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Before researchers rush to reason across all available data or try complex methods, perhaps it is prudent to first check for simpler alternatives. Specifically, if the historical data has the most information in some small region, then perhaps a model learned from that region would suffice for the rest of the project.

To support this claim, we offer a case study with 240 projects, where we find that the information in those projects "clumps" towards the earliest parts of the project. A quality prediction model learned from just the first 150 commits works as well, or better than state-of-the-art alternatives. Using just this "early bird" data, we can build models very quickly and very early in the project life cycle. Moreover, using this early bird method, we have shown that a simple model (with just a few features) generalizes to hundreds of projects.

Based on this experience, we doubt that prior work on generalizing quality models may have needlessly complicated an inherently simple process. Further, prior work that focused on later-life cycle data needs to be revisited, since their conclusions were drawn from relatively uninformative regions.
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1 INTRODUCTION

In software defect prediction, researchers often fail to try simpler methods before trying complex analytics [106, 144]. For example:

- "For many new projects we may not have enough historical data to train prediction models." [93]
- "At least for defect prediction, it is no longer enough to just run a data miner and present the result without conducting a tuning optimization study." [30]
- "Many research studies have shown that ensemble learning can achieve much better classification performance than a single classifier." [132]
Fig. 1. Most defective commits occur early in the life cycle. Black: Red = Clean: Defective commits. In this article, we compare (a) models learned up to the vertical green (dotted) line to (b) models learned using more data. While we do not doubt those results in that context, we show in this work that can simplify software defect prediction if we focus more on the quality of the training data than on applying various software analytic techniques. Furthermore, this article shows that many of the prevalent methods used to build defect predictors are needless and can be "simplified" to a large extent with knowledge-rich early project data.

By simplified, we mean:

- Stable conclusions (no need to update defect predictors for every new project release).
- Less runtime (with fewer project data, we can find and build relevant predictors faster).
- Better explanations (with fewer features, we can communicate the oracles (predictors) decisions to stakeholders effectively).

In our lab exercise, we have sometimes seen unsatisfactory results from such a complex approach. For example, once we tried learning defect attributes from 700,000+ commits. The web slurping required for that process took nearly 500 CPU days, using five machines with 16 cores, over seven days (since the data from those projects had to be cleaned, massaged, and transformed into some standard format). Within that data space, we found significant differences in the models learned from different parts of the data. So, even after all that work and over a year of CPU, we were unable to report a stable conclusion to our business users.

This kind of experience motivates us to ask the question, “When is enough data just enough to build effective defect predictors?” Our answer to this question comes from a previously unreported effect is shown in Figure 1. As shown in this figure, when we look at the percent of buggy commits in GitHub projects, a remarkable pattern emerges. Specifically, most of the buggy commits occur earlier in the life cycle.

This observation prompted an investigation of the “early bird” heuristic (or the “early-data-lite” sampling method) that just uses early life cycle data to predict defects. The literature review of Section 4 shows that, surprisingly, this approach to software defect prediction has been overlooked
by prior work [106]. This is a significant oversight, since, in 240 GitHub projects, we can show that defect predictors learned from the first 150 commits work as well, or better, than state-of-the-art alternatives.

Our prior work showed early-data-lite (E) within-project supervised defect prediction models performed statistically better or on par with those that were built using either recent (RR) or abundant commits (ALL) [106]. In this work, we exploit the early-data-lite (E) method to answer four research questions (RQs), they are:

- RQ1: Can we build early software defect prediction models from unpopular projects?
- RQ2: Can we build early software defect prediction models with fewer features?
- RQ3: Can we build early software defect prediction models by transferring early life cycle data from other projects?
- RQ4: Do complex methods supersede early software defect prediction models?

Results of four RQs in Section 6 confirm that the software defect prediction model built from another project (cross) from the same organization using the early bird heuristic can identify defects in local projects having fewer commits. Notably, the early bird (discussed later in Section 2.2) heuristic offers the following benefits: (a) only the first 150 commits are considered for training; therefore, the cross-project can be young (only a few months old); (b) we find using only two size-based features to build defect prediction models was sufficient, (c) the cross-project need not be well maintained (unpopular); and (d) the results also indicate that much of the augmenting machine learning practices such as hyper-parameter optimization and ensemble learning were needless.

Overall, the contributions of this article are to show:

- The information (like software defects) within projects may not be evenly distributed across the life cycle. For such data, it can be very useful to adopt a "early-data-lite" approach.
- For example, early life cycle data finds simple models (with only two features) that generalize across hundreds of projects. Such models can be built much faster than traditional methods (weeks versus months of CPU time).
- So, before researchers use all available data, they need to first check that their buggy commit data occur at equal frequency across the life cycle. We say this since much prior work on methods for learning from multiple projects [12, 18, 19, 23–27, 31, 37–40, 42, 43, 46–48, 57, 58, 63–66, 69, 70, 78–80, 84, 88–91, 93, 98–101, 118, 121, 122, 126, 127, 133, 138–140, 142, 144] needlessly complicated an inherently simple process.

The rest of this article explains our method and offers experimental evidence that this early-bird method works better than sophisticated methods such as classifier tuning, ensemble, and notably made transfer learning algorithms work simpler, faster, and are more stable. This article uses the abbreviations of Table 1.

Before all that, we digress to address the obvious objections to our conclusion. The results presented here are only for software defect prediction. In future work, we need to test if our results hold for other domains.

2 CONNECTION TO PRIOR WORK

2.1 Initial Report

Previously, we have reported the Figure 1(a) results at ICSE’21 [106]. We calculate that only Figure 1(a) and five pages of this text (e.g., Section 8.1) come from that prior work.

1For reviewers, we note that that paper is available online at https://arxiv.org/pdf/2011.13071.pdf.
Table 1. Table of Important Acronyms

| Acronym | Abbreviation |
|---------|--------------|
| AUC     | Area under the receiver operating characteristic curve |
| CFS     | Correlation-based Feature Selection |
| DODGE   | Optimizer proposed by Agrawal et al. in Reference [2] |
| DT      | Decision Tree |
| HPO     | Hyperparameter optimization |
| HYPEROPT| Optimizer proposed by Bergstra et al. [10] |
| IFA     | Initial Number of False Alarms |
| KNN     | k-nearest neighbors algorithm |
| LA and LT| Refer to features list in Table 4 |
| LR      | Logistic Regression |
| MCC     | Matthews correlation coefficient |
| NB      | Naive Bayes classifier |
| PF      | False Alarm Rate |
| RF      | Random forest |
| SMOTE   | Synthetic Minority Over-sampling Technique [20] |
| SVM     | Support vector machines |
| SZZ     | Sliwerski Zimmerman Zellar Algorithm [109] |
| TCA     | Transfer Component Analysis [79] |
| TLEL    | Two-layer Ensemble Learning Algorithm [132] |
| TPE     | Tree-structured Parzen Estimator [10] |

As to the semantic difference between this article and prior work, that prior study was more limited, since it did not have the additional data of Figure 1(b). Also, that prior study only ran some within-project sampling methods on the Figure 1(a) data. This article takes the additional step of comparing our methods to transfer learning, classifier tuning, and ensemble methods. Further, previously, we did not report the model learned via this method. We show here that a simple model (that uses just a few variables) can be learned from a few early life cycle samples. Last, as shown by the new results of this article in Table 7, Table 8, Table 9, and Table 10, we can outperform the results from that prior work. Hence, it is important to ingest the results of our prior work first, especially to understand why we omit certain treatments in our experiments in this work.

2.2 Early Bird Heuristic

In our prior work, we find that much of the software engineering (SE) project activity occurs during the early periods of the software project life-cycle [106]. We used that observation as a heuristic to answer if defect prediction models can stop learning early. Interestingly, we found that defect prediction models that learned from just 150 commits (which occurred in less than four months of the project) yield statistically the same predictive performance as models trained with recent or all available project data (commits). In this work, we label this effect as the “early-bird” heuristic (or E).

Software defect predictors built in the literature or practice using all available data are data-hungry or those that use recent project data may be labeled as late data. The defect prediction models built using the “early-bird” heuristic are early-data-lite as they use only a tiny portion (4%) of the early project data [106]. Data-hungry models are frequently re-trained, and this gives rise to the conclusion-instability issue [57]. In other words, retraining would cause the models to behave differently for every project release (e.g., A commit classified as defective in release “X” may be classified as clean in release “X+1”). Early-data-lite models are never retrained,” as they always use the fixed 150 early project commits to building defect predictors.

3 MOTIVATION

3.1 Defect Prediction

The case studies of this article are based on software defect prediction. Hence, before doing anything else, we need to introduce that research area.
Fixing software defects is not cheap [33]. Accordingly, for decades, SE researchers have been devising numerous ways to predict software quality before deployment. One of the oldest studies was made in 1971 by Akiyama using size-based defect predictions for a system developed at Fujitsu, Japan [6]. This approach remains popular today. A 2018 survey of 395 practitioners from 33 countries and five continents [20] found that over 90% of the respondents were willing to adopt software defect prediction techniques [120].

Software defect prediction uses data miners to input static code attributes and output models that predict where the code probably contains most bugs [71, 81]. The models learned in this way are very effective and relatively cheap to build:

- **Effective**: Misirili et al. [74], and Kim et al. [50] report considerable cost savings when such predictors are used in guiding industrial quality assurance processes.
- **Relatively simpler to implement**: Also, Rahman et al. [92] show that such predictors are competitive with more elaborate approaches. For example, they note that static code analysis tools can have expensive licenses that need to be updated after any major language upgrade. Defect predictors, however, can be quickly implemented via some lightweight parsing of commit-level metrics that are programming language agnostic.

Our prior work [106] proposed numerous extensions that improve the validity and scope of the “early-data-lite” method. Therefore, in this work, we continue to assess the efficacy and applicability of the “early-data-lite” method broadly on two active areas in software defect prediction, specifically:

- **Data**: Transfer Learning (Cross-project defect prediction)
- **Technique**: Tuning and Ensemble methods

### 3.2 Data: Transfer Learning

Defect predictors are learned from project data. What happens if there is not enough data to learn those models? This is an especially acute problem for newer projects (and in the absence of historical data in some legacy projects [17]).

In such scenarios, practitioners and researchers might identify matured projects that share some similarities to their local projects. Once found, then lessons learned could be transferred from the older to the new project. There are kinds of transfer:

- **Cross**: cross-project defect prediction. Lessons learned from other projects and applied to this project.
- **Within**: within-project defect prediction. Using data from this project, lessons learned from prior experience are used to make predictions about later life cycle development.

To say the least, transfer learning is a very active research area in SE. We can find more than 1,000 articles in the past five years alone (found using the query “cross-project defect prediction”\(^2\)). By our count, within that corpus, there have been at least two dozen transfer learning methods [7]. Interesting methods evolved in that research, including:

- Heterogeneous transfer that lets data expressed indifferent formats transferred from project to projects [78];
- Temporal transfer learning, which is a within-project defect prediction (**Within**) tool where earlier life cycle data is used to make predictions later in the life cycle [52].

