

Reassessing Code Authorship Attribution in the Era of Language Models

Atish Kumar Dipongkor
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida, USA
atish.kumardipongkor@ucf.edu

Ziyu Yao
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia, USA
ziyuyao@gmu.edu

Kevin Moran
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida, USA
kpmoran@ucf.edu

Abstract

The study of Code Stylometry, and in particular Code Authorship Attribution (CAA), aims to analyze coding styles to identify the authors of code samples. CAA is crucial in cybersecurity and software forensics for addressing copyright disputes, detecting plagiarism, and supporting criminal prosecutions. However, CAA is a complex and error prone task, due to the need for recognizing nuanced relationships between coding patterns that may indicate authorship. This challenge is compounded in large software systems with numerous authors due to the subtle variability of patterns that signify the coding style of one author among many. Given the challenges related to this task, researchers have proposed and studied automated approaches that rely upon classical Machine Learning (ML) and Deep Learning (DL) techniques. However, such techniques have historically relied upon hand-crafted features, and due to the often intricate interaction of different features (e.g., formatting, identifier naming, etc.), have key limitations in properly characterizing authorship, and are sensitive to adversarial code perturbations.

Recently, transformer-based Language Models (LMs) have shown remarkable efficacy across a range of software engineering tasks, and in the authorship attribution on natural language in the NLP domain. However, their effectiveness in CAA is not well understood. As such, we conduct the first extensive empirical study applying two larger state-of-the-art code LMs, and five smaller code LMs to the task of CAA to six diverse, distinct datasets that encompass 12k code snippets written by 463 developers. Furthermore, we perform an in-depth quantitative and qualitative analysis of our studied models' performance on CAA using established machine learning interpretability techniques. The results of our analysis illustrate important findings that illuminate the behavior of LMs in understanding stylometric code patterns during the task of CAA, and point towards important directions for future work.

1 Introduction

The study of Code Authorship Attribution (CAA) centers around the analysis of coding styles, including coding structure, naming conventions, and formatting styles, to identify the authors of code samples [2, 8]. This is crucial in cybersecurity and software forensics for addressing copyright disputes, detecting plagiarism, and supporting criminal prosecutions [16, 33]. Consequently, this area of research is becoming increasingly popular [16]. However, manually verifying or identifying authors is tedious and time-consuming; these tasks are susceptible to human errors and inconsistencies, especially in large software systems [23]. These difficulties tend to arise because such systems often involve numerous authors, who often exhibit nuanced overlaps in coding styles (e.g., due to the

presence of style guidelines or linters) that can make differentiation among contributors difficult [34].

Considering the above challenges, researchers have proposed approaches using Machine Learning (ML) and Deep Learning (DL) techniques to automate tasks related to CAA [2–4]. However, these techniques suffer from two key limitations. Namely, they typically rely on *hand-crafted* feature engineering and they are susceptible to *adversarial attacks*, wherein authors attempt to avoid identification through purposeful code perturbations. Hand-crafted features are problematic because there are many different aspects that can define coding style (e.g., length, whitespace, declaration usage, identifier style) and manually defining features to properly capture a range of different coding styles is challenging. Prior models have also been shown to be susceptible to adversarial attacks [40]. Given these limitations, further research is needed to understand how to best design practical, robust techniques for carrying out CAA.

Recently, transformer-based Language Models (LMs) for code have shown remarkable effectiveness across several Software Engineering (SE) tasks including but not limited to Code Clone Detection, Vulnerability Detection, and Software Documentation [19, 42]. Much of the work that adapts LMs to SE tasks originated in the field of Natural Language Processing (NLP). In fact, stylometry for *natural language* is well studied within the field of NLP, where LMs have been illustrated to excel at the task [20, 22]. However, LMs have not been well studied for tasks related to *code* stylometry. We argue that it is worthwhile to understand the application of LMs to code stylometry for two main reasons. First, LMs are typically trained on massive datasets, spanning both code and natural language, meaning that they have likely observed a wide array of coding styles, and hence may perform well at picking up on the nuanced patterns that define authorship. Second, models fine-tuned for CAA can take advantage of the automated feature engineering capabilities of LMs, making use of rich code embeddings for CAA.

As such, in this paper, we carry out the first comprehensive, large-scale empirical study applying LMs to the task of CAA, with the intent of examining in what settings LMs excel at the task, their limitations across datasets of varying code composition, and their robustness to adversarial code transformations. Additionally, we aim to gain a better understanding of *why* we observe the model performance reported in our study through an in-depth analysis of LM behavior using machine learning interpretability techniques.

Our study context encompasses 12K code snippets gathered from six different sources, one of which is a novel dataset not explored in prior work. These datasets are highly diverse in terms of coding styles, with contributions from 463 developers. We fine-tune two larger code LMs, *Code Llama* [43] and *DeepSeek-Coder* [26], and five smaller code LMs including *CodeBERT* [21], *ContraBERT_C* [35],

ContraBERT_G [35], *GraphCodeBERT* [25] and *UniXcoder* [24], and evaluate their effectiveness in CAA across our studied datasets. More importantly, we also study the robustness of these models to adversarial attacks, by applying carefully crafted code perturbations to our dataset samples that have been shown effective at deceiving prior work. Finally, we conduct both qualitative and quantitative analysis by adapting well-known interpretability technique to our model and problem context in order to better understand *why* we observe the model performance captured in our study. Our analysis captures several significant findings that further our understanding of how LMs for code perform when tasked with tasks related to code stylometry, and point toward important directions for future investigation. The key findings from our study are as follows ¹:

Larger and Smaller LMs are Effective in Different Settings: Larger LMs like *Code Llama* have significant capacity, and when properly fine-tuned for the (CAA) task, tend to perform well on *multilingual, imbalanced datasets with shorter code snippets*, provided that they undergo adequate fine-tuning. Smaller fine-tuned models tend to perform well on *balanced, monolingual datasets*.

Stylistic Variation Influences Attribution Performance: A larger number of training samples does not always translate to better performance. For instance, in a dataset we derive from *LeetCode* [30], *C++ (62.19%) had the most samples but achieved only 64% accuracy*, whereas *C# (2.01%) had fewer samples but attained 94% accuracy*. This discrepancy arises due to the reduced stylistic variation in C++, where many developers solve the same problem in a similar style, making authorship attribution harder.

LMs Exhibit Orthogonal Stylistic Understanding: Different LMs are able to learn *distinct, non-overlapping stylistic features* to attribute authorship. The *top 30% most important features* (identified using Integrated Gradients [46]) play a crucial role in this process, and different models tend to learn different “important” features, motivating future work on combining different models.

LMs Are Less Vulnerable to Adversarial Attacks Than Prior ML/DL Techniques: Although adversarial success rates vary across models, LMs are generally more robust against adversarial attacks than *PbNN* [13], a prior DL-based technique that uses hand-crafted features. This is because LMs tend to learn more robust syntactic and structural features, primarily composed of combinations of **keywords** (`int, public, long`), **braces** (`{}`), and **parentheses** (`()`). Modifying these elements while preserving code semantics is challenging, making LMs more resistant to attacks.

Smaller LMs Exhibit Greater Robustness to Adversarial Attacks: Models with fewer parameters, such as *CodeBERT*, *ContraBERT_C*, *ContraBERT_G*, and *GraphCodeBERT* (each having 125M parameters), show *lower adversarial success rates* compared to larger models like *UniXcoder* (223M) and *DeepSeek-Coder* (1.3B).

Adversarial Pre-Training Improves Robustness: Models trained using contrastive learning, such as *ContraBERT_C* and *ContraBERT_G*, exhibit *lower adversarial success rates* than their non-contrastive counterparts. This suggests that *adversarial pre-training improves robustness* and helps mitigate attacks.

