

Automatic Programming: Large Language Models and Beyond

MICHAEL R. LYU, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

BAISHAKHI RAY, Columbia University, USA

ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY, National University of Singapore, *[Corresponding Author]*, Singapore

SHIN HWEI TAN, Concordia University, Canada

PATANAMON THONGTANUNAM, University of Melbourne, Australia

Automatic programming has seen increasing popularity due to the emergence of tools like GitHub Copilot which rely on Large Language Models (LLMs). At the same time, automatically generated code faces challenges during deployment due to concerns around quality and trust. In this article, we study automated coding in a general sense and study the concerns around code quality, security and related issues of programmer responsibility. These are key issues for organizations while deciding on the usage of automatically generated code. We discuss how advances in software engineering such as program repair and analysis can enable automatic programming. We conclude with a forward looking view, focusing on the programming environment of the near future, where programmers may need to switch to different roles to fully utilize the power of automatic programming. Automated repair of automatically generated programs from LLMs, can help produce higher assurance code from LLMs, along with evidence of assurance.

1 CHALLENGES IN AUTOMATIC PROGRAMMING

The task of programming both in terms of intent capture (capturing the desire of the user) as well as in generation of correct code — has occupied much of the Computing profession for the last 50–60 years. There has been significant progress in modeling and system design to support accurate intent capture leading to the growth of formal specifications. However, despite all the progress — software engineers are reluctant to write formal specifications, and for large software systems a formal description of intent is not available — leading to tremendous hardship in debugging and fixing errors. The field of automated program repair has shown promise in terms of code generation at a micro-scale. The key question there is how to trust the automatically generated code.

Recent developments on automated code generation from Large Language Models (LLMs) bring the trust issues in auto-coding even more into the forefront. This raises not only the overall question of correctness of automatically generated code, but at what point we can start trusting automatically generated code enough to integrate it into our code-base. In past decades, niche industries have generated code from models, however there is no precedent of automatically generated code from natural language specifications being used widely. We discuss the trust issues for such automatically generated code thoroughly in this article. While the immediate motivation of the article is to study the trust issues in code from Large Language Models (LLMs), we study the topic of automated programming more broadly in this article.

We notice that increasingly many organizations are moving towards automatically generated code, even apart from the popularity of large language models. A recent keynote at Oracle CloudWorld 2023 [27] mentions how Oracle is considering moving away from writing software in Java, and instead automatically generating code for new software projects in a language called Apex. Apex is a well-known low code application platform to assemble an application out of application pages. This movement towards low code enables other benefits such as easily achieving security audit of

Authors' addresses: Michael R. Lyu, lyu@cs.cuhk.edu.hk Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China; Baishakhi Ray, rayb@columbia.edu Columbia University, New York, USA; Abhik Roychoudhury, abhik@comp.nus.edu.sg National University of Singapore, *[Corresponding Author]*, Singapore, Singapore; Shin Hwei Tan, shinhwei.tan@concordia.ca Concordia University, Montreal, Canada; Patanamon Thongtanunam, patanamon.t@unimelb.edu.au University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia.

a software project. Overall, we note that automatic programming goes beyond the use of large language models and implicitly includes recent trends in the growth of *low-code no-code* application development.

As a result of the recent interest in automatic programming, the set of problems associated with automatically generated code have received wide attention. Apart from correctness, there are concerns about security, privacy, explainability of the code - particularly when generated from a large language model. Pragmatically speaking, there could remain concerns about “passing the blame” when a software project which includes automatically generated code fails. To understand the underlying issue, we can draw an analogy between interaction between application software and systems software which leads to the well-known *application compatibility* (often called appcompat by developers) problem (e.g. see [1]). Typically due to version change of systems software such as operating system (OS), a specific application running on top of the OS (such as PDF reader) may fail. However, this need not be owing to the operating system itself. It may be due to a mistaken understanding of the *expectations* between the application software and the OS. In a similar fashion, when automatically generated code and manually written code co-exist in a software project, errors may creep in due to mistaken understanding of the expectations between different software components.

In this article, we thus examine how trust boundaries can shift when we integrate automatically generated code into a software project. One of the technical questions that could be of interest for the research community are the acceptability criterion for integrating LLM generated code into a software project. The capability of LLMs augmented by program analysis tools in automating key programming tasks such as bug-fixes and feature additions, as articulated in the recently proposed SWEbench [71] is also worthy of study. The last mile improvement of automatically generated code from LLMs, through the systematic use of program repair [28] remains a possibility to explore [93]. Such a penultimate auto-repair strategy can help provide specific evidence of correctness (such as passing curated tests) that builds confidence towards accepting LLM-generated code into a code repository.

