

# From Lab to Reality: A Practical Evaluation of Deep Learning Models and LLMs for Vulnerability Detection

Chaomeng Lu  
chaomeng.lu@kuleuven.be  
DistriNet Group-T, KU Leuven  
Leuven, Belgium

Bert Lagaisse  
bert.lagaisse@kuleuven.be  
DistriNet Group-T, KU Leuven  
Leuven, Belgium

## Abstract

Vulnerability detection methods based on deep learning (DL) have shown strong performance on benchmark datasets, yet their real-world effectiveness remains underexplored. Recent work suggests that both graph neural network (GNN)-based and transformer-based models, including large language models (LLMs), yield promising results when evaluated on curated benchmark datasets. These datasets are typically characterized by consistent data distributions and heuristic or partially noisy labels. In this study, we systematically evaluate two representative DL models—ReVeal and LineVul—across four representative datasets: Juliet, Devign, BigVul, and ICVul. Each model is trained independently on each respective dataset, and their code representations are analyzed using t-SNE to uncover vulnerability related patterns. To assess realistic applicability, we deploy these models along with four pretrained LLMs, Claude 3.5 Sonnet, GPT-o3-mini, GPT-4o, and GPT-5 on a curated dataset, VentiVul, comprising 20 recently (May 2025) fixed vulnerabilities from the Linux kernel. Our experiments reveal that current models struggle to distinguish vulnerable from non-vulnerable code in representation space and generalize poorly across datasets with differing distributions. When evaluated on VentiVul, our newly constructed time-wise out-of-distribution dataset, performance drops sharply, with most models failing to detect vulnerabilities reliably. These results expose a persistent gap between academic benchmarks and real-world deployment, emphasizing the value of our deployment-oriented evaluation framework and the need for more robust code representations and higher-quality datasets.

## Keywords

Deep learning, Large Language Models, Vulnerability Detection, Code Representation

## 1 Introduction

Software vulnerabilities remain a persistent and critical threat in modern computing environments, enabling attackers to exploit bugs for unauthorized access, data leakage, or system compromise [3]. Over the years, numerous high-profile breaches have demonstrated that even a single vulnerability can lead to significant economic losses and reputational damage [50]. As the scale and complexity of codebases increase, manually auditing source code for potential vulnerabilities becomes not only impractical but also error-prone [38]. In response, the research community and industry have turned to automation, leading to the development of a variety of techniques for detecting vulnerabilities automatically [28, 44, 48].

In recent years, deep learning models [7, 17, 36] and LLMs-based approaches [25, 46, 51] have achieved state-of-the-art results on widely used benchmark datasets such as Juliet [4], Devign [53],

and BigVul [14]. These datasets have accelerated research progress by providing standardized evaluation environments that facilitate direct comparisons between different methods. However, these datasets suffer from issues such as limited size, low label quality, synthetic constructs, or duplication, which raise concerns about their representativeness [8, 11, 12]. Our primary motivation arises from a critical observation about existing research. DL-based vulnerability detection models have seldom been rigorously evaluated in deployment-oriented, realistic settings involving novel or previously unseen vulnerabilities. Public datasets frequently rely on synthetic or heuristically labeled samples, which may fail to capture the full diversity and complexity of real-world vulnerabilities [11, 21]. Moreover, most existing studies adopt a closed-world assumption, where training and test data are drawn from similar distributions, often leading to overly optimistic performance estimates [6, 7]. Addressing this gap requires not only assessing model performance but also understanding how representations, dataset characteristics, and model design influence their practical effectiveness. To this end, we investigate three complementary research questions:

- **RQ1:** How effectively do current code representation methods capture distinctions between vulnerable and non-vulnerable code?
- **RQ2:** What factors influence the performance of current deep learning models on benchmark vulnerability datasets in controlled lab settings?
- **RQ3:** How well do current deep learning and large language models generalize to detecting novel vulnerabilities in deployment settings?

To address these questions, we designed a deployment-oriented evaluation framework for assessing vulnerability detection models, as shown in Figure 2. We selected two widely studied deep learning-based models—ReVeal and LineVul [7, 17]—and evaluated them on four public datasets (Juliet [4], BigVul [14], Devign [53], and ICVul [24]) as well as a newly curated out-of-distribution test set, VentiVul. Our evaluation proceeds in three systematic steps: first, we assess the quality of the learned representations using t-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (t-SNE) and Centroid Distance; next, we evaluate model performance through both within-dataset and cross-dataset experiments; finally, we examine deployment behavior using our newly proposed Whole-File and Function-Pair evaluation methods, in which we also incorporate four LLMs.

The novelty of this work lies in its comprehensive and deployment-oriented perspective. Our key contributions are summarized as follows:

- We analyze code representations produced by ReVeal and LineVul across four benchmark datasets, revealing significant limitations in their ability to separate vulnerable and non-vulnerable code.
- We investigate cross-dataset generalization, uncovering key factors that impact model robustness and the reliability of common evaluation metrics
- We evaluate the performance of both DL models and LLMs on VentiVul and observe significant performance degradation, underscoring their limited ability to generalize in practical settings.
- We manually construct a small but high-quality out-of-distribution vulnerability dataset and design a deployment-oriented evaluation framework introducing two novel modes, Whole-File and Function-Pair.

Together, these contributions form a unified and reproducible framework for evaluating the reliability, transferability, and robustness of vulnerability detection models under both controlled and deployment-oriented conditions. Overall, our findings provide strong empirical evidence that, despite recent progress, current DL-based vulnerability detection techniques remain insufficiently robust for real-world deployment. All of our datasets, code, and results are available at the following link<sup>1</sup>.

## 2 Datasets

This section describes the benchmark datasets used in our experiments. We present four widely-used vulnerability detection datasets and our newly curated, out-of-distribution, temporally separated evaluation dataset.

### 2.1 Benchmark Datasets

We utilize four benchmark datasets commonly used in vulnerability detection research. Each, however, has limitations—such as small size, low label quality, synthetic constructs, or imbalance. These issues raise concerns about their representativeness and suitability for evaluating real-world performance.

**Juliet** [4] is a large synthetic dataset developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). It contains small, labeled C/C++ code snippets with vulnerabilities corresponding to various CWE types. It is often used for benchmarking due to its controlled and well-labeled nature.

**Devign** [53] contains C/C++ functions from open-source GitHub projects FFMpeg and Qemu, labeled as vulnerable or non-vulnerable manually. It offers a realistic but smaller dataset than BigVul. The dataset focuses on function-level vulnerability detection, making it suitable for fine-grained analysis and DL approaches.

**BigVul** [14] is a large-scale dataset mined from commit histories of open-source C/C++ repositories. Vulnerable functions were identified based on rule-based matching of security-related commits, with buggy versions labeled as vulnerable, and both their fixes and unrelated unchanged functions labeled as non-vulnerable.

**ICVul** [24] is a high-quality software vulnerability dataset addressing challenges in label quality, diversity, and comprehensiveness. It focuses on CVEs linked to GitHub fix commits, extracting

relevant functions, files, and metadata. It uses the SZZ algorithm to trace vulnerability-contributing commits and the ESC (Eliminate Suspicious Commit) technique to improve label reliability.

Table 1 presents a comparative overview of four selected datasets. Key characteristics include the number of functions (*# of Functions*), the proportion of vulnerable samples (*Vul Ratio*), vulnerability label accuracy (*Label Acc*), availability of CWE type annotations (*CWE*), and type of data collection method (*Type*). For Juliet, Devign, and BigVul, *Label Acc* is based on prior studies [8, 11]. For ICVul, we manually evaluated label accuracy by randomly sampling 50 vulnerable functions, identifying their corresponding patch commits, and validating labels based on commit messages and code changes. The *Type* column describes how vulnerability functions were collected: synthetically generated (Juliet), manually selected (Devign), or collected from real-world patch data (BigVul and ICVul).

