

Update from Hell: Can Coding Agents Survive Hidden Breakage in Dependency Upgrades?

Zijian Luo*, Runzhi He†, Pengfei Gao‡, Yu Kang‡, Zeqi Lin‡,
Minghua Ma‡, Qingwei Lin‡, Saravan Rajmohan‡, and Yongqiang Tian*

*Monash University

Emails: jack.luo@monash.edu, yongqiang.tian@monash.edu

†Peking University

Email: rzhe@pku.edu.cn

‡Microsoft

Emails: gaopengfei@microsoft.com, kay@microsoft.com,

Zeqi.Lin@microsoft.com, minghuama@microsoft.com,

qlin@microsoft.com, saravar@microsoft.com

Abstract—Modern software systems rely heavily on third-party dependencies, but upgrading those dependencies remains a costly maintenance activity. Dependency upgrades do not always preserve the function signatures, type systems, APIs, or runtime semantics assumed by existing code. Consequently, developers often need to perform source code adaptations to accommodate dependency-induced changes. However, such code-level changes are often not explicitly communicated to project maintainers, posing a significant challenge to software reliability.

Meanwhile, coding agents have emerged as a new form of software development tool and are increasingly adopted by developers due to their automation capabilities. In this paper, we introduce DEP BENCH, a benchmark consisting of 203 real-world dependency-upgrade tasks across five package ecosystems spanning five language communities, each involving hidden code-level changes that require source code adaptation. We evaluate mainstream coding agents on DEP BENCH. The best completed configuration solves only 104/203 tasks (51.2%), with substantial variation across agent harnesses, models, and ecosystems, highlighting an important gap between current agent capabilities and real-world software maintenance needs.

Index Terms—dependency management, software maintenance, benchmark, automated program repair, large language models, coding agents

I. INTRODUCTION

Third-party dependency reuse is now routine in modern software engineering. Reuse improves productivity, but it also creates a continuous maintenance obligation: downstream projects must update dependencies to receive bug fixes, security patches, performance improvements, and compatibility with surrounding ecosystems. Empirical studies show that projects often lag behind available versions because upgrades are perceived as risky, low-priority, or costly [1]–[3]; security studies further show that vulnerable direct and transitive dependencies can propagate risk across package graphs [4].

Upgrades are risky because they can cause *upgrade-induced breakage*: a dependency version bump no longer preserves the function signatures, types, APIs, build constraints, or runtime semantics that downstream code assumes. The resulting

project may fail to build, fail its tests, or silently produce the wrong behavior until its source is repaired. We study this problem as *dependency-upgrade repair*: a repository-level task in which an automated agent must preserve a dependency version bump and repair the source-level incompatibilities needed for the upgraded repository to pass validation.

Existing automation reduces but does not remove this repair burden. Tools such as Dependabot [5] and Renovate [6] detect outdated dependencies and open update pull requests, but they are primarily update-proposal systems: they can propose a version bump, yet they typically do not perform the non-trivial repository repair an upgrade requires. Safer-update tools such as UpCy [7] can reduce unsafe upgrade choices, but they do not turn a broken upgraded repository into a repaired one. Coding agents have recently emerged as a plausible way to automate this missing repair step, but their ability to fix upgrade-induced breakage remains largely untested.

Evaluating dependency-upgrade repair requires a benchmark with stronger validity guarantees than ordinary issue repair or dependency-update datasets. General repository-level benchmarks such as SWE-bench [8] evaluate issue resolution, dependency-update datasets such as BUMP [9] focus on reproducible breaking updates, and migration benchmarks such as MigrationBench [10], FreshBrew [11], and PyMigBench [12] target language or library migration settings. Recent work such as BeyondSWE [13] further argues that code-agent evaluation should include dependency-driven migration. However, a dependency-upgrade repair benchmark needs to isolate a causal, repository-level task: it should show that the held-out failure is tied to the dependency upgrade rather than to unrelated pull-request churn, and that the repair is necessary and sufficient under an executable task oracle. Existing benchmarks were not designed to enforce these properties together.

We present DEP BENCH, an executable repository-level benchmark that isolates dependency-upgrade repair. DEP BENCH is built from merged pull requests opened by dependency-update bots, but it does not treat a merged pull

request as a task directly. Instead, each candidate undergoes *patch decomposition*, which separates dependency manifest and lockfile changes, the developer repair from the original pull request, and a held-out test patch reserved for evaluation. Every retained task must satisfy a four-state oracle. Starting from the same original pre-upgrade repository state, the oracle checks four patch combinations: the unmodified state must successfully install, build, and run the project-specific test command; the dependency-manifest and lockfile changes together with the held-out tests must expose a failure; adding the developer repair must make the same tests pass; and the developer repair with the held-out tests but without the manifest and lockfile changes must still fail. This contract certifies that the held-out failure is tied to the dependency upgrade, that the repair is needed together with the upgrade, and that the repair is sufficient under the task oracle. To reduce solution leakage during evaluation, the agent receives neither patch-derived repair descriptions nor the developer repair or held-out tests. The resulting DEP BENCH release contains 203 oracle-clean tasks across five ecosystems: 68 npm/yarn, 65 Maven/Java, 40 Go, 20 Cargo/Rust, and 10 Python tasks.

We evaluate mainstream coding agents in a full-upgrade setting: the agent starts from the base repository state and an upgrade instruction, while the developer repair and held-out tests remain hidden until the task verifier runs. The benchmark is far from saturated. The strongest completed agent configuration solves only 104/203 tasks, and performance varies sharply by model, harness, and ecosystem. The dominant failure mode is incomplete repository-wide migration: agents often identify a relevant dependency surface yet fail to propagate the upgraded dependency contract through wrappers, types, fixtures, generated artifacts, or behavioral outputs.

This paper makes the following contributions:

- We introduce DEP BENCH, the first executable, repository-level benchmark that isolates dependency-upgrade repair through patch decomposition, held-out test patches, and a four-state oracle across five package ecosystems.
- We develop a construction pipeline that combines dependency-update bot mining, path-based hunk classification, manual and LLM-assisted audit, leakage controls, and four-state oracle validation to produce oracle-clean release tasks.
- We evaluate mainstream coding agents under containerized, reproducible task verification and analyze how agent configurations, ecosystems, and failure modes shape performance on dependency-upgrade repair.

II. BACKGROUND

Upgrade-induced breakage is either explicit, where signatures, types, APIs, or build constraints change and compilers or type checkers expose the break, or implicit, where internal semantics change so downstream code still compiles yet misbehaves; both are widespread, though not every library change reaches a given client [14], [15]. A useful

benchmark must therefore collect real client-level, upgrade-caused failures rather than library-level API diffs. Our starting point was the need to evaluate whether coding agents can handle dependency-upgrade repair as a realistic maintenance task. Rather than constructing a benchmark from scratch immediately, we first examined existing repository-level agent benchmarks and selected BeyondSWE because it explicitly includes dependency-driven migration as one of its task categories. BeyondSWE contains tasks drawn from 246 real GitHub repositories, including a dependency-upgrade slice of 120 tasks, making it a natural candidate for evaluating agent performance on real upgrade scenarios.