We also study the impact of LLMs in automating non-code artifacts and processes such as test generation, code review and code summarisation. More importantly from the human-LLM interaction perspective, we seek to provide an emerging new outlook in future day programming. Traditionally, when formal specifications are unavailable, software engineers have resorted to *program comprehension* or specification inference to understand the functionality of a complex software system. This practice is particularly relevant when the software system is not built as a monolithic artifact, but rather assembled via the co-operation of different teams or via open-source contributions.

We note that the traditional program comprehension problem is conducted by the human, and may involve the usage of analysis / debugging tools to understand the working of a complex software system. In the age of LLM driven programming, we could postulate a *new comprehension problem* - where based on the natural language requirements LLMs augmented by program analysis tools can automate bulk of the comprehension tasks. There could be structured provisions for consulting the human to disambiguate requirements, at different stages of the comprehension process. Studying the mechanisms for such human-LLM collaboration and providing adequate primitives for consulting the human programmer by the LLM / analyzers could point us to the programming environments of the near future. We also underline the possibility of automated program repair of automatically generated code as a flexible mechanism for trusted automatic programming. These could feature in future day programming environments of 2030-35 and beyond.

2 HISTORICAL MILESTONES AND LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, we will delve into the development of automatic programming, pinpointing historical milestones and conducting a thorough literature review. Specifically, we will first introduce several key tasks that propelled the field

forward including code generation, program repair, and software testing. Additionally, we will highlight recent advances of LLMs in automatic programming and logging.

2.1 Code Generation

Code generation, also known as program synthesis, refers to the automated generation of software code based on user intent. This technique boosts developer productivity by reducing manual coding and accelerating the software development lifecycle. Early research in code generation mainly centers on deductive and inductive program synthesis which crafts code based on specification and/or input-output pairs. With the advent of deep learning techniques, natural language-based code generation that describes users' intent in plain language gains prominence. Besides, there are also other works that focus on generating code based on images and structured data. In this paper, we will mainly introduce deductive, inductive, and natural language-based code generation methodologies.

Deductive and Inductive Program Synthesis. Deductive program synthesis crafts programs from high-level descriptions, which involves mechanical theorem proving and formal methods [45, 49]. The requirement of detailed specifications helps reduce logical errors. It has diverse applications in fields such as robotics [31] and software engineering [58]. For example, STRIPS [31] is an automatic planner that addresses robot problems, and PROW [144] generates LISP code from specifications in predicate calculus by incorporating a two-step process involving theorem proving and code production. Another work [78] uses genetic programming approaches to automatically evolve programs that are consistent with a specification. Conversely, inductive program synthesis, or programming by example (PBE), generates programs directly from specific input-output pairs. This approach is less complex and more user-friendly than deductive synthesis and has been extensively investigated. It enables users unfamiliar with programming to instruct computers through examples. For instance, FlashFill [48], one of the most popular real-world program synthesis application, generates programs for spreadsheets like Excel from very few input-output examples. Similar methods [145] are also used to generate programs for relational databases for schema refactoring.

Natural Language-based Code Generation. Existing natural language-based code generation mainly employs deep-learning techniques and can typically be divided into three categories: sequence-based, tree-based, and pre-trained model approaches. In the realm of sequence-based models, the generation process employs the sequence-to-sequence paradigm and treats this process as a machine translation process to translate the natural language description into source code. For instance, Ling et al. [92] employ a neural network with a structured attention mechanism to handle semi-structured inputs for code generation. For tree-based models, these methods take into account the inherent structured nature of programs and parse them into a tree such as an Abstract Syntax Tree (AST). For example, Yin et al. [164] train an LSTM to generate a sequence of tree-construction actions and subsequently build the AST from these actions. Rabinovich et al. [121] propose the Abstract Syntax Networks and directly generate the tree structure of source code. Another work [133] design Transformer blocks to encode both the natural language and the previously generated grammar rules and then predict subsequent grammar rules in the sequence. In recent years, the advent of pre-trained models [30, 146] has achieved significant improvement in the field. These models are pre-trained on extensive datasets and then fine-tuned on datasets related to code generation. Furthermore, some studies draw inspiration from code reuse practices to enhance code generation models using retrieval-augment generation. Hayati et al. [55] improve code generation by retrieving code similar to the input and copying n-gram actions from the retrieved code. Xu et al. [159] introduces two external knowledge bases from Stack Overflow and API documentation for retrieval and improve model

performance. Parvez et al. [111] improve the generation process by introducing similar code snippets alongside the input description into the generator and training the model to selectively incorporate reusable codes.

