Evaluation of Version Control Merge Tools

Benedikt Schesch ETH Zürich

Ryan Featherman Microsoft



ETHzürich

Kenneth J. Yang University of Washington

Ben R. Roberts University of Washington

Michael D. Ernst University of Washington

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON





Merging Algorithms make mistakes

Too conservative algorithms





Incorrect Merges

AST merge can **solve** this

AST Merging (Spork, IntelliMerge)



AST (abstract syntax tree)

Is AST Merging any good?

No one knows!

Problems with previous evaluations:

- 1. Few tool comparisons
- 2. Cost of incorrect merges
- 3. Unrepresentative merges
 - Cherry-picked examples
 - Main branch only

Problem 1: Which merge tools?

Compared 16 merge tools

Do complex merging algorithms outperform simple heuristics?

- Imports: Resolve Java *import* conflict
 - Spork and IntelliMerge do this
- Version-Numbers: Resolve version numbers conflicts
- I+Vn: Combines Imports and Version-Numbers

Problem 2: Incorrect merges

Old Methodology

	Conflict	Merged		
		Correctly	Incorrectly	
Git Merge	51%	46% 49	% 3%	
Spork [1]	35%	54% 65	% 11%	
IntelliMerge [2]	26%	24% 74	% 50%	R

Which is best depends on #conflicts and #incorrect

Dataset: >6k merges with good test coverage

[1] Larsén et al. (2023). Spork: Structured merge for Java with formatting preservation. IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng., 49(01), 64–83.
[2] Shen et al. (2019). IntelliMerge: A refactoring-aware software merging technique. In OOPSLA 2019 (pp. 170:1–170:28). Athens, Greece.

Which merge algorithm is the best?

 $k = \frac{\text{Cost of incorrect merge}}{\text{Cost of unhandled merge}}$

 $Cost(T) = numUnhandled(T) + numIncorrect(T) \times k$

 $EffortReduction(T) = \frac{Cost(Manual) - Cost(T)}{Cost(Manual)}$

Effort Reduction Results



Problem 3: Features branches are harder Feature branches

Main branches



(not in Git history)

Contributions

1. New methodology corrects 3 problems with previous merge evaluations:

- Many merge tools
- Cost of incorrect merges (changes the ranking)
- Feature branch merges
- 2. Created new tools that outperform all others.
- 3. Simple tools outperform complex ones. The research community should reward effectiveness.

4. Our merge tools, experimental scripts, and data are public.

Git Evaluation Results

Merges					
Correct		Unhandled		Incorre	
#	%	#	%	#	
2748	46%	3078	51%	157	
2889	48%	2905	49%	189	
2748	46%	3078	51%	157	
2748	46%	3078	51%	157	
2748	46%	3078	51%	157	
2751	46%	3074	51%	158	
2703	45%	3124	52%	156	
	Corr # 2748 2889 2748 2748 2748 2748 2748 2748 2751 2703	Correct#%274846%288948%274846%274846%274846%275146%270345%	Correct Unhan # % # 2748 46% 3078 2889 48% 2905 2748 46% 3078 2748 46% 3078 2748 46% 3078 2748 46% 3078 2748 46% 3078 2748 46% 3078 2748 46% 3078 2751 46% 3074 2703 45% 3124	MergesCorrectUnhandled#%#%274846%307851%288948%290549%274846%307851%274846%307851%275146%307451%270345%312452%	Merges Unhandled Incom # % # % # 2748 46% 3078 51% 157 2889 48% 2905 49% 189 2748 46% 3078 51% 157 2748 46% 3078 51% 157 2748 46% 3078 51% 157 2748 46% 3078 51% 157 2748 46% 3078 51% 157 2748 46% 3078 51% 157 2748 46% 3078 51% 157 2748 46% 3078 51% 157 2748 46% 3074 51% 158 2703 45% 3124 52% 156





Merge tools we did not evaluate

- Many other tools only have only a GUI interface, unsuitable for automated testing
- DeepMerge and MergeBERT are not publicly available making it impossible to evaluate
- JDime discards comments, file headers and arbitrarily reorders methods and fields. Often requires more than 15 minutes for a merge.

General notes on merge tools

- Sporks implementation is buggy (in discussion with maintainers to fix it), underlying algorithm might still be competitive
- Intellimerge compared itself to git but only on a few examples where git failed and refactoring was the main problem. Implementation is also buggy and non deterministic.
- Many other tools only have only a GUI interface, unsuitable for automated testing
- DeepMerge and MergeBERT are not publicly available making it impossible to evaluate

Character Merge Case Analysis

Adjacent Case Analysis

<<<<< LEFT

String comments = SourcesHelper.readerToString(reader); CompilationUnit cu = new JavaParser().setSource(comments).parse(); |||| BASE String comments = SourcesHelper.readerToString(reader); CompilationUnit cu = new InstanceJavaParser(comments).parse(); _____

String comments = readerToString(reader); CompilationUnit cu = new InstanceJavaParser(comments).parse(); >>>>> RIGHT

Adjacent Case Analysis

```
<<<<< LEFT
synchronized (cacheMap) {
   List<DNSEntry> entryList = cacheMap.get(dnsEntry.getKey());
   if (entryList != null) {
       entryList.remove(dnsEntry);
|||| BASE
List<DNSEntry> entryList = this.get(dnsEntry.getKey());
if (entryList != null) {
   synchronized (entryList) {
       entryList.remove(dnsEntry);
_____
List<DNSEntry> entryList = this.get(dnsEntry.getKey());
if (entryList != null) {
   synchronized (entryList) {
       result = entryList.remove(dnsEntry);
>>>>> RIGHT
/* Remove from DNS cache when no records remain with this key */
if (result && entryList.isEmpty()) {
   this.remove(dnsEntry.getKey());
```

Merge Result:

```
synchronized (cacheMap) {
   List<DNSEntry> entryList = cacheMap.get(dnsEntry.getKey());
   if (entryList != null) {
      result = entryList.remove(dnsEntry);
   }
}
/* Remove from DNS cache when no records remain with this key */
if (result && entryList.isEmpty()) {
   this.remove(dnsEntry.getKey());
}
```


Testing infrastructure: https://github.com/benedikt-schesch/AST-Merging-Evaluation

Merging Tool:

https://github.com/plume-lib/merging

Git Merging Algorithm

- Adjacent: Merge two adjacent lines as opposed to Git
- Hires merge uses exactly the same idea as git but operates at a character level instead of a line level 19

- Patience: Improve readability and avoid spurious matches
- Histogram: Similar to patience but construct a histogram of element occurrence

Motivation

Old Methodology

	Conflict	Merged
Git Merge	51%	49%
Spork [1]	35%	65%
IntelliMerge [2]	26%	74%

Git Inte

[1] Larsén et al. (2023). Spork: Structured merge for Java with formatting preservation. IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng., 49(01), 64–83. [2] Shen et al. (2019). IntelliMerge: A refactoring-aware software merging technique. In OOPSLA 2019 (pp. 170:1–170:28). Athens, Greece.

Best

Our Methodology

		Merged		
	Conflict	Correctly	Incorrectly	
t Merge	51%	46%	3%	
Spork	35%	54%	11%	
elliMerge	26%	24%	50%	V

20

