

VFDelta: A Framework for Detecting Silent Vulnerability Fixes by Enhancing Code Change Learning

Abstract—Vulnerability fixes in open source software (OSS) usually follow the coordinated vulnerability disclosure model and are silently fixed. However, it is crucial for OSS users to be informed about vulnerability fixes as soon as possible since malicious parties can detect the corresponding vulnerability and use it to exploit the software. Therefore, it is important to automatically identify vulnerability fixes. However, the code change representation learning of previous approaches lacks the direct induction to highlight the changes or interaction between the removed/added code, which hinders existing approaches from effectively capturing nuanced information from code changes. Additionally, previous approaches fine-tune the code embedding models and final commit-level classification models separately, which under-optimizes the effectiveness of the entire mode. We propose a new simple yet effective framework, VFDelta, that leverages two independent embedding models to embed the code before and after changes (with surrounding code as the context) and uses element-wise subtraction between their embeddings to capture the fine-grain changes in embedding space. Benefiting from our lightweight model architecture, we enable the training of embedding models together with the final classification model together to optimize the performance of the entire model. Our experiments show that our models achieve up to 0.33 F1 score and 0.63 CostEffort@5, improving over existing state-of-the-art methods by 77.4% and 8.6%. Our ablation analysis reveals that our code change representation learning plays a critical role in our approaches and is typically effective in capturing small code changes. Moreover, we expanded the existing dataset and split it based on time to simulate a more real-world scenario. VFDelta significantly outperforms the SOTA baselines VulFixMiner and MiDas across all metrics in this temporal dataset setting.

Index Terms—TODO

I. INTRODUCTION

Open-source software (OSS) is widely used by developers around the world. Developers must effectively manage OSS vulnerabilities, e.g., timely detection and remediation. Failure to address these vulnerabilities promptly exposes users to significant security risks, potentially leading to severe consequences [1], [2]. To enhance OSS vulnerability management, the Coordinated Vulnerability Disclosure (CVD) process is widely adopted [3]–[5]. This process dictates that vulnerabilities should be fixed before being publicly disclosed, enabling developers to initiate the remediation process promptly upon disclosure. Additionally, to mitigate the risk of disseminating vulnerability-related information, CVD recommends fixing vulnerabilities silently, such as refraining from including vulnerability details in commit messages. However, due to various factors like limited resources or lengthy fix-to-integration release cycles, the timing of public disclosure often deviates

from the fixed date, resulting in a time gap and opening the door for attack [6]. Due to the transparent nature of OSS, attackers can exploit this time gap to uncover fixes and derive the corresponding vulnerabilities before public disclosure. For instance, research shows that unpatched vulnerabilities are directly responsible for up to 60% of all data breaches [2]. Therefore, developers need to detect silent fixes to start the remediation process as soon as possible.

Therefore, there is an emergence for the research community and industry to invest efforts in developing techniques to identify silent vulnerability fixes. Recent approaches typically train the commit-level prediction model in two stages [7]–[9]. First, they train embedding models independently on different levels of granularity by fine-tuning pre-trained models (e.g., CodeBert). In the second stage, they feed the joint representations produced by multiple embedding models into a new ensemble classification model, which needs to be trained as well, and predict whether the commit is to fix a vulnerability.

Existing approaches exhibit several limitations. ❶ They typically represent changes as the concatenation of added code and removed code as a single sequence and employ a single embedding model to embed the sequence [7]–[9], or as the concatenation of the resultant embeddings of added code and removed code produced by embedding models [8]. They assume the code changes represented in the concatenated sequence or the concatenated embedding could be captured well in the new ensemble classification model. However, those representation approaches lack the direct induction to highlight the changes or interaction between the removed/added code, which hinders existing approaches from effectively capturing nuanced information from code changes. ❷ They do not consider the surrounding code of the changed code as the context [7]–[9], instead they only consider added/removed code, which has been demonstrated to help capture the semantics of the code in various software engineering tasks [10], [11]. ❸ They tend to be heavyweight, necessitating the training of multiple models individually in multiple stages to handle various granularity of information (e.g., lines, hunks, files, or entire commits) [7]–[9]. The fine-tuning of the embedding models is separated from the final commit-level classification model’s training, which under-optimizes the entire model’s effectiveness.

To address the above-mentioned limitations, we present VFDelta, a lightweight yet effective framework to identify commit-level vulnerability fixes by enhancing the code change

representation learning and model training process. To address Limitation ①② and improve the code change representation learning, VFDelta proposes to use two independent code embedding models to embed the code before and after the change (including the surrounding code as the context), respectively. The changes are then represented as the result of the *element-wise subtraction* between the embeddings of those two pieces of code (vectors) to directly capture the difference between two pieces of code in embedding space. This design is inspired by the examples of word2vec [12] to capture the relationship between two words. For instance, word2vec captures the relationship between gender relationship in monarchical using subtraction e.g. $\text{vec}(\text{King}) - \text{vec}(\text{Man}) \simeq \text{vec}(\text{Queen}) - \text{vec}(\text{Women}) = \Delta$, where Δ captures the semantic relationship between the gender and royalty. Similarly, we capture the change between two pieces of code by performing element-wise subtraction on their embeddings. The resultant embedding is then fed into a fully connected layer (as our classification network) for file-level prediction. More specifically, in the training phase, we train a lightweight model to predict file-level vulnerability fixes (i.e., predicting whether a modified file in a commit is vulnerability-fixing or not). During the inference phase, given a commit, we aggregate the probability of all the files of the commit by averaging them as the final commit-level prediction result. VFDelta avoids ensembling multiple embedding models into the final commit-level classification model. Benefiting from the lightweight of our model architecture, the entire model (both the code embedding models and file-level classification network), could be optimized together at once during the training phase (addressing Limitation ③).

We evaluate our framework on the VFM dataset [7] which consists of 1,147 Java CVE patches from 146 OSS projects. We compare it with state-of-the-art (SOTA) baselines Vul-FixMiner [7] and MiDas [8]. VFDelta outperforms the baselines on all metrics and achieves an F1 of 0.33, a CostEffort@5 of 0.632, and a CostEffort@20 of 0.76, with an improvement of 77.4%, 8.4%, and 5.1% over the best baseline, respectively. Our ablation analysis shows that our code change representation learning plays a critical role in VFDelta, and is typically effective in capturing small code changes. To test the effectiveness of VFDelta in real-world scenarios, we extended the VFM dataset to December 2023 and performed temporal prediction (use data before 2021 for training and data of 2021-2023 for evaluation). VFDelta achieves a large margin of improvement over baselines, i.e., improving at least 64.5% and 93.9% in terms of F1 and CostEffort@5, respectively.