**Table 1: Comparative analysis of selected benchmark datasets.**

Dataset	# of Functions	Vul Ratio	Label Acc	CWE	Type
Juliet	253,002	37%	100%	YES	Synthetic
Devign	27,318	46%	80%	NO	Manual
BigVul	188,636	6%	25-54%	YES	Patches
ICVul	15,396	41%	92%	YES	Patches

### 2.2 Out-of-distribution Evaluation Dataset

To further evaluate the performance of state-of-the-art models that have shown promising results under controlled experimental settings. We constructed a new, small-scale evaluation dataset, which we name **VentiVul**. To ensure high relevance and minimize external interference, the collection process was conducted fully manually and involved careful human inspection at each step. Specifically, we retrieved all Linux-related CVE reports disclosed in May 2025 from the official CVE database. Each report was then manually examined to identify those containing explicit fix commits with detailed code changes. We excluded CVEs lacking fix information, missing commit messages that clearly indicated vulnerability-related changes, or referring to historical issues, thereby ensuring that all selected samples corresponded to recently reported and verifiable vulnerability fixes.

To include diversity in our evaluation dataset, we deliberately included vulnerabilities arising from different root causes, as illustrated in Figure 1. For example, Figure 1a shows CVE-2025-37791, in which the associated fix modified a single function within a file to address a potential stack corruption issue. Figure 1b presents CVE-2025-37777, where two functions across two files were modified to fix a use-after-free vulnerability. Our manual analysis revealed that most vulnerabilities—such as CVE-2025-37791—affect a single function within a file, whereas more complex cases involve interdependent or cross-file modifications.

For each CVE, we extracted the vulnerable and patched versions of affected functions directly from the corresponding Git commits. These were carefully aligned to form function pairs, labeled as vulnerable (1, before-fix) and non-vulnerable (0, after-fix). To provide

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/Chaomeng-Lu/A-Practical-Evaluation-of-Deep-Learning-Models-and-LLMs-for-Vulnerability-Detection.git>

additional context and challenge for model evaluation, we also included non-vulnerable functions from the same files that were unrelated to the fix. In total, we collected 25 function pairs (each consisting of a vulnerable and a patched version) from the 20 selected Linux CVEs. These pairs span 21 distinct .c source files and include 835 unrelated functions from the same files, providing a realistic and challenging testbed for vulnerability detection models.

```
/net/ethtool/cmis_cdb.c
@@ -346,7 +346,7 @@ ethtool_cmis_module_poll(struct net_device
 *dev,
 struct netlink_ext_ack extack = {};
 int err;
- ethtool_cmis_page_init(&page_data, 0, offset, sizeof(rpl));
+ ethtool_cmis_page_init(&page_data, 0, offset, sizeof(*rpl));
page_data.data = (u8 *)rpl;
err = ops->get_module_eeprom_by_page(dev, &page_data, &extack);
```

(a) Fix for CVE-2025-37791: single-function modification addressing stack corruption

```
/fs/smb/server/connection.c
@@ -39,8 +39,10 @@ void ksmbd_conn_free(struct ksmbd_conn *conn)
xa_destroy(&conn->sessions);
kvfree(conn->request_buf);
kfree(conn->preauth_info);
- if (atomic_dec_and_test(&conn->refcnt))
+ if (atomic_dec_and_test(&conn->refcnt)) {
+ ksmbd_free_transport(conn->transport);
kfree(conn);
+ }
}
```

```
/fs/smb/server/transport_tcp.c
@@ -93,17 +93,21 @@ static struct tcp_transport
*alloc_transport(struct socket *client_sk)
-static void free_transport(struct tcp_transport *t)
+void ksmbd_free_transport(struct ksmbd_transport *kt)
{
- kernel_sock_shutdown(t->sock, SHUT_RDWR);
- sock_release(t->sock);
- t->sock = NULL;
+ struct tcp_transport *t = TCP_TRANS(kt);
+ ksmbd_conn_free(KSMBD_TRANS(t)->conn);
+ sock_release(t->sock);
kfree(t->iiov);
kfree(t);
}
+static void free_transport(struct tcp_transport *t)
+{
+ kernel_sock_shutdown(t->sock, SHUT_RDWR);
+ ksmbd_conn_free(KSMBD_TRANS(t)->conn);
+}
```

(b) Fix for CVE-2025-37777: multi-function and multi-file modification for use-after-free vulnerability

**Figure 1: Examples of code Modifications in selected CVE fixes from the VentiVul.**

### 3 Methodology and Experiment Design

To address our research questions, we propose a deployment-oriented evaluation framework for assessing vulnerability detection models, as illustrated in Figure 2. This framework provides a systematic basis for our methodology. In this section, we first describe the selection of benchmark models and datasets. We then present the research questions along with their motivations and corresponding experimental designs. Finally, we detail the evaluation metrics used for analyzing both code representation methods and deep learning models.

#### 3.1 Benchmark Selection

To conduct a comprehensive study on DL-based vulnerability detection, we systematically reviewed well-known published datasets and models starting from publications on key conferences and in key journals: ICSE, TSE, EMSE, TOSEM, JSS, MSR, FSE, PROMISE, RAID, NeurIPS. Our benchmark selection was guided by the goal of evaluating models across a diverse range of conditions—spanning both controlled environments and real-world scenarios—to thoroughly assess their generalizability and robustness from a dataset perspective. For the purpose of this study, we consulted recent papers up to a set date (May 2025) to ensure broad coverage of relevant models, while acknowledging that some works may have been missed.

**3.1.1 Model Selection.** We categorized existing models based on the type of code representations they employ, considering only those that are representative and widely used as baselines in prior work. While newer models exist, they generally fall into the same two categories, with only incremental improvements. The models we considered include Devign [53], DeepWukong[9], Reveal [7], IVDetect [22], LineVul [17], LineVD [20], DeepVD [41], AMPLE [42], EPVD [47], LIVABLE [43], MGVD [34], and GRACE [25]. Broadly, these approaches can be grouped into two main categories:

a. **Graph-based representations** are typically obtained using tools like Joern, which extract Abstract Syntax Tree (ASTs), Program Dependency Graphs (PDGs), and other graph-based structures. These representations capture the syntactic and control or data flow information of source code and are commonly used as input to GNN. In many cases, token-level embeddings are generated by methods such as Word2Vec [27] or GloVe [33]. These embeddings are incorporated as node features within these graphs, enhancing the expressiveness of structural representations [22, 42].

b. **Token-based representations**, which treat source code as a linear sequence of tokens and employ embedding techniques such as Word2Vec or pretrained transformer models like CodeBERT. These methods directly model the semantic and syntactic relationships between tokens and are widely used in LLMs for code understanding tasks [17, 25].

From these categories, we selected two representative and widely benchmarked models for detailed evaluation. **ReVeal** [7] represents the graph-based feature learning paradigm, building upon the Devign model by combining Joern-derived structural information with Word2Vec embeddings. In contrast, **LineVul** [17] exemplifies the token-based approach, directly utilizing the CodeBERT Tokenizer to encode source code and employing a transformer-based custom binary classifier built on top of CodeBERT. These two models capture the core paradigms of current vulnerability detection research and serve as widely adopted benchmarks.