A. Auditing an Existing Benchmark

After manual audit, however, we found that this dataset does not fully satisfy the requirements of a dependency-upgrade agent benchmark, in three respects.

First, some tasks are not actually caused by a dependency upgrade. The associated pull request may contain a version bump, but the source change or test expectation can be driven by an unrelated bug fix, refactoring, or test cleanup. Such tasks are useful as general repository repair examples, yet they do not isolate the agent’s ability to reason about an upgraded dependency.

Second, the problem statements are reverse-generated from solution patches, which creates solution-leakage risk. Even after obvious hints are removed, patch-derived descriptions may still reveal replacement APIs, target files, triggering paths, or the intended direction of the repair, which is especially harmful for upgrades, where the key challenge is discovering the new dependency contract.

Third, the benchmark does not consistently support a code-patch-level fail-to-pass validation contract. Without tasks where the upgrade plus hidden tests fails before the source repair and passes once the upstream code patch is replayed, it is difficult to tell whether the code patch is necessary and sufficient, or whether the outcome is affected by unrelated tests, weak oracles, or unreplayable environment state.

B. Limitations of Existing Work

Existing benchmarks were largely designed for goals other than isolating dependency-upgrade repair. General-purpose repository benchmarks such as SWE-bench [8] target issue resolution, and dependency- and migration-oriented datasets vary in how tightly each task is tied to the upgrade itself. Consequently, three properties needed to evaluate upgrade repair are not consistently guaranteed: that a task’s failure is genuinely caused by the upgrade, that the task description does not leak the intended repair, and that an executable contract certifies the repair is both necessary and sufficient to pass. These are differences in design focus rather than defects of any particular benchmark, and they motivate DEP BENCH’s construction principles: tasks must be tied to an actual dependency upgrade, descriptions must avoid patch-derived solution hints, and every retained instance must satisfy an executable

oracle contract that separates the manifest change, the source repair, and the held-out tests.

III. METHOD

A. Benchmark Overview

DEPBENCH converts real dependency-update pull requests into executable dependency-upgrade repair tasks. A merged pull request is not directly a task: it may combine dependency-manifest changes, a developer repair, test evolution, and unrelated maintainer churn. The goal of the construction pipeline is to separate these components and retain only tasks where the held-out failure is causally tied to the dependency upgrade.

Figure 1 summarizes the workflow. The construction phase starts from merged pull requests opened by dependency-update bots, performs patch decomposition to separate manifest changes, repair changes, and a held-out test patch, and then applies a four-state oracle with audit to produce oracle-clean release tasks. The evaluation phase uses these tasks to test coding agents: an agent starts from the base repository state and an upgrade instruction, while the developer repair and held-out test patch remain hidden until task verification.

Each release task packages the information needed for reproducible evaluation: a pinned repository environment, an agent-facing upgrade instruction, dependency-change artifacts, the developer repair from the original pull request, a held-out test patch, a task verifier, and metadata such as ecosystem and resource budget. The agent-facing input excludes the developer repair and held-out test patch; those artifacts are used only by the benchmark construction pipeline and by the task verifier.

B. PR Mining

We mine public GitHub pull requests opened by dependency-update bots. The crawl starts from PRs that are already merged into the main branch and whose author is a dependency-update bot, such as Dependabot or the Renovate GitHub App. We then keep only PRs that (i) modify dependency manifests or lockfiles, (ii) contain non-trivial source or test changes by human contributors, and (iii) were ultimately integrated into the project’s mainline history.

These filtering criteria ensure, either directly or indirectly, that the retained candidates satisfy several important properties. First, the PR is related to a dependency upgrade. Second, the upgrade is non-trivial: if the bot-generated change were sufficient, the PR could have been merged automatically without additional intervention. Third, the upgraded dependency introduces observable differences from the previous version, or changes the downstream behavior enough to require updates to the source code and tests. Finally, the human effort invested in resolving the upgrade was accepted by the project maintainers, as the PR was ultimately merged into the project’s mainline history. These properties make the subsequent filtering and validation steps more tractable. They are not, however, sufficient to certify a task by themselves: a merged pull request can still contain unrelated maintainer changes, weak test updates, or repository bookkeeping. We therefore treat mining as a candidate-generation step and rely

TABLE I
DEPBENCH TASK DISTRIBUTION ACROSS FIVE ECOSYSTEMS.

Ecosystem	Tasks
npm/yarn	68
Maven/Java	65
Go	40
Cargo	20
Python	10
Total	203

on patch decomposition and four-state oracle validation to produce release tasks. This crawl identified 4,660 candidate PRs with strong signals from GitHub, spanning five package ecosystems: npm/yarn, Maven/Java, Go, Cargo, and Python.

Example 1. Figure 2 shows a representative candidate PR. This PR (*js-wacz#41*¹) was opened by Dependabot to upgrade the project’s dependency on *glob* from version 8.1.0 to 10.3.3. The PR contains two commits before it was eventually merged. The first commit was generated by the bot and updated the dependency manifest files for the version bump. The second commit was made by a human contributor and modified the implementation and test files to account for *glob*’s v10 ESM-style export surface.

C. Patch Decomposition

After a PR passes the mining filters, we split its diff into three disjoint patches. The *manifest patch* contains dependency declarations and lockfiles, such as *package.json*, *go.mod*, *go.sum*, or *Cargo.lock*. The *repair patch* contains the developer repair needed to make the upgraded dependency work. The *test patch* contains changed tests, fixtures, mocks, and expected-output files used by tests.

We first classify hunks by path. Manifest and lockfile paths are routed to the manifest patch. Files under conventional test directories, fixture directories, or with ecosystem-specific test names are routed to the test patch. Remaining files are routed to the repair patch. Ambiguous cases are reviewed manually, since some names that look test-related can be production APIs in specific projects and some generated mocks are part of normal source code.

Example 2. The retained PR in Figure 2 gives a compact example. For *js-wacz#41*, the upstream diff is decomposed as follows.

¹<https://github.com/harvard-lil/js-wacz/pull/41>




Fig. 1. Overview of DEPBENCH’s construction and evaluation workflow. DEPBENCH first converts real dependency-update bot pull requests into causally validated dependency-upgrade repair tasks through patch decomposition and a four-state oracle. Agents are then evaluated from the base repository state and upgrade instruction while the developer repair and held-out test patch remain hidden until task verification.




Fig. 2. Representative commit history for *js-wacz#41*.

