras config file at '~/.keras/keras.json'.
41 If you never set it, then it will be "channels_last".
42 >>>>>> b

```

Listing 2: Demo 2: text and functional conflict

```

1 <<<<<< a
2 constraints = _process_dynamic_shapes(mod, args, kwargs, dynamic_shapes) or []
3
4 kwargs = kwargs or {}
5 =====
6 if constraints is not None:
7 log_export_usage(event="export.private_api", flags={"constraints"})
8 warnings.warn(
9 "Using 'constraints' to specify dynamic shapes for export is DEPRECATED "
10 "and will not be supported in the future. "
11 "Please use 'dynamic_shapes' instead (see docs on 'torch.export.export').",
12 DeprecationWarning,
13 stacklevel=2,
14)
15 else:
16 constraints = _process_dynamic_shapes(f, args, kwargs, dynamic_shapes) or []
17 >>>>>> b

```

Listing 3: Demo 3: syntax conflict

```

1 <<<<<< a
2 import torch.utils._pytree as pytree
3 =====
4 >>>>>> b
5 from torch._decomp import register_decomposition

```

Listing 4: Demo 4: text, syntax, and functional conflict

```

1 <<<<<< a
2 log.info("converting frame raised error, suppressing error")
3 =====
4
5 # Suppress the error. NB: It's very important to do the

```

```

6 # suppression logging HERE, where the actual suppression
7 # happens. Previously it was somewhere else and so it was
8 # possible to accidentally not log at all.
9 record_filename = getattr(e, "record_filename", None)
10 code = frame.f_code
11 if config.is_fbcode():
12 from torch._dynamo.fb.logging import (# type: ignore[import]
13 log_dynamo_suppress_errors,
14)
15
16 error_msg = format_error_msg_verbose(e, code, record_filename, frame)
17 log_dynamo_suppress_errors(
18 code.co_name, code.co_filename, code.co_firstlineno, error_msg
19)
20 else:
21 error_msg = format_error_msg(e, code, record_filename, frame)
22
23 if soft_fail:
24 log.info(error_msg, exc_info=True)
25 else:
26 log.warning(error_msg, exc_info=True)
27 >>>>> b
28 return None

```

## B.2 Ground Truth

Listing 5: Ground truth of demo 1

```

1 Args:
2 padding: Int, or tuple of 3 ints, or tuple of 3 tuples of 2 ints.
3 - If int: the same symmetric padding is applied to depth, height,
4 and width.
5 - If tuple of 3 ints: interpreted as three different symmetric
6 padding values for depth, height, and width:
7 '(symmetric_dim1_pad, symmetric_dim2_pad, symmetric_dim3_pad)'.
8 - If tuple of 3 tuples of 2 ints: interpreted as
9 '((left_dim1_pad, right_dim1_pad), (left_dim2_pad,
10 right_dim2_pad), (left_dim3_pad, right_dim3_pad))'.
11 data_format: A string, one of "channels_last" (default) or
12 "channels_first". The ordering of the dimensions in the inputs.
13 "channels_last" corresponds to inputs with shape
14 '(batch_size, spatial_dim1, spatial_dim2, spatial_dim3, channels)'
15 while "channels_first" corresponds to inputs with shape
16 '(batch_size, channels, spatial_dim1, spatial_dim2, spatial_dim3)'.
17 When unspecified, uses 'image_data_format' value found in your Keras
18 config file at '~/keras/keras.json' (if exists). Defaults to
19 "channels_last".

```

Listing 6: Ground truth of demo 2

```

1 kwargs = kwargs or {}
2 _process_dynamic_shapes(mod, args, kwargs, dynamic_shapes) # TODO(avik): remove
3

```

Listing 7: Ground truth of demo 3

```

1 import torch._inductor as inductor
2 import torch.utils._pytree as pytree
3 from torch import fx
4 from torch._decomp import register_decomposition

```

Listing 8: Ground truth of demo 4