\(^2\)Queried [https://scholar.google.co.in/](https://scholar.google.co.in/) in 2020.
Our reading of the literature is that, apart from our own research, the prior state-of-the-art in the SE literature is Nam et al.’s TCA+ (Transfer Component Analysis) method [79]. For a list of important abbreviations used in this article, see Table 1. Given data from a source and a target project, TCA strives to “align” the source and target data via dimensionality rotation, expansion, and contraction. TCA+ is an extension to basic TCA that used automatic methods to find normalization options for TCA.

3.3 Technique: Tuning and Ensemble

Classification algorithms can be trained to classify a project commit as defective. Studies have shown their predictive performance can depend upon the set of hyper-parameter they are initially configured [2, 30].

For example, the k-nearest neighbors (KNN) that we explore in this study are available in the widely used scikit-learn [87] machine learning library. And KNN is set to the following default parameters based on standard machine learning literature as follows:

\[
\text{n\_neighbors} = 5, \ast, \text{weights} = \text{uniform}, \text{algorithm} = \text{auto}, \text{leaf\_size} = 30, \\
p = 2, \text{metric} = \text{minkowski}, \text{metric\_params} = \text{None}, n\_jobs = \text{None}.
\]

However, as seen from the numerous parameters available for KNN, there is a huge parameter space of options the KNN can be tried and tested (tuned). Therefore, most machine learning algorithms’ hyper-parameters can be tuned using training data before being tested on project releases in our case.

There are numerous ways to find the right set of parameters for a classifier given the training data. But the decision predominantly comes with the runtime cost. For example, searching through all available options “Manual Search” may not terminate. One may try “Random Search” with a terminating condition, but the probability of finding the near-best parameter may be low. Fu et al. [30] explored “grid-search,” a baseline hyper-parameter approach in the field of machine learning [30], but found it to be very slow for software defect prediction. Recently (2019), Agrawal et al. proposed a novel optimizer that terminates quickly after finding near-optimal hyper-parameters for defect predictors [2]. More details on DODGE will be presented in Section 5.3.1. Therefore, this article will explore DODGE with early methods.

Another avenue of complex approach is the use of the ensemble method, where the philosophy is why use just “one” when “more” is better. Numerous studies have shown defect predictors can be improved significantly when an ensemble of classifiers was used rather than just one [36, 123, 132]. In 2017, Yang et al. proposed a two-layer ensemble approach for software defect prediction called TLEL (Two-layer Ensemble Learner) that showed promising improvements when compared to predictors with a single classifier. Section 5.3.3 elucidates its operation, and this article will explore TLEL as part of the complex methods to test the efficacy of early methods.

3.4 Issues with Current Approaches

Nevertheless, just because a technique is popular does not mean that it should be recommended. Our reading of the literature is most recent SE analytics papers have taken a complex approach (e.g., see the quotes in our prior work [106]) and use state-of-the-art analytics without testing with simpler alternatives [144]. We argue there that it can be useful to try early-data-lite before adopting complex techniques that demand more data, delay analytics, do not offer explanations, and overutilize system resources. Because, for one thing, all that data might not be available. The availability of more data in an industrial setting is not assured. Further, it may not be useful to learn from more data. Proprietary data may not be readily available for practitioners to build predictors for their local projects. Zimmermann et al. showed that transferring predictors from the same domain
does not guarantee quality predictions [145]. Finally, due to privacy concerns, teams even within the same organization may not readily make their matured project available for others to use [88].

Another thing, several researchers have reported that a complex approach can be problematic:

- In our introduction, we reported on our own issues seen when learning from 700,000+ GitHub commits.
- At her ESEM’11 keynote address, Elaine Weyuker questioned whether she will ever have the option to make the AT&T information public [125].
- In over 30 years of COCOMO effort, Boehm could share cost estimation data from only 200 projects [15].

Next, applying techniques discussed in Section 5.8 comes with a CPU runtime cost. When from time-to-time researchers have strived and endorsed to look for simpler alternatives, it is important that we explore them.

4 RELATED WORK

In our prior work, we showed that historical data within the project were used in large quantities to build defect predictors that were needless [106]. And, as promised in our prior work, in this work, we check the validity of our prior conclusion beyond within-project software defect prediction and test the efficacy of early methods in various contexts, such as:

- Unpopular SE projects
- Transfer learning scenarios
- Hyper-parameter optimization and Ensemble approach

One reason to explore early life cycle data reasoning is that it has not been done before (except our prior work that focuses on within-project data to build predictors). Fenton et al. [29] examined the use of human judgment rather than domain data to handcraft a causal model to predict residual defects (defects discovered during operational usage or independent testing), however, this required extensive work (two years), and we do not explore this path [29]. Zhang and Wu demonstrated in 2010 that fewer programs sampled from an entire space of programs (covering the entire project life-cycle) can be used to estimate project quality [141]. The difference here is that we sample them "early" in the project life-cycle and not the entire project history. Rahman et al. endorse employing a substantial sample size in defect prediction models to reduce bias [94]. While we do not deny bias in defect prediction datasets, we find that the performance of our proposed early data-lite approach is comparable to that of prior approaches. Arokiam and Jeremy looked into bug severity prediction [8]. They demonstrate that data transferred from other projects can be used to predict bug severity early in project development. Similar to Arokiam and Jeremy’s work, Sousuke examined Cross-Version defect prediction (CVDP) using Cross-Project Defect Prediction (CPDP) data in 2020 in Reference [7]. Their study with 41 releases suggests that the most recent project release was still superior to the majority of CPDP approaches. However, in contrast to Sousuke, we provide contrary evidence in this work. Notably, we evaluate our strategy using more than a thousand releases and seven performance metrics.

We expanded the scope of early life cycle data reasoning in the subsequent Section 4.1 through a literature survey on other prominent defect prediction approaches, specifically, transfer learning, hyper-parameter optimization, and ensemble approach. Notably, these methods demand more data and computing resources, making it difficult to predict defects early in the project life cycle.

We find that much of the SE transfer learning methods [18, 19, 24, 26, 31, 42, 43, 46–48, 57, 58, 64, 78–80, 84, 88–90, 98–101, 118, 121, 127, 133, 139, 142, 144] and Tuning or ensemble methods [2–4, 14, 16, 21, 30, 32, 44, 45, 47, 48, 48, 59, 60, 62, 65, 83, 84, 86, 90, 95, 96, 99–101, 103, 108,
could be characterized as “late-data” (or data-hungry), since they transferred all available data from one or more projects to build their predictors, supporting our claim that this space has not been explored before.

As to other comparison studies, we explore transfer learning and hyper-parameter optimization in this article. Prior to this article, we focused extensively on transfer learning and hyper-parameter optimization at prominent venues [2, 5, 57, 58], because we believed those were “state-of-the-art” (and had convinced many journal reviewers of that proposition). After this article, our views have changed, and like many other researchers, we believe we have needlessly elaborated an inherently very simple process.

4.1 Literature Survey

To understand more about late-data (data-hungry) reasoning in SE, we queried Google Scholar\(^3\) to find software defect prediction articles (similar to our prior work [106]) in three areas:

- We found 982 articles in Google Scholar using the query (“cross-project defect prediction”) in the past 10 years.
- We found more than 1,740 articles in the past 5 years alone (searching the query “defect prediction” AND “tuning OR hyper-parameter optimization”) and 3,050 articles using the query “defect prediction” AND “ensemble.”

Following the advice of Agrawal et al. [4], and Mathews et al. [67], we focused only on “highly cited” papers, i.e., those with more than 10 citations per year. Reading those papers, and after discarding papers pure of survey nature, we filtered the papers that performed some transfer learning experiments or a complex method (ensemble or tuning). We summarized the results of this literature survey in Table 2 (Transfer learning) and Table 3 (Tuning and Ensemble methods).

Within those three sets, we found three approaches to row selection:

- “All” if the methods of that paper used all rows (training data instances) from one or more projects to build defect predictors.
- “Part” if the methods of that paper explore a large search space of one or more projects to find a small set of rows that are worthy of transfer data.
- In one case, in 2016, we also found a “None” approach that used no training but just clustered the test data to find outliers, which were then labeled as bugs [140]. Having recorded that method, this article will not explore this minority approach.

Note that regardless of being “All” or “Part,” the analysis looks at the data across the entire life cycle before returning some or all of it.

As to other kinds of data selection, for all these papers, we counted:

- The number of projects used in those studies;
- The number of features used by their predictors;
- The applied any ensemble or tuning or both techniques.

When we tried to place this article into Table 2 and Table 3, we found that our approach was, quite literally, off the charts. The methods advocated by this article are neither “whole” nor “part,” since we learn from early data, then stop collecting (so, unlike all the research in Table 2 and Table 3, we never look at all the data). Further, our “number of projects” = 1 (which does not even appear in Table 2), and we only use a handful of features (far fewer than the features used by other work in Table 2).

\(^3\)https://scholar.google.co.in/ in 2020.
Hence, we assert, with some confidence, that the methods of this article have not been previously explored.

4.1.1 Representative Techniques. To design an appropriate experiment, we used the following guidelines:

First, we are comparing the early sample to sampling over a larger space of project data. Hence, in the following, we will show early versus all experiments.

Second, there are two ways to find data: within-project and cross-project. Therefore, we will divide the early-data and all late-data experiments into:

- early-data: early-within and early-cross
- late-data: all-within and all-cross
- Complex Methods: Optimizers (DODGE and HyperOpt) and ensemble method (TLEL).
Table 3. 44 "Highly Cited" (More than 10 Citations per Year) Papers that Built Software Defect Prediction Models Applying Methods Based on Ensemble/Tuning/Both in the Past Decade (2011 to 2020)

| Year | Cites/Year | Type | Data | Projects | Paper |
|------|------------|------|------|---------|-------|
| 2011 | 37.9       | All  | 2    | [10]    |       |
| 2012 | 17.33      | All  | 14   | [17]    |       |
| 2013 | 5.13       | All  | 10   | [12]    |       |
| 2014 | 24         | All  | 41   | [9]     |       |
| 2015 | 23         | All  | 10   | [8]     |       |
| 2016 | 33.33      | All  | 29   | [32]    |       |
| 2017 | 13.33      | All  | 7    | [10]    |       |
| 2018 | 18.17      | All  | 6    | [10]    |       |
| 2019 | 29.2       | All  | 11   | [4]     |       |
| 2020 | 22.4       | All  | 21   | [7]     |       |
| 2016 | 15.8       | All  | 12   | [25]    |       |
| 2017 | 31         | All  | 6    | [33]    |       |
| 2017 | 22.5       | All  | 15   | [102]   | 2020 |
| 2017 | 16.25      | Part | 11   | [96]    | 2015 |
| 2018 | 32.67      | All  | 27   | [111]   | 2015 |
| 2018 | 21.33      | All  | 15   | [4]     | 2016 |
| 2018 | 27.67      | All  | 12   | [118]   | 2016 |
| 2019 | 26         | All  | 44   | [139]   | 2016 |
| 2019 | 21.5       | Part | 10   | [8]     | 2018 |
| 2020 | 28         | All  | 2    | [9]     | 2018 |
| 2020 | 31         | All  | 3    | [2]     | 2018 |
| 2020 | 20         | All  | 12   | [8]     | 2019 |

**Key:** Part, All

Last, looking into the literature, we can see some clear state-of-the-art algorithms that should be represented in our study (specifically, the $TCA+$ and Bellwether cross-project learning methods [58, 79]). Accordingly, when exploring cross-project learning, we will employ those methods.