Manifest patch. The dependency declaration and lockfile move *glob* from 8.1.0 to 10.3.3, pinning the new dependency state in which the v10 ESM entry exposes *globSync* as the named synchronous API.² The breaking change therefore sits at the import boundary: code written against the v8 default export object and its *.sync* property must now use the v10 named export.

```
diff --git a/package.json b/package.json
@@
-  "glob": "^8.1.0",
+  "glob": "^10.3.3",

diff --git a/package-lock.json b/package-lock.json
@@
-    "glob": "^8.1.0",
+    "glob": "^10.3.3",
```

Repair patch. The source migrates from the old default import and *glob.sync* call to the v10 *globSync* API. This patch records the corresponding source-side adaptation to the new export surface.

```
diff --git a/index.js b/index.js
@@
-import glob from 'glob'
+import { globSync } from 'glob'
@@
-  for (const file of glob.sync(path)) {
+  for (const file of globSync(path)) {
```

Test patch. The test patch updates the same upgraded API surface because the test file also used *glob.sync* to compute the expected fixture count.

```
diff --git a/index.test.js b/index.test.js
@@
-import glob from 'glob'
+import { globSync } from 'glob'
@@
-  assert.equal(warcCount, glob.sync(FIXTURE_INPUT).length)
+  assert.equal(warcCount, globSync(FIXTURE_INPUT).length)
```

²See <https://github.com/isaacs/node-glob>.

D. Four-State Oracle Validation and Release

Restricting candidates to dependency-update bot pull requests keeps the task signal clean, but it cannot fully exclude unrelated maintainer context. For example, a project may bump its own version after an upgrade; if the test patch asserts that version, an agent can correctly adapt the upgraded dependency yet still fail on release bookkeeping incidental to the upgrade. We therefore validate every retained candidate with a four-state oracle before release.

Definition 1 (Oracle-clean dependency-upgrade repair task). Let $\mathcal{R}$ be the set of repository states. We write $r \oplus p$ for the state obtained by applying patch p to state r , and let $\Omega : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \{\text{pass}, \text{fail}\}$ be the task validation function that runs the task-specific install, build, and test commands. A candidate tuple (b, m, c, t, Ω) consists of a base repository state b , manifest patch m , repair patch c for the code repair, test patch t , and validation oracle Ω . The candidate is oracle-clean iff the following conjunction holds in the same validation round:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(b) &= \text{pass} \\ \wedge \Omega(b \oplus m \oplus t) &= \text{fail} \\ \wedge \Omega(b \oplus m \oplus c \oplus t) &= \text{pass} \\ \wedge \Omega(b \oplus c \oplus t) &= \text{fail}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, m is restricted to dependency manifests and lockfiles, c is restricted to the developer repair and must not undo m , and t is restricted to tests, fixtures, mocks, and expected-output files used by tests. A fail is a non-infrastructure error: a compilation or build error, a runtime error, or a test failure. The four checks certify the benchmark contract under Ω : $\Omega(b)$ confirms that the base repository state is healthy; $\Omega(b \oplus m \oplus t)$ shows that the manifest change and test patch expose an upgrade-induced failure without the repair; $\Omega(b \oplus m \oplus c \oplus t)$ shows that the repair fixes the upgraded repository under the same test patch; and $\Omega(b \oplus c \oplus t)$ shows that the repair and test patch are not sufficient without the dependency upgrade, which ties the test patch to the upgrade rather than to unrelated changes.

Iterative validation loop. We operationalize this contract as an iterative loop rather than a single pass, summarized in Figure 3. Starting from dependency-update bot PRs to maximize upgrade purity, we decompose each candidate into its manifest patch m , repair patch c , and test patch t , and run the four-state oracle checks in one validation round, keeping a candidate only when a single round satisfies the full




Fig. 3. Iterative four-state oracle validation with human and LLM-assisted audit.

conjunction in Definition 1. When a round does not satisfy the conjunction, we distinguish verifier failures from exceptions. A verifier failure means validation completed but reported a non-infrastructure failure, such as a failing test suite, build error, or runtime error. An exception means validation could not complete because of infrastructure problems, such as an unavailable base image or an expired package repository; for these cases, we re-run the affected checks accordingly.

Audit and release. Candidates that pass the oracle checks form an oracle-clean working set and enter a human and LLM-assisted audit of ambiguous diffs and weak tests. A human reviewer and an LLM jointly inspect the test patch t to decide whether it is well-formed and whether each test hunk is genuinely caused by the dependency upgrade rather than by unrelated test churn co-merged with the bot PR; based on this judgment, we either discard the candidate or strip the unrelated hunks and re-split the patches before re-validating. This step is still not fully automatic: deciding whether a hunk is semantically tied to the upgraded dependency may become a scaling bottleneck even with repeated four-state oracle validation and dependency-update bot PR selection, and candidates that cannot be made oracle-clean are discarded. The resulting DEP BENCH release contains 203 oracle-clean tasks across five package ecosystems, spanning the distribution in Table I.

IV. EVALUATION

We evaluate coding-agent configurations on the DEP BENCH release using Harbor,³ a containerized evaluation harness for

running coding agents on repository-level tasks, in the full-upgrade setting. Harbor provisions the pinned task image, executes the agent under a fixed resource budget, applies the held-out test patch, and computes the final pass/non-pass outcome through the task verifier. In this setting, agents start from the pre-upgrade repository state and must update dependency manifests or lockfiles, resolve the upgraded dependency state, and repair the resulting source-level incompatibilities. Each task is counted as a pass when the final verifier reward is 1 and as a non-pass otherwise. We reserve *verifier failure* for a non-pass run in which the verifier completes but the upgraded repository still fails; RQ3 also categorizes non-pass runtime exceptions.

A. Protocol and Environment

All reported trials run through Harbor in isolated Docker containers, each from a prebuilt image pinned to the repository base state so every agent sees the same filesystem, caches, and tooling. The agent gets the base repository and a natural-language upgrade instruction, but not the developer repair patch c , hidden test patch t , or oracle scripts; the verifier overlays the same hidden test patch t before grading so all agents face an identical oracle. Harbor blocks the task’s upstream repository and pull-request pages. We do not impose a full network blackout, however: resolving an upgrade typically requires fetching the target dependency version from its package registry, and we also want to observe whether agents proactively consult the dependency’s documentation, release notes, or migration guides—a behavior we analyze in RQ4.

All trials use the same resource envelope on a host with a 128-core CPU and 2 TB of RAM. The execution protocol has three phases. First, Harbor starts the task image and mounts the repository at the base commit. Second, the agent runs for a 30-minute budget and may inspect files, run commands, edit source/configuration, and perform the dependency upgrade. Third, Harbor invokes the verifier with a five-minute budget. The verifier applies the held-out test patch and runs the task-specific install/build/test command. A pass means the upgraded repository passes the hidden tests; a verifier failure means the verifier completed but the project still failed. Missing verifier outcomes are tracked as non-pass outcomes rather than counted as successful repairs.

We use *harness* for the agent runner or interface without the LLM, and *configuration* for a harness–LLM pair. We report GPT-5.5 across Codex, Copilot CLI, OpenCode, and Claude Code; Gemini 3.5 Flash across Copilot CLI, OpenCode, and Claude Code; and Claude Opus 4.8 across Copilot CLI, OpenCode, and Claude Code. Codex is included only on GPT-5.5 because Codex after v0.94.0 dropped the chat-completions wire API⁴ required by the non-GPT routes. We organize the study around four research questions: **RQ1** asks how difficult dependency-upgrade repair is for current coding agents; **RQ2** analyzes what behavior the held-out tests encode; **RQ3** examines which non-pass modes dominate when agents

³<https://github.com/harbor-framework/harbor>.