Adversarial Changes that Modify Higher Number of Tokens are More Successful: The most effective adversarial transformation rules involve *removing comments, eliminating unused code, adding print/log statements, modifying functions, and altering control flow*. These transformations change a larger portion of the code, making them more effective in deceiving LMs.

2 Problem Statement and Research Questions

CAA involves analyzing a piece of code to determine who wrote it when the author is unknown. In this paper, as in prior work [13] we formulate this problem as a multi-class classification problem, wherein a model takes a snippet of code as input and, predicts one of a known set of authors. In this paper, we evaluate the effectiveness of LMs on CAA answering the following research questions (RQs):

RQ₁: How effective are LMs for CAA? This RQ aims to evaluate the effectiveness of LMs in identifying the author of a given code snippet across diverse scenarios. Specifically, we assess their performance across different programming languages, code snippet sizes, and number of potential unique authors. To provide a comprehensive analysis, we compare the performance of LMs with an existing DL-based technique, examining their relative strengths and limitations in CAA.

RQ₂: What stylistic features of code do LMs learn when applied to CAA? CAA relies on the assumption that each developer has a unique coding style that models can learn to distinguish. While LMs may achieve high performance in CAA, it remains unclear whether they genuinely capture distinct stylistic features for each author or rely on spurious correlations. If LMs identify orthogonal stylistic features for each author, it would indicate that they are learning author-specific patterns. However, if the important features overlap significantly across authors, it would suggest that the models are making attributions based on shared structures rather than individual stylistic traits. Understanding this distinction is essential to ensure that LMs provide reliable and interpretable authorship predictions rather than merely optimizing for high accuracy through non-meaningful signals. This RQ aims to investigate whether LMs truly capture orthogonal stylistic features in CAA, by assessing their interpretability and robustness.

RQ₃: How robust are LMs against adversarial attacks for the CAA task? This RQ investigates the vulnerability of LMs in CAA when exposed to adversarial modifications. Since LLMs may rely on superficial stylistic patterns, they can be susceptible to attacks such as variable renaming, code refactoring, and statement reordering, which preserve original program logic while altering surface-level features. We aim to assess whether LMs capture deep, meaningful stylistic patterns or merely rely on brittle heuristics. Understanding their robustness will provide insights into potential weaknesses and inform the development of more resilient attribution models.

3 Studied Datasets

To answer the above RQs, we utilized six datasets collected from GitHub, Google Code Jam (GCJ), and LeetCode, whose details are provided in Table 1. The first five datasets are employed in existing studies [33, 52], while we collected the last one ourselves. The datasets GCJ-Java [33], GCJ-CPP [33], and GCJ-Python [52] are originated from the GCJ challenge. The other two datasets, Github-C [33] and Github-Java [33], are sourced from GitHub. We compiled

¹Note that this paper is a significant extension of a prior SRC paper [12] (anonymized for double blind)

Table 1: Summary of the Datasets using for CAA

Dataset	Authors (A)	Samples (S)	Min S per A	Max S per A
GCJ-CPP	20	160	8	8
GCJ-Java	74	2202	24	48
GCJ-Python	66	660	10	10
Github-C	66	1916	10	86
Github-Java	39	2667	11	583
LeetCode	198	4753	10	197

the last dataset from LeetCode. For this dataset, we scraped public solutions to various LeetCode problems. For instance, there are public solutions public solutions [32] to the *Two Sum* [31] problem. For each LeetCode problem, we collected all public solutions and submitted them to the platform to check for correctness. If the solution was accepted, it was included in our dataset. This method ensured the validity of the solutions, as not all public solutions were correct. Using this approach, we scraped solutions to 1,210 different problems from 198 developers, which includes 4,753 solutions across six programming languages: Java, Ruby, Python, JavaScript, C++, and C#. We contributed this dataset to evaluate LMs in following scenarios:

(1) Multilingual Scenario: As displayed in Table 1, existing datasets are monolingual, containing samples from a single programming language which often does not replicate the real-world. In the industries and open-source projects, developers often use multiple programming languages. For instance, a project may be written in Java but utilize Python for testing or JavaScript for web interfaces. This multilingual aspect is crucial for real-world CAA applications.

(2) Smaller Code Size and Imbalanced Data: As shown in Figure 1, the length of the code samples in the existing datasets is relatively larger than the code samples in the LeetCode dataset. As such, we can not evaluate the performance of LMs on small code samples using the existing datasets. However, in real-world scenarios, it is common to encounter small code snippets, such as those found in bug reports or code reviews. Therefore, we included the LeetCode dataset to evaluate the performance of LMs on small code samples. Additionally, existing datasets are mostly balanced, with each author contributing a similar number of samples. However, in real-world scenarios, the number of samples per author can vary significantly. For instance, some authors may contribute only a few lines of code, while others may contribute entire modules or libraries. Therefore, we included the LeetCode dataset to evaluate the performance of LMs on datasets with a large number of authors and varying numbers of samples per author.

(3) Less Stylistic Variation among Authors: In open-source or industry projects, developers often follow similar coding styles and conventions, making it challenging to distinguish between authors based on stylistic features. This is particularly true for large projects with many contributors, where the codebase is often subject to strict style guidelines and code reviews. While solving LeetCode problems, users often need to use the best data structure and algorithm to avoid time and space complexity issues. Therefore, there is less stylistic variation among authors.

(4) Adversarial Attack Scenario: While attacking LMs or any model, there are two main constraints needed to be considered: (1) the attack should not change the original logic of the code, and (2) adversarial samples should be plausible [40]. Prior CAA datasets do




Figure 1: Example Distributions of Code Sample Size in two Studied Datasets.

not include test cases, which makes it challenging to fulfill the first constraint. In our LeetCode dataset, we can test the first constraint by submitting the adversarial samples to LeetCode and checking if they are accepted. We discuss the second constraint for LeetCode datasets in threats to validity section.

4 Empirical Study Methodology

4.1 RQ₁: LM Effectiveness in CAA?

To answer RQ₁ and RQ₂, we fine-tune six pre-trained LMs for code including *CodeBERT* [21], *ContraBERT_C* [35], *ContraBERT_G* [35], *GraphCodeBERT* [25], *UniXcoder* [25], *DeepSeek-Coder* [26], and *Code Llama* [43] on the CAA task. LMs for code fall into several categories based on their architecture, pretraining objectives and number of parameters. We selected these LMs to include state of art large models (e.g., *DeepSeek-Coder*) and smaller more efficient models with different training schemes (e.g., *UniXcoder* and *ContraBERT_C*). The properties and attributes of these LMs are summarized in Table 2.

Figure 1 and Table 2 show that most samples exceed the input size of our smaller studied LMs. To address this, we split larger code samples into smaller chunks, ensuring each chunk fits within the model’s input limit while retaining the original author. This approach was applied to all LMs except *Code Llama* and *DeepSeek-Coder*. Due to GPU memory constraints, we could not split samples into chunks equal to their maximum input size. Instead, we limited chunk size to 2500 tokens for these models.

To fine-tune all encoder-only LMs, we adopt the standard sequence classification approach [17], which involves adding a classification layer to the embedding of the [CLS] token. For *Code Llama* and *DeepSeek-Coder*, we use the embedding of the last token as input to the classification layer. Fine-tuning is performed using the cross-entropy loss function, with the Adam optimizer [29] for weight updates. For all models, we set the maximum number of epochs to 20 and apply early stopping with a patience of 3. All experiments are conducted using the Hugging Face library [51].