In addition, we included recent LLMs—Claude 3.5 Sonnet [1], GPT-o3-mini, GPT-4o, and GPT-5 [32]—to evaluate their ability to detect vulnerabilities without task-specific fine-tuning. Our selection prioritized representativeness and free availability, aiming to capture the general performance of current LLMs in this domain. While more advanced or proprietary models exist, their inclusion would not fundamentally change the evaluation paradigm; however, incorporating newer available LLMs in future work could further strengthen the study.




Figure 2: A deployment-oriented framework for evaluating vulnerability detection models

**3.1.2 Dataset Selection.** There are numerous publicly available datasets in the field of vulnerability detection. The datasets we considered include Juliet [4], SARD [31], Devign [53], ReVeal [7], BigVul [14], CrossVul [30], CVEFixes [2], DiverseVul [8], D2A [49], MegaVul [29], ICVul [24]. When selecting datasets for our pipeline, we consider two key factors. First, we prioritize datasets that are widely used and well-established in the research community [11]. Second, we evaluate the structure and organization of the dataset to ensure it meets our methodological requirements. We aim to select datasets that offer diversity in terms of label accuracy, data collection methodology, dataset volume, and class balance, ensuring a comprehensive evaluation of DL models. Although ICVul is a newly published dataset, it stands out for its relatively high vulnerability ratio (41%) and high label accuracy (92%), while maintaining real-world relevance through patch-based labeling and CWE annotations. These attributes, as summarized in Table 1, make it a strong candidate for evaluating models in realistic settings. We finally selected Juliet, BigVul, Devign, and ICVul.

### 3.2 Research Questions

We now introduce our research questions, motivation and rationale as well as our experiment design.

**RQ1: How effectively do current code representation methods capture distinctions between vulnerable and non-vulnerable code?**

**Motivation:** Effective code representation is crucial for distinguishing vulnerable from non-vulnerable functions, particularly when differences are subtle. Prior work has either lacked systematic comparisons across multiple datasets or focused only on feature distributions from trained models, without evaluating representation methods independently [6, 7, 20]. Moreover, few studies consider specific CWE types, despite clear semantic differences between vulnerable and non-vulnerable functions across CWE categories, which often leads to lower performance for general binary classifiers [34, 43]. Motivated by this, we conduct a systematic, multi-dataset evaluation of representation methods, including CWE-specific analyses, to better understand how well they capture the semantic nuances of different vulnerability types.

**Experiment Design:** To investigate RQ1, we conduct a comparative analysis of two prevalent code representation techniques: graph-based representations using GNNs and token-based embeddings using the CodeBERT Tokenizer. We apply both methods to generate function-level embeddings across four benchmark datasets: Juliet, Devign, BigVul, and ICVul. For ICVul and Devign, we utilize all available samples for both visualization and quantitative analysis. Given the large scale of BigVul and Juliet, we apply sampling strategies to ensure clarity in visualization. Specifically, we randomly sample 5% of functions from the Juliet dataset. For BigVul, due to significant class imbalance, we include all vulnerable functions and randomly sample an equal number of non-vulnerable functions to maintain a balanced subset for analysis.

We use t-SNE to visualize the high-dimensional embeddings in 2D space, enabling us to qualitatively assess the separation between vulnerable and non-vulnerable functions. Additionally, we compute the Euclidean distance between centroids of vulnerable and non-vulnerable groups, as well as between different vulnerability types, to quantitatively evaluate inter-class separability. When examining the separability of vulnerability types, we focus on the ICVul and Juliet datasets, as they, along with BigVul, provide CWE type information. However, we exclude BigVul from this analysis due to its poor label accuracy. These evaluations allow us to understand whether current representation methods produce meaningful clusters that reflect vulnerability status or types, and how this capability varies across datasets with different characteristics and labeling strategies.

**RQ2: What factors influence the performance of current deep learning models on benchmark vulnerability detection datasets in controlled lab settings?**

**Motivation:** DL models for vulnerability detection are commonly evaluated in controlled lab settings using specific benchmark datasets. However, these benchmarks vary significantly in terms of data source, labeling quality, and structure. For instance, synthetic datasets like Juliet offer clean and consistent labels but lack real-world diversity, while datasets like BigVul contain more realistic samples but suffer from noisy labeling. As a result, models trained

on one dataset often perform poorly when applied to another, limiting their generalizability. To understand what factors influence model performance and generalization, especially in cross-dataset scenarios, we systematically analyze model behavior when trained and tested across different datasets.

**Experiment design:** To investigate the factors that influence the performance of current DL models in controlled lab settings, we conducted a comprehensive experiment involving both model- and dataset-level analyses. Our goal was to assess how various characteristics—such as label quality, class balance, dataset size, and feature representation—affect model effectiveness. We began by training two representative models, LineVul and ReVeal, from scratch using four benchmark datasets. Each model is trained on the selected benchmark datasets using the recommended hyperparameters from the original papers. The core of our experimental strategy lies in a cross-dataset validation paradigm. Each model was evaluated not only on the dataset it was trained on but also on other datasets. This setup allowed us to analyze how well models generalize across different dataset distributions and labeling practices. We also examine how models trained on different datasets perform on a shared evaluation set, enabling comparison of generalization patterns across varying training distributions.

To ensure data integrity and prevent leakage, we implemented several precautions. First, within each dataset, we performed strict train–test splits and filtered out duplicate functions, ensuring no overlap between training and test samples. Second, to guarantee evaluation consistency, we fixed the test sets across all datasets, allowing all models to be evaluated on identical test data in cross-dataset experiments. Finally, to address temporal leakage, we introduced a time-wise out-of-distribution dataset, VentiVul, which was used in RQ3 for further evaluation. This design ensures a fair and broad assessment of what truly impacts model success in benchmark conditions. We report standard classification metrics including Accuracy, Precision, Recall, and F1-score to assess both within-dataset and cross-dataset performance.

**RQ3: How well do current deep learning and large language models generalize to detecting novel vulnerabilities in deployment settings?**

**Motivation:** Controlled experimental settings use training, test, and validation sets drawn from the same dataset of historical vulnerabilities. These datasets are known to contain many duplicates or poorly labeled data [11]. Despite optimistic benchmark results, the effectiveness of DL models and LLMs in detecting previously unseen vulnerabilities needs careful examination, particularly in complex realistic codebases. Evaluating model performance on such novel, security-critical vulnerabilities is essential for understanding these models’ generalization capabilities and identifying potential limitations in their practical application.

**Experiment Design:** To assess model robustness in real-world settings, we constructed a new evaluation dataset, termed VentiVul, based on 20 recent, manually verified vulnerability cases (CVEs) in the Linux kernel. These samples represent recent vulnerabilities drawn directly from a realistic system, providing a strong contrast to the synthetic or historical datasets commonly used in prior work. We design two sub-settings to test models’ robustness, as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Evaluation settings and details**

Setting	Details
Whole-File	<b>Input:</b> All functions extracted from vulnerable files, with each function labeled as vulnerable or non-vulnerable. <b>Metrics:</b> Accuracy, Precision, Recall, F1-score
Function-Pair	<b>Input:</b> Function pairs corresponding to each recent CVE, where each pair consists of a vulnerable version and its corresponding patched (non-vulnerable) version. <b>Metrics:</b> <i>Vul Detected</i> : the number of unique vulnerabilities (out of 20) correctly identified <i>Vul Funcs Detected</i> : the number of vulnerable functions (out of 25) correctly found <i>Pairs Differentiated</i> : the number of cases where the model detects the vulnerable function while correctly labeling the patched version as non-vulnerable.