⁴<https://github.com/openai/codex/pull/10157>.

TABLE II

Pass counts on the 203-task benchmark by model and agent harness. Dashes denote unsupported combinations.

Model	Claude Code	Codex	Copilot CLI	OpenCode
GPT-5.5	71	104	99	80
Claude Opus 4.8	79	—	83	80
Gemini 3.5 Flash	53	—	52	51

TABLE III

Pass counts by ecosystem for each configuration. Ecosystem totals are npm/yarn 68, Maven/Java 65, Go 40, Cargo 20, and Python 10.

Configuration	npm	Maven	Go	Cargo	Python
Copilot CLI + GPT-5.5	28	44	19	2	6
Codex + GPT-5.5	27	46	20	6	5
OpenCode + GPT-5.5	23	32	17	2	6
Claude Code + GPT-5.5	24	26	14	2	5
Copilot CLI + Claude Opus 4.8	21	36	19	2	5
OpenCode + Claude Opus 4.8	18	36	19	2	5
Claude Code + Claude Opus 4.8	21	29	22	2	5
OpenCode + Gemini 3.5 Flash	11	22	12	3	3
Copilot CLI + Gemini 3.5 Flash	16	22	9	2	3
Claude Code + Gemini 3.5 Flash	12	26	9	2	4

do not pass; and **RQ4** analyzes which task properties make upgrades hard.

B. RQ1: How Difficult Is Dependency-Upgrade Repair for Current Coding Agents?

The main result is that dependency-upgrade repair remains difficult even for the strongest completed configurations (Table II). The best configuration solves 104/203 tasks with Codex and GPT-5.5; Copilot CLI with GPT-5.5 solves 99/203 and OpenCode with GPT-5.5 solves 80/203. Claude Code with GPT-5.5 solves 71/203. The best run therefore still fails to solve a majority of the release. Claude Opus 4.8 is competitive but also far from saturating the benchmark: Copilot CLI, OpenCode, and Claude Code solve 83, 80, and 79 tasks respectively. Gemini 3.5 Flash is weaker in every matched harness, with 51, 52, and 53 passes for OpenCode, Copilot CLI, and Claude Code. Agent/runtime exceptions and missing verifier rewards do not contribute to the pass counts in Table II unless the subsequent verifier still returns reward 1.

Harness choice also matters. Holding GPT-5.5 fixed, the spread between Codex and Claude Code is 33 tasks (16.3 percentage points); holding Gemini fixed, the spread between OpenCode and Claude Code is 2 tasks (1.0 points); and holding Claude Opus 4.8 fixed, the spread between Copilot CLI and Claude Code is 4 tasks (2.0 points). Thus the benchmark is not only measuring the underlying model: prompting, tool access, execution policy, and patch application strategy all affect whether the same repository-level upgrade can be repaired.

Difficulty is highly ecosystem-dependent (Table III). Maven/Java remains the easiest ecosystem for the strongest rows, but harness differences are still large: with GPT-5.5, Copilot CLI solves 44/65 Maven tasks, Codex solves 46/65,

TABLE IV

Held-out test behavior labels for the current 203-task release. The upper block is multi-label; the lower block is a primary partition.

Held-out test signal	Tasks	Share
Corrects existing behavior	142	70.0%
Adds new tests or coverage	60	29.6%
Deletes/removes tests	39	19.2%
Fixture/setup only	47	23.2%
Primary: corrects only	87	42.9%
Primary: mixed direct behavior	55	27.1%
Primary: adds only	14	6.9%
Primary: fixture/setup only	47	23.2%

OpenCode solves 32/65, and Claude Code solves 26/65. Under Claude Opus 4.8, Maven pass counts range from 29 to 36. npm/yarn and Cargo are much harder: completed rows solve only a minority of npm/yarn tasks, and most configurations solve at most two Cargo tasks. This split suggests that agents are more effective when dependency incompatibilities surface through strong static build systems and conventional test runners, but struggle with JavaScript package churn, lockfile/-tooling interactions, and Rust macro or trait migration tasks.

Model choice also interacts with ecosystem. For Copilot CLI, switching from GPT-5.5 to Gemini 3.5 Flash reduces Maven/Java passes from 44 to 22, Go passes from 19 to 9, npm/yarn passes from 28 to 16, Python passes from 6 to 3, and reduces Cargo from 2 to 2; Claude Opus 4.8 sits between these two Copilot CLI rows overall, with 83 total passes and 36 Maven passes. Thus model choice, harness choice, and ecosystem all contribute measurable variation: the same benchmark is easy for some harness-model-ecosystem configurations and nearly unsolved for others.

Answer. Current coding agents do not yet reliably solve dependency-upgrade repair: the best completed configuration solves 104/203 tasks, and performance varies substantially by model, harness, and ecosystem.

C. RQ2: What Behavior Do the Held-Out Tests Encode?

Because the held-out test patch t is the behavioral oracle for each task (Definition 1), task quality depends on *what* those tests check after the upgrade. We therefore audit test patches along two axes (Table IV): whether they directly assert or correct dependency-induced behavior, and whether they are strong enough to prevent trivial no-op or test-deletion solutions.

Table IV summarizes these labels. Most tasks have direct behavioral signal: 142/203 modify existing expectations, mocks, fixtures, or snapshots to match the upgraded dependency, and 60/203 add new tests or test cases. In the primary partition, 156/203 tasks (76.8%) either correct existing behavior, add direct coverage, or combine both with smaller deletions. These are the strongest tasks because the hidden test patch forces the agent to reproduce observable behavior of the upgraded dependency rather than merely keep the old program compiling.

The qualitative range behind these labels is broad, so we discuss examples in prose rather than encoding them as another table. Some tests check an upgraded API surface

directly. In *29k#3418*, the OpenAI SDK migration from v3 to v4 changes the client construction and chat-completion call path; the hidden Jest test rewrites its mock around the v4 client shape, so an import-only repair cannot pass. In *29k#5244*, the PostHog React Native upgrade changes the adapter from asynchronous initialization to constructor-based usage, and the test checks both construction and downstream event methods.

Other tests preserve the same high-level feature but change the expected behavior. *ArcadeDB#2808* updates a Gremlin overflow expectation after a TinkerPop upgrade, so the repair must reflect a changed engine behavior rather than merely compile. A generated-output example appears in *create-typescript-app#1489*: the hidden test updates the generated package metadata from pnpm 8 to pnpm 9, forcing the source generator to follow the package-manager upgrade.