Explaining the exact methods used in this study requires some further details on those algorithms. Please see Section 5.2 for the algorithm details and for a discussion of what algorithms we selected. But, in summary, to the best of our knowledge, the early-data variants of these techniques have not been explored before in SE.

We understand the above areas do not cover all of the software defect prediction literature, but to the best of our knowledge, we assert that we covered a range of active research areas within defect prediction to test the scope of our conclusion about early methods.

**5 EXPERIMENTAL METHODS**

The rest of this article assesses supervised defect prediction models built using the early-bird heuristic versus other learning policies and optimization techniques for the data of Figure 1.

At a high level, we build a defect prediction model in three steps.

First, we sample training commits using one of the sampling methods listed in Section 5.8. The test data is the commits from a project release. In the case of within-project defect prediction, past commits are never used as test commits. In all the experiments of this article, there is no overlap of commit data between test and training data. Second, training and test commits are pre-processed using the techniques listed in Section 5.7. Third, we build the model using one of the classifiers listed in Section 5.2.

We use the measures listed in Section 5.9 to assess the performance of the defect prediction model’s ability to classify test commits (as defective or clean). This process of training, testing, and evaluation is repeated for every applicable project release in all 240 projects. Apart from RQ1, all other RQs consider all 240 GitHub projects for analysis.

Last, to compare the overall performance of various treatments, we apply the Scott-Knott test discussed in Section 5.10. Here, treatment is a defect prediction model built using a specific “sampling method,” “classifier” and evaluated on a particular “measure.” For example, one treatment
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Table 4. 14 Commit Level Features that Commit Guru Tool [49, 97] Mines from GitHub Repositories

| Dimension | Feature | Definition |
|-----------|---------|------------|
| Diffusion | NS      | Number of modified subsystems (subsystem identified using root directory (package) name) |
|           | ND      | Number of modified directories |
|           | NF      | Number of modified files |
|           | ENTROPY | Distribution of modified code across each file |
| Size      | LA      | Lines of code added |
|           | LD      | Lines of code deleted |
|           | LT      | Lines of code in a file before the change |
| Purpose   | FIX     | Whether or not this change is a defect fixing change. |
| History   | NDEV    | #developers changing modified files |
|           | AGE     | Mean time from last to the current change |
|           | NUC     | #changes to modified files before |
| Experience| EXP     | Developer experience |
|           | REXP    | Recent developer experience |
|           | SEXP    | Developer experience on a subsystem |

Fig. 2. 240 GitHub project data distributions.

can be a logistic regression-based defect prediction model that uses an early-bird (early-data) sampling method. Another could be a decision-tree-based model that used a data-hungry (late-data) sampling method. The population in this example is the distribution of “Recall” scores evaluated in all the applicable project releases. The two treatments are then ranked (clustered) using the Scott-Knott test on the basis of an evaluation measure (say, “Recall”).

5.1 Data

All data used in this study comes from open-source projects hosted on GitHub that other SE researchers can replicate. For details on that data, see Table 4, Figure 2, and Figure 3.

We reuse the 155 popular projects from our prior study, which was randomly sampled from the project list curated by Munaiah et al. [76]. Additionally, we collected 85 unpopular projects to answer RQ1 using the same process as our prior work, except that we are looking for projects with less than 1,000 stars. In both popular and unpopular projects collected, we started with sampling 100s of projects from the Munaiah et al. list but only 155 popular projects and 85 unpopular projects satisfied the non-trivial and sanity checks.

To repeat from the prior work, we rely on the criteria listed by Munaiah et al. to differentiate an engineering project from a trivial one. Then, we used Commit Guru’s public portal to mine these project data (commits) along with their 14 process metrics [97]. Similar to the back-trace approach by SZZ algorithm [109], each commit was labeled “defective” (based on certain defect-related
Fig. 3. Distributions seen in the first 150 commits.

keywords) or “clean” (otherwise) internally by *Commit Guru*. *Commit Guru* walks back into the code to find the changes associated with that commit. Projects were rejected according to the standard sanity checks listed in prior work [106, 130]:

- Less than 1% defective commits;
- Less than two releases;
- Less than one year of activity;
- No license information;
- Less than five defective and five clean commits.

Further, looking at Figure 2, we see that above and below 1000 stars, the distributions are different (for example, the median number of commits is 3,728 and 957).

The projects collected in this way were developed in widely used programming languages (including Java, Python, C, C++, C#, Kotlin, JavaScript, Ruby, PHP, Fortran, Go, Shell, etc.) for various domains.

All 14 features used in this study are listed in Table 4. Those features are extracted from these projects using *Commit Guru* [97]. The use of these particular features has been prevalent and endorsed by prior studies [49, 91]. *Commit Guru* is a publicly available tool used in numerous works [54, 128] based on a 2015 ESEC/FSE paper. Those 14 features became the independent attributes used in this empirical study.

In light of results by Nagappan and Ball, we created relative churn and standardized LA (lines of code added) and LD (lines of code deleted) features by separating by LT (lines of code in a file before the change) and LT and NUC (the number of unique changes to the modified files before) dividing by NF (number of modified files) [53, 77]. Likewise, we dropped ND (number of modified directories) and REXP (recent developer experience), since Kamei et al. revealed that NF and ND are correlated with REXP and EXP (developer experience). Last, we applied the logarithmic transformation to the remaining features (except for the Boolean variable “FIX”) to handle skewness [105].

This empirical study uses three sets of algorithms:

- The nine classification algorithms described in Section 5.2;
- Pre-processing algorithms (for some sampling policies) described in Section 5.7;
- The seven sampling methods are described in Section 5.8.

But, *Commit Guru* does not provide project release information. Therefore, we cloned each GitHub project to our local machine and extracted GitHub releases/tags information by executing the following command shown below:

(a) Popular projects. Median = 5 releases, 4 months, and 41 defective commits.
(b) Unpopular projects. Median = 5 releases, 7 months, and 29 defective commits.
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5.2 Classifiers

We use all the six classifiers and optimizers used in our prior work [106]. Those six classifiers are prevalent in the SE literature chosen from the four groups tabulated by Ghotra et al. [32]. The classifiers we include in this empirical study are:

- Logistic Regression (LR);
- Nearest neighbor (KNN) (minimum 5 neighbors);
- Decision Tree (DT);
- Random Forest (RF);
- Naive Bayes (NB);
- Support Vector Machines (SVM).

5.3 Complex Methods

This section describes the optimizers and an ensemble learning technique that is prevalent for software defect prediction. They are used in augmenting classifiers to yield better predictive performance.

5.3.1 DODGE. Agrawal et al.’s DODGE is a state-of-the-art hyper-parameter optimization method extensively assessed for software defect prediction [2]. One critical problem in hyper-parameter optimization (such as grid search or brute force) is the runtime overhead. DODGE overcomes this by terminating much faster by skipping redundant options.

DODGE is an ensemble tree of classifiers and pre-processors, as shown in Table 5. DODGE is broadly a two-step process, as shown in Figure 4. First, DODGE iteratively shrinks (prunes the tree) the tuning search space by ignoring redundant options sampled from the tree. Then, in the next set of iterations, it finds near-optimal options by looking between the best and worst options seen so far.

DODGE is shown to perform much better than building models with classifiers or pre-processors directly with off-the-shelf default options [2]. Notably, Agrawal et al. have highlighted that DODGE fails on complex datasets. Here, the complexity of a dataset is determined using Levina et al. intrinsic dimensionality ($\mu_D$) computation [61]. They say that many datasets that are stored in high-dimensional formats can actually be compressed without losing much information [1] and that Principal Component Analysis-based methods frequently overestimate intrinsic dimensions.

Calculating the number of items found at distances within radius $r$ (where $r$ is the distance between two configurations) while varying $r$ yields the intrinsic dimension of a dataset with $N$ items. The intrinsic dimensionality is measured by this because:

- If the items are distributed only in one $r = 1$ dimension, then we will only discover a linear increase in the number of items as $r$ rises.
- If the items are dispersed across, say, $r > 1$ dimensions, then we will discover polynomially more items as $r$ grows.

As shown in Equation (1), Levina et al. normalize the number of items based on the number of $N$ items that are being compared. They advise reporting the number of intrinsic dimensions ($\mu_D$) as the maximum value of the slope between $\ln(r)$ vs. $\ln(C(r))$. The $\ln(C(r))$ value computed as follows:

$$C(r) = \frac{2}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} I(||x_i, x_j|| < r).$$

\[1\]
### Table 5. Hyperparameter Tuning Options Explored in this Article (Taken from Reference [2])

| DATA PRE-PROCESSING | Software defect prediction: |
|---------------------|----------------------------|
| • Transformations   | Software defect prediction: |
| – StandardScaler    |                           |
| – MinMaxScaler       |                           |
| – MaxAbsScaler       |                           |
| – RobustScaler(quantile_range=(a, b)) |   |
|  *= a,b= randint(0,50), randint(51,100) |   |
|  = KernelCenterer    |                           |
| – QuantileTransformer(n_quantiles=a, output_distribution=c, subsample=b) |   |
|  *= a, b = randint(100, 1000), randint(1000, 1e5) |   |
|  = c=randchoice([‘normal’, ‘uniform’]) |   |
| – Normalizer(norm=a) |                           |
|  *= a = randchoice([‘l1’, ‘l2’, ‘max’]) |   |
| – Binarizer(threshold=a) |                       |
|  *= a= randuniform(0,100) |                       |

| LEARNERS | Software defect prediction and text mining: |
|----------|-------------------------------------------|
| • DecisionTreeClassifier(criterion=b, splitter=c, min_samples_split=a) | |
|  = a= randuniform(0.0,1.0) | |
|  = b, c= randchoice([‘gini’, ‘entropy’]), randchoice([‘best’, ‘random’]) | |
| • RandomForestClassifier(n_estimators=a, criterion=b, min_samples_split=c) | |
|  = a= randint(50, 150), randchoice([‘gini’, ‘entropy’]) | |
|  = c = randuniform(0.0, 1.0) | |
| • LogisticRegression(penalty=a, tol=b, C=float(c)) | |
|  = a= randchoice([‘l1’, ‘l2’]) | |
|  = b,c = randuniform(0.0,0.1), randint(1,500) | |
| • MultinomialNB(alpha=a) | |
|  = a= randuniform(0.0,0.1) | |
| • KNeighborsClassifier(n_neighbors=a, weights=b, p=d, metric=c) | |
|  = a, b = randint(2, 25), randchoice([‘uniform’, ‘distance’]) | |
|  = c = randchoice([‘minkowski’, ‘chebyshev’]) | |
|  = if c==’minkowski’: d= randint(1,15) else: d=2 | |

Note that we make no claim that this is a complete list of options. Rather, we merely claim that a reader of the recent SE literature on hyperparameter optimization might be tempted to try some subset of the following.