In addition to this setup, we conduct hyperparameter tuning for the learning rate and batch size using a grid search approach, following an existing CAA study [13]. We evaluate three learning rates (5e-05, 3e-05, and 2e-05) and two batch sizes (16 and 32), as these values have been shown to be effective for fine-tuning LMs on downstream tasks [17]. This results in six configurations, each evaluated using *10-fold cross-validation* for all datasets except GCJ-CPP, where we use *8-fold cross-validation* due to 8 samples per

Table 2: Comparison of Studied Code Language Models

Model (Parameter Size, Short Description, Pretraining Data)	Details (Type, Layers, Input Limit, Pretraining Objective)
Code Llama (7B) - LLaMA-based model for code generation & completion, trained on 500B tokens of code data from GitHub.	Type: Decoder-Only, Layers: 32, Max Input: 16,384 tokens, Pretraining: Causal LM
DeepSeek-Coder (1.3B) - Large instruct-tuned model for code generation, trained on 2T tokens from multilingual data from GitHub.	Type: Decoder-Only, Layers: 24, Max Input: 4,096 tokens, Pretraining: Causal LM + Instruction Tuning
UniXcoder (223M) - Unified pretraining framework for code understanding & generation, trained on CodeSearchNet, GitHub and StackOverflow.	Type: Encoder-Decoder, Layers: 24, Max Input: 1,024 tokens, Pretraining: MLM (Masked Language Modeling) + PLM (Permuted Language Modeling) + RTD (Replaced Token Detection)
CodeBERT (125M) - Bimodal model trained on source code and NL, using CodeSearchNet (Python, Java, JavaScript, PHP, Ruby, Go) + NL.	Type: Encoder-Only, Layers: 12, Max Input: 512 tokens, Pretraining: MLM + RTD
GraphCodeBERT (125M) - Extends CodeBERT with structure-aware learning, trained on CodeSearchNet + Data Flow Graphs.	Type: Encoder-Only, Layers: 12, Max Input: 512 tokens, Pretraining: MLM + Edge Prediction
ContraBERT_C (125M) - Robust version of CodeBERT using contrastive learning, trained on CodeSearchNet + Augmented Data.	Type: Encoder-Only, Layers: 12, Max Input: 512 tokens, Pretraining: MLM + Contrastive Learning
ContraBERT_G (125M) - Robust version of GraphCodeBERT with contrastive pretraining, trained on CodeSearchNet + Data Flow + Augmented Data.	Type: Encoder-Only, Layers: 12, Max Input: 512 tokens, Pretraining: MLM + Contrastive Learning

author. We select the best hyperparameter set based on the average F1 score across all folds.

Our experiments reveal that the optimal hyperparameters vary across models and datasets. However, a learning rate of 3e-05 with a batch size of 16 performs best for the majority of models and datasets. Fine-tuning is conducted on a single NVIDIA H100 GPU with 80GB of memory. Due to memory constraints, we do not apply grid search to *Code Llama* and *DeepSeek-Coder*. Instead, we tune only the learning rate while fixing the batch size at 2. For *DeepSeek-Coder*, learning rates of 5e-05 and 3e-05 yield the best results depending on the dataset, while for *Code Llama*, a learning rate of 8e-5 performs best across all datasets. For *Code Llama*, we could not fine-tune its whole 7B parameters due to GPU memory constraints. Therefore, we fine-tune its projection layers in the self-attention mechanism using LoRA [27]. Specifically, we tune the query and value projection layers in the self-attention mechanism as suggested by the LoRA paper [27] with rank 32 and alpha 64.

For evaluating the effectiveness of LMs on the CAA task, we use *Accuracy*, *Precision*, *Recall*, and *F1-Score* as metrics. *Accuracy* is widely used in the literature [33, 52] to evaluate the effectiveness of baselines on the CAA task. However, *Accuracy* is biased towards majority classes, meaning if a model predicts the majority author correctly while failing on minority authors, it may still report a high accuracy. Therefore, we consider the other metrics as well to provide a more balanced evaluation. To ensure a robust assessment of model performance, we employ *K-fold cross-validation*, which mitigates biases from a single train-test split and provides a more stable performance estimate across different subsets of the dataset. This approach helps assess the generalization of LMs by ensuring that all authors contribute to both training and testing phases. As we mentioned above, we split the code samples into smaller chunks to fit the input size of LMs. To obtain the final prediction for a given code sample, we aggregate the predictions of its chunks by summing up their scores and selecting the author with the highest total score as the final prediction.

We employ Mann-Whitney U-test [38] to ascertain whether a statistically significant difference in performance exists between LMs. When comparing any two LMs, null hypothesis (H_0) posits that there is no significant difference in the average performance

($\mu_0 = \mu_1$) of the two. Conversely, alternative hypothesis suggests a significant difference in the average performance ($\mu_0 \neq \mu_1$) of the two LMs. Then we calculate the U-statistic, which is based on the difference in the summed ranks between the two models' accuracy scores across k -folds. If the p-value associated with U-statistic is less than the level of significance (α), we reject the null hypothesis. Otherwise, we conclude that a significant difference exists between the two models' performance.

Finally, we compare the effectiveness of LMs with a state-of-the-art (SOTA) DL-based technique *PbNN* [13]. *PbNN* (Path-based Neural Network) is a language-agnostic authorship attribution model designed to analyze source code. It is based on the code2vec [7] model, which transforms code into numerical representations by extracting AST (Abstract Syntax Tree) paths. We use the implementation of *PbNN* provided by the authors [13] and follow the same hyperparameters as in their paper. We use the same evaluation metrics as for LMs to compare the performance of *PbNN* with LMs.

4.2 RQ₂: What Patterns to LM Learn in CAA?

Some LMs may achieve exceptionally high *Accuracy*, *Precision*, *Recall*, and *F1-Score* in CAA. However, high performance alone does not confirm that these models are genuinely learning meaningful patterns. It is possible that they rely on spurious correlations rather than identifying distinct stylistic features for each author. Therefore, we investigate whether LMs capture orthogonal stylistic features of code during authorship attribution.

By orthogonal stylistic features, we mean that the model relies on a distinct and non-overlapping set of stylistic features for each author. If LMs truly learn unique stylistic patterns per author, then their decision-making process should be based on features that are specific to individual authors and uncorrelated across different authors. Conversely, if the models achieve high accuracy but rely on overlapping or non-distinctive features, this would suggest that LMs may be making predictions by chance, reducing the reliability of their authorship attribution capabilities.

To answer this research question, we employ an interpretability method, called *Integrated Gradients* [46]. This method assigns an importance score to each feature in the input, indicating its contribution to the model's prediction. By analyzing these feature

attributions, we can determine whether the model focuses on distinct stylistic aspects for different authors. While interpretability methods such as *Integrated Gradients* provide insights into feature importance, it is critical to assess whether these interpretations are faithful—that is, whether they accurately reflect the model’s actual decision-making process. To do this, we evaluate faithfulness using two key metrics: *Necessity* and *Sufficiency*. These metrics are well-established in the interpretability literature [9, 11, 41, 48] and measure how crucial the identified important features are for the model’s predictions.

Necessity quantifies whether removing the most important features (as identified by *Integrated Gradients*) significantly increases the model’s uncertainty. If LMs genuinely rely on these features, removing them should lead to higher perplexity in predictions—i.e., the model should struggle more to make accurate predictions. A higher *Necessity* value means that removing the identified features significantly increases the model’s uncertainty, confirming that these features were crucial for prediction.

Sufficiency measures whether the model can still make accurate predictions using only the important features identified by *Integrated Gradients*. If these features truly drive the model’s decision-making, then predictions should remain confident, meaning perplexity should stay low.