A third group exposes the upgrade through compilation, generated artifacts, or reactivated regressions. *AxonFramework#1654* moves validation code from the Javax namespace to Jakarta, so tests compiled against the new namespace fail unless production imports and wrappers migrate consistently. In *actix#554*, new trybuild cases exercise the syn 2 parser contract for proc macros; fixing a single compile error is not enough if another derive path remains on the old parser model. *Graylog-server#21446* and *Spoon#6087* illustrate still other forms: generated protobuf sources must stay synchronized with the upgraded runtime, and a re-enabled JDT regression test forces the integration logic to match the new dependency behavior. These examples show that a dependency upgrade witness may be a runtime assertion, a snapshot, a compile path, a generated artifact, or a focused regression test.

The remaining tasks are not automatically invalid, but they are weaker and need extra scrutiny. Fixture/setup-only patches can still be legitimate when the dependency changes serialization, generated fixtures, package layout, or test bootstrap behavior; however, they provide a less local assertion of the new API contract. Pure or deletion-heavy changes are the riskiest because an agent might pass without constructing a positive replacement behavior. This is why the oracle includes both $\Omega(b \oplus m \oplus t) = \text{fail}$ and $\Omega(b \oplus c \oplus t) = \text{fail}$: the upgrade alone must still fail without the source repair, and the code patch alone must remain insufficient unless the dependency upgrade is also present.

The release construction uses these observations as quality controls rather than as post-hoc explanations. Candidates with path-clean test patches can still be weak if the patch is tiny, assertion-free, mostly deletion-only, or satisfiable without exercising the upgraded dependency. We therefore combine multiple signals during curation: oracle satisfiability under the four-state definition, path cleanliness, whether the test patch adds or updates concrete assertions, whether the test mentions or exercises the upgraded dependency surface, and whether the task remains discriminative for current agents. The goal is to keep tests that encode a concrete dependency contract, not merely tests that happen to change in the same pull request.

TABLE V
Adjudicated non-pass categories in dependency-upgrade repair. Every non-pass trial is assigned one primary category.

Root cause	Codex GPT	Copilot GPT	OpenCode GPT	Copilot Gemini
Incomplete migration	30	35	32	73
Wrong root cause	7	11	6	5
Wrong semantic output	24	28	23	8
Runtime exception	8	10	21	3
Gave up / budget	1	2	10	26
No upgrade attempted	11	5	6	19
Compile / namespace inconsistency	13	11	17	9
Install / build failure	5	1	6	3
Test tampering	0	1	2	5

Answer. Most retained tests encode concrete upgrade-induced behavior rather than arbitrary test churn, typically by updating expectations, mocks, snapshots, compile targets, or adding focused coverage for the upgraded dependency.

D. RQ3: Which Non-Pass Modes Dominate?

When agents produce a non-pass outcome on DEP BENCH, we focus on the agent-side root causes that arise during dependency-upgrade repair: whether the agent identifies the right upgrade surface, applies the right API or semantic change, and propagates it consistently through the repository. Across non-pass runs with a completed verifier outcome, the main obstacle is making a repository-consistent source repair for the upgraded dependency.

We further analyze the same non-pass set as Table II. For each non-pass run, we assign a primary root cause when the evidence is clear. To keep the original qualitative trajectory analysis auditable, two automated annotators inspect each recoverable original full-run trajectory, final patch, and verifier outcome. We then use a separate adjudication pass to resolve all 172 category disagreements and classify 74 trials with an incomplete original annotation pair, consulting the paired diagnoses, oracle patch, trajectory, and verifier log when available. Targeted rerun non-passes are classified with the same schema using the rerun trajectory, final patch, oracle patch, and verifier log. Thus each final non-pass trial receives one of the nine categories in Table V, and each column sums to the corresponding non-pass count in Table II. Excluding runtime exceptions, incomplete migration is the largest adjudicated agent-side category in every configuration (first row of Table V). In these cases, agents often identify the right dependency-upgrade surface but do not propagate the change through all wrappers, generated state, fixtures, or call sites.

To separate uniformly hard tasks from configuration-asymmetric non-passes, we also split tasks into pass-overlap regimes. Consensus-hard tasks are unsolved by every included configuration under a given LLM (77/203 for GPT-5.5, 114/203 for Gemini, and 102/203 for Claude Opus 4.8); the rest are configuration-asymmetric—solvable by some configurations but not others, which makes them diagnostic. Configuration-asymmetric non-passes often expose incomplete migration: the agent finds the changed dependency surface

TABLE VI

Pass-overlap regimes by LLM and ecosystem across included harnesses under that LLM. Partial pass means at least one but not all included harness-LLM configurations pass.

LLM	Ecosystem	Harnesses	N	0 pass	Partial pass	All pass
GPT-5.5	npm/yarn	4	68	34	17	17
	Maven/Java	4	65	11	36	18
	Go	4	40	14	17	9
	Cargo	4	20	14	4	2
	Python	4	10	4	2	4
Gemini 3.5 Flash	npm/yarn	3	68	45	21	2
	Maven/Java	3	65	23	38	4
	Go	3	40	25	10	5
	Cargo	3	20	17	1	2
	Python	3	10	4	4	2
Claude Opus 4.8	npm/yarn	3	68	43	11	14
	Maven/Java	3	65	20	25	20
	Go	3	40	16	9	15
	Cargo	3	20	18	0	2
	Python	3	10	5	0	5

but does not propagate it through every wrapper, type, helper, fixture, or call site. The following case illustrates this dominant mode.

The overlap regimes are ecosystem-specific (Table VI). npm/yarn contributes the largest absolute number of consensus-hard tasks: under GPT-5.5, 34/68 are unsolved by all four configurations, under Gemini this is 45/68 among the three included configurations, and under Claude Opus 4.8 it is 43/68. Cargo is smaller but proportionally hardest, with 14/20 GPT-5.5 zero-pass tasks and 17/20 zero-pass tasks under both Gemini and Claude Opus 4.8. Maven/Java shows the opposite pattern: 18/65 are solved by all four GPT-5.5 configurations and 20/65 by all three Claude Opus 4.8 configurations. Go tasks remain configuration-asymmetric, suggesting that tool strategy and repair propagation matter substantially even within the same model family.

The held-out tests also vary by kind, so agents must repair different failure mechanisms rather than apply a single migration recipe. For API-surface tests, the dominant failure is *incomplete surface migration*: the agent replaces one removed symbol but misses a wrapper, mock, factory, return object, or secondary call site. The OpenAI and PostHog examples in RQ2 require the repair to migrate both construction and downstream method calls; a patch that changes only the import or only the constructor still fails the hidden mock assertions.

For semantic-output tests, agents often make a syntactically valid migration but do not re-derive the changed behavior. A Gremlin repair can compile yet fail the new overflow expectation; a package-generator repair can update a dependency declaration but still emit the old package-manager snapshot. These failures are not missing-import errors. They show that the agent did not connect the dependency version change to the observable output encoded by the test.

Compile-time and namespace tests produce a different pattern: agents fix the first visible compiler error but leave the migration inconsistent across the repository. For the Javax-to-Jakarta validation migration, for example, tests compile against

the new namespace while production code may still refer to the old one. For syn macro migrations, a local parsing fix can leave another derive path or compile-fail expectation broken. Fixture/setup tests add another source of failure: generated sources, lockfiles, snapshots, and test bootstrap files must be updated consistently with production code. Across these categories, the common failure is an incomplete repository-wide adaptation to the upgraded library.

