

# HACovGNN: Hierarchical Attention Based Convolutional Graph Neural Network for Code Documentation Generation in Jupyter Notebooks

Xuye Liu

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute IBM Research

liux3@outlook.com dakuo.wang@ibm.com

Dakuo Wang

April Wang

University of Michigan

aprilww@umich.edu

Lingfei Wu

IBM Research

## Abstract

Many data scientists use Jupyter notebook to experiment code, visualize results, and document rationales or interpretations. The code documentation generation (CDG) task in notebooks is related but different from the code summarization task in software engineering, as one documentation (markdown cell) may consist of a text (informative summary or indicative rationale) for multiple code cells. Our work aims to solve the CDG task by encoding the multiple code cells as separated AST graph structures, for which we propose a hierarchical attention-based ConvGNN component to augment the Seq2Seq network. We build a dataset with publicly available Kaggle notebooks and evaluate our model (HACovGNN) against baseline models (e.g., Code2Seq or Graph2Seq).

## 1 Introduction

Data scientists and machine learning researchers commonly use computational notebooks to explore and experiment their model building or data preprocessing ideas, as the notebook can support them to combine code, result, and documentation together (Kery and Myers, 2017). Documentation in these notebooks provides a richer medium for users to record not only what the code does, but also what the result means, and why a particular model is selected. This richness of content is a distinctive nature of the code documentation in a notebook versus in a traditional software program.

Code documentation is found critical for data scientists to share or reuse code (Chattopadhyay et al., 2020), but research (Rule et al., 2018) shows that many data scientists still neglect to write appropriate documentation for their code in a notebooks, as they feel writing documentation will slow down or hinder their coding process.

Automated CDG technique may help. However, existing code summarization techniques have two limitations when applied to the context of computational notebooks: First, prior work (e.g., (LeClair

```
import keras
from keras.models import Model, Sequential, load_model
from keras.layers import Input, Flatten, Dense, Dropout
from keras import backend as K

def nn_model(X, y, optimizer, kernels):
    classifier = Sequential()
    classifier.add(Dense(units = input_shape, kernel_initializer = kernels,
                        activation = 'relu',
                        input_dim = input_shape))
    classifier.compile(optimizer = optimizer, loss = loss, metrics = ['accuracy'])
    classifier.summary()
    return classifier

model = nn_model(X_train, y_train, 'adam', 'he_uniform')
history = model.fit(X_train, y_train, batch_size = 64, epochs = 1000,
                    validation_data=(X_test, y_test))
```

Figure 1: An example of multiple code blocks after one documentation block

### Code Summary

Ground truth	Implementing Neural Network
Our model	Implementing Neural Network
Code2seq	The following function of the model
Graph2seq	After perturbations

Table 1: Generated documentation for Fig.1 example

et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2019)) only consider one summary for one single code snippet. In computational notebooks, one markdown cell may contain documentation to summarize or to rationalize more than one code blocks beneath it. Second, the documentation in notebooks often has a hierarchical structure. For example, data preparation related code cells and documentation cells are often ahead of the model training cells. Existing literature (LeClair et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2019) does not consider the hierarchical structure of documentation or for more than one code snippets.

In this paper, we propose a graph-augmented encoder-decoder model for CDG task in the computational notebook context. In particular, our model consists of three parts, a code sequence encoder, an auxiliary documentation text encoder, and a Hierarchical Attention-based Convolutional Graph Neural Network (HACovGNN). Our sequence encoders encode the semantic information in code and docu-

mentation text, and the graph encoder encodes the contextual abstract syntactic trees (AST extracted from the code sequence) in order to better capture all structural information from the inputs. We then employ a hierarchical attention mechanism consisting of a high-level attention to attend the corresponding code ASTs and a low-level attention to attend the code tokens in order to learn a stronger relationship between codes and the predicted sequence. A comparison between our model and the other two baseline models shows that our model achieves a better performance on the notebook dataset, improving ROUGE-LCS F1 score (18.54) by over 81% compared to the code2seq model (10.24) and over 62% compared to the graph2seq model (11.18).