To assess whether LMs capture orthogonal stylistic features, we analyze *Necessity* and *Sufficiency* for the top-k% important features for each LM. An increase in *Necessity* and a decrease in *Sufficiency* as k increases indicate that the model relies on these features for predictions. Next, we examine whether these features are distinct across authors. If the top-k% features are largely non-overlapping, it suggests that LMs capture orthogonal stylistic patterns unique to each author. Conversely, if significant overlap exists, it implies that the models may be relying on shared structures rather than individual stylistic signals, raising concerns about the reliability of LMs for CAA task.

4.3 RQ₃: Effectiveness of Adversarial Changes

Existing literature has explored adversarial attacks on CAA models in two main categories: targeted and non-targeted attacks [33, 40, 52]. In targeted attacks, the adversary attempts to mislead the model into attributing a code snippet to a *specific incorrect author*. In non-targeted attacks, the goal is to cause the model to make *any incorrect attribution*. Prior studies [33, 40, 52] have shown that non-targeted attacks are more effective for CAA, achieving higher attack success rates. Therefore, we focus on non-targeted attacks in this study.

Several methods exist for generating adversarial code samples [34, 40, 47, 52]. However, these methods have limitations: (1) they are often specific to certain programming languages, or (2) they lack support for a wide range of program transformations. To address these limitations, we leverage a *prompt-based approach* using *GPT-4* [5] to generate adversarial code samples. Our approach consists of the following steps:

- (1) **Generating adversarial samples:** A *code transformation prompt*, and a given code snippet, are submitted to *GPT-4*.
- (2) **Functionality verification:** The adversarially transformed code is submitted to LeetCode to verify that its functionality remains unchanged.




Figure 2: Adversarial Sample Generation and Verification

- (3) **Transformation verification:** Since *GPT-4* is prone to hallucinations, we implemented a parser to verify whether the transformations were performed correctly.
- (4) **Evaluating LMs robustness:** If both verifications are successful, we query the LMs with the adversarial samples to assess their resilience to adversarial attacks.

Figure 2 illustrates the full adversarial sample generation and verification process. The code transformation rules used in this study are derived from transformation rules established in previous adversarial attack for CAA [33, 34, 40]. Below, we present a high-level summary of the code transformation rules used in this study, full details are in our appendix [10].

A. Statement Transformations: This category includes splitting or combining variable declarations, swapping the order of statements, and modifying the order of independent statements.

B. Name Transformations: This category includes rules that involve changing the naming style of variables and functions. For example, converting snake case to camel case or vice versa.

C. Operator Transformations: This category includes swapping relational operators (*a > b* to *b < a*), converting conditional statements to inverse operators (*a < b* would be *!(a > b)*), converting integer literals to expressions (*int b = 2 * 4*), and changing the style of increment or decrement operators (*i++* to *i += 1*).

D. Data Transformations: This category includes rules that involve converting integer numbers to hexadecimal values, character literals to ASCII values, string variables to character arrays, and boolean literals to integer literals.

E. Loop Transformations: This category includes rules that involve converting ‘for’ statements to ‘while’ statements & vice versa.

F. Control Flow Transformations: This category involves converting ‘if-else’ statements to ‘switch’ statements, ‘switch’ statements to ‘if-else’ statements, ‘if-else’ statements to ternary operators, and swapping the statements within ‘if-else’ statements.

G. Function Transformations: This category involves swapping the order of function parameters, adding an extra integer parameter with a default value of zero, creating a new function from a group of statements, and swapping the order of function declarations.

H. Miscellaneous Transformations: This category includes removing comments, unused code, and adding print/log statements to track variable values.

Using the above rules, we create 28 code transformation prompts to generate adversarial code samples. Then, each adversarial code

sample is verified for functionality and transformation correctness before being used to evaluate the LMs robustness to adversarial attacks. In our online appendix [10], we provide a detailed description of each code transformation prompt. We also provide the details of our parser for transformation verification.

5 Results

5.1 RQ1: Effectiveness of LMs for CAA

Table 3 presents the results of our *K-fold cross-validation* experiments, including the *Accuracy*, *Precision*, *Recall* and *F1-Score* for each model across all datasets. Figure 4 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U-test for two datasets. The black cells in Figure 4 indicate that the performance difference between the two models is not statistically significant since the p-value is greater than the level of significance (0.05). Based on these results, we discuss the effectiveness of LMs for CAA.

SOTA vs LMs: By using the replication package provided by *PbNN*, we have achieved slightly higher *Accuracy* than the *Accuracy* reported for GCJ-CPP, GCJ-Java, Github-C and Github-Java datasets by Zhen *et. al.* [33]. In the *PbNN*'s hyperparameters settings, they ran this model for 10 epochs. From the training dynamics, we observe that its *Accuracy* increases even after 10 epochs. Therefore, we ran *PbNN* for 40 epochs with early stopping patience 10 during our replication. This is likely the reason for slightly better *Accuracy*.

Figure 3 illustrates the percentage improvement of LMs over *PbNN* in terms of *Accuracy*, *Precision*, *Recall*, and *F1-Score*.

The results demonstrate a substantial advantage of LMs over *PbNN* across all datasets in CAA. In particular, the LeetCode dataset exhibits the largest performance gap, where LMs achieve over 130% improvement in *Accuracy*, up to 204.17% in *Precision*, 196% in *Recall*, and 213.04% in *F1-Score*. These improvements highlight the limitations of *PbNN* in handling *multilingual*, *imbalanced*, *short code snippets with minimal stylometric variation*, all of which are key characteristics of LeetCode. Across other datasets, LMs outperform *PbNN* by up to 38.03% in *Accuracy*, 53.97% in *Precision*, 46.97% in *Recall*, and 39.13% in *F1-Score*.

Interestingly, the performance gap in GCJ-Java is less than 10% across all metrics, suggesting that *PbNN* performs comparably to LMs when code samples are of equal size. In summary, LMs consistently outperform *PbNN* in CAA, and these improvements are **statistically significant** as shown in Figure 4. This confirms that LMs are more effective than *PbNN* for CAA.

LMs vs LMs: While LMs consistently outperform *PbNN*, their effectiveness varies depending on the dataset. Our statistical analysis indicates that in some datasets, LLMs perform comparably with no statistically significant differences, whereas in others, certain models achieve notably better results.

In GCJ-CPP and GCJ-Java, all LMs except one, achieved near-perfect scores with no statistically significant differences in performance. In GCJ-Python, however, *UniXcoder* and *DeepSeek-Coder* significantly outperformed other models, with *DeepSeek-Coder* achieving the highest *Accuracy*, *Precision*, *Recall*, and *F1-Score*. Other LMs performed similarly in this dataset, showing no statistically significant differences. A similar trend is observed in Github-C, where *DeepSeek-Coder* and *Code Llama* outperform other models, with *DeepSeek-Coder* achieving the highest scores across all metrics. In




Figure 3: Performance improvement of LMs over *PbNN*

contrast, the remaining LMs exhibit comparable performance. In Github-Java, *UniXcoder*, *DeepSeek-Coder*, and *Code Llama* significantly outperform other models. As previously discussed, these datasets share a similar distribution of code samples and authors, which explains the limited performance variation among LMs. In such cases, capacity factors like model number of parameters, and maximum input length appear to have a minimal impact on performance differences, as all top-performing models can effectively leverage the dataset's characteristics.