Case Study 1: signature change propagation. One representative configuration-asymmetric case is *renoglaab#30*, which upgrades the Go GitLab client from v0.161.1 to v1.2.0. This is a clear breaking change: GitLab merge-request and pipeline identifiers exposed by the client move from `int` to `int64`. The repair therefore has to propagate the widened ID type through the repository’s GitLab abstraction and merge-request filtering logic. The official 1.0 migration guide instructs clients to migrate references accordingly,⁵ and the module source confirms that the concrete surfaces used here—pipeline IDs, merge-request IDs, and GetPipeline’s pipeline parameter—changed from `int` to `int64` between v0.161.1 and v1.2.0.

client-go migration guide excerpt. “All structs and functions in ‘client-go’ have been updated to use ‘int64’ types where they previously used ‘int’. This ensures there is no ambiguity about the fact that GitLab can use large integers to all integer values, and prevents some cross-platform issues. When referencing ‘int64’ returns from ‘client-go’, either update the referencing code to use ‘int64’, or cast it to an ‘int’ instead.”

```
// internal/gitlab/client.go
- GetPipeline(repo string, pipelineID int)
+ GetPipeline(repo string, pipelineID int64)

// internal/mergerequests/list.go
- func listProjectMergeRequests(...) []int
+ func listProjectMergeRequests(...) []int64
```

Codex completed this migration and passed the verifier. Copilot CLI with GPT-5.5 identified the correct root cause and even noted that the v1 API changes pipeline IDs to `int64`, but it only fixed part of the production code. It left the merge-request list return type as an `int` slice. When the hidden test patch updated the test oracle to the new type, the verifier failed with a **semantic type mismatch**:

```
expected: []int64{[]int64{1}}
actual   : []int{[]int{1}}
```

This case illustrates the benchmark’s target failure mode. The task is not a simple manifest update: the agent must trace a dependency-level API type change through interfaces, wrappers, helper functions, and returned values. Copilot’s partial repair compiled far enough to run tests, but it did not preserve the `int64` migration end-to-end; Codex did.

Case Study 2: semantic behavior change in Gremlin. *ArcadeDB#2808* illustrates a different kind of breaking change: the public surface is not the main issue; the dependency’s runtime semantics changed. The task upgrades the Gremlin/TinkerPop dependency from 3.7.4 to 3.8.0. Under the new engine, adding one to the maximum long value is no longer treated like the old behavior expected by ArcadeDB’s test. The TinkerPop 3.8.0 upgrade guide lists this as a breaking numeric-semantics

⁵GitLab client-go Version 1.0 Migration Guide, “Migrate int to int64”: <https://gitlab.com/gitlab-org/api/client-go/-/blob/v1.2.0/docs/release-1.0-migration.md#migrate-int-to-int64>.

change: integer operations now promote byte to short to int to long and then throw an overflow exception; its example specifically shows a 3.8.0 traversal over `Long.MAX_VALUE` plus one throwing “`java.lang.ArithmeticException: long overflow.`”⁶ The hidden test mirrors that upstream guidance by expecting an arithmetic overflow exception for the long-valued expression, while explicitly using a big-integer value still succeeds. In other words, the oracle is not asking the agent to rename an API. It asks whether the repository now respects the upgraded engine’s numeric semantics.

TinkerPop 3.8.0 Upgrade Guide excerpt. “Now, any mathematical operations such as ‘Add’, ‘Sub’, ‘Mul’, and ‘Div’ will now automatically promote to the next numeric type if an overflow is detected. For integers, the promotion sequence is: byte → short → int → long → overflow exception. For floating-point numbers, the sequence is: float → double → infinity. The following example showcases the change in overflow behavior between 3.7.3 and 3.8.0.” “// 3.8.0 gremlin g.inject([Long.MAX_VALUE, 1]).sum(local) // throws java.lang.ArithmeticException: long overflow.”

```
// Simplified from GremlinTest.longOverflow()
- result = gremlin("Long.MAX_VALUE + 1")
- assertThat(result).isEqualTo(Long.MAX_VALUE + 1)
+ assertThatThrownBy(() -> gremlin("Long.MAX_VALUE + 1"))
+   .isInstanceOf(ArithmeticException.class)
+   .hasMessageContaining("long overflow");

// Explicit BigInteger summation remains valid.
gremlin("BigInteger(Long.MAX_VALUE) + 1")
```

The source repair is also subtle. ArcadeDB carries a Gremlin value comparator that must remain compatible with TinkerPop internals. The upstream repair stops depending on a removed Gremlin-specific type-error exception, switches to a standard exception path, and exposes a comparability helper that the upgraded comparison logic can access. These changes are small in file count, but they connect two levels of behavior: the library-internal comparison contract needed for the project to compile and run, and the user-visible overflow behavior checked by the hidden test.

The current results show why this is a useful semantic case. In the current result set, OpenCode with GPT-5.5 and OpenCode/Copilot CLI with Gemini pass the task, while the other included GPT-5.5 rows fail. Under Claude Opus 4.8, OpenCode passes while Copilot CLI and Claude Code fail. The task is therefore not inherently unsolvable, but it is easy for an agent to stop at a plausible compatibility edit that does not fully restore the post-upgrade semantics. This complements the GitLab integer-width case above: one failure is a type-contract propagation problem, while this one is a changed runtime behavior problem.

Answer. The most common listed agent-side root cause is incomplete migration: agents often find the right migration area but leave wrappers, types, generated state, fixtures, or behavioral outputs inconsistent with the upgraded dependency.

E. RQ4: What Makes a Dependency-Upgrade Task Hard?

The results suggest that task difficulty is not explained by a single factor. Instead, hard tasks combine ecosystem/tooling friction, rich held-out behavioral oracles, and repository-wide propagation requirements. Ecosystem is the most visible axis:

⁶Apache TinkerPop 3.8.0 Upgrade Guide, “Auto-promotion of Numbers”: <https://tinkerpop.apache.org/docs/3.8.0/upgrade/#auto-promotion-of-numbers>.

TABLE VII

Counts of discovery behaviors observed in the final merged configuration trajectories. Columns are non-exclusive. Docs counts dependency documentation, release notes, or migration evidence, excluding own-project fix lookups; API means local dependency API/source inspection; BC hyp. means an explicit breaking-change hypothesis.

Configuration	Docs	API	Tests	BC hyp.
Copilot CLI + GPT-5.5	20	141	186	178
Codex + GPT-5.5	75	169	197	192
OpenCode + GPT-5.5	54	144	170	167
Claude Code + GPT-5.5	36	170	197	177
OpenCode + Gemini 3.5 Flash	43	68	115	66
Copilot CLI + Gemini 3.5 Flash	62	80	150	86
Claude Code + Gemini 3.5 Flash	110	116	197	150
Copilot CLI + Claude Opus 4.8	20	169	186	191
OpenCode + Claude Opus 4.8	44	161	185	177
Claude Code + Claude Opus 4.8	77	172	193	189

TABLE VIII

Original full-run non-pass trials with paired annotations where both annotators identify a visible-test pass before hidden-test verification fails.