We evaluated trained models in inference-only mode, simulating realistic conditions where models are applied directly without retraining. These included the DL-based LineVul and ReVeal (introduced in RQ2), as well as four LLMs: Claude 3.5 Sonnet, GPT-o3-mini, GPT-4o, and GPT-5. For LLMs, task-specific prompts were used as shown in Table 3. In the Whole-File prompt, [X] represents the full source file, and the model identifies [n] vulnerable functions by name [a, b, ...]. In the Function-Pair prompt, [Y] is a single function, and the model classifies it as either ‘vulnerable’ or ‘non-vulnerable’ [52]. In the Function-Pair setting, the LLM’s context window is sufficient. However, in the Whole-File setting, if a file exceeds the context length, we split it into multiple inputs.

**Table 3: Task-specific prompts for LLMs.**


Setting	Prompt
Whole-File	“Now you need to identify which method(s) might contain a vulnerability in a file. If you find none, output: ‘none’. If you find some, output like ‘I find [n] vulnerable functions, their names are [a, b, ...]’. The file is [X].”
Function-Pair	“Now you need to identify whether a method contains a vulnerability or not. If it has any potential vulnerability, output: ‘vulnerable’. Otherwise, output: ‘non-vulnerable’. The code is [Y].”

This experimental design focuses on real-world conditions without tuning or retraining, thereby isolating the generalization capabilities of these models. By using recent, security-critical samples from the Linux kernel, our goal is to assess existing models for their predictive power to find new vulnerabilities. After all, the main goal of such models is to achieve predictive power in the future, and not to find existing, known vulnerabilities.

### 3.3 Evaluation Metrics

To comprehensively evaluate the performance of our models, we adopt a set of standard classification metrics as well as feature





**Figure 3: Comparison of feature space visualizations and cluster analysis on four benchmark datasets using (a) GNN and (b) CodeBERT Tokenizer.**

representation metrics. These metrics allow us to assess both the predictive capability of the models and the quality of the learned code representations.

**3.3.1 Feature Representation Metrics.** To assess the effectiveness of the feature engineering process and the quality of learned code representations, we employ both visualization and quantitative analysis. We use t-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (t-SNE) to reduce high-dimensional feature vectors into two dimensions for visualization. This technique enables us to inspect the separability of vulnerable and non-vulnerable code samples in the embedded space. Additionally, we calculate the centroid distance between classes based on the normalized t-SNE coordinates. Let  $\mu_{vul}$  and  $\mu_{non}$  denote the mean feature vectors (centroids) of the vulnerable and non-vulnerable (or neutral) samples, respectively. The centroid distance is defined as the Euclidean distance between the two centroids:

$$D_{\text{centroid}} = \|\mu_{vul} - \mu_{non}\|_2 \quad (1)$$

This distance is computed in the normalized 2D space after applying Min-Max scaling to the t-SNE output. A larger centroid distance indicates better class separability, which reflects the ability of the feature extraction method to distinguish between vulnerable and non-vulnerable code segments effectively.

**3.3.2 Classification Metrics.** We report four standard metrics for binary classification: accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-score. Let  $TP$ ,  $TN$ ,  $FP$ , and  $FN$  denote the number of true positives, true negatives, false positives, and false negatives, respectively. Accuracy measures the overall proportion of correct predictions: Accuracy =

$\frac{TP+TN}{TP+TN+FP+FN}$ . Precision indicates the proportion of predicted positives that are actually positive: Precision =  $\frac{TP}{TP+FP}$ . Recall reflects the proportion of actual positives correctly identified: Recall =  $\frac{TP}{TP+FN}$ . F1-score is the harmonic mean of precision and recall:  $F1 = 2 \cdot \frac{\text{Precision} \cdot \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}}$ . These metrics allow us to measure not only the correctness of the model predictions but also how well the models manage false positives and false negatives—especially important in imbalanced datasets.

## 4 Results and Analysis

In this section we show the experiment results and summarize the key findings of our three RQs.

**RQ1: How effectively do current code representation methods capture distinctions between vulnerable and non-vulnerable code?**

**Results:** Figure 3a and 3b show binary t-SNE plots on four benchmark datasets, where each point represents a function colored by its label (Neutral or Vulnerable). GNN-based embeddings provide limited class separability, with heavy overlaps in Juliet and ICVul (centroid distances 0.0242 and 0.0057). BigVul shows slightly larger separation (0.1612) but still lacks distinct clusters. CodeBERT embeddings yield somewhat better separation—especially on Devign and BigVul—but the effect is inconsistent, and realistic datasets like ICVul and Juliet still show substantial overlap. Overall, both representations struggle to produce well-separated clusters, reflecting that structural or semantic richness does not necessarily yield discriminative vulnerability features. The apparent separability in BigVul likely stems from labeling artifacts that inflate inter-class variance.


**Finding 1**

GNN- and CodeBERT-based embeddings show limited and inconsistent separation between vulnerable and non-vulnerable functions across datasets.

Figure 4 further shows erratic centroid distances between vulnerability types and neutral samples. Both ICVul and Juliet exhibit inconsistent distance patterns, with no method showing clear superiority. In some cases, distances between different vulnerabilities even exceed those between vulnerabilities and neutral code, highlighting the instability of the learned feature spaces.

**Finding 2**

Centroid distances across vulnerability types are erratic and inconsistent, indicating unreliable feature-level distinctions from both embedding methods.



**Figure 4: Centroid distance comparison between top 5 vulnerability types and neutral samples in the ICVul and Juliet datasets.**

Centroid distances in the realistic ICVul dataset are generally smaller than in the synthetic Juliet dataset, mainly due to higher code complexity and greater semantic similarity between vulnerable and non-vulnerable functions. In addition, ICVul and Juliet involve different CWE distributions—the top five CWEs in ICVul do not appear in Juliet—further explaining the disparity in feature separability.

**Finding 3**

Realistic datasets like ICVul have smaller centroid distances than synthetic ones like Juliet, due to higher code similarity and differing CWE type distributions.

**RQ2: What factors influence the performance of current deep learning models on benchmark vulnerability datasets in controlled lab settings?**

**Results:** Tables 4 and 5 summarize cross-dataset results for LineVul and ReVeal on Juliet, Devign, BigVul, and ICVul. Each table cell reports Accuracy (A), Precision (P), Recall (R), and F1-score (F); darker shading indicates higher performance within each column. Bolded values indicate the highest score within each row, showcasing the best model performance on a target dataset when trained on different sources. Models with F1-scores below 20 were excluded from ranking to avoid trivial results. The results demonstrate that model performance is highly sensitive to the dataset on which it is trained. Both models perform well on their training datasets (e.g., LineVul: 95.98% accuracy, 94.52 F1 on Juliet). However, performance significantly deteriorates in cross-dataset testing. For example, LineVul trained on Juliet drops to a 38.77 F1-score on ICVul, and ReVeal trained on BigVul drops to only 0.5 F1-score on Devign. Models trained on Devign and ICVul show relatively better transferability despite moderate within-dataset scores. These trends are further supported by embedding visualizations in Figure 3, where the separability between vulnerable and non-vulnerable code is often ambiguous.

**Finding 4**

Model performance is highly dataset-dependent. Within-dataset testing yields strong results, but cross-dataset performance drops sharply, especially for models trained on Juliet or BigVul.

A major factor influencing cross-dataset performance is label quality. Datasets like BigVul contain severe mislabeling, leading to inflated recall but poor generalization. In contrast, ICVul’s smaller yet accurately labeled samples allow models to learn more transferable representations. Dataset characteristics also matter: synthetic datasets such as Juliet provide clean, consistent labels and sufficient data for high in-domain performance but limited real-world transferability. Dataset volume further influences learning stability—larger datasets offer greater coverage and help mitigate overfitting but can amplify the effects of label noise if quality is not maintained. Finally, class imbalance—most pronounced in BigVul—biases models toward the majority (non-vulnerable) class, inflating accuracy while harming recall and F1, even when using rebalancing methods like SMOTE.