## 2 Background

Documenting the story behind codes and results is critical for data scientists to collaborate with others, as well as with their future selves (Kery and Myers, 2017). Automated CDG has many potential applications such as for code search (Howard et al., 2013). Though the CDG task in computational notebook context is new, we can review related research work on general program code summarization task.

**Heuristic-based Code Summarization** This group of work consider the code summarization task as two subtasks: selecting keywords and assembling them as a summary. They use heuristic/template-based techniques to generate a summary. For the first subtask, (Haiduc et al., 2010; Haiduc et al., 2010) in 2010 proposed a few heuristic-based approaches for source code summarization. (Rodeghero et al., 2014) proposed a novel summarization tool to find keywords. Recently, (Allamanis et al., 2016) tried to use a machine learning method to find keywords. On the second task, (Sridhara et al., 2010; McBurney, 2015) developed specific templates to rearrange identified keywords into the final summary. However, these methods all rely on finding keywords, thus the quality of the final summary is limited on the identified representative keywords, which often do not work for complex codes.

**Learning-based Code Summarization** This group of work utilize the recent development of neural network architectures and they often outperform the heuristic/template-based solutions. We highlight a few recent representative works here: (Iyer et al., 2016) collected Stack Overflow question titles as summaries (output) and top-rated code as

code (input). They then fed them into an attentional seq2seq model. (Hu et al., 2018) used a Structure-based Traversal(SBT) method to flatten the AST of code, and fed it into an encoder-decoder model. (Alon et al., 2019) proposed a code2seq model to further rely on a vector representation for each AST path separately through the encoder, the decoder applied attention on these representations to generate the output sequence. They found that the AST path helped to get more information from code, and the model performed better than the previous work (Alon et al., 2019). Later, (Xu et al., 2019; LeClair et al., 2020) proposed a general graph to sequence model to learn node embeddings and then reassemble them into the graph embeddings. However, this group of work only focus on summary generation for a single standalone code snippets. In our new CDG task, multiple adjacent code cells may be under one documentation and these code cells may have a hierarchical structure, thus these existing code summarization generation methods can not handle this new task. Our work is inspired by the previous approach proposed by (Xu et al., 2019; LeClair et al., 2020), where they propose to use code’s AST to augment a seq2seq model. We observe that for the multiple adjacent code cells in a notebook, we can define a hierarchical AST graph structure to represent the multiple code cells, if they are all covered by one documentation markdown cell. Thus, we build a new Hierarchical Attention-based Convolutional Graph Neural Network (HAConvGNN) for the new CDG task in a notebook.

## 3 Approach

### 3.1 Model Overview

Because there may be more than one adjacent code blocks after a documentation markdown cell in a notebook, we proposed a HAConvGNN model to encode all the useful information as a graph structure. As shown in Figure 2, our work uses HAConvGNN to process graph data. In addition, based on an descriptive analysis of the data, we identify there are on average 4 adjacent code blocks under a markdown block (Wang et al., 2021). Thus, we generate AST for each code block and assemble up to 4 AST sub-graphs into a higher level graph. Each training data point has 4 parts as input: the nodes of the AST graph, the edges of the AST graph, tokenized code sequence, and the tokenized documentation text. We denoted code sequence



the same operation as in EQ.1 and EQ.2. For each code block  $R_i$ , we are able to get a new attention weight  $\beta_i$ . For all code blocks, we can denote these attention scores as  $\beta = \{\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m\}$ .

Eventually, we fuse these attention weights with code block:

$$O = \sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_{i,j} G_{i,j} \quad (3)$$

Now we get the AST matrices from HAConvGNN. It is then concatenated with code matrices from the attention mechanism and decoder into a single context matrix. Then we apply linear projection to project it to 256 dimension space. This is an effective way to avoid overfitting during the training process. Finally, we flatten the new context matrix and apply another linear layer to project it into an output. The output layer size is the vocabulary size. By applying the Argmax<sup>1</sup> function in the numpy library to the output layer, we can get the predicted next token in the sequence.