Note that Equation (1) above uses the L1-norm rather than the Euclidean L2-norm to calculate, because Courtney et al. [1] suggest that for data with many columns, L1 performs better than L2. Accordingly, DODGE yields the best performance for datasets with low dimensionality ($\mu_D \approx 3$) and below par performance for higher-dimensional data ($\mu_D > 8$). Notably, the intrinsic dimensionality of 240 projects explored in this study is $\mu_D < 2$ (compatible with DODGE to perform).

#### 5.3.2 Hyperopt.

A prevalent hyper-parameter optimizer is proposed by Bergstra et al. in Reference [10]. Agrawal et al., in a recent software defect prediction work [5], showed DODGE to outperform hyperopt for software defect prediction. However, we include Hyperopt, because it is a state-of-the-art optimizer in the machine learning community that may augment early methods and work differently compared to DODGE. Formally, hyperopt is a framework that can work with different optimization algorithms. For our experiments, we used Sequential model-based optimization and **Tree-structured Parzen Estimator (TPE)** wrapped in the Hyperopt toolkit available online [11].

Hyperopt stochastically inputs hyper-parameter settings to TPE. The TPE groups the evaluations of various hyper-parameter settings to best and rest. Essentially, TPE reflects on the history of evaluations seen up-to-date to jump to the next-best setting to explore. The TPE explores the
Assessing the Early Bird Heuristic (for Predicting Project Quality)

Fig. 4. Pseudo-code of DODGE replicated from Reference [2].

best hyper-parameter setting from the history of evaluations seen to date by order. It then selects
the best hyper-parameter options and is then modeled as a Gaussian with its own mean and
standard deviation.

5.3.3 Two-layer ensemble learning (TLEL). Yang et al. in 2017 proposed an ensemble approach
that leverages decision trees with bagging similar to a Random Forest model [132] depicted in
Figure 5. A difference here is that Random Forest uses many decision trees, but in TLEL, the training
data is under-sampled randomly to train many yet different Random Forest models. A commit is
classified by TLEL as defective when most of the stacked and trained random forest models agree
(second layer ensemble).

5.4 No Data Methods
In the past, Menzies et al. showed trivial approaches that use no training information like Manual
Up/Down outperformed in identifying defects compared to complex methods [72]. Recently (2018)
Zhou et al. reported that simple size-based models show a promising predictive performance, there-
fore advising researchers to include Manual Up/Down methods as a baseline while proposing any
new technique [144].

Koru et al. related a module’s defect proneness to its size. In one case with two commercial
projects, they found smaller modules were defective [55] whereas in another they found larger
classes were more defect-prone [56]. Therefore, we include both their methods ManualDown and
ManualUp to label our test commits.

5.5 ManualDown
We label all test commits as defective if the size (“la” in Table 4) is greater than the median size
among the test commits [144]. The philosophy here is more enormous changes should be inspected
first and therefore penalized.
Table 6. This Table Lists Three Baseline Approaches (Where Two of Them Are Cross and the Remaining One Is a Within) along with Three Early-data Variants to Support This Study

| Nature     | Type   | Method      | Pre-processing | # Features (columns) | # of commits (rows) |
|------------|--------|-------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| late-data  | Cross  | Bellwether  | CPS, SMOTE and steps illustrated in §5.1 | Selected by CPS. 5 components with a linear kernel (data supplied with all features) | All commits from the identified cross-project. Pick the first 150 and last 150 commits from the bellwether project. |
|            |        | TCA+ [79]  |                |                      |                     |
| early-data | Cross  | E[dist] (Bellwether) | Steps illustrated in §5.1 in [49, 54, 77] | LA, LT = lines added, lines of code in the file before change | Sample an equal number of defective and clean commits as available in the first 150 commits (not exceeding 75 each). |
|            |        | E[dist] (TCA+) | Steps illustrated in §5.1 | 2 components with the linear kernel (data supplied only with LA and LT) |                     |
| early-data | Within | E [107]    | CPS and steps illustrated in §5.1 | Selected by CPS |                     |
|            |        | E[dist]    | Steps illustrated in §5.1 | LA and LT | (same as above) |
| late-data  | Within | ALL        | CPS, SMOTE and steps illustrated in §5.1 | Selected by CPS | All the commits before the release, which is under test. |

KEY: All early-data sampling methods are shaded (■) and policies proposed in this study are indicated by *. Note, many of these methods used the steps advised in References [49, 54, 77]. Those steps are discussed in Section 5.1. Further, for a discussion on CFS, see Section 5.7.

5.6 ManualUp
We label all test commits as defective if the size ("la" in Table 4) is less than or equal to the median size among the test commits [56]. The philosophy here is more minor changes should be inspected first and therefore penalized.

5.7 Pre-processors
Pre-processing the training and, in some cases, test data, has been shown very effective and necessary in building defect predictors. The following methods are representative of much of the prior research in this field:

- The steps advised by References [53, 77, 105] (see Section 5.1);
- Correlation-based Feature Selection (CFS);
- Synthetic Minority Over-Sampling (SMOTE).

Note: Not all combinations of pre-processing steps are valid. Table 6 shows the types of pre-processing applied for each sampling policy used in this article. Further, we avoid a common threat to validity; we state there that we applied SMOTE only to the training data but not to the test data [4].
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5.7.1 Correlation-based Feature Selection (CFS). CFS is a prevalent feature selection technique proposed by Hall [34] that is often used in building supervised software defect prediction models, especially while building defect predictors [53]. CFS is a heuristic-based technique to incrementally assess a subset of features. Internally, a best-first search is applied to identify influential sets of features that are not correlated with each other. Nevertheless, it should be correlated with the target (classification). Each feature subset is computed as follows: \( \text{merit}_s = \frac{k \cdot r_{cf}}{\sqrt{k + k(k - 1)r_{ff}}} \)

where:

- \( \text{merit}_s \) is the value of subset \( s \) having \( k \) features;
- \( r_{cf} \) is the score that explains the connection of that feature set to the class;
- \( r_{ff} \) is the feature to feature mean and connection between the items in \( s \).

5.7.2 Synthetic Minority Over-Sampling (SMOTE). A sampling technique was proposed by Chawla et al. [20] to handle the class imbalance problem. Because when there is an unequal number of clean and defective commits (or modules, records, etc.) in the training set, classifiers can scuffle to discover the target class. SMOTE is recommended by many researchers in the space of software defect prediction [4, 116].

5.8 Training Data Selection Methods

The essence of this work is how we sample data to train defect predictors, and Figure 6 attempts to portray the same. The Figure 6 shows a set of options from which we can generate a large number of sampling options. For example, training data come from within or be drawn cross from another project. It is helpful to view Figure 6 along with the selection methods listed in Table 6.

Shrikanth et al. identified many sampling strategies (based on recent releases, recent months of data, and all past data) to build predictors in the Within project context [106]. To find representative training data selection methods for the Cross context, we checked the papers listed in Table 2. We found numerous Cross techniques reported in the past decades; for example, Sousuke’s work recently (2020) explored 24 Cross approaches [7]. Overall, in the context of Cross, we found only two (“whole” or “part”). Nevertheless, both “whole” and “part” is late-data, as the focus of this study is to check the efficacy of using early-data approaches in prevalent Cross approaches and not rank numerous Cross techniques.

5.8.1 Cross. We chose two representative Cross techniques, specifically, TCA+ and Bellwether, because:

- \( \text{TCA+} \) is an active Cross technique in this space based on the seminal work by Nam et al. [79].
- \( \text{Bellwether} \) is a recent (2018) baseline approach by Krishna et al. that performed better than \( \text{TCA+} \) [57].

**Bellwether Project (Bellwether):** The bellwether transfer learning method assumes “When a community works on software, then there exists one exemplary project, called the bellwether, which can define predictors for the others.” [57]
Transfer Component Analysis (TCA+): Pan et al. proposed a domain adaptation technique that enables the transition of information between source and target domains [82]. Extending that, Nam et al. stacked many normalization rules on top of TCA to form TCA+ [79]. A specific normalization rule is applied based on the similarity of the dataset characteristics between the source and the target project. Rahul and Menzies [57] report TCA+ to perform better than other transfer methods, namely, Transfer Naive Bayes [66] and Value Cognitive Boosting Learner [99]. TCA+ can be somewhat computationally expensive (both time and memory). To pacify the computational complexity of TCA+ we limit the number of training commits in our experiments. Our prior work endorsed that we should build defect predictors only using the first 150 commits [106]. However, to mitigate any sampling threat in building defect predictors based on TCA+, we sample the earliest 150 commits and the latest (recent) 150 commits of the project data before the project release under test. This is not a sampling threat, because later in Section 6, we find the early-data-lite TCA+ variant performs better than TCA+ trained with 300 commits supporting our early conjecture. For TCA+-related policies listed in Table 6, we reused the implementation from their replication package by Kondo et al., which is an EMSE’19 article about feature reduction techniques on software defect prediction models [53]. The above two techniques use all available cross-project data. We include two Early Cross variants, specifically, Early Bellwether (E\text{size}(Bellwether)), Early TCA+ (E\text{size}(TCA+)) that only uses early cross-project data and only two features.

5.8.2 Within. ALL uses all available past data within the project under test to predict future defects. We create two early variants (E) that use early within project data with all the features (as selected by CFS) and (E\text{size}) is same as E except it uses only two features.

For specific sampling numbers and rules, please refer to Table 6.

5.9 Evaluation Criteria

We use all eight criteria used in the baseline study to gauge the predictors built using various sampling policies. That study consults from widely used measures [9, 28, 49, 54, 68, 73, 114, 116, 123, 131, 135, 137, 138] in the software defect prediction literature.

5.9.1 Brier. The Brier score is the mean squared error (MSE) of the actual outcome \( y \in \{0, 1\} \) (clean or defective) and the predicted probability estimate \( p = \Pr(y = 1) \) for test commits (samples) computed as below:

\[
Brier = \frac{1}{n_{\text{samples}}} \sum_{i=0}^{n_{\text{samples}}-1} (y_i - p_i)^2.
\]

(2)

Numerous software defect prediction papers [54, 68, 114, 116] endorse this measure [87].

5.9.2 Initial number of False Alarms (IFA). Parnin and Orso observed that software developers lose their trust in software analytic tools if those tools report numerous false alarms (clean commits classified as defective commits) [85]. Thus IFA is a number obtained by counting the number of false alarms encountered after sorting the commits in the order of probability of being defect-prone. In other words, IFA is simply the number of false alarms before finding the first true alarm (defective commit).