**Finding 5**

Label quality, dataset size, type, and balance critically influence cross-dataset generalization. High-quality, balanced datasets enable transferable learning, while synthetic datasets show limited real-world transferability, and noisy or imbalanced datasets reduce robustness and bias models toward majority classes.

Model architecture alone does not guarantee generalization. Both LineVul and ReVeal degrade similarly across datasets, suggesting that current representations fail to capture transferable vulnerability semantics. ReVeal’s more complex code representation design often underperforms on noisy datasets like BigVul, where label errors and imbalance amplify overfitting, while token-based models like LineVul remain comparatively stable. These observations highlight that without well-balanced, high-quality labeled data, even

**Table 4: Performance of ReVeal trained on four benchmark datasets with cross-dataset testing**

Bench- mark	ReVeal (Juliet)				ReVeal (Devign)				ReVeal (BigVul)				ReVeal (ICVul)			
	A	P	R	F	A	P	R	F	A	P	R	F	A	P	R	F
Juliet	<b>74.87</b>	<b>60.13</b>	<b>92.62</b>	<b>72.92</b>	47.36	38.84	76.71	51.57	63.38	32.84	0.24	0.47	52.71	38.27	48.01	42.59
Devign	48.59	46.14	74.56	57.01	<b>49.81</b>	<b>47.59</b>	<b>96.84</b>	<b>63.82</b>	54.29	50	0.25	0.5	48.97	45.86	64.51	53.61
BigVul	19.65	5.28	74.47	9.85	30.55	6.59	81.76	12.19	<b>87.45</b>	<b>17.87</b>	<b>34.67</b>	<b>23.58</b>	59.05	5.24	34.80	9.11
ICVul	41.86	40.23	86.48	54.91	<b>49.08</b>	41.49	59.43	48.86	58.89	33.33	0.41	0.81	42.64	<b>41.92</b>	<b>95.20</b>	<b>58.21</b>

**Table 5: Performance of LineVul trained on four benchmark datasets with cross-dataset testing.**

Bench- mark	LineVul (Juliet)				LineVul (Devign)				LineVul (BigVul)				LineVul (ICVul)			
	A	P	R	F	A	P	R	F	A	P	R	F	A	P	R	F
Juliet	<b>95.98</b>	<b>95.16</b>	93.90	<b>94.52</b>	38.20	36.92	<b>94.71</b>	53.13	62.97	0	0	0	63.86	52.68	22.27	31.30
Devign	49.01	45.79	65.65	53.95	<b>66.54</b>	<b>65.68</b>	55.43	<b>60.12</b>	54.69	63.16	0.97	1.90	47.04	45.42	<b>81.42</b>	58.31
BigVul	27.57	5.76	77.60	10.73	11.43	4.96	81.38	9.34	<b>96</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>91</b>	39.33	6.42	72.31	11.79
ICVul	44.09	38.77	75.46	38.77	39.16	38.93	<b>99.17</b>	<b>55.91</b>	57.6	32.24	8.18	13.05	<b>44.35</b>	<b>39.01</b>	76.46	51.66

advanced architectures struggle to develop generalizable vulnerability detection capabilities.

#### Finding 6

Model architecture alone does not ensure generalization. Both LineVul and ReVeal degrade similarly across datasets, indicating current representations fail to capture universally transferable vulnerability patterns.

**RQ3: How well do current deep learning and large language models generalize to detecting novel vulnerabilities in deployment settings?**

**Results:** Table 6 and Table 7 present the evaluation results of models on the VentiVul dataset. Figure 5 presents the predicted vulnerability scores for 25 function pairs (before-fix and after-fix) under the Function-Pair evaluation setting, across eight model variants. Each red dot corresponds to the score assigned to a vulnerable (before-fix) function, and each blue dot indicates the score for its corresponding fixed (after-fix) version. Lines connect each pair, with green lines indicating a score decrease (i.e., the model correctly reduced the vulnerability prediction after the fix), and gray lines indicating a non-decrease. The dashed black line at 0.5 denotes the classification threshold, separating predicted vulnerable (score > 0.5) from non-vulnerable (score ≤ 0.5) samples.

As shown in Table 6, most DL models exhibit polarized behavior under the Whole-File setting. For instance, ReVeal (BigVul) achieves the highest accuracy (89.06%), but this stems from an all-negative prediction bias—demonstrated by its extremely low recall (4%) and a weak F1-score (2.17), making it practically unusable. In contrast, ReVeal (Devign) and LineVul (Devign) display all-positive tendencies, hitting 100% recall but offering poor precision (3%), which results in deceptively moderate F1-scores (6.27 and 5.73). LineVul (BigVul) fails entirely, scoring 0 across all metrics. Notably, Juliet-trained models like ReVeal (Juliet) and LineVul (Juliet) achieve more balanced performance—around 50% accuracy and the highest F1-scores among DL models (8.13 and 5.62 respectively)—suggesting better generalization due to the cleaner and more structured nature of the Juliet dataset. ICVul-trained models reach high recall (96% and 80%) but suffer from low precision, resulting in limited effectiveness in

**Table 6: Performance of models on VentiVul under Whole-File setting**

Model	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
ReVeal (Juliet)	50.55	4.31	72	8.13
ReVeal (Devign)	9.23	3.24	100	6.27
ReVeal (BigVul)	89.06	1.49	4	2.17
ReVeal (ICVul)	5.1	2.99	96	5.79
LineVul (Juliet)	49.19	2.97	52	5.62
LineVul (Devign)	4.42	2.95	100	5.73
LineVul (BigVul)	97.09	0	0	0
LineVul (ICVul)	22.09	2.92	80	5.63
Claude 3.5 Sonnet	92	2.3	4	2.9
GPT-o3-mini	96.51	0	0	0
GPT-4o	96.24	0	0	0
GPT-5	95.41	6.25	4	4.9

**Table 7: Performance of models on VentiVul under Function-Pair setting**

Model	Vul Detected	Vul Funcs Detected	Pairs Differentiated
ReVeal (Juliet)	15	18	0
ReVeal (Devign)	20	25	0
ReVeal (BigVul)	1	1	0
ReVeal (ICVul)	20	24	0
LineVul (Juliet)	12	13	1
LineVul (Devign)	20	25	0
LineVul (BigVul)	0	0	0
LineVul (ICVul)	18	20	3
Claude 3.5 Sonnet	13	14	1
GPT-o3-mini	4	4	3
GPT-4o	13	14	5
GPT-5	13	14	6

real-world contexts. LLMs such as Claude 3.5 Sonnet, GPT-o3-mini, GPT-4o, and GPT-5 achieve seemingly high accuracy scores (above 92%), but this is primarily because they predict nearly all samples






Figure 5: Model predictions on before-fix and after-fix functions in VentiVul

as non-vulnerable. Their extremely low F1-scores (0–4.9) reveal that they fail to identify vulnerable cases, highlighting a strong bias toward the majority class and limited practical usefulness for real-world vulnerability detection.

#### Finding 7

DL models exhibit extreme biases in Whole-File evaluation, producing either all-negative or all-positive predictions. LLMs achieve high accuracy but extremely low F1 due to predicting mostly non-vulnerable samples, limiting practical usefulness.