In summary, this paper makes the following contributions:

- We propose a simple yet effective framework to identify commit-level vulnerability fixes by enhancing code change representation learning and the training and inference process.
- We conducted extensive experiments and show that our framework significantly outperforms all state-of-the-art baselines in identifying commit-level silent vulnerability fixes.
- We make our enhanced temporal VFM_2023 dataset and

source code public to facilitate future research [1][*Shaowei says: add link*].

II. BACKGROUND & RELATED WORK

In this section, we first present the formal definition of the problem and current solutions. Then, we introduce the background of pre-trained model leveraged in our framework. Lastly, we introduce related work.

A. Silent commit-level vulnerability fix identification

The primary objective of the task is to predict whether a commit is intended for vulnerability-fixing. The input is a commit and the output is a label either vulnerability-fixing (VF) or non-vulnerability-fixing (NVF). Commit comprises several types of information, which can be broadly categorized into three groups: commit metadata (including details such as the committer, commit date, repository, etc), commit message, and commit code changes. A commit's code change consists of alterations across multiple files, with each file's modification potentially including multiple changes at the hunk level. Models can, therefore, be designed to operate at various granularities, e.g., commit-level and file-level.

The typical framework for training a model to identify the commit-level vulnerability fixes could be decomposed into the following phases: 1) feature extraction, 2) code change representation learning, and 3) classification training. In the feature extraction, features such as code changes and commit messages will be extracted. During code change representation learning, the extracted features will be represented into vectors (i.e., embedding). How features are extracted and how a representation is learned depends on the techniques and model design. We will introduce more details on the code change representation learning in Section II-B. Once the representation learning is done, a binary classification model is trained to distinguish vulnerability fixes. Many previous works have developed mechanisms (e.g. neural network or ensemble model) to aggregate features from multiple fine-grained levels, culminating in a final prediction at the commit level. This aggregation ensures that the classifier makes a commit-level prediction based on a comprehensive view of the diff, facilitating accurate vulnerability-fixing commit identification.

Some early work focused on using commit messages to identify vulnerability fixes [13], [14]. However, CVD recommends fixing vulnerabilities silently, such as refraining from including vulnerability details in commit messages, which makes it challenging to leverage the message for this task. Therefore, in this study, we focus on only using code changes to identify silent commit-level vulnerability fixes as recent work [7], [8].

In this paper, we make the following definitions and use them in the following sections.

- **diff:** The removed/added code in a file of a commit. Note that the diff we define here is distinct from the output by the Git diff algorithm, which contains three lines of surrounding code.

- **context:** The surrounding k lines of code before and after the added/removed code.
- **code_before:** The removed code plus the context before the modification.
- **code_after:** The added code plus the context after the modification.

For instance, Figure 1 illustrates these definitions using an example of file-level changes aimed at fixing a CVE vulnerability. The added lines are highlighted in green, while the removed lines are highlighted in red, collectively representing the diff. Additionally, the surrounding lines are considered as the context. Specifically, the removed code highlighted in red, along with its context, constitutes the `code_before`, whereas the added code highlighted in green, along with its context, constitutes the `code_after`. Our study focuses on leveraging these code changes at the file level to identify commit-level vulnerability fixes.




Fig. 1. A sample file-level code changes for fixing CVE-2018-11776 [15] vulnerability.

B. Code changes representation learning using pre-trained models

The introduction of transformer [16] architecture has significantly advanced natural language processing (NLP) and programming language (PL) analysis. Several pre-trained models tailored for programming languages have emerged, with CodeBERT being particularly notable [17]. CodeBERT is a model that builds upon the foundations laid by BERT [18], further refined through pre-training on natural language (NL) - programming language (PL) pairs. Its design and training methods enable it to understand not only the relationship between natural language and code but also the semantics of the programming language. This versatility has allowed CodeBERT to demonstrate its utility across a wide range of downstream software engineering tasks [19], such as clone detection [20], [21], code search [22], program repair [23], and vulnerability detection [24], [25]. In vulnerability fix identification, pre-trained models such as CodeBert are usually used to represent the code changes in two ways, 1) use the

models to embed diff directly [7], [8], or use models to embed removed and added code separately and then concatenate their resultant embeddings [8]. To optimize the performance of pre-trained models in downstream tasks, they usually require fine-tuning.

C. Related work in identifying vulnerability fixes

Identifying commit-level vulnerability fixes has been one active area of research, for which different methodologies have been undertaken to improve the accuracy and efficiency of the approaches [7]–[9], [13], [14], [26]–[32]. The related work can be categorized into two families based on whether they utilize commit messages or not.

The first family uses the commit message in their framework. Early work by Zhou and Sharma [13] proposed an approach to identify vulnerability fixes by leveraging word2vec to capture the latent information represented in commit messages. They ensemble multiple classifiers to robust the performance. Sabetta and Bezzi [33] used both code changes and commit messages to identify the vulnerability fixes by representing both the code and message as natural language. Nguyen et al. [14] combine not only information within a commit such as its commit message, but also information from the issues associated with the commit, to boost the performance.

However, the approaches in the first family may not work well when vulnerabilities are recommended to be fixed silently and details refrain from being included in the commit messages. To tackle this, recently developed approaches only focus on learning the patterns from code changes of commits to identify vulnerability fixes. For example, Zhou et al. [7] extracted diff from each file in a commit and used a pre-trained language model CodeBERT to embed it. To boost the performance of CodeBERT, they fine-tuned it first and then fed the embedding of diff into a new classifier for the final training. Later, Zhou et al. introduced CoLeFunDa [9] that leverages contrastive learning to effectively train a function change encoder from diverse data. Then, they leveraged the trained function change encoder to further fine-tune three downstream tasks (i.e., silent fix identification, CWE category classification, and exploitability rating classification), and demonstrated its effectiveness on those three downstream tasks. Nguyen et al. proposed to combine different granularities of information in commit (commit-level, file-level, hunk-level, and line-level) to capture various aspects of code changes by using CodeBert to embed each granularity of information [8]. However, previous approaches separate the training of the embedding model(s) and the final classification model due to the complexity of their framework, which under-optimizes the performance of the final classification model. In addition, they typically represent changes as the concatenation of added code and removed code as a single sequence, or as the concatenation of the resultant embeddings of added code and removed code produced by the embedding model. However, those representation approaches lack the direct induction to highlight the changes or interaction between the removed/added code. Therefore, to tackle those

limitations, we improve the code change representation learning and enhance the training process by optimizing embedding models and the final classification model jointly.

III. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we describe the methodology of VFDelta and present the overall framework in Figure 2. We focus on leveraging `code_before` and `code_after` at the file level to identify Vulnerability fixes. Our framework has two phases: training and inference. In the training phase, given a collection of commits and their labels, which is either Vulnerability fix (VF) or Non-vulnerability fix (NVF), we first decompose each commit into file level. We consider all the files in a VF commit as VF. We extract the `code_before` and `code_after` from each file and send them into the model. The model is trained to predict whether the file is a vulnerability fix. During the inference phase, given a commit, we first perform file-level prediction to obtain the probability of each file, then aggregate the probability across all the files to get the final commit-level prediction result. Below, we elaborate on the details of each phase and component.

A. Data Processing

In the data processing stage, we decompose a commit into file level and then extract `code_before` and `code_after` from each file by following previous studies [7], [9]. Specifically, for each file, we extract file-level diff, which effectively splits the modifications into two segments for each file, i.e., code removed and code added. We also extract the surrounding code as context which is important for learning the difference between two pieces of code, and has been demonstrated by previous studies [10], [11]. In this study, we extract k lines of code before and after the diff. We set k to 3 empirically as it achieves the best performance, which is the default setting of Git “diff” algorithm. See more details of the impact of context on our approach in Section V-B. In this study, we select the surrounding lines of code since we aim to keep our framework lightweight (e.g., avoid heavy program analysis). Nevertheless, more advanced context extraction approaches such as program slicing could be adapted to our framework.

B. Model Architecture and Training

The architecture of our model is intuitive. It takes `code_before` and `code_after` as the input and performs a file-level prediction. We first use two individual embedding models, to embed the input code, one for `code_before` and one for `code_after`. The reason we selected to use two independent embedding models is that we aim to amplify and capture the nuance between `code_before` and `code_after` (evidenced by results in Section V-B). Furthermore, inspired by word2vec [12], which captures the relationship between two words using element-wise subtraction between their two embeddings as we introduced in Section I. Similarly, to capture the essence sometimes nuances of the modifications between `code_before` and `code_after`, we compute the delta between them through element-wise subtraction of their embeddings as

shown in Figure 2. This method, as opposed to concatenating the code changes in one single sequence and using one single embedding model to learn the code difference from the concatenated sequence [7]–[9], learns the difference from latent space (embedding) and enable the model to learn the difference more effectively (see more discussion on why using subtraction in Section III-D). Therefore, the code changes could be represented as $\Delta = \text{embedding}_1(\text{code_before}) - \text{embedding}_2(\text{code_after})$. In addition, it is worth noting that our framework is flexible to any code embedding model. This flexibility ensures that our model can leverage the most advanced model available to better understand code changes’ nuances (as shown in Section V-A).

Upon establishing the representation of code changes Δ , we pass it through a feed-forward neural network leading to a classification head designed to distinguish between VF and NVF files. The network is trained on a dataset where each file-level change is labeled as either VF or NVF, thus learning to identify potential vulnerability fixes based on the characteristics of the code modifications. Note that different from previous approaches [7]–[9], in which the model has to be trained in multiple stages (e.g., fine-tune the embedding models and train the final commit-level classification model), we fine-tune embedding models and final classification model in one stage.

C. Commit-level Inference

Once trained, the model’s inference process is geared towards predicting whether an unseen commit is VF or not. This inference is not merely a file-level analysis but extends to a comprehensive commit-level assessment. To achieve this, we aggregate the predictions for all files within a commit by calculating their mean prediction probability as $\text{Prediction}(\text{Commit}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{Prediction}(\text{File}_i)$, as N denotes the number of files in a commit. We consider a commit with a probability larger than 0.5 as VF, otherwise NVF. Although, in theory, we could add and train an extra layer or model to aggregate the file-level prediction probability and learn the weights during the training phase, we decided to use a simple mean pooling since we found it is effective for predicting commit-level vulnerability fix.

D. Why element-wise subtraction?

Apart from the intuitive example given above, we would like to elaborate on why we select element-wise subtraction, as previous work [32], [34], [35] have also used element-wise subtraction as one part of their code change representation, however, none of them explain why. We argue that element-wise subtraction is a special case of concatenation with inductive bias [36], and this induction helps with code change representation learning.

Consider two vector representations e_1 and e_2 , corresponding to the embedding of `code_after` and `code_before`, $e_1 - e_2$ represent the element-wise subtraction of the two vectors, the combination of two vectors side by side can be represented as $[e_1, e_2]^T$. Specifically, if we apply the transformation




Fig. 2. The workflow of VFDelta.

$W[e_1, e_2]^\top$, with W being the weight matrix $[w_1, w_2]$ on the concatenation in the model. The operation of element-wise subtraction $e_1 - e_2$ can be obtained through the transformation $W_0(e_1 - e_2) = [w_0, -w_0][e_1, e_2]^\top$. Here, W_0 represents the weights associated with the element-wise subtraction and is a special case of $[w_1, w_2]$. This perspective shows element-wise subtraction as a special form of concatenation, facilitated by a subsequent linear transformation. We use element-wise subtraction by explicitly focusing on differences between two vectors, it introduces a strong induction that aids the learning process. Models leveraging this heuristic can more effectively learn to discern patterns of code changes and converge faster (see our analysis in Section V-B).

IV. EXPERIMENTAL SETTING

In this section, we present research questions (RQs), dataset, evaluation metrics, our analysis approach for RQs, and implementation details.

TABLE I
STATISTICS OF OUR STUDIED DATASETS.

	Training Set			Validation Set			Testing Set		
	#V.F.	#N.V.F	#Prj	#V.F.	#N.V.F	#Prj	#V.F.	#N.V.F	#Prj
VFM_2021									
file-level	1889	72635	117	163	7564	115	596	2E+05	29
commit-level	796	30120	117	135	6304	115	242	87457	29
VFM_2023									
time window	2012/06-2019/12			2019/12-2021/01			2021/02-2023/12		
file-level	2407	93908	145	241	8119	127	892	87138	9
commit-level	980	37783	145	109	3164	127	291	31374	9

A. Research Questions

We evaluate VFDelta in different aspects to answer the following research questions.

