

Item 108

**git\_comments:**

**git\_commits:**

1. **summary:** [SPARK-25321][ML] Revert SPARK-14681 to avoid API breaking change  
**message:** [SPARK-25321][ML] Revert SPARK-14681 to avoid API breaking change ## What changes were proposed in this pull request? Revert SPARK-14681 to avoid API breaking change. PR [SPARK-14681] will break mleap. ## How was this patch tested? N/A Closes #22492 from WeichenXu123/revert\_tree\_change. Authored-by: WeichenXu <weichen.xu@databricks.com> Signed-off-by: Xiangrui Meng <meng@databricks.com>

**github\_issues:**

**github\_issues\_comments:**

**github\_pulls:**

1. **title:** [SPARK-25321][ML] Revert SPARK-14681 to avoid API breaking change  
**body:** ## What changes were proposed in this pull request? Revert SPARK-14681 to avoid API breaking change. PR [SPARK-14681] will break mleap. ## How was this patch tested? N/A

**github\_pulls\_comments:**

1. Since this changes public API, shall we also revert it from master?
2. **\*\*[Test build #96352 has finished]**  
(<https://amplab.cs.berkeley.edu/jenkins/job/SparkPullRequestBuilder/96352/testReport>)\*\* for PR 22492 at commit [`d976a7e``]  
(<https://github.com/apache/spark/commit/d976a7e8646a61fffffb76f417f11557f25cc9e>). \* This patch passes all tests. \* This patch merges cleanly. \* This patch adds the following public classes `_(experimental)_`: \* ``sealed abstract class Node extends Serializable``
3. @mengxr Should this be put into master ?
4. We can keep it in master if the next release is 3.0.
5. LGTM. Merged into branch-2.4. @WeichenXu123 Next time please create dedicated JIRAs for each QA task PR. Thanks!
6. @WeichenXu123 Please close this PR manually. Thanks!
7. The next version is very likely to be 2.5.0...
8. @WeichenXu123 @cloud-fan I made <https://github.com/apache/spark/pull/22618> to revert the change in master.
9. May I ask a question, @mengxr ? The master becomes 3.0 today by @gatorsmile 's PR and I saw the following your comment [here](<https://github.com/apache/spark/pull/22492#issuecomment-423604739>). > We can keep it in master if the next release is 3.0. Is there any new reason to change the decision?
10. @cloud-fan said above the next version is very likely to be 2.5.0 instead of 3.0. Well the next version number is not fully discussed yet. For that reason, I think we should revert the changes in master as well. After that we should check if the feature itself can be added without introducing breaking changes.
11. Thank you! Although ``master`` becomes [3.0.0](<https://github.com/apache/spark/pull/22606>) already and seems to start to target ``Mar 2019``, I agree with you on reverting for rechecking, @mengxr . Spark 3.0.0 has better have the minimal number of incompatible APIs.

**github\_pulls\_reviews:**

**jira\_issues:**

**jira\_issues\_comments:**