Configuration	Analyzed non-passes	Visible pass	Share
Copilot + GPT	113	89	78.8%
Codex + GPT	119	80	67.2%
OpenCode + GPT	136	94	69.1%
Copilot + Gemini	153	59	38.6%
Total	521	322	61.8%

as shown earlier, 14/20 Cargo tasks and 34/68 npm/yarn tasks are unsolved by all four GPT-5.5 configurations; with Gemini, the same zero-pass pattern is 17/20 Cargo tasks and 45/68 npm/yarn tasks among included Gemini configurations, and with Claude Opus 4.8 it is 18/20 and 43/68. This does not mean Maven upgrades are intrinsically easy, but it suggests that conventional build systems and type-checking can provide stronger repair guidance than JavaScript package churn or Rust macro/trait migrations.

Held-out test behavior is the second axis. On the current 203-task release, mixed direct-behavior tests are the hardest primary category: 31/55 are solved by none of the four GPT-5.5 configurations. Corrects-only tests are also difficult with 35/87 zero-pass tasks. By contrast, adds-only tests and fixture/setup-only tests have lower zero-pass counts, 3/14 and 8/47 respectively. The likely reason is that mixed and correction-heavy tests often force the agent to update several semantic surfaces at once: mocks, expected values, wrappers, generated fixtures, and source call sites. Hidden-test size echoes this: under GPT-5.5, tasks solved by no GPT-5.5 configuration have about 82 hidden-test lines across 4 files on average, versus 38 lines across 2 files when all four pass, so larger patches signal that the upgrade altered several behaviors or fixtures at once.

Agent behavior is a fourth axis. Using the final merged trajectory-inspection setup, we ask which discovery behaviors appeared at any point in each run. Table VII reports counts rather than success rates, because the same trial can appear

in multiple columns and the goal here is to measure agent behavior rather than infer causality. Two descriptive patterns are clear. First, external documentation lookup varies sharply by configuration and is not the dominant signal overall. For GPT-5.5, documentation evidence ranges from 20 to 75 trajectories across configurations, while local dependency API/source inspection appears in 141 to 170 trajectories and test-running evidence appears in 170 to 197 trajectories. Claude Opus 4.8 shows a similarly broad spread in documentation behavior (20 to 77 trajectories) while retaining high counts for local API/source inspection and test/build feedback. Second, explicit breaking-change hypotheses appear frequently once agents start reasoning about failures, but this does not imply that agents first discovered those hypotheses from migration evidence. We also analyze original full-run non-pass trials where the agent had evidence that visible repository tests or builds passed before the verifier applied hidden post-upgrade tests (Table VIII). Across the four configurations in this paired annotation cohort, both annotators identify this pattern in 322/521 analyzable non-passes. These denominators precede the targeted exception reruns and can include trials later replaced in the final RQ1 results; they are therefore not subsets of the final task-level non-pass counts in Table II. The result suggests that many failures are not simple execution crashes: agents often satisfy the old visible test surface but miss the dependency-upgrade behavior encoded by the hidden test patch. Thus the main issue is not merely whether agents inspect upgrade evidence. Agents often interact with tests, local APIs, or documentation, but they do not reliably turn the observed upgrade contract into a repository-wide repair. Current harnesses often treat upgrades like ordinary test-driven repair, rather than carrying the upgraded library’s API or semantic requirement through all repository layers exercised by the hidden tests.

The fifth axis is propagation depth. The two case studies illustrate this clearly. The GitLab client case requires a type-contract migration from the dependency API through local interfaces, helper functions, and returned values. The Grem-lin case requires connecting an upstream numeric-semantics change to a local comparator compatibility repair and the user-visible overflow behavior. In both cases, a plausible local edit is insufficient. The agent must carry the upgraded API or semantic requirement through every repository layer exercised by the hidden oracle.

Answer. Hard tasks tend to combine a difficult ecosystem, a broad or mixed-behavior hidden test patch, a repair that spans multiple repository layers, and agents that often fail to propagate the observed dependency-upgrade contract across the whole repository.

V. RELATED WORK

A. Dependency-Upgrade Benchmarks and Repair

Among earlier benchmarks, BUMP is closest to our setting: it defines a breaking dependency update as a version-change commit that turns a successful build into a failing one [9]. DEPBENCH extends this setting across ecosystems, treats

repair as an agent task, and covers hidden test, runtime, lockfile, package-manager, and setup failures.

Concurrent benchmarks study complementary problems. SWE-Chain evaluates chained release upgrades across 12 chains from nine Python packages, with each transition inheriting the preceding codebase [16]; DEPBENCH instead isolates independent downstream-client upgrades across five ecosystems. DI-BENCH evaluates inference of the dependencies needed to execute a repository [17], rather than repair after a known upgrade.

Breaking-Good analyzes breaking updates using build logs and dependency trees [18]. Repair approaches include LLM-based fixes for breaking-update compilation failures [19], automated repair on Java projects [20], and multi-step LLM-agent upgrade workflows [21]. UPGRADVISOR combines program analysis and hardware tracing to assess updates [22], while specialized agents target dependency-related build repair [23]. DEPBENCH complements these methods with executable evaluation over broader hidden upgrade failures.

B. Repository-Level Benchmarks

Repository-level benchmarks provide useful evaluation templates. SWE-bench uses real GitHub issues, containerized environments, and fail-to-pass tests [8]; MigrationBench and FreshBrew evaluate Java runtime migration [10], [11]; PyMigBench targets Python library migration [12]; and CI-Repair-Bench focuses on full-CI repair [24]. GitTaskBench spans 54 workflow tasks and identifies environment setup and dependency resolution as prominent agent failure modes [25].

BeyondSWE treats dependency-driven migration as a first-class category [13]. As discussed in Section II, DEPBENCH addresses construction risks in this setting through manifest/code/test decomposition, manual audit, held-out tests, and a four-state oracle that isolates dependency-upgrade repair across ecosystems.

VI. THREATS TO VALIDITY

Reproducibility. Dependency registries, base images, package mirrors, and upstream Git refs can change over time; DEPBENCH mitigates this by pinning commits, recording container configuration, and validating tasks before release.

Test-as-oracle assumption. The benchmark uses each upstream project’s test suite as the behavioral oracle; passing tests do not guarantee semantic correctness, and tests may be incomplete or flaky. The oracle-completeness gate removes tasks whose tests are too unstable to validate reliably.

Selection bias. Pull requests from Dependabot, Renovate, and similar workflows represent projects that already use dependency automation, so manual upgrades may contain different failure modes. Future versions should expand the source pool.

Solution leakage. The upstream pull requests used to construct tasks are public and may appear in model pretraining data. The benchmark does not claim out-of-distribution generalization; it supports controlled comparison under identical executable tasks.