- *RQ1: How effective is VFDelta compared with SOTA approaches?*

- *RQ2: How effective is our code change representation learning?*
- *RQ3: To what extent does the context contribute to the effectiveness of VFDelta?*
- *RQ4: What is the effectiveness of VFDelta in real-world scenario?*

In RQ1, we aim to evaluate the performance of VFDelta by comparing it to recent SOTA approaches. We propose a simple yet effective approach to learning the representation of code changes. Therefore, in RQ2, we aim to understand the contribution of the representation learning approach by comparing it to various variants. In RQ3, we aim to investigate the impact of context on VFDelta. Lastly, in RQ4, we aim to conduct a rigorous evaluation of VFDelta in a challenging and real-world scenario, i.e., using the historical data for training and future data for evaluation.

1) *VFM_2021 dataset*: To evaluate the effectiveness of VFDelta in identifying silent vulnerability fixes, we used the Java dataset proposed by recent work VulFixMiner [7], short as VFM_2021. VFM_2021 dataset includes fixes for vulnerabilities disclosed by February 07, 2021. It contains 1,474 vulnerability-fixing commits from 150 Java repositories, alongside 474,555 non-vulnerability-fixing commits from the same set of repositories. A key feature of the VFM_2021 dataset is its project-level separation, ensuring no repository appears in both the training/validation/testing sets. Furthermore, to mitigate the challenge of label imbalance, the non-vulnerability fixing (NVF) commits in the training and validation sets were down-sampled. We evaluate RQ1 - RQ3 on VFM_2021.

The origin VFM_2021 dataset itself only contains added code and removed code (i.e., diff), while our approach requires the surrounding code as the context to achieve better

performance. Therefore, we updated the VFM_2021 to include more surrounding context for each piece of code change. To do so, we cloned the repositories afresh and gathered all commit information via Pydriller¹, which is a framework that helps developers for mining software repositories. Any commits untraceable by Pydriller or repositories no longer accessible on GitHub were omitted. In total, we ended with 1,172 commits. Table I shows the statistics of the updated VFM_2021.

2) *Enhanced temporal VFM_2023 dataset*: To answer RQ4, we need to construct a dataset that is split chronologically. To do so, we extend the original VFM_2021 dataset to December 2023. First, we re-divided the entire VFM_2021 data set according to time. We split VFM_2021 into a training set with the first 90% VF commits and a validation set with the last 10% VF commits. To form the test set, we looked for Vulnerability Fixes (VFs) after 2021. First, we collected all commits between 2021 to 2023 from the VFM_2021's Open Source Software (OSS) repositories. We then cross-referenced these commits with records in the National Vulnerability Database (NVD) and Snyk Vulnerability Database from 2021 to 2023 to identify VF commits by following previous study [7]. From this process, we found 527 VFs in 52 repositories. To maintain dataset quality and ensure the model's evaluation on adequately represented OSS repositories, we removed repositories with less than 10 VFs in either the training or testing set. Ultimately, the refined dataset comprised 9 repositories with 285 VFs and 31,374 Non-Vulnerable Fixes (NVFs). The detailed statistics of this dataset are presented in Table I.

B. Evaluation metrics

We evaluate the effectiveness of VFDelta from two perspectives: classification effectiveness and effort-awareness. We use F1, precision, and recall as the classification effectiveness metric. Those metrics are widely used in classification tasks [24], [37]. Second, to measure the effort-awareness of our approach, we select CostEffort@L by following previous studies [7]–[9]. Given the fact that vulnerability fixes are rare among the code commits (i.e., the extremely imbalanced dataset scenario), the goal of VFDelta is to help users reduce the efforts in identifying vulnerability fixes from a large scope of code commits. CostEffort@L is the proportion of inspected vulnerability fixes among all the actual vulnerability fixes when $L\%$ lines of source code in all commits are inspected and is computed as $\frac{n}{N}$, where n is the correctly identified vulnerability fixes, N denotes for the total vulnerability fixes, and L accounts for $L\%$ of total LOC of commits.

C. Code embedding models

To embed code, we select to use two widely used pre-trained models CodeBERT [38] and StarEncoder [39] that are trained on source code and designed for source code-related tasks. We select CodeBERT since it is also used in VulFixMiner [7] and MiDas [8] as the model for code embedding so that

we can compare with those baselines in a fair manner. We select StarEncoder as it is a more recent and advanced model. However, both models have the same parameters - 125M. We intend to investigate whether using a more advanced model could improve the effectiveness of VFDelta.

D. Implementation details

We begin by downloading the official pre-trained model checkpoint for all evaluated models from HuggingFace². Subsequently, the PyTorch and Transformers packages are employed to perform all the experiments. We use $5e-05$ as the training rate and AdamW as the optimizer, and we train the model for 10 epochs with a batch size of 128. We use bfloat16 (brain floating point) mixed precision and all experiments are done in Python 3.10. Experiments were conducted on a Linux server equipped with four Nvidia RTX 3090 GPUs, a 24-core CPU, and 128 GB of RAM.

E. Approach for RQs

1) *Approach of RQ1*: To demonstrate the effectiveness of VFDelta, we compare it with two recent SOTA baselines: VulFixMiner [7] and MiDas [8] on the VFM_2021 datasets in terms of all evaluation metrics. Note that CoLeFunDa [9] identifies only function-level vulnerability fixes, so we do not consider it as our baseline approach. As we discussed in Section IV-C, we use two code embedding models, thereby we refer to the version of implementation that employs CodeBERT as to $VFDelta_{Bert}$ and the version that uses StarEncoder as to $VFDelta_{Star}$.

2) *Approach of RQ2*: In this RQ, we aim to evaluate the contribution of our code change representation learning approach to VFDelta. More specifically, we first aim to elucidate the contributions of 1) using two independent embedding models for embedding code_before and code_after, and 2) adapting element-wise subtraction for embedded representation. Hence, we compare our approach VFDelta with the following variants to understand the contribution of the two designs. We elaborate on the details of each variant below.

VFDelta_{SingleEmbed} In this variant, we retain the element-wise subtraction of embeddings but process both code_before and code_after through a single embedding model. A similar design was used by CCRRep [35] to capture code change representation. This experiment aims to quantify the impact of using separate embedding models for each piece of code, allowing us to understand if the nuances and differences between code_before and code_after can be captured and represented more effectively using two independent embedding models compared with one.

VFDelta_{EmbedConcat} In this variant, we replace the element-wise subtraction operation with concatenation, in which we concatenate the outputs of the two embedding models. This variant assesses the importance of element-wise subtraction in capturing the relational dynamics between code_before and code_after, providing insights into how different embedding combination methods affect model performance.

¹<https://pydriller.readthedocs.io/en/latest/intro.html>

²<https://huggingface.co/>




Fig. 3. Comparison of different code change representation learning approaches.