While the capacity factors of LMs (such as the number of parameters and maximum input length) have shown minimal impact on performance differences across most datasets, the LeetCode dataset presents a different scenario due to its multilingual nature, class imbalance, short code snippets, and minimal stylometric variation. Models with smaller number of parameters (125M) and similar input length (512 tokens), such as *CodeBERT*, *ContraBERT_C*, *ContraBERT_G*, and *GraphCodeBERT*, perform comparably. However, *UniXcoder* (223M, 1024 tokens) and *DeepSeek-Coder* (1.5B, 2500 tokens) significantly outperform the others, with *DeepSeek-Coder* achieving the highest *Accuracy*, *Precision*, *Recall*, and *F1-Score*. This suggests that in datasets with these characteristics, LLMs with larger capacity are more effective for CAA.

Interestingly, although *Code Llama* has the largest model size and input length, it performs comparably to *UniXcoder* and *DeepSeek-Coder*. This is likely because its parameters are not fully fine-tuned for the CAA task. Thus, we conclude that larger LMs are more effective for CAA in multilingual, imbalanced datasets with short code snippets and minimal stylometric variation, provided that they are appropriately fine-tuned.

Generalization: A critical aspect of evaluating LMs for CAA is understanding how well their performance generalizes across different dataset characteristics, including monolingual vs. multilingual code, balanced vs. imbalanced distributions, and variations in the length of the code snippet and stylometric diversity. Our analysis reveals that while LMs show strong generalization in well-balanced monolingual datasets, their effectiveness varies significantly in more complex multilingual and imbalanced settings.

For example, in well-balanced monolingual datasets such as GCJ-CPP, GCJ-Java, GCJ-Python, Github-C, and Github-Java, LMs achieve an average *Accuracy* of 96%, indicating strong generalization across these datasets. However, the LeetCode dataset presents additional challenges, such as short code snippets and reduced stylometric variation. As shown in Table 4, the average *Accuracy* drops to 77%, suggesting that LMs struggle to generalize as effectively

Table 3: K-fold cross-validation performance of LMs and baselines on the CAA task. The best results are in bold.

Dataset	Metric	PbNN	CodeBERT	Code Llama	ContraBERT_C	ContraBERT_G	DeepSeek-Coder	GraphCodeBERT	UniXcoder
LeetCode	Accuracy	0.32	0.60	0.69	0.66	0.66	0.74	0.66	0.68
	Precision	0.24	0.60	0.66	0.65	0.65	0.73	0.65	0.67
	Recall	0.25	0.60	0.69	0.66	0.66	0.74	0.66	0.68
	F1-Score	0.23	0.57	0.65	0.63	0.64	0.72	0.64	0.66
GCJ-CPP	Accuracy	0.90	0.98	0.99	0.94	0.98	1.00	0.99	1.00
	Precision	0.86	0.98	0.99	0.92	0.97	1.00	0.98	1.00
	Recall	0.90	0.98	0.99	0.94	0.98	1.00	0.99	1.00
	F1-Score	0.87	0.98	0.99	0.92	0.97	1.00	0.98	1.00
GCJ-Java	Accuracy	0.94	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.99	0.99	0.99
	Precision	0.94	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99
	Recall	0.93	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.99	0.99	0.99
	F1-Score	0.93	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.99
GCJ-Python	Accuracy	0.71	0.92	0.93	0.91	0.92	0.98	0.94	0.96
	Precision	0.63	0.90	0.91	0.90	0.90	0.97	0.92	0.95
	Recall	0.71	0.92	0.93	0.91	0.92	0.98	0.94	0.96
	F1-Score	0.66	0.91	0.92	0.90	0.90	0.97	0.93	0.96
Github-C	Accuracy	0.77	0.94	0.96	0.94	0.95	0.96	0.95	0.95
	Precision	0.71	0.94	0.96	0.94	0.95	0.97	0.95	0.96
	Recall	0.71	0.94	0.96	0.94	0.95	0.96	0.95	0.95
	F1-Score	0.69	0.93	0.96	0.93	0.94	0.96	0.94	0.95
Github-Java	Accuracy	0.97	0.98	1.00	0.99	0.98	1.00	0.99	1.00
	Precision	0.95	0.98	1.00	0.99	0.99	1.00	0.99	1.00
	Recall	0.95	0.98	1.00	0.99	0.98	1.00	0.99	1.00
	F1-Score	0.94	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.98	1.00	0.98	1.00

Table 4: Language-wise Accuracy of the LMs in LeetCode.
Sample per language: 62.19% CPP, 24.82% Java, 6.77% Python,
3.78% JavaScript, 2.01% C#, 0.03% Ruby.

Model	CPP	Java	Python	JavaScript	C#	Ruby
CodeBERT	0.55	0.58	0.74	0.82	0.93	0.79
ContraBERT_C	0.63	0.62	0.72	0.86	0.94	0.74
ContraBERT_G	0.62	0.63	0.73	0.79	0.91	0.74
GraphCodeBERT	0.63	0.62	0.74	0.80	0.95	0.68
UniXcoder	0.66	0.66	0.78	0.88	0.94	0.89
DeepSeek-Coder	0.72	0.75	0.77	0.91	0.95	0.79
Code Llama	0.67	0.66	0.68	0.79	0.95	0.79
Average	0.64	0.65	0.74	0.84	0.94	0.77

in this setting. Models tend to perform better with longer code snippets, as the mean and median lengths of incorrectly attributed samples are notably shorter than those correctly attributed.

Another key observation from Table 4 is that having more training data does not necessarily improve *Accuracy*. For example, CPP accounts for the largest proportion of samples (62.19%) in the LeetCode dataset, yet the average *Accuracy* of LMs is only 64%. In contrast, with just 2.01% of the dataset, C# achieves a significantly higher average *Accuracy* of 94%. The reason for this discrepancy is that when more developers solve a problem using the same language, the solutions exhibit *less stylometric variation*, making authorship attribution more difficult. For example, the CPP solutions to the *Power of Two* problem [1] are among the most misattributed samples in our results. This problem has two main solutions with different time complexities: $O(\log N)$ and $O(1)$. Since the $O(\log N)$ solution is less efficient, most users opt for the $O(1)$ approach, leading to highly similar solutions. As a result, the uniformity in coding patterns reduces distinguishable stylometric differences, making it harder for LMs to correctly attribute authorship.

A correlation analysis between the number of samples per author and *Accuracy* reveals a weak but statistically significant correlation




Figure 4: U-test results of Models for GCJ-Java and LeetCode.
The black cells indicate that the performance between models is not statistically significant.

(0.17). Although it is generally expected that authors with more samples would have higher attribution accuracy, the lack of strong correlation suggests that *having more samples does not necessarily aid authorship attribution when stylometric variation is low*.

Taken everything together, these findings highlight that while LLMs generalize well in larger, balanced datasets, their performance deteriorates for shorter code snippets that contain less stylometric variation, underscoring the need for further improvements in handling such complexities.

5.2 RQ₂: LMs' Code Stylometry Understanding

To determine whether LMs truly learn orthogonal coding styles, it is crucial to first assess the faithfulness of the interpretability method used — Integrated Gradients. Faithfulness ensures that the feature attributions provided by the method accurately reflect the model's true decision-making process. Without faithful explanations, conclusions about orthogonal coding styles may be misleading.




Figure 5: Faithfulness of *Integrated Gradients*'s explanations




Figure 6: Visualization of *DeepSeek-Coder*'s explanations

To ensure faithful attribution of model predictions, we apply *Integrated Gradients* to the embedding layers of LMs. The embedding layer serves as the model's initial processing stage, where raw code tokens are transformed into numerical representations. By computing feature attributions at this level, we ensure that the importance scores correspond directly to input tokens rather than higher-level latent representations. As shown in Figure 5, *Necessity* values are consistently high across most LMs up to 30%, indicating that removing 30% of the most important features identified by *Integrated Gradients* significantly reduces model confidence. This suggests that *Integrated Gradients* correctly identifies 30% features that are critical for classification. Additionally, *Sufficiency* values are also consistently decrease up to 30%, meaning that the LMs can make confident predictions when retaining only the 30% identified important features. Therefore, we use the top 30% important features to analyze orthogonal coding styles analysis to provide a balance between capturing critical information and interpretability.