## 4 Experiment

### 4.1 Dataset

The CDG task in notebooks is new task thus there is no existing dataset available, and we have to construct our own dataset. After checking the Kaggle data policy and the notebook license, we collected the top 10% of the publicly available notebooks from the top 20 popular competitions on Kaggle (a popular data science challenge platform <https://www.kaggle.com/c/>). We also contacted the Kaggle administrators to make sure our data collection complies with all data and privacy policy.

Then we preprocess the data by removing disqualified notebooks (e.g., non-English), and prepare the data into a usable format (following (LeClair and McMillan, 2019)). We first locate the markdown cells that have code cells beneath them. We use the markdown cell’s content as our target documentation sequence. Sometimes the markdown content is too long, we have two approaches to further shorten the documentation text: First, we identify the content enclosed by a headline schema, and use it directly as the target documentation text; if there is no headline schema, we then extract the first sentence in the markdown cell as the target

<sup>1</sup><https://numpy.org/doc/stable/reference/generated/numpy.argmax.html>

documentation sequence. After data preprocessing, our dataset has 28,625 documentation–code(s) pairs. Note that for one documentation sequence, the code sequence may have upto 4 code snippets. As part of the data preparation, we also parse all the code snippets into AST graphs through a python AST library<sup>2</sup>.

The data will be shared upon paper acceptance.

### 4.2 Settings

We split the dataset to train:dev:holdout with a 8:1:1 ratio. We use the Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2014) with a batch size of 20. The learning rate is 0.001. The code sequence embedding size is 100. In the encoder, we use GRU (Cho et al., 2014) with the hidden size of 256. The hop size of our GNN is 2. The dropout rate of our attention layer is 0.5.

### 4.3 Baseline Model

We compare our model against two baseline models. The reasons why we choose these models are: 1). these models are from recent SOTA papers on the code summarization task; 2). these models use two different approaches including using the path through the AST graph + code, and using GNN to encode the AST graph + code.

**Code2seq:** Alon et al. (Alon et al., 2019) proposed a method that created a vector representation for each AST path separately through an encoder. Then the decoder attends to them to generate the target sequence. They focused on C# code while we focus on Python. We re-implement their model in order to train on our dataset structure.

**Graph2seq:** (Xu et al., 2019) proposed a GNN based model to learn node embeddings and then reassemble them into the graph embeddings. This method proved that using GNN for AST as a separate input to the model can improve the documentation generation performance. Their work used SQL queries. To train on our dataset, We re-implement their model followed by (Haque et al., 2020) with all recommended parameters provided by (Xu et al., 2019).

### 4.4 Automated Model Evaluation

**Evaluation metrics:** We use ROUGE scores (Lin, 2004) to evaluate our model performance. ROUGE can be considered as a recall score to denote how much of the reference text appears in the predicted text. In this paper, we report ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2,

<sup>2</sup><https://docs.python.org/3.7/library/ast.html>



Models	ROUGE-1			ROUGE-2			ROUGE-L		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
code2seq	11.45	8.46	8.23	1.67	1.11	1.11	13.13	10.28	10.24
graph2seq	13.21	9.87	9.51	2.86	1.99	2.03	14.46	11.40	11.18
<b>Our Model &amp; Ablation Study</b>									
HACnvGNN (ours)	<b>22.87</b>	<b>16.92</b>	<b>16.58</b>	<b>6.72</b>	<b>4.86</b>	<b>4.97</b>	<b>24.03</b>	<b>18.60</b>	<b>18.54</b>
w/ separated attention w/o hierarchical attention w/ uniform attention	20.66	15.65	14.91	4.74	3.92	3.80	21.84	17.27	16.81
w/ separated attention w/o hierarchical attention w/o uniform attention	19.57	14.59	14.23	4.87	3.56	3.63	20.83	16.24	16.12
w/o separated attention w/ uniform attention	11.39	7.73	7.82	1.58	1.06	1.08	13.13	9.47	9.82

Table 2: ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, and ROUGE-L scores for baselines, our model, and ablation models. Results show that our model has higher scores for all three metrics, demonstrating a robust advantage to the code2seq and graph2seq model.

ROUGE-LCS (longest common sub-sequence) to provide comprehensive evaluation metrics.

**Results:** The CDG task in a notebook is much more difficult than the previous code summary tasks. The previous works only focused on one code block and use the simple inline comment as the target.