2.2 Program Repair

Automated Program Repair (APR) methodologies [80] were initially introduced to automatically fix program bugs and reduce the need for intensive manual debugging. In this article we will also examine the possibility of automated repair of automatically generated code. APR leverages automated techniques to analyze buggy code and generates correct patches to address the identified issues. The research of APR techniques can be mainly divided into three categories: search-based, constraint-based, and learning-based [80].

Search-based Program Repair. Search-based APR methods employ heuristic algorithms to search for the right fix in a predefined patch space [73]. These methods use heuristics to identify potential bug positions and generate repair candidates. For instance, GenProg [44] uses an extended form of genetic programming to generate program variants that could fix the bugs and retain the required functionalities. RSRepair [119] employs the mutation techniques used in GenProg and uses random search to generate a fix patch. ARJA [166] formulates automated program repair as a multi-objective search problem and uses NSGA-II [21] to look for simpler repairs. One challenge of search-based APR is the costly validation of patches by testing [33]. To enhance efficiency, various strategies that try to minimize candidate patches and test cases for validation have been proposed. For example, AE [150] introduces RepairStrat and TestStrat which leverage equivalent patches to prune semantically-equivalent patches and sample validates patches to cut down costs. relifix [134] targets regression error fixes using previous program versions and contextual repair operators. The work of [35] focuses on the software regression errors and proposes to leverage previous versions of a buggy program. Search-based repair techniques may suffer from having to navigate a large search space and to alleviate this issue, fix template guided repair (such as the work of PAR [77]) has been suggested. Search based repair suffers from the more serious issue of test-data overfitting where the generated repair can pass the given tests, but not other tests. The issue of overfitting in program repair, and specifically search-based program repair has been mentioned in [120] Constraint-based program repair approaches mitigate these concerns, by constructing a generalization of given tests via symbolic analysis.

Constraint-based Program Repair. Constraint-based APR methods utilize constraint specifications to guide the repair by converting the repair problems into a constraint solver problem. For example, SemFix [105] fixes single-line bugs using symbolic execution by crafting repair constraints. DirectFix [102] improves patch generation with constraint solving and program synthesis, extending the ability to fix multi-line bugs but suffering from the scalability problem due to maxSMT solving overheads. To overcome this, Angelix [103] proposes to employ the lightweight value based specifications (angelic forest) for better scalability. Nopol [161] was proposed to fix if-conditional bugs using SMT. It uses value replacement instead of symbolic execution. Another work called SPR performs enumerative search to find suitable values to be returned by boolean expressions in different iterations of a loop [97]. The repair tool Prophet [98] is an improvement of SPR, where a machine learning model is employed as the last step to rank patch candidates.

Learning-based Program Repair. With the advent of machine learning, numerous methods have been proposed that utilize learning-based models to capture program semantics for repairing bugs. Early deep learning-based APR approaches [53, 151] utilized neural models to learn code semantics for aiding repair tasks, instead of directly generating patches. DeepRepair [151] identifies similarities between buggy code and potential fixes to guide the patch generation.

More recent methods [19, 88, 101] employ neural machine translation (NMT) techniques using encoder-decoder models to understand the semantics of buggy code and translate buggy code into fixed code. For instance, CoCoNuT [101] tokenizes code into sequences like text to translate the buggy code into correct code. DLFix [88] leverages abstract syntax trees with tree-based models to capture code structure information. CURE [69] integrates pre-trained models in NMT-based APR and proposes a code-aware search strategy to find compilable patches. Compared with generating patches, Recoder [173] proposes to generate the edit to ensure the syntactic correctness of the patched program. The recent work RewardRepair [163] improves repair performance and the successful compilation rate of patches by training models with program execution information.