Before analyzing the orthogonal coding styles of different authors, we first examine whether LMs capture consistent coding styles among the samples of the same author. Suppose a particular LM correctly attributes multiple code snippets ($C_1, C_2, C_3, \dots, C_n$) to author X_1 . If the model truly relies on the top 30% most important features identified by *Integrated Gradients*, we should observe a significant overlap in the important features across these samples. Our analysis reveals that the top 30% important features of $C_1, C_2, C_3, \dots, C_n$ exhibit a high degree of overlap (ranging from 84% to 94%), indicating that LMs capture consistent coding styles for the same author. Additionally, Figure 6 presents a t-SNE [50] visualization of the top 30% important features extracted from code samples in the GCJ-CPP dataset, where *Integrated Gradients* is applied to




Figure 7: Visualization of orthogonal coding styles across different authors using word clouds.

DeepSeek-Coder. The figure shows that samples from the same author form distinct clusters, further confirming that *DeepSeek-Coder* consistently relies on similar stylistic features within an author's code samples. We also observe similar results for other LMs.

From Figure 6, we observe that code samples from different authors are well separated, indicating that LMs capture distinct, orthogonal coding styles across authors. To further investigate this, we visualize the top 30% important features of different authors using word clouds. The word clouds in Figure 7 illustrate that different authors exhibit unique stylistic preferences, as evidenced by the dominant keywords and patterns in their respective clouds. For example, Author 2 frequently uses the keyword 'int', suggesting a preference for integer-based operations, while Author 3 consistently includes '//' comments, indicating a habit of documenting their code. This reinforces the idea that LMs effectively capture orthogonal coding styles by recognizing individualized patterns in variable usage, commenting habits, and other stylistic features.

Somewhat interestingly, we observe that different LMs capture distinct orthogonal coding styles for the same author. This variation arises due to differences in tokenization, as each LM employs a unique tokenizer that affects how the same code snippet is segmented into tokens. For example, *DeepSeek-Coder* treats 'addTwoNumbers' as four tokens ('add', 'Two', 'Num', 'bers'), whereas *Code Llama* splits into three tokens ('_add', 'Two', 'Numbers'). Consequently, *Integrated Gradients* identifies different important features across models, leading to variation in feature attributions and contributing to the orthogonal behavior observed in LMs.

Figure 8 illustrates the Degree of Orthogonality [18] in CAA within the LeetCode dataset. The value in the common area represents the number of code snippets correctly attributed by all LMs, while the exclusive regions indicate the number of samples uniquely classified by each model, highlighting their individual strengths. For instance, all baselines correctly assign 2004 code snippets to the original developer across all datasets. However, *DeepSeek-Coder* exhibits the highest Degree of Orthogonality in CAA, followed by *Code Llama* and *CodeBERT*.

These findings suggest two potential directions for improving CAA performance: (1) developing an *ensemble method* that leverages the diverse strengths of multiple LLMs, or (2) transferring the *orthogonal behaviors* of different models into a single LLM through *feature fusion* or *knowledge distillation*. By incorporating diverse stylistic representations, these approaches could enhance the robustness and accuracy of authorship attribution.




Figure 8: Orthogonality of LMs in LeetCode dataset

5.3 RQ₃: LMs’ Robustness to Adversarial Attacks

Since we used *GPT-4* to generate adversarial samples, we first evaluate its effectiveness in generating these samples before assessing the robustness of LMs against adversarial attacks. To measure robustness, we use the **adversarial success rate** [33]. Here, a higher adversarial success rate indicates that an LM is **less robust** against adversarial attacks.

All LMs correctly attributed 4072 samples from the LeetCode dataset. Each of these samples was transformed into an adversarial version using *GPT-4* with a predefined transformation prompt. Since we employed 28 different transformation prompts, the total number of adversarial samples generated was 114016 (4072 × 28). To ensure that the transformations preserved the original code’s logic, we submitted all generated samples to LeetCode. However, only 41.85% (47,716) of the samples were accepted, meaning they retained functional correctness.

Next, we applied a three-step verification process using our parser to ensure that only valid adversarial samples were used for evaluation. Only 35498 samples passed all three verification criteria and were subsequently used to evaluate the robustness of LMs against adversarial attacks.

- (1) **Applicability Check:** Was the requested transformation applicable to the original sample? (**Expected: YES**). For example, if the prompt instructed *GPT-4* to remove all comments, but the original code contained no comments, the transformation would be invalid.
- (2) **Correctness Check:** Was the requested transformation accurately applied to the adversarial code? (**Expected: YES**). For example, if *GPT-4* was instructed to remove comments, the adversarial code should indeed contain no comments.
- (3) **Consistency Check:** Did *GPT-4* introduce any unintended transformations? (**Expected: NO**). For example, if *GPT-4* was instructed to replace a ‘for’ loop with a ‘while’ loop but also removed comments, this would introduce an unintended modification, making it difficult to isolate the cause of attack success.

SOTA vs LMs: Figure 9 illustrates the adversarial success rate of *PbNN* and various LMs. The results indicate that *PbNN* has the highest adversarial success rate (42.18%), making it more susceptible




Figure 9: Adversarial Success Rate of LMs

to adversarial attacks than most LMs. Additionally, its category-wise success rate is also the highest across all categories.

LMs vs LMs: Among the LMs, *Code Llama* exhibits the highest adversarial success rate (56.57%), followed by *DeepSeek-Coder* (28.74%), *UniXcoder* (25.42%), *GraphCodeBERT* (17.92%), *CodeBERT* (17.83%), *ContraBERT_G* (16.64%), and *ContraBERT_C* (15.72%). Since we were unable to fine-tune all parameters of *Code Llama*, this may explain its comparatively lower robustness.

Excluding *Code Llama*, Table 2, Table 3, and Figure 9 lead to the following key observations:

- (1) **More effective LMs tend to be more vulnerable to adversarial attacks.** For instance, *DeepSeek-Coder*, which demonstrates the highest effectiveness in CAA, is also the most susceptible to adversarial attacks. However, one might argue that the total number of adversarial samples is not the same across all LMs, making direct comparisons unfair. To address the sample imbalance concern, we re-conducted adversarial attacks using only the samples that were correctly attributed by all LMs. The results remained consistent with our previous findings. For example, the adversarial success rates under equal sample conditions for *CodeBERT*, *ContraBERT_C*, *ContraBERT_G*, *GraphCodeBERT*, *UniXcoder*, and *DeepSeek-Coder* are 13.40%, 10.96%, 11.22%, 11.77%, 16.05%, and 19.20%, respectively.
- (2) **Smaller LMs (in terms of parameters) exhibit greater robustness to adversarial attacks.** Models with fewer parameters, such as *CodeBERT*, *ContraBERT_C*, *ContraBERT_G*, and *GraphCodeBERT* (each having 125M parameters), show lower adversarial success rates than larger models like *UniXcoder* (223M) and *DeepSeek-Coder* (1.3B).
- (3) **Adversarial pre-training improves robustness.** Contrastive learning-based models like *ContraBERT_C* and *ContraBERT_G*, which were designed to enhance the robustness of *CodeBERT* and *GraphCodeBERT*, respectively, exhibit lower adversarial success rates compared to their non-contrastive counterparts.