Table 7 and Figure 5 uncover deeper flaws through Function-Pair analysis. While models like ReVeal (Devign) and LineVul (Devign) detect all 25 vulnerable functions, they fail to distinguish them from their patched counterparts—yielding zero correctly differentiated pairs. The visualization in Figure 5 confirms this trend. Most models assign similar scores to both before-fix and after-fix functions, which reflects a lack of confidence and an inability to capture the semantic impact of code fixes. Few predictions change meaningfully between before-fix and after-fix versions. LineVul (ICVul), however, shows some encouraging behavior, with several clear score decreases, and is the only DL model that differentiates three pairs correctly—suggesting partial sensitivity to code fixes. Claude 3.5 Sonnet detects 13 vulnerabilities and differentiates 1 patched pair, while GPT-o3-mini identifies only 4 vulnerabilities but achieves 3 correctly differentiated pairs—the highest relative pair-differentiation among the smaller models. More advanced models, GPT-4o and GPT-5, each detect 13 vulnerabilities and 14 vulnerable functions, while differentiating 5 and 6 pairs, respectively. These results suggest that, even with modest recall, LLMs—particularly GPT-4o and GPT-5—exhibit superior ability to discern fine-grained semantic changes and separate vulnerable functions from their fixed counterparts. Notably, the improved performance of GPT-4o and GPT-5 cannot be fully explained by potential data leakage, as GPT-4o was released before May 2025 and GPT-5 shortly thereafter.

#### Finding 8

DL models largely fail to differentiate before-fix and after-fix functions, showing minimal sensitivity to semantic changes, with LineVul (ICVul) being a partial exception. LLMs outperform traditional DL models in patch-level reasoning.

## 5 Discussion

Our evaluation uncovers a pronounced gap between benchmark performance and real-world effectiveness, revealing fundamental limitations in current vulnerability detection models.

**Representation Learning Limitations.** Our findings in RQ1 suggest that current representation methods—both graph-based and token-based—fail to capture the deeper semantics underlying vulnerabilities. This limitation likely stems from their reliance on structural or token-level patterns, which are insufficient for modeling contextual, data-flow, and semantic dependencies critical for vulnerability reasoning. The centroid distance analysis reveals another concerning pattern: the distances between different vulnerability types often exceed the distances between vulnerable and non-vulnerable samples. This pattern may reflect an inherent characteristic of code vulnerabilities, suggesting that future research could explore developing CWE-specific models.

**Dataset Quality vs. Model Performance.** Our cross-dataset evaluation in RQ2 exposes critical interactions between dataset characteristics and model behavior. The results highlight that dataset quality, not size, dominates model generalization. Label noise introduces spurious correlations that deep models tend to memorize, while cleaner datasets promote stable but narrower generalization. This underscores the need for benchmark redesign—focusing on annotation quality, balanced vulnerability types, and realistic distributions rather than mere scale.

**Real-World Applicability Challenges.** Perhaps most concerning are our findings in RQ3 regarding deployment evaluation. The severe performance degradation observed on VentiVul highlights a broader issue: current vulnerability detectors optimize for dataset-specific correlations rather than generalizable semantics. Their inability to recognize code changes reflects a fundamental mismatch between benchmark training and deployment conditions.

Addressing this gap requires evaluation frameworks that incorporate patch-level reasoning, temporal code evolution, and realistic deployment conditions.

## 6 Threats and Limitations

Although numerous state-of-the-art models and advanced code representation methods have been proposed in recent literature [5, 36], our evaluation focuses on two widely adopted DL models due to constraints in page length, computational resources, and project scope. Preliminary experiments showed that more recent methods did not yield significant performance improvements, reinforcing the practicality of our model choices. However, limiting the range of evaluated models may constrain the generalizability of our conclusions to some extent.

In addition, while our findings are grounded in evaluations across diverse datasets, they remain influenced by the nature of these datasets. Real-world datasets like VentiVul and ICVul are derived from open-source codebases, which may not reflect the coding patterns, architectural complexity, and security practices found in closed-source industrial software. As such, applying our conclusions to proprietary environments should be done with care. Our evaluation methodology also incorporates metrics and visualizations, such as centroid distances and t-SNE mappings, to analyze model representations. Although these tools may not fully capture fine-grained semantic nuances and can vary under different parameter settings, the results from RQ2 demonstrate that t-SNE patterns align consistently with quantitative metrics, reinforcing their value as complementary evaluation methods. Despite potential variability introduced by dataset quality and scale, the consistency of our results across benchmarks lends strong confidence to our conclusions.

## 7 Related Work

Existing **DL-based approaches** have explored diverse code representations and model architectures [36]. Graph-based models such as Devign [53], DeepWukong [9], LineVD [20], DeepVD [41], EPVD [47], AMPLE [42], and MGVD [34] incorporate structural semantics of source code using GNNs or CNNs to improve detection accuracy. Other methods like IVDetect [22] and LIVABLE [43] emphasize interpretability and attempt to mitigate issues related to class imbalance. Reveal [7] underscores a key challenge in the field—many of these models are trained on low-quality or biased datasets, which contributes to sharp performance degradation when evaluated in real-world scenarios. Although some studies, such as Hin et al. [20] and Zhang et al. [47], have attempted real-world evaluations across different projects, their models were trained on imbalanced and noisily labeled datasets and tested on historical codebases, limiting their ability to generalize to novel and emerging vulnerabilities. Recent advances in vulnerability detection have leveraged pre-trained language models such as CodeBERT [15], GraphCodeBERT [18], GPT-2-based [40], and RoBERTa-based variants like VulBERTa [19]. More powerful LLMs like GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 have also shown promising results, with studies (e.g., Zhou et al. [52], Zhang et al. [46]) exploring prompt design and few-shot learning for improved accuracy. Models like GRACE [25] and LineVul [17] incorporate graph or line-level information to enhance

detection granularity. Fu et al. [16] proposed a Vision Transformer-inspired framework for vulnerability repair.

Several empirical studies have investigated the effectiveness of deep learning for vulnerability detection, revealing key limitations and challenges. Jimenez et al. [21] showed that many vulnerability prediction models rely on unrealistic labeling assumptions, and that their performance drops sharply under realistic conditions, highlighting the need for deployment-oriented evaluation. Tang et al. [39] compared neural architectures and preprocessing techniques, providing guidance on model selection considering efficiency–accuracy trade-offs. Lin et al. [23] evaluated six models on a function-level dataset, showing that RNNs capture contextual information well, while CNNs excel at local patterns. Mazuera-Rozo et al. [26] found that deep models often fail to outperform shallow ones across three datasets, questioning their practical reliability. Chakraborty et al. [7] reported over 50% performance drops in realistic settings due to flawed data and simplistic models, and proposed improved designs that enhance precision and recall. Croft et al. [10] emphasized the inevitability of noisy labels and introduced a noise-aware learning framework that improves robustness. Yang et al. [45] revealed that data imbalance can reduce F1-scores by up to 73%, with raw-data oversampling yielding the best results. Steenhoek et al. [37] reproduced nine state-of-the-art models, highlighting variability and sensitivity to training data. Sejfia et al. [35] showed that ReVeal, DeepWukong, and LineVul struggle with multi-unit vulnerabilities and proposed a framework to address them. Similarly, Chakraborty et al. [6] introduced the Real-Vul dataset to test these detectors under realistic conditions, observing performance drops of up to 91 F1 points. More recently, Ding et al. [13] introduced the PRIMEVUL dataset, revealing major issues in existing datasets and showing that even GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 perform near-randomly under realistic conditions.

Distinct from earlier work, our work provides a systematic, deployment-driven evaluation that spans multiple model families and heterogeneous datasets, introducing new evaluation settings to rigorously assess real-world generalizability.