Security Vulnerability repair. Program repair techniques have shown promise in automatically fixing security vulnerabilities. This has significant promise and relevance for automatically generated code from LLMs, since security vulnerabilities in LLM produced code remains a big concern. The work of ExtractFix [42] uses address sanitizers to extract specifications of crash-freedom and then uses symbolic reasoning to produce patches via a repair-augmented weakest pre-condition computation. This leads to a completely automated vulnerability repair method for memory errors. The work of SenX [60] requires safety properties which are then used to automatically generate vulnerability patches. Last but not the least, the work of Crashrepair [40] suggests a promising workflow where vulnerability detection via grey-box fuzz testing and vulnerability repair are fused into a single step - prioritizing tests which can better distinguish among patch candidates. Such workflows may hold promise as automatically generated code from LLMs (potentially replete with security vulnerabilities) become common-place in future.

2.3 LLM-based Intelligent Programming

In this section, we will first detail introduce recent representative Large Language Code Models and then introduce some works that utilize LLMs to boost the above programming tasks.

2.3.1 Large Language Code Models. Recently the advent of pre-training techniques techniques has significantly advanced progress in automatic programming. Pre-trained code models are first pre-trained on large-scale unlabeled datasets using self-supervised learning tasks and then fine-tuned or prompted for downstream tasks. Since this process does not require human annotation, it can be applied to large-scale unlabeled datasets, enabling the models to acquire a vast amount of general programming knowledge. Recent studies [75, 148] show that increasing the size of these models significantly boosts their abilities, resulting in substantial enhancements in performance once the models grow beyond a certain parameter threshold. The term “Large Language Model” (LLM) has been proposed to distinguish these models based on the extent of their parameters. In this section, we will provide a detailed account of well-known Large Language Code Models, ranging in size from Bert-like models to those as large as ChatGPT.

One pioneer work of pre-trained code model is CodeBERT [30], which is an encoder-only pre-trained model on six programming languages with two self-supervised tasks, i.e., masked language modeling and replaced token detection, which significantly outperforms previous non-pre-trained models. Another model, CodeT5 [146] is an encoder-decoder pre-trained model following the same architecture as T5. It formulates all the tasks in a sequence-to-sequence paradigm with different task-specific prefixes and achieves promising results on a variety of code intelligence tasks. CodeGPT [99] is a decoder-only model that pre-trains on programming languages dataset and has the same architecture as GPT-2. PLBART [2] uses denoising sequence-to-sequence pretraining for both program understanding and generation purposes. UniXCoder [51] involves multi-modal contrastive learning and cross-modal generation objective to learn the

representation of code fragments. More recently, there are also some pre-trained code models that are designed for specific programming tasks such as CodeReviewer [90] and CodiT5 [169].

Apart from these smaller pre-trained models in academics, many pre-trained code models with much larger sizes have been proposed in the industry in recent years. INCODER [34] is a model that adopts a causal masking training objective for both code infilling and synthesis and has two versions with 1.3B and 6.7B parameters, respectively. CodeGen [108] is a large pre-trained model with more than 16B parameters, which achieves promising results for multi-turn program synthesis. Codex [17] is a large code pre-trained model proposed by OpenAI that supports the service of Copilot. It is adept at understanding and generating code, facilitating the automation of programming tasks, and supporting developers in writing code more efficiently. In addition to Codex, the models recently released by OpenAI, such as ChatGPT [14] and GPT-4 [110], are also pre-trained on source code data and demonstrate impressive programming abilities. AlphaCode [84] is trained for generating code for programming competitions with 715G data and 41B parameters. It can generate novel solutions to unseen programming problems and outperform about half of developers in competitive programming with more than 5,000 participants. StarCoder [83] is an advanced LLM for assisted programming. Its base version is trained on the Stack dataset with 15.5B parameters and increases the input size into 8000 tokens to enable dealing with longer code. Code Llama [123] is a family of large-scale code language models developed by Meta and has variations including base, Python-specialized, and instruction-following models, ranging from 7B to 34B parameters. These models are adept at handling sequences up to 100k tokens and are available for both research and commercial use under license. Phi-1 [50], from Microsoft Research, is a 1.3B parameter decoder-only transformer model, trained on a curated dataset of 7B samples, designed for code-related tasks. WizardCoder [100] is an open-source LLM based on StarCoder, fine-tuned with instruction-based datasets to enhance code generation capabilities across various complexity levels. DeepSeek Coder [22] is trained on a mixed corpus of code and natural language. It focuses on project-level code completion and infilling and achieves state-of-the-art performance in multiple programming languages on various benchmarks. Magicoder [149] is a recent work that is trained on synthetic instruction data enhanced with open-source code snippets. Its primary aim is to produce diversified, realistic, and controllable data, addressing the bias typically found in synthetic data generated by LLMs.