Second, we are interested in investigating the impact of performing operations (i.e., concatenation and subtraction) on the raw code and embedding.

CodeConcat In this variant, raw code_before and code_after are concatenated with a separate token (i.e., [code_before, sep, code_after]) before being fed into the embedding model.

CodeConcat_{NoContext} In this variant, we remove the context of code_before and code_after before concatenate them. Therefore, only the changed code (i.e., [removed code, sep, added code]) will be retained and the common context will be discarded. This design was adopted by previous studies MiDas [8] and Vulfixminer [7]. This variant allows us to compare with the code change representation of previous approaches directly.

RawGitDiff In this variant, we do not conduct any pre-processing to the code diff generated by the Git Diff algorithm,

the input is represented as a sequence [3 lines of context before, added code, removed code, 3 lines of context after]. We use it directly as input to the embedding model. This design simulates the most simple approaches to represent code change.

Figure 3 provides the comparison of our approach with the studied variants.

In addition, to have a better understanding of the capacity of VFDelta, particularly in capturing small code changes in a commit. We measure the effectiveness of each studied representation approach on commits with different sizes of code changes (i.e., number of added/removed lines of code), i.e., (1,20], (20, 40], (40,60], (60, 80], (80, 100] and (100,∞).

We use the same experimental setting as RQ1.

3) *Approach of RQ3:* In RQ1 and RQ2, we use the default context (three lines before and after the changed code) generated by the *diff* algorithm of Git. In this RQ, we aim to investigate the impact of the window size of context on the effectiveness of VFDelta. We set context size to 0, 1, 3, 5, 7, 9. We re-train our models with different sizes of context and evaluate their performance accordingly. To accommodate as much context as possible within the token limit of the pre-trained model, we evaluate VFDelta with StarEncoder which can take up to 1024 tokens. We keep all other experimental settings the same as RQ1.

4) *Approach of RQ4:* In the previous RQs, we assessed the performance of VFDelta utilizing the VFM_2021 dataset. This dataset is organized based on open-source software (OSS) projects (cross-project setting), which may not adequately simulate real-world scenarios where the emergence of vulnerabilities (VFs) is inherently unpredictable. To address this limitation and more accurately reflect real-world application scenarios, this RQ aims to examine the efficacy of VFDelta in navigating the complexities of temporal data. Specifically, this RQ uses the VFM_2023 temporal dataset, which was crafted to represent a real-world challenge where the model is trained on historical data to forecast future vulnerability fixes (VF). We compare VFDelta with the baselines (i.e., VulFixMiner and MiDas) to provide a comprehensive understanding of their performance in predicting emergent vulnerabilities within the evolving landscape of OSS projects. Similar to RQ1, we compare both the VFDelta_Bert and VFDelta_Star with other baseline models.

V. RESULTS

A. Results of RQ1

TABLE II
COMPARISON OF VFDELTA WITH BASELINES ON VFM_2021 DATASET.
WE HIGHLIGHT THE CELLS WITH THE BEST PERFORMANCE IN BOLD.

Method	F1	Precision	Recall	CostEffort@5	CostEffort@20
VulFixMiner	0.186	0.113	0.540	0.583	0.619
MiDas	0.120	0.072	0.240	0.484	0.723
VFDelta_Bert	0.269	0.265	0.273	0.607	0.748
VFDelta_Star	0.330	0.285	0.392	0.632	0.76

VFDelta_Bert improves the SOTA baselines at least by 44.6%, 4.1%, and 3.5% in terms of F1, CostEffort@5, and CostEffort@20, respectively. Table II presents the results of our approaches and current state-of-the-art approaches, VulFixMiner and MiDas. First, for a fair comparison, we compare VFDelta_Bert with MiDas and VulFixMiner, which all use codeBert as their embedding model. VFDelta_Bert achieves an F1 of 0.269, and outperforms VulFixMiner (0.186) and MiDas (0.120) with an improvement of 44.6% and 124.2%, respectively. This better F1 achieved by VFDelta_Bert is attributed to the better precision, although we have a worse recall compared with VulFixMiner, which suggests our approach can reduce false positives significantly. When examining cost-efficiency metrics, VFDelta_Bert improves CostEffort@5 to 0.607 compared to VulFixMiner’s 0.583 and MiDas’s 0.484, achieving an improvement of 4.1% and 25.4%, respectively. Similarly, VFDelta_Bert achieves an improvement of 20.1% and 3.5% over VulFixMiner and MiDas, respectively, in terms of CostEffort@20.

VFDelta_Star achieves the best performance among all baselines including VFDelta_Bert, benefiting from its more advanced embedding model. VFDelta_Star, which uses the StarEncoder as the embedding model achieves better performance than VFDelta_Bert. VFDelta_Star improve VFDelta_Bert’s F1 CostEffort@5, and CostEffort@20 from 0.269, 0.607, and 0.748 to 0.33, 0.632, and 0.76, typically achieve a 22.7% improvement in terms of F1. If we compare VFDelta_Star with MiDas and VulFixMiner, VFDelta can improve the baselines at least by 77.4%, 8.4%, and 5.1% in terms of F1, CostEffort@5, and CostEffort@20. VFDelta_Star demonstrates potential benefits from utilizing more advanced embedding models. The results indicate that while foundational models like CodeBert provide a solid base, exploring and incorporating cutting-edge models can lead to further notable performance improvements.

VFDelta improves SOTA baselines significantly. For instance VFDelta_Star achieves the best performance on all metrics, and achieves an F1 of 0.33, a CostEffort@5 of 0.632, and a CostEffort@20 of 0.76, with the improvement of 77.4%, 8.4%, and 5.1% over the best baselines.

B. Results of RQ2

Using independent embedding models for code_before and code_after and element-wise subtraction to capture the difference between two embeddings as a combination plays a critical role in our approach. Table III summarizes the results of each variant. Compared to VFDelta_Bert, VFDelta_EmbedConcat which concatenates embedding outputs instead of element-wise subtraction, has a 16.0% decrease in F1 score, 2.6% drop in CostEffort@5, and 8.8% drop in CostEffort@20. This result demonstrates using the subtraction operation to capture the differences between two embeddings is more effective than concatenation. As discussed in Section III, subtraction is the special case of concatenation, using element-wise subtraction in the model provides

a direct induction to the model to capture the difference in such a way and facilitate the learning process. This is evidenced in Figure 4, where we can observe that the training loss of VFDelta_Bert drops faster than VFDelta_EmbedConcat. VFDelta_SingleEmbed processes both pieces of code through the identical embedding model but retains element-wise subtraction. This variant results in a 21.9% decrease in F1, 7.4% drop in CostEffort@5, and 11.6% in CostEffort@20 compared to VFDelta_Bert, which proves the importance of using two independent embedding models for code representations. More importantly, as we can see, only using one strategy does not improve the performance much compared with other variants. Two individual embedding models and element-wise subtraction need to be used as a combination to optimize their effectiveness.