Figure 9 also presents the success rates of individual transformation rules for all LMs. The results indicate that transformation rules *E*, *G*, and *H* — which involve removing comments, eliminating unused code, adding print/log statements, and modifying functions and control flow — are the most effective in deceiving LMs.




Figure 10: Extent of Code Changes per Rule

To understand why these rules are particularly effective, we examined the amount of code they modify. As shown in Figure 10, these transformation rules introduce more code changes than others. From Figure 10, it is evident that *transformation rule H* results in the highest number of code modifications and is also the most effective adversarial transformation in Figure 9. These findings suggest that transformation rules that modify more lines of code tend to be more effective in deceiving LMs.

Why are LMs less vulnerable to adversarial attacks? Although adversarial success rates vary across LMs, they are generally less susceptible to adversarial attacks compared to *PbNN*. This is because LLMs rely on subtle syntactic and structural features of the code, such as keywords (e.g., `int`, `public`, `private`, `long`), braces (`{}`), and parentheses (`()`), as illustrated in Figure 7. Modifying these elements while preserving semantics and successfully evading LMs is inherently challenging, making them more robust.

6 Related Work

Mohammed *et al.* [2, 3] utilized both ML and DL to address CAA. They employed Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) to extract TF-IDF-based stylometric features and used a Random Forest Classifier (RFC) for authorship attribution. In a separate study, they applied Convolutional Neural Networks for the same purpose [4]. Alsulami *et al.* [8] proposed using a Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) [44] network to extract relevant features from the AST representation of programmers’ source code, followed by a SoftMax Layer for authorship attribution. Although their study reported high accuracy, it did not assess the model’s resilience against adversarial attacks. Bogomolov *et al.* [13] introduced a Path-based Neural Network (*PbNN*) for authorship attribution by modifying the *code2vec* neural network architecture, focusing on the relative term frequencies of tokens and paths in the abstract syntax tree (AST). Burrows *et al.* [14, 15] used n-gram features extracted from source code to train a Support Vector Machine (SVM) for the same purpose. These studies also incorporated various manual feature engineering techniques to extract stylometric features such as byte-level information and program dependence graphs from source code [16, 23, 49]. Despite their high reported accuracy, these studies did not examine their models’ performance under adversarial attack.

Addressing the gap in evaluating resistance to adversarial attacks, we found several studies that did assess this aspect. Quiring *et al.* [40] designed an adversarial attack strategy for CAA using Monte-Carlo tree search, which dramatically reduced the model’s accuracy from 88% to 1%. Other studies have also showed that automated CAA models are susceptible to adversarial attacks [33, 34, 36, 37, 45]. In this study, we follow the similar methodology to perform adversarial attack on LMs.

Although LMs have demonstrated promising results in various SE tasks such as code completion [42], code summarization [6], code translation [39], and bug triaging [18], their application in CAA has been relatively unexplored. Yang *et al.* [52] introduced *ALERT*, a method that generates adversarial samples by renaming method names. They then fine-tuned and targeted *CodeBERT* and *GraphCodeBERT* in their attacks, affecting Vulnerability Prediction, Clone Detection, and Authorship Attribution. However, their approach to perturbing code, limited to renaming method names, is considerably less extensive than our 28 transformation rules.

7 Threats to Validity

It is known that language models like *GPT-4* provide non-deterministic outputs and may produce slightly different adversarial samples upon reproduction. To mitigate this threat, we use a low temperature (0), as suggested by Huang *et al.* [28].

Another potential threat to reproducibility arises from our reliance on *GPT-4*—a proprietary tool—for adversarial sample generation, rather than open-source alternatives like *Llama* or *DeepSeek*. While we attempted to use *Llama*, most of its adversarial samples were rejected by LeetCode’s submission system, which is crucial for verifying the semantic correctness of adversarial transformations. *DeepSeek* provides free access through its web interface, but its API is paid, making it impractical for generating adversarial samples for 114,016 code snippets. We instead use *GPT-4o*’s API, which is free through the GitHub Copilot plugin. Thus, researchers can reproduce our results using GitHub Copilot’s plugin.

A further validity threat is that adversarial samples may reflect *GPT-4*’s stylistic tendencies rather than those of a real human attacker. To mitigate this, we conduct a human evaluation of adversarial samples that significantly impact model performance. These samples, verified by our parser and LeetCode’s submission system, cover all transformation rules. For this human evaluation, we followed similar setup of Yang *et al.* [52] for evaluating the naturalness of adversarial samples.

We employ a two-step evaluation process. First, one of the authors manually verifies statistically representative samples (95% confidence level), assessing whether: (i) *GPT-4* followed the supplied transformation prompt, (ii) the adversarial code contains extraneous changes, and (iii) the transformed code remains plausible, readable, and free from obfuscation or junk code. Then, four PhD students in software engineering independently evaluate disjoint subsets of adversarial samples using the same criteria. After independent reviews, negotiated agreement was used to reach consensus.

Through this process, all evaluators agreed that *GPT-4* follows the supplied prompts and that our parser effectively verifies transformations. Additionally, evaluators note that *GPT-4* tends to remove comments while applying transformations. To prevent unintended bias, we exclude such cases from the adversarial attack experiments. Regarding plausibility, the evaluators confirm that the generated adversarial samples are generally realistic, except for those adding print/log statements, which were rated moderately plausible.

8 Conclusion

Our results show that LMs *generally excel at CAA* when properly fine-tuned, with *larger models* like *Code Llama* and *DeepSeek-Coder*

providing superior performance on multilingual datasets that exhibit significant variance. Surprisingly, even *smaller models* such as *CodeBERT* and *GraphCodeBERT* often perform competitively, especially in structured, monolingual scenarios. We also found that LMs—particularly those pre-trained with contrastive objectives—are substantially *more robust to adversarial perturbations* compared to earlier neural techniques.