As shown in Table 2, our HACnvGNN model outperforms the other two baselines in all ROUGE metrics (1/2/L). Therefore, it demonstrates that our hierarchical model establishes a new state-of-the-art to solve code documentation generation tasks in the notebook setting. This highlights the importance of having the HACnvGNN structure to incorporate multiple code blocks characteristic in this context. We also provide the attention visualization to help users better understand our model.

**Attention Visualization:** We provide a visualization (Fig. 3) to illustrate the high-level attention mechanism (corresponding to the code example in Fig. 1). From Fig. 1, we speculate the second code block is the most important code blocks for the documentation “*Implementing Neural Network*”. Figure 3 shows that the second row, which is the second code block, has the darkest color thus it has the greatest influence weight on the output sequence.




Figure 3: Attention visualization. Each row represents a code block, and each column is a code token.

**Ablation study:** We also perform ablation study

for our model as shown in Table 2. Our ablation study shows how separate attention, uniform attention, and hierarchical attention contribute to the model. More concretely, we generate ablation models as follow:

(1) w/o separated attention: We remove separated attention mechanism in our HACnvGNN structure. When we remove the separated attention mechanism, we also remove hierarchical attention because we treat multiple code blocks as a standalone code snippet in this situation and process graph data with the original GNN layer.

(2) w/o hierarchical attention: We remove hierarchical attention mechanism in our HACnvGNN structure. That means we do not compute attention weights for separated code blocks.

(3) w/o uniform attention: We do not apply uniform attention mechanism for our HACnvGNN output with decoder.

We found that the hierarchical structure in our HACnvGNN is proven to enhance our final performance. It is worth noting that the separated attention mechanism is proved very useful in our model. A separated attention mechanism means we use the attention mechanism for our 4 code blocks separately. Therefore, for multiple code blocks documentation generation tasks, it is better to use the separate attention mechanism for this kind of task. According to the experiment, we can find that the hierarchical structure is very suitable and important for our task.



Figure 4: Average rated scores given by participants to each method across three dimensions.

Model	Correctness	Informativeness	Readability
Groundtruth	$\bar{x} = 1.09, \sigma=0.95$	$\bar{x} = 0.85, \sigma=0.97$	$\bar{x} = 1.03, \sigma=1.01$
Our model	$\bar{x} = 0.21, \sigma=1.33$	$\bar{x} = 0.17, \sigma=1.18$	$\bar{x} = 0.67, \sigma=1.20$
Code2seq	$\bar{x} = -0.59, \sigma=1.29$	$\bar{x} = -0.72, \sigma=1.17$	$\bar{x} = 0.03, \sigma=1.35$
Graph2seq	$\bar{x} = -0.30, \sigma=1.40$	$\bar{x} = -0.21, \sigma=1.25$	$\bar{x} = 0.32, \sigma=1.35$

Table 3: Human Evaluation Result

## 5 Human Evaluation

We also conduct a human evaluation to further evaluate our model against the two baselines and the ground truth.

**Participants:** Our human evaluation task involves reading code snippets and rating the generated documentation of the codes. We recruited participants with data science and machine learning backgrounds ( $N = 15$ ).

**Task:** We randomly selected 30 pairs of documentation and code(s) from our dataset. Note that each pair has only one summary, but may have multiple code snippets. Each participant is randomly assigned 10 trials, and the order of these 10 trials is also randomized. Each pair is evaluated by 5 individuals. In each trial, a participant reads 4 candidate documentation for the same code snippet(s): three generated by the three models, and the other one is the groundtruth. Participants do not know which documentation text is from which model. The participant is asked to rate the 4 documentation texts along three dimensions using a five-point Likert-scale from -2 to 2.

**Correctness:** The generated documentation matches with the code content.

**Informativeness:** The generated documentation covers more information units.

**Readability:** The generated documentation is in readable English grammar and words.

**Evaluation Results:** We conducted *pairwise t-tests* to compare each model’s performance. The result shows that for the *Correctness* dimension, our model (avg=0.21) is significantly better than

the other two baselines (avg=-0.59 for code2seq, avg=-0.30 for graph2seq, both  $p<.01$ ). Our model is also the only model that has a positive rating. For the *Informativeness* dimension, groundtruth also has the best rating. Our model (avg=0.17) comes in second and outperforms code2seq (avg=-0.72,  $p<.01$ ) and graph2seq (avg=-0.21,  $p<.01$ ).