Fig. 4. Comparison of training loss between VFDelta_Bert and VFDelta_EmbedConcat.

When comparing the two families of variants that apply operations (e.g., subtraction and concatenation) before and after embedding models, we find that they have similar performance in all metrics. CodeConcat, CodeConcat_NoContext, and RawGitDiff share similar performance as VFDelta_EmbedConcat and VFDelta_SingleEmbed, which indicates that capturing differences in raw code and embeddings have similar effectiveness for the VF identification.

Our approach of learning code change representation is more effective in capturing small changes than other studied variants, and achieves better performance in identifying VF with small changes. Figure 5 presents the performance (F1) of the studied variants in the groups of commits with different sizes of code changes, and the data distribution of each group. As observed, VFDelta_Bert outperforms other approaches when the code change is small (i.e., LOC is 0 -60). It is worth noting that the majority of the commits (72%) fall into this range and our approach performs better for the majority of commits. This analysis provides evidence that our design is more effective in capturing small code changes and leads to better performance in identifying VFs with small changes, typically, when the changed LOC is less than 60.

TABLE III
COMPARISON OF VFDELTA AND STUDIED VARIANTS ON VFM_2021.

Variant	F1	Precision	Recall	CostEffort@5	CostEffort@20
VFDelta _{EmbedConcat}	0.226 (16.0% ↓)	0.155(41.5% ↓)	0.410(50.2% ↑)	0.591(2.6% ↓)	0.682(8.8% ↓)
VFDelta _{SingleEmbed}	0.219 (21.9% ↓)	0.149(43.8% ↓)	0.409(49.8% ↑)	0.562(7.4% ↓)	0.661(11.6% ↓)
CodeConcat	0.221 (17.8% ↓)	0.149(43.8% ↓)	0.430 (57.5% ↑)	0.566(6.8% ↓)	0.690(7.8% ↓)
CodeConcat _{NoContext}	0.236 (12.3% ↓)	0.166(37.4% ↓)	0.413(51.3% ↑)	0.566(6.8% ↓)	0.678(9.4% ↓)
RawGitDiff	0.216 (19.7% ↓)	0.144(45.7% ↓)	0.430 (57.5% ↑)	0.570(6.1% ↓)	0.711(4.9% ↓)
VFDelta	0.269	0.265	0.273	0.607	0.748




Fig. 5. The barplot denotes the effectiveness of different approaches on different groups of commits with different sizes in terms of F1. The black line denotes the data distribution of each group of commits.

Compared to other variants, our design achieves higher precision and reduces false positives. As we can observe, VFDelta_Bert achieves the best f1, precision, CostEffort@5, and CostEffort@20, which indicates that VFDelta_Bert introduces fewer false positives. One explanation is that using two independent embedding models enables our approach to better capture the nuances between VF and NVF. This is evidenced by the best performance of VFDelta_{EmbedConcat} among the variants (excluding VFDelta_Bert) typically for the small changes as shown in Figure 5, which is the only one using two embedding models to represent code_before and code_after.

Using the separated models for code embedding and element-wise subtraction to capture the difference between two embeddings as a combination plays a critical role in our approach and is typically effective in capturing small code changes.

C. RQ3: To what extent does the context contribute to the effectiveness of VFDelta?

VFDelta achieves the optimal Performance with a 3-line context window. Table IV illustrates the performance of our approach using varying numbers of surrounding code lines as context. We note that the effectiveness of VFDelta, indicated by F1 score, precision, recall, and cost-effort metrics, fluctuates with different window sizes. Remarkably, the model

TABLE IV
PERFORMANCE OF VFDELTA_STAR UNDER DIFFERENCE CONTEXT WINDOWS ON VFM_2021.

Context	F1	Precision	Recall	CostEffort@5	CostEffort@20
0	0.280	0.214	0.405	0.603	0.727
1	0.295	0.254	0.351	0.541	0.752
3	0.33	0.285	0.392	0.632	0.760
5	0.293	0.243	0.368	0.558	0.744
7	0.268	0.210	0.368	0.579	0.748
9	0.264	0.206	0.368	0.545	0.744

achieves its peak performance with a 3-line context window. Subsequently, the performance of VFDelta diminishes as the number of lines increases. This trend suggests that inadequate context may hinder accurate vulnerability detection, whereas excessive context might introduce noise and divert the model's attention from pertinent changes. This observation underscores the critical role of context in refining the model's capability to identify vulnerability fixes precisely.

It is worth noting that even without context, VFDelta outperforms the baselines (i.e., MiDas and VulFixMiner) in terms of F1, CostEffort@5, and CostEffort@20, which indicates the superiority of our framework.

VFDelta achieves the optimal Performance with a 3-Line context window. Too little or much context hinders the performance.

D. RQ4: What is the effectiveness of VFDelta in real-world scenario?

TABLE V
COMPARISON OF VFDELTA AND BASELINES ON VFM_2023 DATASET.

Method	F1	Precision	Recall	CostEffort@5	CostEffort@20
VulFixMiner	0.053	0.058	0.049	0.133	0.228
MiDas	0.121	0.103	0.147	0.228	0.589
VFDelta_Bert	0.158	0.162	0.154	0.351	0.540
VFDelta_Star	0.199	0.165	0.256	0.442	0.618

VFDelta significantly outperforms the SOTA baselines VulFixMiner and MiDas across all metrics in this temporal dataset setting. For instance, VFDelta_Star achieves an F1 of 0.199, which demonstrates a notably higher prediction performance compared to MiDas (0.121) and VulFixMiner

(0.053), with an improvement of 64.5% and 275.5%, respectively. For CostEffort@5 and CostEffort@20, we observe a similar trend. For instance, VFDelta_Star improves MiDas which outperforms VulFixMiner, from 0.228 to 0.442 for CostEffort@5 and 0.589 to 0.653 for CostEffort@20, with an improvement 93.9% and 4.9%. Effort-awareness metrics are particularly important in the real-world scenario under the constraints of limited resources or inspection capacity. Our observations demonstrate the efficiency of VFDelta in real-world scenarios.