2.3.2 Utilization of LLMs for Intelligent Programming. Recently, apart from training a base LLM, there are also a lot of works that focus on how to utilize these powerful LLMs by tuning or prompting them for automatic programming [37, 38, 81, 115, 155]. In code generation, there is a growing interest in methods that utilize the chain-of-thought prompt to generate better code and solve more complicated programming problems. For example, TIP [81] utilizes LLMs to formulate a high-level code sketch before working on detailed coding tasks, which improves the precision and reliability of generated code. Dong et al. [24] proposes a self-collaboration method to advance LLMs in complex coding tasks by employing multiple LLMs as distinct experts and making them interact with each other. Besides, apart from generating codes at function-level, many recent work also explores extending the scope of code generation into class-level [25] and repository-level [128]. As for program repair, there are also a lot of studies utilizing LLMs to repair software bugs. Fan et al. [28] studied the mistakes in auto-generated code and investigated whether existing automated program repair techniques can fix the incorrect code produced by LLMs such as Codex. Xia et al. [154] applied several LLMs for program repair by adopting a infilling-style approach (i.e., predicting what the correct code should look like given its surrounding prefix and suffix). Huang et al. [59] studies the impact of different LLMs and different program repair scenarios. Peng et al. [115] proposes to mine domain-aware fix templates and incorporate them into code prompts to repair Python type error. Apart from the above works that only generate the repair patch in a one-stop way. ChatRepair [155] leverages

the conversational nature of advanced LLMs like ChatGPT and learns from both previous test failure information to provide the model with immediate feedback. With the feedback information from test cases, it could produce more precise and context-sensitive fixes. Moreover, LLMs are also employed for logging activities such as logging statement automation [89, 171]. For example, Li et al. [86] present the first extensive evaluation of LLMs for logging statement generation. Furthermore, Sridhara et al. [131] explore the proficiency of ChatGPT in summarizing logs, achieving promising results surpassing the existing method. Li et al. [87] propose to incorporate static context into code prompt and employ a self-refinement manner to further rectify previous errors. Another important field in logging activities is log parsing, which aims at extracting structured templates and parameters from raw log messages to provide insights for developers [56, 61, 172]. To facilitate the effectiveness of LLM for log parsing, [160] leverages LLM and in-context learning (ICL) for log template extraction and another work [70] improves log parsing by ICL and parsing cache. LLMs are also beneficial in generating test cases from natural language descriptions, which enhances cooperation between software developers and testers. These include the automated test case generation of various scenarios such as enhancing the coverage of testing [129, 157] and the detection of possible defects [157]. Ryan et al. [124] proposes to provide LLMs with path constraints and code context to improve the coverage of generated test cases. ChatUniTest [157] extracts essential information and creates an adaptive focal context for LLMs to generate test cases.

3 PROGRAM REPAIR AND AUTO-CODING

Program synthesis converts a formal or semi-formal specification into expressions or code snippets. The area has been studied as early as [117] and a recent survey appears in [5]. The specifications driving program synthesis may often be given as a collection of *(input, output)* examples - providing the oracle for a given input. Program repair [80] involves a correction or rectification of a code-base so that it can meet certain correctness criteria. The correctness criteria can be given in terms of system level test cases that the overall software system needs to pass. Both program synthesis and repair suffer from the *overfitting* problem due to the incompleteness of the specifications driving these processes. If the specification is given as a test-suite the overfitting can appear in the form of the generated code overfitting the test-data. As a simple example let us suppose we have *(input, output)* specifications given in terms of collections of input-output pairs as follows.

```
(input = 2, output = 4)
```

```
(input = 3, output = 9)
```

and we have a buggy program

```
output = input + input;
```

An inadequate program repair system may fix the above program to

```
if (input == 2) output = 4;
```

```
else if (input == 3) output = 9;
```

while our desire will be to produce the following (minimal) fix via program repair

```
output = input * input;
```

This simple example also makes it apparent the core issue of "generalization" underlying program synthesis approaches - particularly those that are driven by input-output examples. It is always possible to synthesize code that works exactly for the given input-output examples by producing code with the following schematic

```
if (input == input1) return output1
```

```

else if (input == input2) return output2
else ...

