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ABSTRACT

Users use Issue Tracking Systems to keep track and manage issue reports in their repositories. An issue is a rich source of software information that contains different reports including a problem, a request for new features, or merely a question about the software product. As the number of these issues increases, it becomes harder to manage them manually. Thus, automatic approaches are proposed to help facilitate the management of issue reports. This paper describes CatIss, an automatic Categorizer of Issue reports which is built upon the Transformer-based pre-trained RoBERTa model. CatIss classifies issue reports into three main categories of Bug report, Enhancement/feature request, and Question. First, the datasets provided for the NLBSE tool competition are cleaned and preprocessed. Then, the pre-trained RoBERTa model is fine-tuned on the preprocessed dataset. Evaluating CatIss on about 80 thousand issue reports from GitHub, indicates that it performs very well surpassing the competition baseline, TicketTagger, and achieving 87.2% F1-score (micro average). Additionally, as CatIss is trained on a wide set of repositories, it is a generic prediction model, hence applicable for any unseen software project or projects with little historical data. Scripts for cleaning the datasets, training CatIss and evaluating the model are publicly available.1
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1 INTRODUCTION

Issue reports are used for communication, decision making, and collecting users’ feedback in software repositories. Any GitHub user can contribute to the progress of a project using issue reports. Users open issue reports for different reasons including reporting a bug, requesting a new feature, asking for improvement, asking questions, and asking for support.

Issues in software repositories must have a title, a description, and a state (open/closed). They can also have additional data such as labels, assignees, milestone, timestamps, author association, comments, and more. Issue description usually includes useful information about the reported problem and even code snippets to elaborate on the reported problem. Moreover, each issue can have several labels such as bug report to denote the goal behind opening the issue. Labels, as a sort of metadata, describe the goal and content of an issue. They are mainly used for categorizing, managing, searching, and retrieving issues. Thus, assigning labels to issues facilitates task assignment, maintenance, and management of a software project. Cabot et al. [1] analyzed about three million non-forked GitHub repositories to investigate the label usage and its impact on resolving issues. They showed only about 3% of these repositories had labeled issues. Furthermore, in the repositories which incorporated issue labeling, only about 58% of issues were labeled. The authors showed addressing an issue and the engagement rate both have a high correlation with the number of labeled issues in a repository [1]. Recently, Liao et al. [7] investigated the effect of labeling issues on issue management and found labeled issues were addressed immediately, while unlabeled issues could remain open for a long time.

As the number of users and reported issues increases, efficient and timely management of issue reports becomes harder. Team members should address these issues as soon as possible to keep their audience engaged and improve their software product. Thus, automatic approaches for managing issues are proposed. However, their accuracy can be improved by using contextual information better.

In this tool paper, using data-driven approaches, The author fine-tunes a Transformer-based pre-trained RoBERTa-based model to predict the category of issue reports. These categories are the three frequent reasons for opening an issue, namely Bug reports, Enhancement requests, and Questions. CatIss achieves 87.2% F1-score as the micro average score for all three categories of issues. Furthermore, CatIss obtains 89.6%, 87.9%, and 69.1% of per class F1-score for bugs, enhancements, and questions, respectively. As CatIss is built using a Transformer architecture, it is able to better utilize the contextual information in issue reports, hence providing more accurate predictions. CatIss surpasses TicketTagger [5, 6], the baseline approach in all categories and for all metrics. More importantly, based on the Recall score of classes, CatIss significantly outperforms TicketTagger by 89% for the Question category. Compared to Bug and Enhancement, “Question” is the least-represented class in the datasets, and consequently suffered from weak accuracy scores in previous studies. However, CatIss is able to obtain much higher
results. CatIss is open source and can be accessed on GitHub. The Jupyter notebooks describe data processing, model training, and evaluation. Note that this work is based on our previous study on the management of issue reports through categorization and prioritization [2].

## 2 TOOL DESCRIPTION

The author first cleans and pre-processes the dataset provided for the NLBSE tool competition [4]. Then, she proceeds to fine-tune the pre-trained Transformer-based RoBERTa model [8] on the pre-processed data, and finally, evaluates it on the competition test set. In the following, CatIss will be described in more detail. Figure 1 presents a concise summary of the proposed approach.

### 2.1 Preprocessing Data

Data processing techniques used to clean the provided training set are as follows. Using the “describe” function of the Pandas dataframes, it is evident that the training set consists of duplicate issue reports. Thus, the author first removes the duplicate issues using their issue URL as their unique ID. This process removes 26220 from the 722899 available issues in the training set. Note that deduplication is only performed on the training set to avoid modifying the samples’ distribution in the test set.

Next, the author performs normalization on the text of issue titles and bodies. Normalization refers to the technique of replacing the content of a concept in the text with the name of that concept. For instance, function names are extracted using regular expressions and replaced with a fixed token (FUNCTION). Text normalization is conducted with two objectives; (1) to keep the existence of a function in text, and (2) to reduce the vocabulary size for the machine learning models [3].

Then, punctuation marks, and non-ASCII characters are removed from both title and body of issues. Next, the text in titles and bodies is converted to lower case. The base URL of repositories (https://api.github.com/repos/) is also removed from the repository_url column as it does not provide additional information for the model.