For the *Readability* dimension, in which we consider whether generated documentation is a valid English sentence or not, groundtruth outperforms all ML models again, but our model (avg=0.67) also significantly outperforms baseline models code2seq (avg=0.03  $p<.01$ ) and graph2seq (avg=0.32  $p<.01$ ). Our model can generate more readable documentation than baselines.

All of the results suggest that our model has an above-zero rating, which suggests it reaches an acceptable user satisfaction along all three dimensions.

## 6 Conclusion and Future Work

This work targets a new application that aims to automatically generate code documentation (CDG) for a data science notebook. We construct a dataset from Kaggle challenge notebooks, and present a novel HAConvGNN model to encode the multiple adjacent code cells as a hierarchical AST graph to enhance a sequence model architecture. Our next step is to further improve the model performance, so that we can incorporate such a CDG algorithm as an application to support data scientist documentation practice.

## References

- Miltiadis Allamanis, Hao Peng, and Charles Sutton. 2016. A convolutional attention network for extreme summarization of source code.
- Uri Alon, Omer Levy, and Eran Yahav. 2019. [code2seq: Generating sequences from structured representations of code](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Souti Chattopadhyay, Ishita Prasad, Austin Z Henley, Anita Sarma, and Titus Barik. 2020. What’s wrong with computational notebooks? pain points, needs, and design opportunities. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–12.
- Kyunghyun Cho, Bart van Merriënboer, Caglar Gulcehre, Fethi Bougares, Holger Schwenk, and Y. Bengio. 2014. [Learning phrase representations using rnn encoder-decoder for statistical machine translation](#).
- S. Haiduc, J. Aponte, L. Moreno, and A. Marcus. 2010. [On the use of automated text summarization techniques for summarizing source code](#). In *2010 17th Working Conference on Reverse Engineering*, pages 35–44.
- Sonia Haiduc, Jairo Aponte, and Andrian Marcus. 2010. [Supporting program comprehension with source code summarization](#). *32nd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering*.
- Sakib Haque, Alexander LeClair, Lingfei Wu, and Collin McMillan. 2020. [Improved automatic summarization of subroutines via attention to file context](#). MSR ’20, page 300–310, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Matthew J Howard, Samir Gupta, Lori Pollock, and K. Vijay-Shanker. 2013. Automatically mining software-based, semantically-similar words from comment-code mappings. In *2013 10th Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*, pages 377–386. IEEE.
- Xing Hu, Ge Li, Xin Xia, David Lo, Shuai Lu, and Zhi Jin. 2018. Summarizing source code with transferred api knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI’18*, page 2269–2275. AAAI Press.
- Srinivasan Iyer, Ioannis Konstas, Alvin Cheung, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2016. [Summarizing source code using a neural attention model](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2073–2083, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mary Beth Kery and Brad A. Myers. 2017. [Exploring exploratory programming](#). In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing (VL/HCC)*, pages 25–29.
- Diederik Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- A. LeClair and C. McMillan. 2019. Recommendations for datasets for source code summarization. In *2019 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL)*.
- Alexander LeClair, Sakib Haque, Lingfei Wu, and Collin McMillan. 2020. Improved code summarization via a graph neural network. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Program Comprehension (ICPC)*.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. [ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries](#). In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- P. W. McBurney. 2015. [Automatic documentation generation via source code summarization](#). In *2015 IEEE/ACM 37th IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering*, volume 2, pages 903–906.
- Paige Rodeghero, Collin McMillan, Paul McBurney, Nigel Bosch, and Sidney D’Mello. 2014. [Improving automated source code summarization via an eye-tracking study of programmers](#).
- Adam Rule, Aurélien Tabard, and James D Hollan. 2018. Exploration and explanation in computational notebooks. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–12.
- Giriprasad Sridhara, Emily Hill, Divya Muppaneni, Lori Pollock, and K. Vijay-Shanker. 2010. [Towards automatically generating summary comments for java methods](#). pages 43–52.
- April Yi Wang, Dakuo Wang, Jaimie Drozdal, Michael Muller, Soya Park, Justin D Weisz, Xuye Liu, Lingfei Wu, and Casey Dugan. 2021. Themisto: Towards automated documentation generation in computational notebooks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.12592*.
- Kun Xu, Lingfei Wu, Zhiguo Wang, Yansong Feng, Michael Witbrock, and Vadim Sheinin. 2019. [Graph2seq: Graph to sequence learning with attention-based neural networks](#).