For instance, VFDelta successfully detects a silent vulnerability fix commit while other baseline failed to identify. The commit was a silent vulnerability fix for CVE-2022-46363 as shown in Figure 6. The vulnerability was initially reported to Apache by Qihoo 360 adlab, and then it was silently fixed without any indication of the vulnerability fix in the commit message on Nov 24, 2022 following the CVD procedure before it was revealed and published on NVD on Dec 13, 2022.

[Before Silent Fix] Report to Apache by: Qihoo 360 adlab (finder)
[Nov24, 2023] Code Change Snippet: <pre> if ((dispatcherServletPath != null dispatcherServletName != null) - && (redirectList != null && matchPath(redirectList, request) + && (redirectList != null && matchPath(redirectQueryCheck, redirectList, request) redirectList == null)) { ... boolean staticResourcesMatch = staticResourcesList != null - && matchPath(staticResourcesList, request); + && matchPath(false, staticResourcesList, request); boolean staticWelcomeFileMatch = staticWelcomeFile != null ... - private boolean matchPath(List<Pattern> values, HttpServletRequest request) { private static boolean matchPath(boolean checkRedirect, List<Pattern> + values, HttpServletRequest request) { ... - if (redirectQueryCheck) { + if (checkRedirect) { String queryString = request.getQueryString(); </pre>
[Nov24, 2023] Commit Message: Don't use redirect-query-check with the static resource list (#1034)
[Dec 13, 2023] Report to NVD and Disclosed: CVE-2022-46353

Fig. 6. A Silent Vulnerability Fix for CVE-2022-46363 [40] that detected by VFDelta

VFDelta significantly outperforms the SOTA baselines VulFixMiner and MiDas across all metrics in this temporal dataset setting. For instance, VFDelta_Star improves the baselines at least by 86.4% and 10.9%. in term of CostEffort@5 and CostEffort@20, respectively.

VI. DISCUSSION

A. Potential applications of code change representation learning.

While our task is to identify silent vulnerability fixes, our framework is flexible and can be used for other code change-related work, such as just-in-time defect prediction [31], [32],

[35] and commit message generation [32], [35], which rely on capturing the code change information as the fundamental component. For instance, for the commit message generation, our code change representation could be used as the encoder and then connected to the decoder to generate the message. We encourage future research to investigate our code change representation to other tasks.

B. Threats to validity

Internal Validity In this study, we use two categories of metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of VFDelta and baselines. Although there might be other metrics that could be used, our selected metrics are commonly used in evaluation in previous studies [7], [8] for the same task. VFDelta has a parameter which is the size of the context window. We selected the window size empirically and investigated their impact in RQ3. In this study, we evaluate the impact of the size of context on one model with a max token limit of 1024. Although our experiment results suggest that using a context window of 3 lines provided the best result, and we observe a decline trend after 3 lines. However, more advanced models that support more tokens might perform better with a larger context window and we suggest future research to investigate models with larger window sizes. Another threat is that we consider all files in a VF commit as VF when training file-level prediction model, this may not always be the case and introduce bias. To mitigate this, we used a widely used dataset VFM, and demonstrated the superiority of VFDelta over SOTA baselines. **External Validity** Threats to external validity relate to the generalizability of our findings. In this study, we evaluated our proposed framework on one task and demonstrated its superiority in identifying vulnerability fixes over baselines. However, our findings might not be generalized to other tasks. Future research is encouraged to evaluate our approach to more code change-related tasks.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose a simple yet effective framework to identify commit-level vulnerability fixes by enhancing code change representation learning to enhance the capacity of our model to capture small code changes, and simplifying the training process to enable us to train the embedding models and final classification model jointly for optimal performance. Our evaluation shows that VFDelta outperforms SOTA baselines on all metrics and achieves an F1 of 0.33, a CostEffort@5 of 0.632, and a CostEffort@20 of 0.76, with an improvement of 77.4%, 8.4%, and 5.1% over the best baselines, respectively. Our ablation analysis shows that our code change presentation learning plays a critical role in VFDelta, and is typically effective in capturing small code changes. Evaluation of the temporal dataset demonstrates the superiority of VFDelta over baselines with a large margin improvement in real-world situation.