5.9.3 Recall. Recall is the number of inspected defective commits divided by all the defective commits.

\[
\text{Recall} = \frac{\text{True Positives}}{\text{True Positives} + \text{False Negatives}}
\]

(3)

4https://sailhome.cs.queensu.ca/replication/featred-vs-featsel-defectpred/.
5.9.4 False Positive Rate (PF). PF is the ratio between the number of clean commits predicted as defective to all the defective commits (irrespective of classification).

\[
PF = \frac{\text{False Positives}}{\text{False Positives + True Negatives}}
\]  
(4)

5.9.5 Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic curve (AUC). It is simply the area under the curve between the false-positive rate and true-positive rate.

5.9.6 Distance to Heaven (D2H). D2H, or “distance to heaven,” is computed as an aggregation on two metrics Recall and False Positive Rate (PF), where “heaven” is a place with \( \text{Recall} = 1 \) & \( \text{PF} = 0 \) [22].

\[
D2H = \frac{\sqrt{(1 - \text{Recall})^2 + (0 - \text{PF})^2}}{\sqrt{2}}
\]  
(5)

5.9.7 G-measure (GM). GM is computed as a harmonic mean between the complement of PF and Recall. It is measured as shown below:

\[
G - \text{Measure} = \frac{2 \times \text{Recall} \times (1 - \text{PF})}{\text{Recall} + (1 - \text{PF})}
\]  
(6)

GM and D2H essentially combine the same two measures, \( \text{Recall} \) and \( \text{PF} \). Nevertheless, we still employ those, as they have been used and endorsed separately in the literature. Notably, as seen from results in Reference [106] and in this work shown later in Section 6, it is not necessary that achieving good results on GM would also associate with good D2H (or vice versa).

Due to the nature of the classification process, some criteria will always offer contradictory results:

- A classifier may simply achieve 100% \( \text{Recall} \) just by labeling all the test commits as defective. But as a side-effect, that method will incur a high \( \text{PF} \).
- Second, a classifier may classify all test commits as clean to show 0% \( \text{PF} \), but that method will incur a very low \( \text{Recall} \).
- Last, Brier and Recall are also antithetical, since reducing the loss function implies missing some conclusions lowering \( \text{Recall} \).

5.9.8 Matthew’s Correlation Coefficient (MCC). MCC utilizes all four computations, namely, \( \text{True Positives (TP)} \), \( \text{True Negatives (TN)} \), \( \text{False Positives (FP)} \), and \( \text{False Negatives (FN)} \) of the confusion matrix, such that:

\[
\text{MCC} = \frac{TP \times TN - FP \times FN}{\sqrt{(TP + FP)(TP + FN)(TN + FP)(TN + FN)}}.
\]  
(7)

Thus, many researchers endorse the use of MCC, especially in the space of software defect prediction [54, 134]. It returns a score between \(-1\) and \(+1\), where \(+1\) indicates higher predictive performance, \(-1\) contrary predictions, and \(0\) indicates most of the predictions’ poor predictive performance (random).

Note for the above eight predictive performance measures:

- Initial number of False Alarms range from 0 to \# (maximum number of commits inspected);
- MCC range from \(-1\) to \(1\);
- \(D2H, \text{IFA, Brier, PF}\) of these criteria need to be minimized, i.e., for these criteria \textit{less is better}.
- For four of these \( \text{AUC, Recall, G-Measure, and MCC} \) criteria need to be maximized, i.e., for these criteria, \textit{more is better}.  
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Prior work has shown that precision has significant issues for unbalanced data. We do not include that in our evaluation [73]. Prior reviewers of this article have noted that this might mean we miss certain effects relating to that section of the evaluation space. To address that point, we have added an evaluation metric that draws from multiple “corners” of the evaluation space (see the MCC measure of Section 5.9.8).

5.10 Statistical Tests

Predictors built using each of the sampling policies listed in Table 6 are tested on all appropriate (future) project releases. Then, we compute each of the evaluation criteria discussed above in Section 5.9. Then, each of the scores is grouped and exported by a sampling policy and classifier pair.

To reiterate, each population is a collection of a specific evaluation score. Moreover, populations can have the same median but have an entirely different distribution. Thus, to rank each of those populations of evaluation scores, we use the Scott-Knott test recommended by Mittas et al. in TSE’13 paper [75]. This procedure is a top-down bi-clustering method used to rank different predictors created using different sampling policies and classifiers under a specific evaluation measure. This method sorts a list of $l$ those evaluation scores $ls$ by their median score. Next, it then splits $l$ into sub-lists $m, n$. This is done to maximize the expected value of differences in the observed performances before and after divisions.

For lists $l, m, n$ of size $ls, ms, ns$ where $l = m \cup n$, the “best” division maximizes $E(\Delta)$; i.e., the difference in the expected mean value before and after the split:

$$E(\Delta) = \frac{ms}{ls} \text{abs}(m.\mu - l.\mu)^2 + \frac{ns}{ls} \text{abs}(n.\mu - l.\mu)^2.$$ 

Additionally, a conjunction of bootstrapping and A12 effect size test by Vargha and Delaney [119] is applied to avoid “small effects” with statistically significant results.

**Important note:** We apply the Scott-Knott test independently to all the eight evaluation criteria; i.e., when we compute ranks, we do so for (say) Recall separately to PF. In the rest of this article, when we say “similar,” we mean the distributions in comparison belong to the same Scott-Knott rank (i.e., clustered in the same group), and when we say “better,” we mean the distribution is statistically different (i.e., cannot be clustered into the same group) and favorable (e.g., higher Recall or lower PF).

5.11 Other Details

We wish to report not just performance scores but also offer some details about the model that generates those scores. To that end, we will exploit the bellwether effect. Specifically, we will (a) find the most important features, then (b) use them in bellwethers that represent most of our data.

6 RESULTS

An overview of our experiments is shown in Figure 6. We build defect predictors using the sampling strategies listed in Table 6 and classifiers elucidated in Section 5.2. Then, similar to our prior work [106], we test the built defect predictors in all the project releases.\(^5\)

In this article, the results of RQ1 are used in RQ2 and so on. We do this to eliminate redundant treatments (defect predictors) in our analysis and improve brevity in our results. For instance, we do not build defect predictors using training commits based on recent data (since it was assessed in prior work against early-bird heuristic [106]).

\(^5\)Exception: RQ1 only considers unpopular projects.
6.1 RQ1: Can We Build Early Software Defect Prediction Models from Unpopular Projects?

6.1.1 Motivation. Our prior results that endorsed early methods were scoped to only popular GitHub projects [106]. Choosing only popular projects is a sampling decision often made by many SE researchers in empirical studies to mitigate generalizability threat [76]. As mentioned earlier in Section 5.1, unpopular projects could be non-trivial projects (like homework assignments), and that could affect the conclusion.

On the contrary, a strong argument could be that perhaps popular projects may not realistically represent SE in the real world. In other words, not all projects are fully staffed with a sufficient budget. Therefore, it is necessary and worthy to check the value of early methods on the unpopular sample of projects. To reiterate, in Section 5.1, we elucidate the selection criterion of unpopular and non-trivial SE projects from GitHub. Later, in Section 7, we discuss how we mitigated GitHub SE project sampling threats.

6.1.2 Approach. To check whether the proposed early method works on unpopular projects, we compare defect predictors built by sampling training commits using $E$ with those that sampled all past data, i.e., $ALL$. We do not consider other stratification like the release, or three months, since $ALL$ subsumes more data. Notably, $ALL$ is a prevalent (50%) sampling methods in software defect prediction [106]. Therefore, to assess defect predictors on each project release, we construct the experiment as follows:

- First, we sample training data within the project. The sampling will depend upon either $E$ or $ALL$.
- The sampled training data is pre-processed and appropriate features are selected as listed in Table 4.
- Classifiers listed in Section 5.2 are instantiated with copies of pre-processed training data.
- All the instantiated predictors are tested on all 85 unpopular project releases, and their predictive performance is gauged using seven measures elucidated in Section 5.9.
- Last, their scores (e.g., the population of recall scores) per classifier+policy (pair) is ranked using the Scott-Knott test elucidated in Section 5.10.

To avoid a methodological error, we avoid overlap of train and test commits. For instance, we do not test on project releases before the first 150 commits. Notably, the population of evaluation measures (e.g., Recall) is tested on an equal number of unpopular project releases.

6.1.3 Results. To reiterate, we wanted to check if our early-bird effect identified in our prior work also holds among unpopular GitHub projects [106]. The results shown in Table 7 support our early-bird heuristic even among unpopular GitHub projects, because the policy $E$ uses fewer early data (row #1) and performs just as same as predictors that were built sampled with $ALL$ (all past commits) in row #3.

Early methods are “not” scoped to only popular projects.

6.2 RQ2: Can We Build Early Software Defect Prediction Models with Fewer Features?

6.2.1 Motivation. The prior work showed that it is possible to build operable defect predictors using fewer early project data. One reason for the preceding work was that much of the knowledge required (defects) to build defect predictors were reported within a few months of the project. In this work, we explore that region again to understand which of those 14 features listed in Table 4...
Table 7. “12” within-project Software Defect Prediction Models Tested “Only” in 85 unpopular Projects’ Releases

| Policy | Classifier | Wins | Recall+ | PF- | AUC+ | D2H+ | Brier- | G-Score+ | IFA- | MCC+ |
|--------|------------|------|---------|-----|------|------|--------|---------|------|------|
| E      | LR         | 78   | 50 (30) | 40 (17) | 64 (17) | 41 (22) | 38 (22) | 65 (27) | 1 (4) | 24 (28) |
| E      | SVM        | 67   | 60 (31) | 38 (18) | 64 (18) | 41 (21) | 37 (21) | 63 (30) | 1 (4) | 23 (31) |
| ALL    | SVM        | 6    | 50 (34) | 15 (18) | 65 (25) | 40 (32) | 23 (14) | 54 (51) | 1 (5) | 28 (45) |
| ALL    | RF         | 50   | 50 (32) | 16 (22) | 64 (22) | 42 (28) | 25 (16) | 53 (46) | 1 (4) | 28 (41) |
| ALL    | KNN        | 50   | 50 (33) | 20 (17) | 64 (21) | 40 (25) | 26 (14) | 54 (41) | 1 (4) | 26 (38) |

In the first row, “+” and “-” denote the criteria that need to be maximized or minimized, respectively. All the other rows show combinations of sampling policies and classifiers. Green cells denote “early-data” sampling was employed. Cells marked in gray all have the same top rank as the best results (and those ranks were determined by the Scott-Knott algorithm described in Section 5.10). The “wins” column (see column #3) counts how often a particular sampling policy/classifier achieves a top score. Inter-quartile ranges are indicated within “( ).”