References

- [1] [n. d.]. Power of Two. <https://leetcode.com/problems/power-of-two/>. Accessed: 2025-03-05.
- [2] Mohammed Abuhamad, Tamer AbuHmed, Aziz Mohaisen, and DaeHun Nyang. 2018. Large-scale and language-oblivious code authorship identification. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 101–114.
- [3] Mohammed Abuhamad, Tamer AbuHmed, David Mohaisen, and Daehun Nyang. 2021. Large-scale and Robust Code Authorship Identification with Deep Feature Learning. *ACM Transactions on Privacy and Security (TOPS)* 24, 4 (2021), 1–35.
- [4] Mohammed Abuhamad, Ji-su Rhim, Tamer AbuHmed, Sana Ullah, Sanggil Kang, and DaeHun Nyang. 2019. Code authorship identification using convolutional neural networks. *Future Generation Computer Systems* 95 (2019), 104–115.
- [5] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Alten Schmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774* (2023).
- [6] Toufique Ahmed, Kunal Suresh Pai, Premkumar Devanbu, and Earl Barr. 2024. Automatic semantic augmentation of language model prompts (for code summarization). In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1–13.
- [7] Uri Alon, Meital Zilberman, Omer Levy, and Eran Yahav. 2018. A general path-based representation for predicting program properties. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* 53, 4 (2018), 404–419.
- [8] Bander Alsulami, Edwin Dauber, Richard Harang, Spiros Mancoridis, and Rachel Greenstadt. 2017. Source code authorship attribution using long short-term memory based networks. In *Computer Security—ESORICS 2017: 22nd European Symposium on Research in Computer Security, Oslo, Norway, September 11–15, 2017, Proceedings, Part I* 22. Springer, 65–82.
- [9] David Alvarez Melis and Tommi Jaakkola. 2018. Towards robust interpretability with self-explaining neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 31 (2018).
- [10] Anonymous. 2024. LLM and Code Stylometry. Accessed: 2024-01-11.
- [11] Pepa Atanasova. 2024. A diagnostic study of explainability techniques for text classification. In *Accountable and Explainable Methods for Complex Reasoning over Text*. Springer, 155–187.
- [12] Anonymous Author. 2024. Code Stylometry and Language Modeling Study. In *Proceedings of the Anonymous Software Engineering Conference (Anonymous City) (SE Conference '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2429–2431.
- [13] Egor Bogomolov, Vladimir Kovalenko, Yurii Rebryk, Alberto Bacchelli, and Timofey Bryksin. 2021. Authorship attribution of source code: A language-agnostic approach and applicability in software engineering. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*. 932–944.
- [14] Steven Burrows and Seyed MM Tahaghoghi. 2007. Source code authorship attribution using n-grams. In *Proceedings of the twelfth Australasian document computing symposium, Melbourne, Australia, RMIT University*. Citeseer, 32–39.
- [15] Steven Burrows, Alexandra L Uitdenbosch, and Andrew Turpin. 2014. Comparing techniques for authorship attribution of source code. *Software: Practice and Experience* 44, 1 (2014), 1–32.
- [16] Aylin Caliskan-Islam, Richard Harang, Andrew Liu, Arvind Narayanan, Clare Voss, Fabian Yamaguchi, and Rachel Greenstadt. 2015. De-anonymizing programmers via code stylometry. In *24th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 15)*. 255–270.
- [17] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [18] Atish Kumar Dipongkor and Kevin Moran. 2023. A Comparative Study of Transformer-based Neural Text Representation Techniques on Bug Triaging. In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 1012–1023.
- [19] Xiaohu Du, Ming Wen, Zichao Wei, Shangwen Wang, and Hai Jin. 2023. An Extensive Study on Adversarial Attack against Pre-trained Models of Code. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*. 489–501.
- [20] Maël Fabien, Esaú Villatoro-Tello, Petr Motlicek, and Shantipriya Parida. 2020. BertAA: BERT fine-tuning for Authorship Attribution. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Natural Language Processing (ICON)*. 127–137.
- [21] Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Xiaocheng Feng, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Bing Qin, Ting Liu, Dixin Jiang, et al. 2020. Codebert: A pre-trained model for programming and natural languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08155* (2020).
- [22] Olga Fourkioti, Symeon Symeonidis, and Avi Arampatzis. 2019. Language models and fusion for authorship attribution. *Information Processing & Management* 56, 6 (2019), 102061.
- [23] Georgia Frantzescou, Efstratios Stamatatos, Stefanos Gritzalis, and Sokratis Katsikas. 2006. Effective identification of source code authors using byte-level information. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on Software engineering*. 893–896.
- [24] Daya Guo, Shuai Lu, Nan Duan, Yanlin Wang, Ming Zhou, and Jian Yin. 2022. Unixcoder: Unified cross-modal pre-training for code representation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.03850* (2022).
- [25] 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).
- [26] Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Yu Wu, YK Li, et al. 2024. DeepSeek-Coder: When the Large Language Model Meets Programming—The Rise of Code Intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196* (2024).
- [27] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhi Chen, et al. 2022. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ICLR* 1, 2 (2022), 3.
- [28] Baixiang Huang, Canyu Chen, and Kai Shu. 2024. Can large language models identify authorship? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08213* (2024).
- [29] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).
- [30] LeetCode. 2024. LeetCode: The World's Leading Online Programming Learning Platform. <https://leetcode.com/>. Accessed: 2024-01-11.
- [31] LeetCode. 2024. Two Sum Problem Description. <https://leetcode.com/problems/two-sum/description/>. Accessed: 2024-01-11.
- [32] LeetCode. 2024. Two Sum Public Solutions. <https://leetcode.com/problems/two-sum/solution/>. Accessed: 2024-01-11.
- [33] Zhen Li, Guenever Chen, Chen Chen, Yayı Zou, and Shouhuai Xu. 2022. Ropgen: Towards robust code authorship attribution via automatic coding style transformation. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1906–1918.
- [34] Qianjun Liu, Shouling Ji, Changchang Liu, and Chunming Wu. 2021. A practical black-box attack on source code authorship identification classifiers. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 16 (2021), 3620–3633.
- [35] Shangqing Liu, Bozhi Wu, Xiaofei Xie, Guozhu Meng, and Yang Liu. 2023. Contrabert: Enhancing code pre-trained models via contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.09072* (2023).
- [36] Alina Matyukhina, Natalia Stakhanova, Mila Dalla Preda, and Celine Perley. 2019. Adversarial authorship attribution in open-source projects. In *Proceedings of the Ninth ACM Conference on Data and Application Security and Privacy*. 291–302.
- [37] Christopher McKnight and Ian Goldberg. 2018. Style counsel: Seeing the (random) forest for the trees in adversarial code stylometry. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*. 138–142.
- [38] Patrick E McKnight and Julius Najab. 2010. Mann-Whitney U Test. *The Corsini encyclopedia of psychology* (2010), 1–1.
- [39] Rangeet Pan, Ali Reza Ibrahimzada, Rahul Krishna, Divya Sankar, Lambert Pouguem Wassi, Michele Merler, Boris Sobolev, Raju Pavuluri, Saurabh Sinha, and Reyhaneh Jabbarvand. 2023. Understanding the effectiveness of large language models in code translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03109* (2023).
- [40] Erwin Quiring, Alwin Maier, and Konrad Rieck. 2019. Misleading authorship attribution of source code using adversarial learning. In *28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 19)*. 479–496.
- [41] Dakning Rai, Yilun Zhou, Bailin Wang, and Ziyu Yao. 2023. Explaining large language model-based neural semantic parsers (student abstract). In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 37. 16308–16309.
- [42] Veselin Raychev, Martin Vechev, and Eran Yahav. 2014. Code completion with statistical language models. In *Proceedings of the 35th ACM SIGPLAN conference on programming language design and implementation*. 419–428.
- [43] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaojing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Romain Sauvestre, Tal Remez, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950* (2023).
- [44] Alex Sherstinsky. 2020. Fundamentals of recurrent neural network (RNN) and long short-term memory (LSTM) network. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* 404 (2020), 132306.
- [45] Lucy Simko, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Tadayoshi Kohno. 2018. Recognizing and imitating programmer style: Adversaries in program authorship attribution.

- Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* (2018).
- [46] Mukund Sundararajan, Ankur Taly, and Qiqi Yan. 2017. Axiomatic attribution for deep networks. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 3319–3328.
 - [47] Zhao Tian, Junjie Chen, and Zhi Jin. 2023. Code Difference Guided Adversarial Example Generation for Deep Code Models. In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 850–862.
 - [48] Yi-Lin Tuan, Connor Pryor, Wenhui Chen, Lise Getoor, and William Yang Wang. 2021. Local explanation of dialogue response generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 404–416.
 - [49] Farhan Ullah, Junfeng Wang, Sohail Jabbar, Fadi Al-Turjman, and Mamoun Alazab. 2019. Source code authorship attribution using hybrid approach of program dependence graph and deep learning model. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 141987–141999.
 - [50] Laurens van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. 2008. Visualizing Data using t-SNE. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 9 (2008), 2579–2605. <http://www.jmlr.org/papers/v9/vandermaaten08a.html>
 - [51] Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierrick Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, and Jamie Brew. 2020. Transformers: State-of-the-Art Natural Language Processing. arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03771. <https://huggingface.co> Available at <https://huggingface.co>.
 - [52] Zhou Yang, Jieke Shi, Junda He, and David Lo. 2022. Natural attack for pre-trained models of code. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1482–1493.