In the end, the text columns in both train and test datasets are truncated based on the average and median number of tokens in issue titles and bodies of the train set. Note that one must not rely on the test set’s statistical information as the model will not see the test set before training. The average numbers of tokens for issue titles and bodies after cleaning are 6 and 49 tokens. Also, the median number of tokens for the latter is about 100 token. Hence, the cutoff point is to 200 tokens in the text column. Note that the issue classes in the label column (bug, enhancement, and question) are also converted to their categorical codes (0, 1, 2) and then fed to the model.

### 2.2 Model Training

For the past few years, Transformers have significantly impacted the Natural Language Processing (NLP) domain. Now, Pre-trained models such as Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) can be fine-tuned using additional outputs layers to create state-of-the-art models for a wide range of NLP tasks, without major task-specific architecture modifications. Based on our recent study on issue report management [2], CatIss adapts a Robustly-optimized BERT approach (RoBERTa) and fine-tunes it [8]. RoBERTa, developed by Facebook [8], includes additional pre-training improvements using only unlabeled text from the web, with minimal fine-tuning and no data augmentation. The authors modified the Masked Language Modeling (MLM) task in the BERT using dynamic masking. The authors also eliminated the Next Sentence Prediction (NSP) task since Facebook’s analysis indicated...
was trained using larger mini-batch sizes compared to BERT. The training and test sets provided by the NLBSE workshop are evaluated using standard measures of evaluating classifiers, namely

\begin{align}
P_e &= \frac{TP_e}{TP_e + FP_e} \\
R_e &= \frac{TP_e}{TP_e + FN_e} \\
F_{1,e} &= \frac{2 \cdot P_e \cdot R_e}{P_e + R_e} \\
P &= \sum TP_e \\
R &= \sum (TP_e + FN_e) \\
F_1 &= \frac{2 \cdot P \cdot R}{P + R}
\end{align}

3.3 Implementation

The author uses HuggingFace Transformers\(^3\), PyTorch\(^4\), and SimpleTransformers\(^5\) libraries to train CatIss. She fine-tunes the pre-trained RoBERTa model accessible through the HuggingFace API\(^6\).

The author also sets the learning rate to 3\(^5\), the number of epochs to 4, the maximum input length to 200 and the training and evaluation batch sizes to 100. Experiments are conducted on a machine equipped with Ubuntu 16.04, 64-bit as the operating system, two GeForce RTX 2080 GPU cards, AMD Ryzen Threadripper 1920X CPU with 12 core processors, and 64G RAM. Training lasts for four hours and 20 minutes.

4 RESULTS

Table 1 presents CatIss’s results on classifying issues of the test set compared to the provided baseline, TicketTagger\([5]\) and an additional baseline, Logistic Regression (LR) as a classical classifier.

As depicted, CatIss is outperforming the baselines, and achieving an F1-score of 0.872 (micro average). Note that the more populated categories (Bug, and Enhancement), obtain higher classification results for all metrics compared to the less-represented class, Question. This is probably due to two reasons; (1) the fewer number of samples for this class, (2) the diversity of information and vocabulary in this category. Nonetheless, CatIss significantly outperforms TicketTagger for the Question category (by 89% based on the Recall). Compared to Bug and Enhancement, “Question” is the least-represented class in the datasets, and consequently has suffered from weak accuracy scores in the previous studies. However, CatIss, utilizing contextual information using its transformer architecture and the knowledge transferred from the pre-trained model, is able to obtain higher scores for this class, specifically for Recall and F1-measure. It is worth mentioning that the author also performed a data ablation study. The results of this experiment indicated that including and concatenating the five sources of information reviewed in Section 2.1 provide better results.

\(^3\)https://huggingface.co
\(^4\)https://pytorch.org/
\(^5\)https://github.com/ThilinaRajapakse/simpletransformers
\(^6\)https://huggingface.co/api/models/roberta-base
Table 1: Classification Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>CatIss</th>
<th>TicketTagger [5]</th>
<th>Logistic Regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bug</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Avg</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 RELATED WORK
Kallis et al. [5, 6] has proposed TicketTagger, a tool based on FastText for classifying issues to three categories of Bug, Enhancement, and Question. These categories are among the default labels of the GitHub issue system. They trained their model on the text (title and description) of 30K issue reports from about 12K GitHub repositories. Their evaluation reports 82%, 76%, and 78% of precision/recall scores for three classes of Bug, Enhancement, and Question, respectively. Recently, BEE was proposed by Song and Chaparro [9], which uses the pre-trained model of TicketTagger to label issues. Then it proceeds to identify the structure of bug descriptions from predicted reportsthat are predicted to be a bug in the issue-objective prediction phase. In our recent study [2], we propose two models to first extract issues’ objectives and then prioritize them using the predicted objectives and other issue features. CatIss is based on this study.

6 CONCLUSIONS
CatIss is an automatic categorizer of issue reports that is built upon the Transformer-based pre-trained RoBERTa model. CatIss categorizes issue reports into three main categories of Bug, Enhancement, and Question. CatIss is trained on the provided training set for the NLBSE tool competition and achieves 87.2% F1-score (micro average) on the test set. Specifically, CatIss significantly outperforms TicketTagger, the main baseline by 89% based on the Recall score of the Question class. Scripts for cleaning the datasets, training CatIss and evaluating the model are publicly available. 7
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