```

1 raise
2
3 # Suppress the error. NB: It's very important to do the
4 # suppression logging HERE, where the actual suppression
5 # happens. Previously it was somewhere else and so it was
6 # possible to accidentally not log at all.
7 record_filename = getattr(e, "record_filename", None)
8 code = frame.f_code
9 error_msg = format_error_msg(e, code, record_filename, frame)
10

```

```

11 if soft_fail:
12 log.info(error_msg, exc_info=True)
13 else:
14 log.warning(error_msg, exc_info=True)

```

### B.3 Resolution generated by LLama3-8B

Listing 9: Demo 1: LLama3-8B resolution

```

1 padding: Int, or tuple of 3 ints, or tuple of 3 tuples of 2 ints.
2 - If int: the same symmetric padding is applied to depth, height, and width.
3 - If tuple of 3 ints: interpreted as three different symmetric padding values for
4 depth, height, and width:
5 '(symmetric_dim1_pad, symmetric_dim2_pad, symmetric_dim3_pad)'.
6 - If tuple of 3 tuples of 2 ints: interpreted as
7 '((left_dim1_pad, right_dim1_pad), (left_dim2_pad, right_dim2_pad), (
8 left_dim3_pad, right_dim3_pad))'.
9 data_format: A string, one of "channels_last" (default) or
10 "channels_first". The ordering of the dimensions in the inputs.
11 "channels_last" corresponds to inputs with shape
12 '(batch_size, spatial_dim1, spatial_dim2, spatial_dim3, channels)'.
13 while "channels_first" corresponds to inputs with shape
14 '(batch_size, channels, spatial_dim1, spatial_dim2, spatial_dim3)'.
15 When unspecified, uses 'image_data_format' value found in your Keras
16 config file at '~/.keras/keras.json' (if exists). Defaults to
17 "channels_last".

```

Listing 10: Demo 2: LLama3-8B resolution

```

1 if constraints is not None:
2 log_export_usage(event="export.private_api", flags={"constraints"})
3 warnings.warn(
4 "Using 'constraints' to specify dynamic shapes for export is DEPRECATED"
5 "and will not be supported in the future."
6 "Please use 'dynamic_shapes' instead (see docs on 'torch.export.export').",
7 DeprecationWarning,
8 stacklevel=2,
9)
10 else:
11 constraints = _process_dynamic_shapes(f, args, kwargs, dynamic_shapes) or []
12 kwargs = kwargs or {}

```

Listing 11: Demo 3: LLama3-8B resolution

```

1 from torch.utils._pytree import pytree

```

Listing 12: Demo 4: LLama3-8B resolution

```

1 log.info("converting frame raised error, suppressing error")

```

### B.4 Resolution generated by Deepseek-Chat

Listing 13: Demo 1: Deepseek-Chat resolution

```

1 padding: Int, or tuple of 3 ints, or tuple of 3 tuples of 2 ints.
2 - If int: the same symmetric padding is applied to depth, height,
3 and width.
4 - If tuple of 3 ints: interpreted as three different symmetric
5 padding values for depth, height, and width:
6 '(symmetric_dim1_pad, symmetric_dim2_pad, symmetric_dim3_pad)'.
7 - If tuple of 3 tuples of 2 ints: interpreted as
8 '((left_dim1_pad, right_dim1_pad), (left_dim2_pad,
9 right_dim2_pad), (left_dim3_pad, right_dim3_pad))'.
10 data_format: A string, one of "channels_last" (default) or
11 "channels_first". The ordering of the dimensions in the inputs.
12 "channels_last" corresponds to inputs with shape
13 '(batch_size, spatial_dim1, spatial_dim2, spatial_dim3, channels)'.
14 while "channels_first" corresponds to inputs with shape
15 '(batch_size, channels, spatial_dim1, spatial_dim2, spatial_dim3)'.
16 It defaults to the 'image_data_format' value found in your

```



```

17 Keras config file at '~/keras/keras.json'.
18 If you never set it, then it will be "channels_last".

```

Listing 14: Demo 2: Deepseek-Chat resolution

