

Scoping Software Engineering for AI: The TSE Perspective

IN recent years, important advances in Artificial Intelligence (AI), and, in particular, in Machine Learning (ML), including Deep Learning (DL) and Large Language Models (LLMs), have caused a substantial increase of submissions to all Software Engineering (SE) venues (conferences and journals) related to SE with and for AI. They are commonly referred to as AI for SE and SE for AI.

On the one hand, AI techniques have been used to provide better solutions to problems with which software engineering researchers have struggled for a long time (e.g., code completion, fault localization, program repair, and test case generation), as well as solve problems for which automated solutions did not exist in the past, or were very limited, e.g., automated bug reproduction, code review, or the generation of complete, non-trivial program elements. Contributions along these lines are commonly described as “AI for Software Engineering” and are welcome at IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON SOFTWARE ENGINEERING (TSE). The questions of what constitutes novelty and significance of such papers are interesting and complex, and we will address them in a future editorial.

On the other hand, certain AI artifacts, e.g., ML models, can be seen as software components forming part of a more complex software system. Thus, the engineering of ML components *might be considered* to be of a core interest to SE. In fact, many top SE venues, including IEEE TSE, have been publishing a broad range of contributions on testing, verifying, repairing, understanding, and optimizing ML components, under the broad umbrella of “software engineering (SE) for AI”.

That said, a matter of growing concern is the number of papers submitted under the category of SE for AI that provide weak arguments motivating the work by connecting it to SE problems, and ultimately bear little or no relation to SE.

Going forward, IEEE TSE would like to take a more nuanced approach with respect to reviewing these “SE for AI” papers. Specifically, we observe that submitted manuscripts frequently go into the depths of core AI techniques to improve them in various ways. The question that editors, reviewers, and authors themselves therefore often ask is whether some of the submitted manuscripts are a good fit for SE venues such as IEEE TSE, or would be a better fit for more AI- or ML-specialized venues instead.

The question of scoping SE with respect to other fields in computing is not new. A similar case can be made, for example, for network protocols, database management systems, or operating systems. There are intersections and common interests

with the Networks, Databases, and OS research communities respectively, all of which ultimately deal with engineering software artifacts. Yet, certain types of contributions are better reviewed and more appreciated in the communities that deal with the specificities of networks, databases or operating systems.

The IEEE TSE call for contributions [1] states:

“IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering is interested in well-defined theoretical results and empirical studies that potentially impact the construction, analysis, or management of software. The scope of this Transactions ranges from the mechanisms through the development of principles to the application of those principles to specific environments.”

That is, the main focus of the submission and the research questions it addresses should be on software engineering, i.e., software engineering cannot be a tangential aspect of the paper.

However, the above call leaves for interpretation what an SE contribution means in the growing area of SE for AI, and we describe our views on this below.

Let us consider aspects of contributions that make submissions more relevant to IEEE TSE.

- 1) The work’s contribution **concerns a software system as a whole, or a subsystem, and not simply its AI or ML component**. For example, on the one side, we will consider manuscripts proposing approaches for testing an ML-intensive software subsystem, like the perception subsystem of a self-driving car, to be highly relevant to IEEE TSE. Conversely, focusing solely on evaluating or improving the inference capability of the ML pedestrian recognition model is a contribution that is more appropriate for an ML-specific or a computer vision venue.
- 2) The manuscript **considers software engineering artifacts** (e.g., requirements, design, architecture) beyond an ML component and its standard constituents, such as its hyperparameters, or datasets for training, testing and evaluation. For example, repairing an ML model while considering its requirements specification, or in the context of the software architecture that incorporates the component under repair, would be considered very relevant. Yet, the repair process that eliminates one incorrectly classified input would be significantly less relevant to IEEE TSE and would be more appropriate for an AI- or ML-specific venue.
- 3) The proposed contribution is targeting a **novel context for an SE task** (such as requirements elicitation or


program repair) where ML models are prominent. Such a paper would then need to argue that (1) it is tackling a problem that is relevant to the ML community and is not adequately solved by such community; and (2) the existing state-of-the-art SE approaches do not straightforwardly solve the ML problem either. Examples of novel contexts for SE tasks include inferring specifications from ML models, or repairing and modularizing them. Note the difference between a task and a technique. SE uses a large toolbox of techniques from a range of fields, from static analysis to model checking, to support different tasks such as debugging, program comprehension, and software design. Simply applying a technique from the SE toolbox to an ML problem (e.g., the direct use of a statistical model checking technique to analyze an ML model) most likely does not advance the SE state-of-the-art. On the other hand, using statistical model checking for an SE task, such as adapting an ML model by repairing it instead of doing so via standard model retraining, directly contributes to SE.