REFERENCES

- [1] “Equifax to Pay at Least \$650 Million in Largest-Ever Data Breach Settlement,” <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/22/business/equifax-settlement.html>, accessed: 2024-02-05.
- [2] “Bad cyber hygiene: 60 percent of breaches tied to unpatched vulnerabilities,” <https://www.automox.com/blog/bad-cyber-hygiene-breaches-tied-to-unpatched-vulnerabilities>, accessed: 2024-02-05.
- [3] “Microsoft’s approach to coordinated vulnerability disclosure,” <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/msrc/cvd>, accessed: 2024-02-05.
- [4] “Working with repository security advisories,” <https://docs.github.com/en/code-security/security-advisories/working-with-repository-security-advisories>, accessed: 2024-02-05.
- [5] T. Walshe and A. C. Simpson, “Coordinated vulnerability disclosure programme effectiveness: Issues and recommendations,” *Computers & Security*, vol. 123, p. 102936, 2022.
- [6] F. Li and V. Paxson, “A large-scale empirical study of security patches,” in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2017, pp. 2201–2215.
- [7] J. Zhou, M. Pacheco, Z. Wan, X. Xia, D. Lo, Y. Wang, and A. E. Hassan, “Finding a needle in a haystack: Automated mining of silent vulnerability fixes,” in *2021 36th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 705–716.
- [8] T. G. Nguyen, T. Le-Cong, H. J. Kang, R. Widyasari, C. Yang, Z. Zhao, B. Xu, J. Zhou, X. Xia, A. E. Hassan et al., “Multi-granularity detector for vulnerability fixes,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2023.
- [9] J. Zhou, M. Pacheco, J. Chen, X. Hu, X. Xia, D. Lo, and A. E. Hassan, “Colefunda: Explainable silent vulnerability fix identification,” 2023.
- [10] B. Lin, S. Wang, M. Wen, and X. Mao, “Context-aware code change embedding for better patch correctness assessment,” *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 1–29, 2022.
- [11] Y. Li, S. Wang, and T. N. Nguyen, “Dlfix: Context-based code transformation learning for automated program repair,” in *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd international conference on software engineering*, 2020, pp. 602–614.
- [12] T. Mikolov, I. Sutskever, K. Chen, G. S. Corrado, and J. Dean, “Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 26, 2013.
- [13] Y. Zhou and A. Sharma, “Automated identification of security issues from commit messages and bug reports,” in *Proceedings of the 2017 11th joint meeting on foundations of software engineering*, 2017, pp. 914–919.
- [14] G. Nguyen-Truong, H. J. Kang, D. Lo, A. Sharma, A. E. Santosa, A. Sharma, and M. Y. Ang, “Hermes: Using commit-issue linking to detect vulnerability-fixing commits,” in *2022 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 51–62.
- [15] Apache Software Foundation, “CVE-2018-11776,” <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2018-11776>, 2018.
- [16] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, “Attention is all you need,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [17] Z. Feng, D. Guo, D. Tang, N. Duan, X. Feng, M. Gong, L. Shou, B. Qin, T. Liu, D. Jiang, and M. Zhou, “CodeBERT: A pre-trained model for programming and natural languages,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, T. Cohn, Y. He, and Y. Liu, Eds. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2020, pp. 1536–1547.
- [18] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, “Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [19] X. Zhou, D. Han, and D. Lo, “Assessing generalizability of codebert,” in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 425–436.
- [20] C. Tao, Q. Zhan, X. Hu, and X. Xia, “C4: Contrastive cross-language code clone detection,” in *Proceedings of the 30th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Program Comprehension*, 2022, pp. 413–424.
- [21] T. Sonnekalb, B. Gruner, C.-A. Brust, and P. Mäder, “Generalizability of code clone detection on codebert,” in *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, 2022, pp. 1–3.
- [22] Y. Shi, Y. Yin, Z. Wang, D. Lo, T. Zhang, X. Xia, Y. Zhao, and B. Xu, “How to better utilize code graphs in semantic code search?” in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2022, pp. 722–733.
- [23] E. Mashhadi and H. Hemmati, “Applying codebert for automated program repair of java simple bugs,” in *2021 IEEE/ACM 18th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 505–509.
- [24] X. Yang, S. Wang, Y. Li, and S. Wang, “Does data sampling improve deep learning-based vulnerability detection? yeas! and nays!” in *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 2287–2298.
- [25] Y. Li, S. Wang, and T. N. Nguyen, “Vulnerability detection with fine-grained interpretations,” in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, ser. ESEC/FSE 2021. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2021, p. 292–303. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3468264.3468597>
- [26] G. Haixiang, L. Yijing, J. Shang, G. Mingyun, H. Yuanyue, and G. Bing, “Learning from class-imbalanced data: Review of methods and applications,” *Expert systems with applications*, vol. 73, pp. 220–239, 2017.
- [27] T. M. Khoshgoftaar, A. Fazelpour, D. J. Dittman, and A. Napolitano, “Ensemble vs. data sampling: Which option is best suited to improve classification performance of imbalanced bioinformatics data?” in *2015 IEEE 27th international conference on tools with artificial intelligence (ictai)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 705–712.
- [28] X. Dong, Z. Yu, W. Cao, Y. Shi, and Q. Ma, “A survey on ensemble learning,” *Frontiers of Computer Science*, vol. 14, pp. 241–258, 2020.
- [29] Y. Chen, A. E. Santosa, A. M. Yi, A. Sharma, A. Sharma, and D. Lo, “A machine learning approach for vulnerability curation,” in *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories*, 2020, pp. 32–42.
- [30] Z. Xu, B. Chen, M. Chandramohan, Y. Liu, and F. Song, “Spain: security patch analysis for binaries towards understanding the pain and pills,” in *2017 IEEE/ACM 39th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 462–472.
- [31] T. Hoang, H. K. Dam, Y. Kamei, D. Lo, and N. Ubayashi, “Deepjit: an end-to-end deep learning framework for just-in-time defect prediction,” in *2019 IEEE/ACM 16th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 34–45.
- [32] T. Hoang, H. J. Kang, D. Lo, and J. Lawall, “Cc2vec: Distributed representations of code changes,” in *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2020, pp. 518–529.
- [33] A. Sabetta and M. Bezzi, “A practical approach to the automatic classification of security-relevant commits,” in *2018 IEEE International conference on software maintenance and evolution (ICSME)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 579–582.
- [34] H. Tian, K. Liu, A. K. Kaboré, A. Koyuncu, L. Li, J. Klein, and T. F. Bissyandé, “Evaluating representation learning of code changes for predicting patch correctness in program repair,” in *Proceedings of the 35th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, 2020, pp. 981–992.
- [35] Z. Liu, Z. Tang, X. Xia, and X. Yang, “Ccrep: Learning code change representations via pre-trained code model and query back,” in *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 17–29.
- [36] L. Mou, R. Men, G. Li, Y. Xu, L. Zhang, R. Yan, and Z. Jin, “Natural language inference by tree-based convolution and heuristic matching,” in *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, K. Erk and N. A. Smith, Eds. Berlin, Germany: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2016, pp. 130–136. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/P16-2022>
- [37] J. Zhou, S. Wang, C.-P. Bezemer, Y. Zou, and A. E. Hassan, “Studying the association between bountysource bounties and the issue-addressing likelihood of github issue reports,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 47, no. 12, pp. 2919–2933, 2020.
- [38] Z. Feng, D. Guo, D. Tang, N. Duan, X. Feng, M. Gong, L. Shou, B. Qin, T. Liu, D. Jiang et al., “Codebert: A pre-trained model for programming and natural languages,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08155*, 2020.

- [39] R. Li, L. B. allal, Y. Zi, N. Muennighoff, D. Kocetkov, C. Mou, M. Marone, C. Akiki, J. LI, J. Chim, Q. Liu, E. Zheltonozhskii, T. Y. Zhuo, T. Wang, O. Dehaene, J. Lamy-Poirier, J. Monteiro, N. Gontier, M.-H. Yee, L. K. Umapathi, J. Zhu, B. Lipkin, M. Oblokulov, Z. Wang, R. Murthy, J. T. Stillerman, S. S. Patel, D. Abulkhanov, M. Zocca, M. Dey, Z. Zhang, U. Bhattacharyya, W. Yu, S. Luccioni, P. Villegas, F. Zhdanov, T. Lee, N. Timor, J. Ding, C. S. Schlesinger, H. Schoelkopf, J. Ebert, T. Dao, M. Mishra, A. Gu, C. J. Anderson, B. Dolan-Gavitt, D. Contractor, S. Reddy, D. Fried, D. Bahdanau, Y. Jernite, C. M. Ferrandis, S. Hughes, T. Wolf, A. Guha, L. V. Werra, and H. de Vries, “StarCoder: may the source be with you!” Transactions on Machine Learning Research, 2023, reproducibility Certification. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=KoFOg4IhaE>
- [40] Apache Software Foundation, “CVE-2022-46363,” <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2022-46363>, 2022.