6.2.2 Approach. To answer this RQ, we perform three experiments as follows:

- In the first experiment, we report the frequency of features chosen by CFS while building defect predictors that were sampled using E.
- In the second experiment, we create a new sampling policy (say, \(E_2\)) that only uses the most frequently chosen feature identified in the above step.
- We create two predictors that sampled training commits (pre-processed as listed in Table 6) using E and \(E_2\) and test on all project releases.
- In the third experiment, we also test all project releases using the ManualUp and ManualDown approach (elucidated in Section 5.2) that uses no training information. This is because researchers have advised including such trivial approaches that do not use any training information [144].
- Last, we compare the predictive performance of defect predictors that were built using \(E\), \(E_2\) and ManualDown and ManualUp on all eight evaluation measures listed in Section 5.9 and rank them using the Scott-Knott test elucidated in Section 5.10.

6.2.3 Results. We make the following observations from Figure 7 and Table 8:

Finding Important Features: Shrikanth et al.’s early sampling rule “E” is shown to be adequate for Within [106]. Given that we are building models from such a sample, it is tempting to ask, “does that small sample produce a succinct model?” Note that if this was indeed the case, then we could offer a clear report on what factors most influence defects.

Figure 7 shows the frequency of features selected by the CFS algorithm (see Section 5.7) across all our 240 projects (using just the first 150 commits). To select the "best" features from that space, we build models using the top \(1 \leq x \leq 12\) ranked features, stopping with \(x + 1\) features performed no better than \(x\) features (and here, we are testing all the releases that occurred after the first 150 commits).
Assessing the Early Bird Heuristic (for Predicting Project Quality)

Fig. 7. Frequency of features chosen by the CFS feature selector (using just the first 150 commits) sampled using $E$ in all the 240 projects.

Table 8. “14” Within-project Software Defect Prediction Models Tested in All 240 Project Releases

| Policy | Classifier | Wins | Recall+ | PF+ | AUC+ | D2HI- | Brier- | G-Score+ | IFA- | MCC+ |
|--------|------------|------|---------|-----|------|-------|-------|----------|------|------|
| $E_{size}$ | LR | 75 (40) | 28 (25) | 70 (15) | 34 (17) | 30 (17) | 70 (25) | 1 (3) | 34 (26) |
| $E_{size}$ | SVM | 6 | 73 (44) | 30 (27) | 69 (15) | 35 (19) | 30 (18) | 69 (26) | 1 (3) | 33 (27) |
| - | ManualDown | 86 (25) | 48 (15) | 70 (12) | 36 (11) | 41 (17) | 75 (14) | 1 (4) | 30 (22) |
| $E_{size}$ | KNN | 4 | 70 (41) | 33 (26) | 67 (17) | 37 (19) | 33 (18) | 66 (26) | 1 (3) | 28 (28) |
| $E_{size}$ | NB | 75 (53) | 38 (41) | 63 (17) | 44 (23) | 36 (25) | 61 (35) | 1 (4) | 24 (31) |
| E | LR | 70 (42) | 37 (33) | 63 (16) | 41 (22) | 36 (20) | 62 (30) | 1 (4) | 24 (28) |
| E | SVM | 67 (42) | 33 (31) | 64 (17) | 40 (20) | 34 (19) | 63 (30) | 1 (4) | 25 (28) |
| E | KNN | 66 (43) | 38 (30) | 62 (18) | 42 (20) | 37 (20) | 59 (28) | 1 (4) | 21 (31) |
| $E_{size}$ | RF | 2 | 64 (40) | 31 (30) | 64 (17) | 40 (20) | 33 (18) | 61 (28) | 1 (4) | 25 (30) |
| $E_{size}$ | DT | 62 (39) | 38 (30) | 61 (18) | 43 (19) | 38 (20) | 57 (28) | 1 (4) | 19 (32) |
| E | RF | 60 (46) | 32 (33) | 61 (18) | 43 (21) | 35 (21) | 56 (33) | 1 (4) | 20 (32) |
| E | DT | 56 (46) | 41 (37) | 56 (17) | 49 (22) | 41 (24) | 52 (33) | 2 (5) | 11 (30) |
| E | NB | 50 (75) | 27 (48) | 54 (14) | 55 (30) | 36 (26) | 38 (62) | 2 (7) | 8 (26) |
| - | ManualUp | 0 | 14 (25) | 52 (15) | 30 (12) | 73 (11) | 59 (17) | 16 (27) | 7 (13) | 30 (22) |

In the first row, “+” and “-” denote the criteria that need to be maximized or minimized, respectively. All the other rows show combinations of sampling policies and classifiers. Green cells denote “early-data” sampling was employed. Cells marked in gray all have the same top rank as the best results (and those ranks were determined by the Scott-Knott algorithm described in Section 5.10). The score highlighted in bold red text indicates undesirable PF, despite many wins on other evaluation measures. The “wins” column (see column #3) counts how often a particular sampling policy/classifier achieves a top score. Inter-quartile ranges are indicated within “( ).”

Table 8 shows that models learned from two size-ranked features performed as well as anything else:

- **LA**: Lines of code added
- **LT**: Lines of code in a file before the change

Using the results from Figure 7, we built an early defect predictor only using the top two features “LA” and “LT”. Therefore, $E_7$ becomes $E_{size}$. The results from Table 8 clearly show that $E_{size}$ has more wins than predictors that sampled training commit using $E$; and by extension, to prior result ALL or other stratification like recent release or based on months. While ManualDown is seen at the top of the table due to higher recall, it also produced many false alarms (see row #3 where PF is 48%).
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6.3 RQ3: Can We Build Early Software Defect Prediction Models from Transferring Early Life Cycle Data from Other Projects?

6.3.1 Motivation. Section 5.8 lists both the situations and challenges of when one might need to transfer project data to build defect predictors. Although we cannot solve all Cross-project challenges in one article, we could pacify some of them by checking the efficacy of early methods in this context. If early methods work, then we can transfer relevant data from vast search space (many projects) in less time. Further, we can also reduce the need for data availability, as we will only need a small portion of early data.

6.3.2 Approach. To check the efficacy of Cross-project methods against early methods, we will build predictors using the following sampling strategies below:

- Cross-project methods Bellwether and TCA+
- We created early variants of Cross-project methods Bellwether and TCA+, namely, \( E_{size}(\text{Bellwether}) \) and \( E_{size}(\text{TCA+}) \). The details of these sampling strategies are elucidated in Table 6 and portrayed visually in Figure 6.
- We also include the within-project \( E_{size} \) to compare Cross and Within.
- Note: We do not include ALL or \( E \), because \( E_{size} \) outperformed those sampling strategies in Table 8 and in our prior result [106].

The Cross-projects methods require a representative project among the 240 projects to transfer data from.

Finding Representative Cross-project: Using just LA and LT for each of our projects, we found a model and measured its performance on the other projects. If that median performance was more than 70% “Recall” and less than 30% “PF,” then the model was deemed “satisfactory.” In a result that endorses the use of early life cycle data, Figure 8 shows that more of the models found via the \( E_{size} \) method was “satisfactory” than those found using all the data. That effect is particularly marked in the popular projects.6

---

6Clearly, this analysis might be overly dependent on the “magic numbers” used to select “satisfactory” bellwethers, i.e., 70% “Recall” and less than 30% “PF.” But we have run our experiments using 12 \((i = 12)\) different bellwether projects with nearly equal frequency (see the seven unpopular + 5 popular bellwethers in the middle of Figure 8). The statistical analysis of the 12 \( E_{size} \) (Bellwethers) using Section 5.10 shows that (a) they tie with each other and (b) perform as well or better than the other transfer learning methods explored in this article.
Fig. 9. Time taken (log-scale) to identify qualifying bellwether projects in all 240 projects using Bellwether and $E_{size}(\text{Bellwether})$ policies. Note that in our experiments, we ran on a multi-core cloud-based CPU farm. To collect the data here (which assumes we are running on a single-core machine), we summed the CPU time across all the cores in our experimental rig. We assert that this sum is valid, since, in our experiments, there is nearly no communication between the cores (except that very end to accumulate the results).

Fig. 10. Time taken by different sampling policies to train a model based on the number of commits.

Last, like in previous RQs, we compare the predictive performance of the various defect predictors that were built using different sampling policies on all eight evaluation measures listed in Section 5.9 and rank them using the Scott-Knott test elucidated in Section 5.10. Note: We avoid the methodological error of testing the representative Cross-project in this experiment.

6.3.3 Results. We make the following observations using Table 9, Figure 9, and Figure 10.

- Rows #1 and #2 top of the Table 9 confirm that it is better to build Cross-based predictors using early-data-lite method $E_{size}$ than using sampling strategies that use more data (such as TCA+ or Bellwether).
- Figure 9 and Figure 10 show that it is much faster to identify and build bellwethers from a large pool of projects using $E_{size}$ than Bellwether. This is because $E_{size}$-based predictors need not update (re-train) by accumulating newer project commits for every new project release.
- Row #6 of Table 9 is the position of our prior result [106] that builds predictors using Within $E$ project commits. That proves to show that we can do better than local data if we find good bellwethers.