```

1 if constraints is not None:
2 log_export_usage(event="export.private_api", flags={"constraints"})
3 warnings.warn(
4 "Using 'constraints' to specify dynamic shapes for export is DEPRECATED"
5 "and will not be supported in the future."
6 "Please use 'dynamic_shapes' instead (see docs on 'torch.export.export').",
7 DeprecationWarning,
8 stacklevel=2,
9)
10 else:
11 constraints = _process_dynamic_shapes(f, args, kwargs, dynamic_shapes) or []

```

Listing 15: Demo 3: Deepseek-Chat resolution

```

1 import torch.utils._pytree as pytree
2 from torch._decomp import register_decomposition

```

Listing 16: Demo 4: Deepseek-Chat resolution

```

1 # Suppress the error. NB: It's very important to do the
2 # suppression logging HERE, where the actual suppression
3 # happens. Previously it was somewhere else and so it was
4 # possible to accidentally not log at all.
5 record_filename = getattr(e, "record_filename", None)
6 code = frame.f_code
7 if config.is_fbcode():
8 from torch._dynamo.fb.logging import (# type: ignore[import]
9 log_dynamo_suppress_errors,
10)
11
12 error_msg = format_error_msg_verbose(e, code, record_filename, frame)
13 log_dynamo_suppress_errors(
14 code.co_name, code.co_filename, code.co_firstlineno, error_msg
15)
16 else:
17 error_msg = format_error_msg(e, code, record_filename, frame)
18
19 if soft_fail:
20 log.info(error_msg, exc_info=True)
21 else:
22 log.warning(error_msg, exc_info=True)
23 return None

```

## B.5 Resolution generated by Deepseek-Coder

Listing 17: Demo 1: Deepseek-Coder resolution

```

1 padding: Int, or tuple of 3 ints, or tuple of 3 tuples of 2 ints.
2 - If int: the same symmetric padding is applied to depth, height,
3 and width.
4 - If tuple of 3 ints: interpreted as three different symmetric
5 padding values for depth, height, and width:
6 '(symmetric_dim1_pad, symmetric_dim2_pad, symmetric_dim3_pad)'.
7 - If tuple of 3 tuples of 2 ints: interpreted as
8 '((left_dim1_pad, right_dim1_pad), (left_dim2_pad,
9 right_dim2_pad), (left_dim3_pad, right_dim3_pad))'.
10 data_format: A string, one of "channels_last" (default) or
11 "channels_first". The ordering of the dimensions in the inputs.
12 "channels_last" corresponds to inputs with shape
13 '(batch_size, spatial_dim1, spatial_dim2, spatial_dim3, channels)'
14 while "channels_first" corresponds to inputs with shape
15 '(batch_size, channels, spatial_dim1, spatial_dim2, spatial_dim3)'.
16 When unspecified, uses 'image_data_format' value found in your Keras
17 config file at '~/keras/keras.json' (if exists). Defaults to
18 "channels_last".

```

Listing 18: Demo 2: Deepseek-Coder resolution

```

1 constraints = _process_dynamic_shapes(f, args, kwargs, dynamic_shapes) or []
2
3 kwargs = kwargs or {}

```

Listing 19: Demo 3: Deepseek-Coder resolution

```

1 import torch.utils.pytree as pytree
2 from torch._decomp import register_decomposition

```

Listing 20: Demo 4: Deepseek-Coder resolution

```

1 log.info("converting frame raised error, suppressing error")
2 record_filename = getattr(e, "record_filename", None)
3 code = frame.f_code
4 if config.is_fbcode():
5 from torch._dynamo.fb.logging import (# type: ignore[import]
6 log_dynamo_suppress_errors,
7)
8
9 error_msg = format_error_msg_verbose(e, code, record_filename, frame)
10 log_dynamo_suppress_errors(
11 code.co_name, code.co_filename, code.co_firstlineno, error_msg
12)
13 else:
14 error_msg = format_error_msg(e, code, record_filename, frame)
15
16 if soft_fail:
17 log.info(error_msg, exc_info=True)
18 else:
19 log.warning(error_msg, exc_info=True)
20 return None

```

## C Git Merge Conflict Example

Figure 9 shows a code merging scenario with conflict. Both version A (Figure 9a) and version B (Figure 9b) implement quick sort, but version A selects the middle element of *arr* as the pivot, while version B selects the first element. This discrepancy causes Git to encounter an impasse and report a conflict, as depicted in Figure 9c.