- 4) The work studies **human, social, socio-technical, and organizational aspects** (e.g., as developer, user, stakeholder characteristics and experiences) **in the development of AI-intensive software systems**. An example of a relevant contribution is an exploration of the collaboration challenges occurring in the interaction between data scientists and software engineers across their respective teams or within a multi-disciplinary team (e.g., during requirements engineering, or as part of exploration and discovery in agile development).

To summarize, the boundaries between SE and AI are, and certainly will be, blurred. Yet, establishing core interests of each research community will help ensure that future manuscripts submitted to IEEE TSE will, on the one hand, receive high-quality and timely reviews, and, on the other hand, be appreciated by our readers¹.

In describing our current vision on SE for AI, which may shift in the future given how dynamic the field is, we do so not in the spirit of settling the discussion. Rather, we would like to start a community-wide conversation, which may, or may not, converge toward a single vision. It is possible that other SE venues would have a wider or a narrower scope.

We look forward to your contributions!


SEBASTIAN UCHITEL 
 Universidad de Buenos Aires
 Argentina
 e-mail: suchitel@dc.uba.ar


MARSHA CHECHIK
 Department of Computer Science
 University of Toronto
 Canada

MASSIMILIANO DI PENTA 
 Department of Engineering
 University of Sannio
 Italy

BRAM ADAMS
 Queen's University
 Canada

NAZARENO AGUIRRE
 Departamento de Computación
 Universidad Nacional de Río Cuarto
 Argentina

GABRIELE BAVOTA 
 Faculty of Informatics
 Università della Svizzera
 Switzerland

DOMENICO BIANCULLI 
 University of Luxembourg
 Luxembourg

KELLY BLINCOE
 University of Auckland
 New Zealand

ANA CAVALCANTI
 University of York
 United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

YVONNE DITTRICH 
 IT University of Copenhagen
 Denmark


FILOMENA FERRUCCI
 Dipartimento di Informatica
 Università di Salerno, Italy

RASHINA HODA 
 Faculty of Information Technology
 Monash University
 Melbourne, Australia

LI GUO HUANG
 Department of Computer Science and Engineering
 Southern Methodist University
 Dallas, TX 75205 USA

DAVID LO
 Singapore Management University
 Singapore

MICHAEL R. LYU
 Department of Computer Science and Engineering
 The Chinese University of Hong Kong
 Hong Kong


LEI MA 
 Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
 University of Alberta
 Canada


¹Please note that this editorial position supersedes any claims of scope of submitted manuscripts based on prior publication venues of related work.

JONATHAN I. MALETIC
Kent State University
OH, USA

LEONARDO MARIANI
University of Milano - Bicocca
Milan, Italy


COLLIN McMILLAN
Department of Computer Science
University of Notre Dame
USA


TIM MENZIES 
Department of Computer Science
North Carolina State University
USA

MARTIN MONPERRUS 
KTH Royal Institute of Technology
Sweden


ANA MORENO
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
Madrid, Spain

NACHIAPPAN NAGAPPAN
Meta Platforms Inc.
USA


LILIANA PASQUALE 
University College Dublin
Ireland


PATRIZIO PELLICIONE 
Department of Computer Science
Gran Sasso Science Institute (GSSI)
Italy

MICHAEL PRADEL
University of Stuttgart
Stuttgart, Germany


RAHUL PURANDARE 
University of Nebraska–Lincoln
USA

SUKYOUNG RYU 
Department of Computer Science
KAIST
Republic of Korea

MEHRDAD SABETZADEH 
University of Ottawa
Canada

ALEXANDER SEREBRENIK 
Eindhoven University of Technology
The Netherlands

JUN SUN
Singapore Management University
Singapore

KLA TANTITHAMTHAVORN 
Department of Information Technology
Monash University
Australia


CHRISTOPH TREUDE
Singapore Management University
Singapore

MANUEL WIMMER 
Johannes Kepler Universitat Linz
Austria

YINGFEI XIONG 
School of Computer Science
Peking University
China

TAO YUE 
Beihang University
China

ANDY ZAIDMAN
Delft University of Technology
The Netherlands

TAO ZHANG 
Faculty of Information Technology
Macau University of Science and Technology
Macao

HAO ZHONG 
Department of Computer Science and Engineering
Shanghai Jiao Tong University
China

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank Matthew Dwyer, Sebastian Elbaum and Mark Harman for their feedback on earlier versions of this editorial.

REFERENCE

- [1] “Scope of IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering.” Accessed: Oct. 14, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.computer.org/csdl/journal/ts/about/14409?title=About&periodical=IEEE>