Oracle weakness and gaming. Agents might disable tests, downgrade dependencies, or weaken validation. The held-out test patch and oracle validation reduce this risk, but future versions should add non-regression checks for downgrades, test deletion, and validation bypass.

VII. CONCLUSION

DEPBENCH provides 203 oracle-validated, container-native dependency- upgrade tasks across five ecosystems. The benchmark separates version changes, source repairs, and held-out post-upgrade tests to measure whether coding agents preserve an upgrade and repair its consequences. The best completed configuration solves only 104/203 tasks (51.2%), with substantial variation across models, harnesses, and ecosystems.

Failures commonly arise from incomplete propagation of an upgraded dependency’s contract across wrappers, generated artifacts, lockfiles, types, and runtime behavior. Effective upgrade agents must therefore reason beyond local API edits and validate repository-wide semantic consistency; benchmarks must likewise establish upgrade causality and use post-upgrade tests rather than visible-test success alone as evidence of a complete repair.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. G. Kula, D. M. German, A. Ouni, T. Ishio, and K. Inoue, “Do developers update their library dependencies?” *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 384–417, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-017-9521-5>
- [2] J. Cox, E. Bouwers, M. C. J. D. van Eekelen, and J. Visser, “Measuring dependency freshness in software systems,” in *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2015, pp. 109–118. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2015.140>
- [3] A. Decan, T. Mens, and E. Constantinou, “On the evolution of technical lag in the npm package dependency network,” in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution*, 2018, pp. 404–414. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSME.2018.00050>
- [4] A. Zerouali, T. Mens, A. Decan, and C. De Roover, “On the impact of security vulnerabilities in the npm and rubygems dependency networks,” *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 27, no. 5, p. 107, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-022-10154-1>
- [5] R. He, H. He, Y. Zhang, and M. Zhou, “Automating dependency updates in practice: An exploratory study on github dependabot,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 49, no. 8, pp. 4004–4022, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2023.3278129>
- [6] H. Mohayjeji, A. Agaronian, E. Constantinou, N. Zannone, and A. Serebrenik, “Securing dependencies: A comprehensive study of Dependabot’s impact on vulnerability mitigation,” *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 30, no. 3, p. 89, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-025-10638-w>
- [7] A. Dann, B. Hermann, and E. Bodden, “UpCy: Safely updating outdated dependencies,” in *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2023, pp. 233–244. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00031>
- [8] C. E. Jimenez, J. Yang, A. Wettig, S. Yao, K. Pei, O. Press, and K. R. Narasimhan, “SWE-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues?” in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=VTF8yNQM66>
- [9] F. Reyes, Y. Gamage, G. Skoglund, B. Baudry, and M. Monperrus, “BUMP: A benchmark of reproducible breaking dependency updates,” in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*, 2024, pp. 159–170. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/SANER60148.2024.00024>
- [10] L. Liu, X. Liu, Q. Zhou, L. Chen, Y. Liu, H. Nguyen, B. Omidvar-Tehrani, X. Shen, J. Huan, O. Tripp, and A. Deoras, “MIGRATION-BENCH: Repository-level code migration benchmark from java 8,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.09569>
- [11] V. May, D. Misra, Y. Luo, A. Sridhar, J. Gehring, and S. S. Ribeiro Junior, “Freshbrew: A benchmark for evaluating ai agents on java code migration,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.04852>
- [12] M. Islam, A. K. Jha, S. Nadi, and I. Akhmetov, “PyMigBench: A benchmark for python library migration,” in *2023 IEEE/ACM 20th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories*, 2023, pp. 511–515. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSR59073.2023.00075>
- [13] G. Chen, F. Meng, J. Zhao, M. Li, D. Cheng, H. Song, J. Chen, Y. Lin, H. Chen, X. Zhao, R. Song, C. Liu, C. Chen, K. Jia, and J.-R. Wen, “BeyondSWE: Can current code agent survive beyond single-repo bug fixing?” 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.03194>
- [14] L. Ochoa, T. Degueule, J.-R. Falleri, and J. J. Vinju, “Breaking bad? semantic versioning and impact of breaking changes in maven central,” *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 27, no. 3, p. 61, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-021-10052-y>
- [15] J. Chen, T. Bi, Y. Wang, and P. Thongtanunam, “Breaking changes in software ecosystems: A systematic literature review,” 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.24397>
- [16] M. H. Lam, C. Wang, H. Liu, J. Xiao, H.-S. Li, J.-t. Huang, T. Y. Zhuo, and M. R. Lyu, “SWE-chain: Benchmarking coding agents on chained release-level package upgrades,” 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.14415>
- [17] L. Zhang, J. Wang, S. He, C. Zhang, Y. Kang, B. Li, J. Wen, C. Xie, M. Wang, Y. Huang, E. Nallipogu, Q. Lin, Y. Dang, S. Rajmohan, D. Zhang, and Q. Zhang, “DI-BENCH: Benchmarking large language models on dependency inference with testable repositories at scale,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, 2025, pp. 10 134–10 153. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2025.findings-acl.528/>
- [18] F. Reyes, B. Baudry, and M. Monperrus, “Breaking-good: Explaining breaking dependency updates with build analysis,” in *2024 IEEE 24th International Working Conference on Source Code Analysis and Manipulation (SCAM)*, 2024, pp. 36–46. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/SCAM63643.2024.00014>
- [19] F. Reyes, M. Mahmoud, F. Bono, S. Nadi, B. Baudry, and M. Monperrus, “Byam: Fixing breaking dependency updates with large language models,” *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 31, no. 4, p. 113, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-026-10835-1>
- [20] L. Fruntke and J. Krinke, “Automatically fixing dependency breaking changes,” *Proceedings of the ACM on Software Engineering*, vol. 2, no. FSE, pp. 2146–2168, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3729366>
- [21] V. Tawosi, S. Alamir, X. Liu, and M. Veloso, “LLM agents for automated dependency upgrades,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.03480>
- [22] Y. David, X. Sun, R. J. Sofaer, A. Senthilnathan, J. Yang, Z. Zuo, G. H. Xu, J. Nieh, and R. Gu, “UPGRADVISOR: Early adopting dependency updates using hybrid program analysis and hardware tracing,” in *16th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 22)*. USENIX Association, 2022, pp. 751–767. [Online]. Available: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi22/presentation/david>
- [23] C. Macho, K. Stengg, and M. Pinzger, “Agent-based dependency-related build repair,” in *2026 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*, 2026, pp. 1–6. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/SANER67736.2026.00026>
- [24] R. K. Muna, M. N. Rafi, and T.-H. Chen, “CI-Repair-Bench: A repository-aware benchmark for automated patch validation via ci workflows,” 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.27148>
- [25] Z. Ni, H. Wang, S. Zhang, S. Lu, Z. He, W. You, Z. Tang, S. Hu, B. Li, C. Hu, B. Jiao, D. Jiang, Y. Du, and P. Lyu, “GitTaskBench: A benchmark for code agents solving real-world tasks through code repository leveraging,” *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 40, no. 38, pp. 32 564–32 572, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v40i38.40533>