## 8 Conclusion

This work evaluates DL models for vulnerability detection across representative datasets with varying focuses on size, label quality, class balance, and data realism. We further evaluate both deep learning and large language models on an out-of-distribution dataset comprising recent, previously unseen vulnerabilities, using a novel deployment-oriented evaluation framework. Our findings show that while models perform well on controlled benchmarks, they struggle with subtle, real-world vulnerability distinctions due to noisy labels, class imbalances, and limited semantic encoding. Although LLMs hold promise in understanding patch-level changes, overall detection remains constrained. Future efforts should focus on advancing code representations and creating balanced, high-quality datasets to bridge the gap between lab and reality settings.

## References

- [1] Anthropic. 2024. Claude 3.5 Sonnet. Available at <https://www.anthropic.com>.
- [2] Guru Bhandari, Amara Naseer, and Leon Moonen. 2021. CVEfixes: automated collection of vulnerabilities and their fixes from open-source software. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Predictive Models and Data Analytics in Software Engineering (Athens, Greece) (PROMISE 2021)*. ACM, 30–39.

- doi:10.1145/3475960.3475985
- [3] Lorenzo Binosi, Gregorio Barzasi, Michele Carminati, Stefano Zanero, and Mario Polino. 2024. The Illusion of Randomness: An Empirical Analysis of Address Space Layout Randomization Implementations. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security* (Salt Lake City, UT, USA) (CCS '24). ACM, 1360–1374. doi:10.1145/3658644.3690239
- [4] Tim Boland and Paul E Black. 2012. Juliet 1.1 C/C++ and java test suite. *Computer* 45, 10 (2012), 88–90.
- [5] Beatrice Casey, Joanna C. S. Santos, and George Perry. 2025. A Survey of Source Code Representations for Machine Learning-Based Cybersecurity Tasks. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 57, 8, Article 217 (April 2025), 41 pages. doi:10.1145/3721977
- [6] Partha Chakraborty, Krishna Kanth Arumugam, Mahmoud Alfeld, Meiyappan Nagappan, and Shane McIntosh. 2024. Revisiting the Performance of Deep Learning-Based Vulnerability Detection on Realistic Datasets. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 50, 8 (2024), 2163–2177. doi:10.1109/TSE.2024.3423712
- [7] Saikat Chakraborty, Rahul Krishna, Yangruibo Ding, and Baishakhi Ray. 2021. Deep learning based vulnerability detection: Are we there yet? *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 48, 9 (2021), 3280–3296.
- [8] Yizheng Chen, Zhoujie Ding, Lamy ALOWAIN, Xinyun Chen, and David Wagner. 2023. DiverseVul: A new vulnerable source code dataset for deep learning based vulnerability detection. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses*. 654–668.
- [9] Xiao Cheng, Haoyu Wang, Jiayi Hua, Guoai Xu, and Yulei Sui. 2021. DeepWukong: Statically Detecting Software Vulnerabilities Using Deep Graph Neural Network. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* 30, 3, Article 38 (April 2021), 33 pages. doi:10.1145/3436877
- [10] Roland Croft, M Ali Babar, and Huaming Chen. 2022. Noisy label learning for security defects. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories*. 435–447.
- [11] Roland Croft, M Ali Babar, and M Mehdi Kholoosi. 2023. Data quality for software vulnerability datasets. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 121–133.
- [12] Roland Croft, Yongzheng Xie, and Muhammad Ali Babar. 2023. Data Preparation for Software Vulnerability Prediction: A Systematic Literature Review. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 49, 3 (2023), 1044–1063. doi:10.1109/TSE.2022.3171202
- [13] Yangruibo Ding, Yanjun Fu, Omniyyah Ibrahim, Chawin Sitawarin, Xinyun Chen, Basel Alomair, David Wagner, Baishakhi Ray, and Yizheng Chen. 2024. Vulnerability detection with code language models: How far are we? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.18624* (2024).
- [14] Jiahao Fan, Yi Li, Shaohua Wang, and Tien N. Nguyen. 2020. A C/C++ Code Vulnerability Dataset with Code Changes and CVE Summaries. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories* (Seoul, Republic of Korea) (MSR '20). ACM, 508–512. doi:10.1145/3379597.3387501
- [15] Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Xiaocheng Feng, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Bing Qin, Ting Liu, Daxin Jiang, et al. 2020. Codebert: A pre-trained model for programming and natural languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08155* (2020).
- [16] Michael Fu, Van Nguyen, Chakkrit Tantithamthavorn, Dinh Phung, and Trung Le. 2024. Vision Transformer Inspired Automated Vulnerability Repair. 33, 3, Article 78 (March 2024), 29 pages. doi:10.1145/3632746
- [17] Michael Fu and Chakkrit Tantithamthavorn. 2022. LineVul: a transformer-based line-level vulnerability prediction. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories* (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania) (MSR '22). ACM, 608–620. doi:10.1145/3524842.3528452
- [18] Daya Guo, Shuo Ren, Shuai Lu, Zhangyin Feng, Duyu Tang, Shujie Liu, Long Zhou, Nan Duan, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Shengyu Fu, et al. 2020. Graphcodebert: Pre-training code representations with data flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.08366* (2020).
- [19] Hazim Hanif and Sergio Maffei. 2022. VulBERTa: Simplified Source Code Pre-Training for Vulnerability Detection. In *2022 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. 1–8. doi:10.1109/IJCNN55064.2022.9892280
- [20] David Hin, Andrey Kan, Huaming Chen, and M. Ali Babar. 2022. LineVD: statement-level vulnerability detection using graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories* (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania) (MSR '22). ACM, 596–607. doi:10.1145/3524842.3527949
- [21] Matthieu Jimenez, Renaud Rwemalika, Mike Papadakis, Federica Sarro, Yves Le Traon, and Mark Harman. 2019. The importance of accounting for real-world labelling when predicting software vulnerabilities. In *Proceedings of the 2019 27th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*. 695–705.
- [22] Yi Li, Shaohua Wang, and Tien N. Nguyen. 2021. Vulnerability detection with fine-grained interpretations. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering* (Athens, Greece) (ESEC/FSE 2021). ACM, 292–303. doi:10.1145/3468264.3468597
- [23] Guanjin Lin, Wei Xiao, Leo Yu Zhang, Shang Gao, Yonghang Tai, and Jun Zhang. 2021. Deep neural-based vulnerability discovery demystified: data, model and performance. *Neural Computing and Applications* 33, 20 (2021), 13287–13300.
- [24] Chaomeng Lu, Tianyu Li, Toon Dehaene, and Bert Lagaisse. 2025. ICVul: A Well-labeled C/C++ Vulnerability Dataset with Comprehensive Metadata and VCCs. In *2025 IEEE/ACM 22nd International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. 154–158. doi:10.1109/MSR66628.2025.00034
- [25] Guilong Lu, Xiaolin Ju, Xiang Chen, Wenlong Pei, and Zhilong Cai. 2024. GRACE: Empowering LLM-based software vulnerability detection with graph structure and in-context learning. *Journal of Systems and Software* 212 (2024), 112031.
- [26] Alejandro Mazuera-Rozo, Anamaria Mojica-Hanke, Mario Linares-Vásquez, and Gabriele Bavota. 2021. Shallow or Deep? An Empirical Study on Detecting Vulnerabilities using Deep Learning. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 29th International Conference on Program Comprehension (ICPC)*. 276–287. doi:10.1109/ICPC52881.2021.00034
- [27] Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S Corrado, and Jeff Dean. 2013. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 26 (2013).
- [28] Stephan Neuhaus and Thomas Zimmermann. 2009. The beauty and the beast: Vulnerabilities in red hat's packages. In *Proceedings of the 2009 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC)*. 383–396.
- [29] Chao Ni, Liyu Shen, Xiaohu Yang, Yan Zhu, and Shaohua Wang. 2024. MegaVul: A C/C++ Vulnerability Dataset with Comprehensive Code Representations. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Mining Software Repositories* (Lisbon, Portugal) (MSR '24). ACM, 738–742. doi:10.1145/3643991.3644886
- [30] Georgios Nikitopoulos, Konstantina Dritsa, Panos Louridas, and Dimitris Mitropoulos. 2021. CrossVul: a cross-language vulnerability dataset with commit data. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering* (Athens, Greece) (ESEC/FSE 2021). ACM, 1565–1569. doi:10.1145/3468264.3473122
- [31] National Institute of Standards and Technology. 2025. NIST Software Assurance Reference Dataset. Retrieved June 16, 2025 from <https://samate.nist.gov/SARD>
- [32] OpenAI. 2025. GPT-o3-mini, GPT-4o, GPT-5. <https://openai.com>. Available at <https://openai.com>.
- [33] Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D Manning. 2014. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*. 1532–1543.
- [34] Fangcheng Qiu, Zhongxin Liu, Xing Hu, Xin Xia, Gang Chen, and Xinyu Wang. 2024. Vulnerability Detection via Multiple-Graph-Based Code Representation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 50, 8 (2024), 2178–2199. doi:10.1109/TSE.2024.3427815
- [35] Adriana Seifia, Satyaki Das, Saad Shafiq, and Nenad Medvidović. 2024. Toward Improved Deep Learning-based Vulnerability Detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering* (Lisbon, Portugal) (ICSE '24). ACM, Article 62, 12 pages. doi:10.1145/3597503.3608141
- [36] Nima Shiri Harzevili, Alvine Boaye Belle, Junjie Wang, Song Wang, Zhen Ming (Jack) Jiang, and Nachiappan Nagappan. 2024. A Systematic Literature Review on Automated Software Vulnerability Detection Using Machine Learning. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 57, 3, Article 55 (Nov. 2024), 36 pages. doi:10.1145/3699711
- [37] Benjamin Steenhoek, Md Mahbubur Rahman, Richard Jiles, and Wei Le. 2023. An Empirical Study of Deep Learning Models for Vulnerability Detection. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 2237–2248. doi:10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00188
- [38] Yuqiang Sun, Daoyuan Wu, Yue Xue, Han Liu, Haijun Wang, Zhengzi Xu, Xiaofei Xie, and Yang Liu. 2024. GPTScan: Detecting Logic Vulnerabilities in Smart Contracts by Combining GPT with Program Analysis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering* (Lisbon, Portugal) (ICSE '24). ACM, New York, NY, USA, Article 166, 13 pages. doi:10.1145/3597503.3639117
- [39] Gaigai Tang, Lianxiao Meng, Huiqiang Wang, Shuangyin Ren, Qiang Wang, Lin Yang, and Weipeng Cao. 2020. A Comparative Study of Neural Network Techniques for Automatic Software Vulnerability Detection. In *2020 International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Software Engineering (TASE)*. 1–8. doi:10.1109/TASE49443.2020.00010
- [40] Chandra Thapa, Seung Ick Jang, Muhammad Ejaz Ahmed, Seyit Camtepe, Josef Pieprzyk, and Surya Nepal. 2022. Transformer-Based Language Models for Software Vulnerability Detection (ACSAC '22). ACM, 481–496. doi:10.1145/3564625.3567985
- [41] Wenbo Wang, Tien N. Nguyen, Shaohua Wang, Yi Li, Jiyuan Zhang, and Aashish Yadavally. 2023. DeepVD: Toward Class-Separation Features for Neural Network Vulnerability Detection. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 2249–2261. doi:10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00189
- [42] Xin-Cheng Wen, Yupan Chen, Cuiyun Gao, Hongyu Zhang, Jie M. Zhang, and Qing Liao. 2023. Vulnerability Detection with Graph Simplification and Enhanced Graph Representation Learning. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 2275–2286. doi:10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00191
- [43] Xin-Cheng Wen, Cuiyun Gao, Feng Luo, Haoyu Wang, Ge Li, and Qing Liao. 2024. LIVABLE: Exploring Long-Tailed Classification of Software Vulnerability Types. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 50, 6 (2024), 1325–1339. doi:10.1109/TSE.2024.3382361
- [44] Hua Yan, Yulei Sui, Shipping Chen, and Jingling Xue. 2017. Machine-learning-guided typestate analysis for static use-after-free detection. In *Proceedings of the*