"Transfer Learning methods perform better (faster and more accurate) when they are sampled using the early method."
| Policy       | Classifier | Wins | Recall+ | PF-  | AUC+ | D2H- | Briar | G-Score+ | IPA- | MCC+ |
|--------------|------------|------|---------|------|------|------|-------|----------|------|------|
| $E_{size}$ (Bellwether) | SVM        | 91 (26) | 40 (34) | 70 (16) | 35 (21) | 35 (23) | 74 (23) | 1 (4) | 32 (26) |
| $E_{size}$ (TCA+)        | SVM        | 88 (33) | 38 (28) | 70 (16) | 35 (19) | 34 (21) | 74 (24) | 1 (4) | 32 (26) |
| $E_{size}$ (Bellwether)  | LR         | 85 (30) | 34 (27) | 73 (15) | 31 (17) | 31 (18) | 76 (20) | 1 (4) | 35 (25) |
| $E_{size}$ (TCA+)        | LR         | 82 (36) | 32 (25) | 72 (16) | 33 (19) | 31 (19) | 74 (22) | 1 (4) | 34 (26) |
| $E_{size}$ (Within)      | KNN        | 79 (50) | 32 (25) | 70 (18) | 35 (20) | 32 (18) | 72 (28) | 1 (5) | 30 (28) |
| $E_{size}$ (Bellwether)  | KNN        | 78 (43) | 30 (26) | 70 (17) | 34 (19) | 30 (19) | 72 (27) | 1 (3) | 32 (27) |
| $E_{size}$ (TCA+)        | RF         | 75 (46) | 31 (24) | 69 (17) | 35 (19) | 32 (18) | 71 (28) | 1 (4) | 30 (28) |
| $E_{size}$ (Bellwether)  | RF         | 81 (41) | 41 (19) | 69 (16) | 36 (15) | 38 (17) | 72 (24) | 2 (5) | 28 (27) |
| $E_{size}$ (Bellwether)  | SVM        | 82 (38) | 34 (30) | 68 (17) | 39 (21) | 38 (22) | 70 (26) | 2 (5) | 25 (28) |
| $E_{size}$ (Bellwether)  | NB         | 88 (33) | 49 (34) | 64 (19) | 42 (22) | 42 (23) | 67 (28) | 2 (5) | 23 (27) |
| $E_{size}$ (TCA+)        | NB         | 82 (38) | 34 (30) | 68 (17) | 39 (21) | 38 (22) | 70 (26) | 2 (5) | 25 (28) |
| $E_{size}$ (Bellwether)  | LR         | 76 (51) | 33 (43) | 67 (16) | 39 (20) | 32 (24) | 66 (34) | 1 (4) | 31 (28) |
| $E_{size}$ (TCA+)        | DT         | 71 (39) | 32 (25) | 67 (19) | 37 (19) | 35 (18) | 67 (27) | 2 (4) | 27 (28) |
| $E_{size}$ (Bellwether)  | DT         | 25 (41) | 6 (10) | 59 (17) | 53 (27) | 20 (16) | 28 (44) | 1 (5) | 24 (39) |
| $E_{size}$ (Bellwether)  | KNN        | 71 (53) | 37 (28) | 64 (20) | 40 (21) | 36 (20) | 65 (33) | 2 (5) | 23 (28) |
| $E_{size}$ (TCA+)        | DT         | 70 (45) | 34 (31) | 64 (20) | 41 (24) | 35 (21) | 64 (40) | 2 (5) | 23 (32) |
| $E_{size}$ (TCA+)        | LR         | 70 (39) | 50 (22) | 61 (22) | 42 (21) | 45 (22) | 64 (28) | 2 (6) | 17 (35) |
| $E_{size}$ (Bellwether)  | NT         | 67 (56) | 39 (38) | 60 (20) | 46 (24) | 38 (24) | 60 (44) | 2 (6) | 17 (32) |
| $E_{size}$ (TCA+)        | NT         | 67 (44) | 30 (26) | 65 (20) | 39 (23) | 33 (19) | 63 (32) | 1 (4) | 25 (32) |
| $E_{size}$ (TCA+)        | NT         | 67 (42) | 37 (25) | 63 (19) | 41 (20) | 38 (18) | 62 (30) | 2 (5) | 20 (30) |
| $E_{size}$ (TCA+)        | RF         | 67 (40) | 34 (23) | 65 (20) | 38 (19) | 35 (18) | 65 (28) | 2 (5) | 24 (28) |
| $E_{size}$ (Bellwether)  | RF         | 50 (60) | 15 (21) | 64 (22) | 41 (32) | 25 (16) | 53 (55) | 1 (5) | 26 (38) |
| $E_{size}$ (TCA+)        | RF         | 50 (50) | 23 (27) | 61 (21) | 45 (25) | 31 (21) | 52 (41) | 2 (5) | 20 (34) |
| $E_{size}$ (TCA+)        | NT         | 50 (50) | 31 (32) | 57 (17) | 48 (23) | 36 (23) | 49 (36) | 2 (6) | 13 (28) |
| $E_{size}$ (TCA+)        | NT         | 50 (40) | 34 (28) | 56 (17) | 49 (21) | 39 (21) | 48 (31) | 2 (6) | 11 (28) |
| $E_{size}$ (Bellwether)  | NT         | 40 (42) | 19 (22) | 57 (18) | 49 (24) | 28 (21) | 42 (36) | 2 (5) | 16 (32) |
| $E_{size}$ (Bellwether)  | DT         | 33 (33) | 13 (12) | 59 (16) | 48 (21) | 24 (16) | 38 (34) | 1 (5) | 19 (32) |
| $E_{size}$ (Bellwether)  | NB         | 0 (23) | 19 (35) | 50 (14) | 61 (22) | 34 (28) | 23 (48) | 3 (9) | 0 (28) |

In the first row, "+" and "-" denote the criteria that need to be maximized or minimized, respectively. All the other rows show combinations of sampling policies and classifiers. Green cells denote "early-data" sampling was employed. Cells marked in gray all have the same top rank as the best results (and those ranks were determined by the Scott-Knott algorithm described in Section 5.10). The "wins" column (see column #3) counts how often a particular sampling policy/classifier achieves a top score. Inter-quartile ranges are indicated within "( )".

6.4 RQ4: Do Complex Methods Supersede Early Software Defect Prediction Models?

6.4.1 Motivation. Our prior work and RQs 1, 2, and 3 have used classifiers with default parameter settings (off the shelf). However, numerous studies, especially in the space of software defect prediction, have shown considerable improvement in predictive performance when the classifiers are tuned [2, 30] or using an ensemble approach [132]. But note the downside of tuning is the runtime overhead.

Therefore, it is essential to check if complex methods such as tuning or ensemble favor sampling policies that use recent (or more) data than those confined to the early regions. It is also motivating to check if early methods can benefit from these complex methods. Perhaps the runtime overheads can be alleviated by working with fewer early data.

6.4.2 Approach. We build predictors using the state-of-the-art methods, specifically, DODGE, Hyperopt, and TLEL elucidated in Section 5.2. RQs 1 to 3 in either Within or Cross context $E_{size}$
Table 10. 7 Within-project Software Defect Prediction Models Tested in All 240 Project Releases

| Policy | Classifier | Wins | Recall+ | PP+ | AUC+ | F1 | D2H- | Brier- | G-Score+ | IFA- | MCC+ |
|--------|------------|------|---------|-----|------|----|------|-------|---------|------|------|
| Esize  | LR         | 7    | 73 (43) | 28 (26) | 70 (15) | 34 (18) | 30 (17) | 69 (26) | 1 (3) | 35 (27) |
| ALL    | TLEL       | 74 (50) | 36 (56) | 61 (20) | 46 (31) | 36 (31) | 54 (46) | 1 (4) | 21 (38) |
| Esize  | TLEL       | 67 (38) | 33 (30) | 64 (17) | 39 (19) | 34 (19) | 62 (27) | 1 (4) | 26 (30) |
| Esize  | HyperOpt   | 27 (60) | 11 (31) | 54 (14) | 56 (28) | 28 (22) | 28 (55) | 2 (11) | 10 (28) |
| Esize  | DODGE      | 100 (80) | 68 (91) | 50 (7) | 71 (17) | 49 (46) | 0 (42) | 3 (9) | 0 (18) |
| ALL    | DODGE      | 100 (80) | 98 (69) | 50 (0) | 71 (3) | 66 (36) | 0 (17) | 4 (9) | 0 (0) |
| ALL    | HyperOpt   | 50 (89) | 40 (66) | 50 (9) | 63 (21) | 44 (30) | 27 (53) | 3 (9) | 0 (21) |

In the first row, “+” and “-” denote the criteria that need to be maximized or minimized, respectively. All the other rows show combinations of sampling policies and classifiers. Green cells denote “early-data” methods (and all other rows employ an optimizer or ensemble approach). Cells marked in gray all have the same top rank as the best results (and those ranks were determined by the Scott-Knott algorithm described in Section 5.10). The “wins” column (see column #3) counts how often a particular sampling policy/classifier achieves a top score. Inter-quartile ranges are indicated within “( ).”

have performed similar or better than prevalent sampling strategies, indicating the importance of early regions of the software project. Therefore, like RQ#3, we create variants of DODGE, Hyperopt, and TLEL using Esize. In other words, we will input fewer early data Esize and use those complex methods to check if they perform better or worse.

The optimizers DODGE and Hyperopt find the best set of hyper-parameters using the commits sampled according to the policy rule (specified in Table 6) to minimize D2H score (elucidated in Section 5.9). We do not sample tuning commits separately; the optimizers sample the tuning commits within the training commit boundary defined by the sampling policy. We note here that we tried to use 50% of the training commits for training and the rest for tuning and used 100% of the commits for both training and tuning; neither stratification impacted the optimizer results.

The optimizers have a huge run-time overhead. Therefore, it is not feasible to test many large models repeatedly on over 10,000+ releases across multiple classifiers. Especially with projects in our samples that have over 10,000 commits (for e.g., homebrew-cask has 98,362 commits). On the other hand, data should not be scarce for optimizers to learn tuning parameters effectively. Hence, we limit optimizers to use up to 957 commits (in the case of ALL). This is because, in RQ1, we confirmed that the project’s popularity has no impact on the results. Hence, we use the median commits (957) of the unpopular projects (see Figure 2(b)), which we think is a reasonable representation of the whole population.

Last, we measure the predictive performance of the above approaches listed in Section 5.9 and rank the predictive performance of defect predictors that were built using the Scott-Knott test elucidated in Section 5.10.

6.4.3 Results. We make the following observations from Table 10:

- Esize (row #1) performs better than all complex methods that use either more data ALL or fewer early data Esize.
- Closest to Esize is the two-layer ensemble method that achieves almost similar results but with more data and more processing. But note TLEL (row #2) was trained on every new project release accumulating more data, whereas Esize or any E-based method is always trained just “once.”

Notably, Figure 11 confirms it is far more faster to build predictors sampled using Esize that neither needs SMOTE nor CFS and is only trained once throughout the project life cycle.
7 THREATS TO VALIDITY

7.1 Sampling Bias

Generalizability of the conclusions will rely on the examples considered; i.e., what is essential here may not be genuine all over. Although the prevalent practice of such empirical studies is to use popular OS GitHub projects, we broaden the scope by including unpopular projects. Nevertheless, all these projects are non-trivial engineering projects developed in numerous programming languages for various domains. Notably, lessons did not vary in either of these two populations of projects.

7.2 Construct Validity

We mined the project samples using Commit Guru. Commit Guru determines risky Commits using a method similar to SZZ [109]. Such an approach despite its prevalence is widely debated for its false positives. To minimize that threat, Commit Guru only considers files that are source-code files and not documents such as readme or PDF files. Commit Guru classifies commit into different categories; one of them is merge-commit. Studies have shown merge commits have little to no influence over making real changes to the software, therefore, in this study, we filter all merge commits.

Last, to further bold the validity of our early effect, we cross-checked our results with the two projects "QT" and "OPENSTACK" used in the 2017 TSE article by McIntosh and Kamei [68] and found our early trend and effect to hold. Please see the early trend of those two projects in Figure 12 and the results in Table 11. Table 11 shows results of defect predictors that sampled training commits using the recent six months (M6) endorsed in Reference [68] versus $E_{size}$ endorsed in this study. Note that our results are compared with 10 classifiers and eight evaluation measures.

7.3 Learner Bias

For identifying bellwethers by all-pairs experiment (each project is tested on all 12,000+ releases), we used only one classifier, "Logistic Regression." This is not to say that using a different qualifier like a 'Random Forest' would also pick the same set of bellwether projects. Using just one classifier in this work may not be a threat for the following two reasons. First a Logistic-Regression is recommended in the baseline study [106] and widely endorsed in classifiers in software defect prediction literature. Second, in all our results in Section 6, Logistic-Regression-based predictors performed similar or better than five other classifiers explored in this study.

Neither Optimizers nor ensemble methods surpass simpler early methods.