## A Appendix: Code-Summary Pair Examples

Code Summary	
Ground truth	Feature scaling
Our model	Feature scaling
Code2seq	We can have the model
Graph2seq	The next step is a lot of the training set

Table 4: Example 2 code summary of baseline models and our model

```
from sklearn.preprocessing import StandardScaler\nscaler = StandardScaler().fit(train_df)\ntrain_scale = pd.DataFrame(scaler.transform(train_df))
```

Figure 5: Example 2 code blocks

```
import warnings\nfrom imgaug import augmenters as iaa\nwarnings.filterwarnings("ignore")\n\naugmentation = iaa.Sequential([\n    iaa.OneOf([iaa.Affine(rotate=0), iaa.Affine(rotate=90), iaa.Affine(rotate=180),\n        iaa.Affine(rotate=270)]),\n    iaa.Fliplr(0.5), iaa.Flipud(0.2), iaa.OneOf([\n        iaa.Cutout(fill_mode="constant", cval=255),\n        iaa.CoarseDropout((0.0, 0.05), size_percent=(0.02, 0.25))],\n    iaa.OneOf([iaa.Snowflakes(flake_size=(0.2, 0.4), speed=(0.01, 0.07)),\n        iaa.Rain(speed=(0.3, 0.5))],\n    iaa.OneOf([iaa.Multiply((0.8, 1.0)),\n        iaa.contrast.LinearContrast((0.9, 1.1))],\n    ]),\n    iaa.OneOf([iaa.GaussianBlur(sigma=(0.0, 0.1)),\n        iaa.Sharpen(alpha=(0.0, 0.1))], random_order=True\n])
```

```
def get_ax(rows=1, cols=1, size=7):\n    _, ax = plt.subplots(rows, cols, figsize=(size*cols, size*rows))\n    return ax\n\nlimit = 4\nax = get_ax(rows=2, cols=limit//2)\n\nfor i in range(limit):\n    image, image_meta, class_ids, bbox, mask = modellib.load_image_gt(\n        dataset_train, config, image_id, use_mini_mask=False,\n        augment=False, augmentation=augmentation)\n\n    visualize.display_instances(image, bbox, mask, class_ids,\n        dataset_train.class_names, ax=ax[i//2, i%2],\n        show_mask=False, show_bbox=False)
```

Figure 7: Example 4 code blocks

Code Summary	
Ground truth	Count Monthly Mean
Our model	Monthly Count
Code2seq	We can have a look at the training set
Graph2seq	Feature Engineering

Table 5: Example 3 code summary of baseline models and our model

```
for year in year_list:\n    for month in range(num_months_per_year):\n        start_date = datetime.datetime(year, month+1, 1, 0, 0, 0)\n        end_date = datetime.datetime(year, month+1, 19, 23, 0, 0)\n        count_mean = train_data[start_date:end_date]['count'].mean()\n        train_data.loc[start_date:end_date, 'count_mean'] = count_mean\n\n        start_date = datetime.datetime(year, month+1, 20, 0, 0, 0)\n        last_day_of_month = calendar.monthrange(year, month+1)[1]\n        end_date = datetime.datetime(year, month+1, last_day_of_month, 23, 0, 0)\n        test_data.loc[start_date:end_date, 'count_mean'] = count_mean\n\ntest_data.head()
```

Figure 6: Example 3 code blocks

Code Summary	
Ground truth	Data Augmentation
Our model	Data Builder
Code2seq	We can have the model
Graph2seq	LSTM

Table 6: Example 4 code summary of baseline models and our model