- 33rd Annual Computer Security Applications Conference. 42–54.
- [45] Xu Yang, Shaowei Wang, Yi Li, and Shaohua Wang. 2023. Does data sampling improve deep learning-based vulnerability detection? yeas! and nays!. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2287–2298.
  - [46] Chenyuan Zhang, Hao Liu, Jiutian Zeng, Kejing Yang, Yuhong Li, and Hui Li. 2024. Prompt-Enhanced Software Vulnerability Detection Using ChatGPT. In *Proceedings of the 2024 IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings* (Lisbon, Portugal) (*ICSE-Companion '24*). ACM, 276–277. doi:10.1145/3639478.3643065
  - [47] Junwei Zhang, Zhongxin Liu, Xing Hu, Xin Xia, and Shanping Li. 2023. Vulnerability Detection by Learning From Syntax-Based Execution Paths of Code. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 49, 8 (2023), 4196–4212. doi:10.1109/TSE.2023.3286586
  - [48] Wei Zheng, Jialiang Gao, Xiaoxue Wu, Fengyu Liu, Yuxing Xun, Guoliang Liu, and Xiang Chen. 2020. The impact factors on the performance of machine learning-based vulnerability detection: A comparative study. *Journal of Systems and Software* 168 (2020), 110659.
  - [49] Yunhui Zheng, Saurabh Pujar, Burn Lewis, Luca Buratti, Edward Epstein, Bo Yang, Jim Laredo, Alessandro Morari, and Zhong Su. 2021. D2A: A Dataset Built for AI-Based Vulnerability Detection Methods Using Differential Analysis. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice (ICSE-SEIP)*. 111–120. doi:10.1109/ICSE-SEIP52600.2021.00020
  - [50] Liyi Zhou, Xihan Xiong, Jens Ernstberger, Stefanos Chaliasos, Zhipeng Wang, Ye Wang, Kaihua Qin, Roger Wattenhofer, Dawn Song, and Arthur Gervais. 2023. SoK: Decentralized Finance (DeFi) Attacks. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 2444–2461. doi:10.1109/SP46215.2023.10179435
  - [51] Xin Zhou, Sicong Cao, Xiaobing Sun, and David Lo. 2025. Large Language Model for Vulnerability Detection and Repair: Literature Review and the Road Ahead. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* 34, 5, Article 145 (May 2025), 31 pages. doi:10.1145/3708522
  - [52] Xin Zhou, Ting Zhang, and David Lo. 2024. Large Language Model for Vulnerability Detection: Emerging Results and Future Directions. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM/IEEE 44th International Conference on Software Engineering: New Ideas and Emerging Results* (Lisbon, Portugal) (*ICSE-NIER'24*). ACM, 47–51. doi:10.1145/3639476.3639762
  - [53] Yaqin Zhou, Shangqing Liu, Jing Kai Siow, Xianfeng Du, and Yang Liu. 2019. De-Vign: Effective Vulnerability identification by Learning Comprehensive Program Semantics via Graph Neural Networks. *arXiv (Cornell University)* 32 (9 2019), 10197–10207. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1909.03496>