Fig. 11. Time taken by different sampling policies to train a model based on the number of commits.
Fig. 12. A repeated pattern where most defects (shaded in red) occur early in the life cycle (before the green dotted line) is also observed among the two projects (QT and OPENSTACK systems) with 37,524 commits assessed recently by McIntosh and Kamei in [68].

Table 11. "12" Within-project Software Defect Prediction Models Tested “Only” in Two Projects “QT” and “OPENSTACK”

| Policy | Classifier | Wins | Recall+ | PF- | AUC+ | D2H- | Brier- | G-Score+ | IFA- | MCC+ |
|--------|------------|------|---------|----|------|------|--------|---------|------|------|
| $E_{size}$ RF | 6 | 71 (13) | 35 (8) | 67 (7) | 33 (6) | 35 (8) | 69 (10) | 5 (7) | 19 (9) |
| $E_{size}$ NB | 5 | 75 (14) | 43 (7) | 67 (9) | 35 (7) | 42 (8) | 71 (9) | 6 (8) | 17 (10) |
| $E_{size}$ SVM | 4 | 67 (18) | 33 (9) | 67 (7) | 34 (8) | 33 (8) | 66 (14) | 4 (7) | 18 (11) |
| $E_{size}$ LR | 64 (16) | 33 (9) | 67 (8) | 33 (8) | 28 (6) | 65 (12) | 4 (8) | 21 (11) |
| $M6$ SVM | 3 | 14 (25) | 6 (5) | 54 (10) | 61 (17) | 13 (7) | 17 (28) | 3 (8) | 9 (16) |
| $M6$ RF | 13 (19) | 4 (5) | 55 (8) | 61 (13) | 9 (10) | 16 (22) | 3 (8) | 11 (17) |
| $M6$ KNN | 20 (13) | 8 (6) | 56 (7) | 56 (9) | 13 (8) | 24 (14) | 3 (7) | 11 (13) |
| $E_{size}$ DT | 67 (18) | 48 (6) | 59 (7) | 42 (6) | 47 (5) | 63 (11) | 7 (9) | 8 (10) |
| $E_{size}$ KNN | 65 (17) | 35 (18) | 65 (7) | 36 (7) | 35 (16) | 65 (13) | 5 (9) | 16 (10) |
| $M6$ DT | 25 (21) | 12 (12) | 55 (7) | 54 (12) | 15 (14) | 28 (22) | 4 (11) | 8 (11) |
| $M6$ NB | 14 (22) | 9 (12) | 52 (8) | 62 (12) | 17 (11) | 17 (21) | 6 (13) | 5 (13) |
| $M6$ LR | 0 | 10 (28) | 10 (13) | 51 (6) | 64 (17) | 17 (12) | 12 (28) | 9 (52) | 1 (10) |

In the first row, “+” and “-” denote the criteria that need to be maximized or minimized, respectively. All the other rows show combinations of sampling policies and classifiers. Green cells denote “early-data” sampling was employed. Cells marked in gray all have the same top rank as the best results (and those ranks were determined by the Scott-Knott algorithm described in Section 5.10). The “wins” column (see column #3) counts how often a particular sampling policy/classifier achieves a top score. Inter-quartile ranges are indicated within “( ).”

Further, an empirical study can only focus on a handful of representative classifiers. Thus, we chose 10 classifiers (Logistic Regression, Nearest neighbor, Decision Tree, Random Forest, and Naive Bayes). These 10 classifiers cover a broad range of classification algorithms [32].

7.4 Evaluation Bias

This article uses both “Recall” and “PF” to identify bellwethers and eight evaluation measures (Recall, PF, IFA, Brier, GM, D2H, MCC, and AUC) to compare the policies extensively. Other widely used measures in software defect prediction are precision and f-measure. However, as mentioned earlier, those threshold-dependant metrics have issues with unbalanced data [73].

7.5 Input Bias

All our proposed sampling policies randomly sample 50 commits from the first 150 commits of the project. Along these lines, it could be true that different executions could yield different results. However, this is not a threat, as our conclusions hold on a large sample size of 12,000+ releases.
8 DISCUSSION

We summarized the results from RQ1 to RQ4 as a simple decision tree drawn in Figure 13. The first rule in the tree eliminated the data-hungry approaches listed in Table 2 by showing that the project under test only requires 25 clean and 25 defective commits to predict post-release defects. The results of this work endorse that practitioners can quickly build an un-tuned $E_{size}$ and $LR$ defect predictor based on two size-based features. More importantly, researchers should use the early-bird treatment as a baseline before trying sophisticated methods.

In the absence of defective commits, the decision tree suggests seeking other projects from the same organization to find a suitable Bellwether project. While Bellwether is not a novel technique, the brute-force process of finding bellwethers can be very expensive, as shown in Figure 9. This work pacifies the $O(n^2)$ process by only looking at the first 150 commits (constant) in each of the bellwether project populations of size “n.” If other projects from the same organization are unavailable due to issues such as data sensitivity, then the tree endorses the use of open-source projects to find a suitable bellwether(s).

In situations when there is no access to data or the inability to find good bellwether projects, we suggest practitioners use ManualDown until their local or other projects from the same organization report more defects (>24). Based on the results of the RQs, we find the complex tuning/ensemble methods and data-hungry sampling methods were needless and thus they are disconnected from the main flow.

8.1 Management Implications

Much prior research has struggled to find stable conclusions that hold across multiple projects. Menzies et al. warn that many global lessons (generalizations) are not supported locally [70]. That is to say, the more data we see, the more exceptions and special cases might appear in the models learned from that data. Such conclusion instability in SE has been often recorded in References [70, 107, 145].

Is that the best we can do? Ideally, SE research can offer stable general software defect prediction principles (such as those seen above) to guide project management, software standards, education,
tool development, and legislation about software. Such conclusion stability would have benefits for trust, insight, training, and tool development.

Trust: Conclusion instability is unsettling for project managers. Hassan [35] warns that managers lose trust in software analytics if its results keep changing. But if we can find stable conclusions (e.g., using early life cycle bellwethers), that would give project managers clear guidelines on many issues, including (a) when a certain module should be inspected; (b) when modules should be refactored; and (c) deciding where to focus on expensive testing procedures.

Insight: Sawyer et al. assert that insights are essential to catalyzing business initiative [102]. From Kim et al. [51] perspective, software analytics is a way to obtain fruitful insights that guide practitioners to accomplish software development goals, whereas for Tan et al. [113] such insights are a central goal. From a practitioner’s perspective, Bird et al. [13] report, insights occur when users respond to software analytics models. Frequent model regeneration can exhaust users’ ability to confident conclusions from new data. In this regard, we note that the early-bird models found would be a stable source of insight for much of the project life cycle.

Tool development and Training: Previously [107], we warned that unstable models make it hard to onboard novice software engineers. Without knowing what factors most influence the local project, it is hard to design and build appropriate tools for quality assurance activities. Hence, here again, the stability of our early life cycle detectors is very useful.

All these problems with trust, insight, training, and tool development can be solved if, early on in the project, a software defect prediction model can be learned that is effective for the rest of the life cycle (which is the main result of this article). Within that data, we have found that models learned after just 150 commits, perform just as well as anything else. In terms of resolving conclusion instability, this is a very significant result, since it means that for much of the life cycle, we can offer stable defect predictors.

One way to consider the impact of such early life cycle predictors is to use the data of Figure 14. That plot shows that software employees usually change projects every 52 months (either moving between companies or changing projects within an organization). According to Figure 14, in seven years (84 months), the majority of workers and managers would first appear on a job after the initial four months are required to learn a defect predictor. Hence, for most workers and managers, the detectors learned via the methods of this article would be the “established wisdom” and “the way we do things here” for their projects. This means that a detector learned in the first four months
would be a suitable oracle to guide training and hiring; the development of code review practices; the automation of local “bad smell detectors”; as well as tool selection and development.

8.2 Systems Implications

Figure 9 shows the runtime required to find bellwether projects in all 240 projects using Bellwether or E_{size}(Bellwether) policies. Note that the early-bird methods use 2.5 months less CPU than the alternative.

Since we only need the first 150 commits to identify a suitable project, many projects in their early stages may be included in the pool of transferable projects. Importantly as seen from Figure 8, 30% “more projects” were qualified in much “less time” when projects are sampled using E_{size}. The choice of bellwether does not matter; perhaps, in practice, practitioners need not continue to look for bellwethers and terminate early as soon as they find the first bellwether. This could also mean lesser privacy concerns and enable practitioners to share less data freely. The early-data nature of our methods can also help to gauge sophisticated techniques like TCA+ faster.

Note: We do not claim E_{size}(Bellwether) is data-lite, because it would still process all the projects in the search space. But we do endorse E_{size} over current methods Bellwether or TCA+. Because E_{size} uses fixed data (150 commits) and does not re-train for every new project release, it is faster and more accurate (see Section 6.3).

Practitioners may feel that retraining defect prediction models for every project release may not be a tedious activity. However, our prior work [106] points out two concerns. First, models that are frequently retrained may yield different conclusions. As seen from Figure 1, information is rich in the earlier periods of the project. When including training data from uninformative regions (training with recent releases or all available data), the model would yield different conclusions. In other words, a commit that was classified as defective could be classified as clean in another project release, causing confusion within teams. Second, it is a methodological error to learn (sample training data) from the shallow end of the project region.

8.3 Research Implications

We have shown that when defect data contains information, that information may be densest in a small part of the historical record of a project. While we have not shown that other kinds of SE data have the same density effect, we would argue that now it is at least an open question: “Have we been learning from the wrong parts of the data?”

Finally, we should now view it as a potential methodological error to reason across all data in a project. In the specific case of software defect prediction, we must now revisit any conclusion based just on later life cycle data There are many examples of such conclusions. For example:

- Hoang et al. say “We assume that older commits changes may have characteristics that no longer effects to the latest commits.” [41]
- Also, it is common practice in software defect prediction to perform “recent validation,” where predictors are tested on the latest release after training from the prior one or two releases [30, 54, 68, 112].

More generally, before researchers focus on later life cycle data, they must first check that their buggy commit data occur at equal frequency across the life cycle. If the buggy commits data is isolated to a specific region, then predictors should be built from that region. This work finds that most buggy commits are found early in the project life cycle.

9 CONCLUSION

Issues with conclusion instability, runtime complexity, and explanations of models improve if we can learn a predictive model early in the life cycle that is effective for the rest of the project.
The prior work on software defect prediction identified the “early bird” heuristic. However, the results were scoped only in the context of within-project defect prediction on popular GitHub projects [106].

We expanded the scope of the early method to simplify software defect prediction. Specifically, the results of this work find that a small early life cycle sample with two features can replace some methods and usefully augment others. For within-project defect prediction, when trying to improve predictive performance, the extra CPU required for (a) ensemble and (b) hyper-parameter optimization is not needed, since sampling from early life cycle data performs better than both (a) and (b). As to transfer learning in cross-company learning, this work recommends that a small early life cycle sample on cross-project learning is significantly better than using the entire cross-project life cycle data.

As for future work, perhaps we can simplify many SE tasks using the “early bird” heuristic.
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