```

def quicksort(arr):
 if len(arr) <= 1:
 return arr
 pivot = arr[len(arr) // 2]
 left = [x for x in arr if x < pivot]
 middle = [x for x in arr if x == pivot]
 right = [x for x in arr if x > pivot]
 return quicksort(left) + middle + quicksort(right)

```

```

def quicksort(arr):
 if len(arr) <= 1:
 return arr
 pivot = arr[0]
 left = [x for x in arr if x < pivot]
 middle = [x for x in arr if x == pivot]
 right = [x for x in arr if x > pivot]
 return quicksort(left) + middle + quicksort(right)

```

```

def quicksort(arr):
 if len(arr) <= 1:
 return arr
 <<<<<< HEAD (Current Change)
 pivot = arr[len(arr) // 2]
 =====
 pivot = arr[0]
 >>>>>> new-feature (Incoming Change)
 left = [x for x in arr if x < pivot]
 middle = [x for x in arr if x == pivot]
 right = [x for x in arr if x > pivot]
 return quicksort(left) + middle + quicksort(right)

```

(a) Quick sort from version A.

(b) Quick sort from version B.

(c) Quick sort with merge conflict.

Figure 9: Quick sort merging example

## D License

We utilized the source code of 34 open-source projects in this research. These projects and their license information are as follows: 1) Linux Kernel, Android Kernel, Raspberry Pi Kernel, Git, MySQL, ReactOS, JDK, NewPipe, Ansible Cpython, are licensed under GNU General Public License (GPL); 2) Bitcoin, GCC, Jenkins, are licensed under the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT); 3) LLVM, Swift, Tensorflow, AOSP, dbeaver, Ghidra, hadoop, Micronaut, Netty, Sprint-boot, Sprint-framework, Keras, Transformers, are under the Apache License; 4) Mongo is under Server Side Public License; 5) PHP is under PHP License; 6) V8, Django, Pandas, Pytorch, Scrapy, are under BSD-3-Clause License; 7) Eclipse is under Eclipse Public License; 8) Youtube-dl is unlicensed. We acknowledge the contributions of the open-source community in developing and maintaining these projects.

## E Code Similarity Metrics

- **Edit Similarity (ES)**. Edit distance is a metric used to measure the difference between two strings (Ristad and Yianilos [1998]). It is defined as the minimum number of edit operations required to transform one string into another. In CONGRA, we normalize the edit distance, treating the normalized result as the similarity measure in character level.
- **Winnowing Similarity (WS)**. Winnowing is an algorithm used for text similarity detection and fingerprint extraction (Schleimer et al. [2003]). It has been implemented in the Moss code plagiarism detection system (Aiken [2022]) to determine code similarity. In CONGRA, we normalize the winnowing result to assess the similarity of the whole conflict code snippets.
- **Semantic Similarity (SS)**. We use the cosine similarity between the generated resolution and the actual resolution as the semantic similarity. In CONGRA, in order to effectively model the semantic information of the resolution, we use BCEmbedding NetEase Youdao [2023] as the embedding model to obtain the representation of each resolution.

## F Visualization of the number of conflicts in CONGRA

Here we visualize the distribution characteristics of the number of conflicts contained in each file in four languages in Figure 10. Overall, most files contain only one or two conflicts, and a very small number of files contain more than 10 conflicts. We also visualize the number of different types of conflicts for each language in Figure 11.







Figure 10: Violin plots of the number of conflicts per file.




(a) Python



(b) Java



(c) C++



(d) C

Figure 11: Strip plots of number of conflicts per file.