```

Imposing certain quality indicators such as code size may induce the program synthesizer to produce more compact code which *generalizes* the given input-output examples. While there exist a large number of synthesis approaches, many of them typically perform an enumerative search over the search space of expressions. The enumerative search may be guided by a choice of operators appearing in the expression (component-based synthesis [67]) or certain restrictions over the syntax of expressions typically captured via a grammar (syntax-guided synthesis [6]). Irrespective of the technical machinery used to conduct the synthesis - the issue of overfitting of the synthesized code remains. The concern is that the synthesized code may return the expected output for the given input-output examples but not for other inputs. For the program synthesis problem, this problem sometimes remains implicit - since the expected output for inputs other than those appearing in the given (input, output) examples may not even be documented fully. In the problem of program repair, where a buggy program is given - the problem of overfitting is more explicit. Here the fixed program may pass the given tests in a test-suite which is used to guide the repair; at the same time, the fixed program may not pass tests outside the given test-suite.

We now discuss a treatment of program repair as a field with some technical glimpses on the underlying challenges such as over-fitting. *The treatment is from the open-source unpublished article by the third author [41].*

3.1 Program repair

The issue of overfitting has been well studied and articulated in the area of program repair [120]. While raising awareness about the issue, these works have articulated concerns which go beyond the incompleteness of tests. It is generally known that any test-suite as collection of (input, expected output) pairs is an incomplete specification of intended program behavior. Therefore repairs generated by using a test-suite T as guidance may not pass tests outside T . However the concerns about generating overfitting repairs go beyond the incompleteness of T . For example if the oracle of certain tests say that an exception should not be raised, a repair may simply delete the code which raises these exceptions and meet the requirement.

For this reason, it is important for automated program repair techniques to

- perform an adequate generalization of the given test-suite T , so that the repairs do not only work on tests in T
- satisfy certain code quality indicators apart from passing the given tests, to avoid obviously unacceptable repairs such as deleting the code checking the oracle.
- to ensure quality patches certain repair techniques emphasize the succinctness of the patches - meaning smaller disruption to the code-base is somehow "better".

We now describe in details one concrete approach for program repair, which seeks to achieve these goals by symbolic analysis of the given tests in T . Here symbolic analysis of the test executions for tests in T , amounts to computing a generalization which we want to work for tests outside T as well. By symbolically analyzing the tests in T , the repair method extracts specifications about the patch code in the form of *repair constraints*. These repair constraints can be used as guidance in generating patches via search or program synthesis. We emphasize here for the reader that this is only one approach for program repair, and there exist several other approaches based on search and learning [80]. One motivation for presenting this constraint based program repair approach is to illustrate ideas about how automatically generated code in program repair techniques can avoid the test over-fitting problem. Conceptually speaking, we could always define a domain of program edits, and then conduct a random search in this domain to find edits which pass

```

1 int tri_detect(int a, int b, int c){
2   if (a <= 0 || b <= 0 || c <= 0)
3     return INVALID;
4   else if (a == b && b == c)
5     return EQUILATERAL;
6   else if (a == b || b == c)
7     return ISOSCELES;
8   else return SCALENE;
9 }

```

a	b	c	Output	Outcome
-1	1	1	INVALID	Pass
2	2	2	EQUILATERAL	Pass
2	2	3	ISOSCELES	Pass
2	3	2	SCALENE	Fail
3	2	2	ISOSCELES	Pass
2	3	4	SCALENE	Pass

Fig. 1. Triangle program from [80] and the test data accompanying the program

given tests. However, the output of such a search would be greatly dependent on the search heuristics and it would be hard to give any assurance about the quality of the patches. Thus, instead of searching at random in the space of patches - we show how the repair technique can be "guided" to produce higher quality patches.

In the approach that we elaborate in prior work [106], the repair technique is "guided" by a repair constraint which generated by symbolically executing the tests in the given test-suite T in a novel fashion. So, the main conceptual step is in using constraints to reduce the search space of possible patches, as opposed to searching in the domain of patches. We do not discuss the computation of the constraint in details, but rather conceptualize at a high level how the presence of such a constraint can help generate high quality repairs and avoid patch overfitting.

Let us consider a program that takes in three sides of a triangle and determines the kind of triangle constructed out of these three sides. The program may look like the program in Figure 1. This program has several bugs. For three sides which violate the triangle inequality - it should return INVALID, but it is not doing so. Similarly, the definition of the isosceles triangle is supposed to check if any two of the three sides are equal. Now, as shown in the test suite from Figure 1, let us show a realistic test-suite consisting one test for invalid triangle, one for equilateral triangle, three tests for isosceles triangle (depending on which two sides are equal), and one test for a scalene triangle. A reasonably constructed test-suite based on the requirements will indeed be of this nature. Let us assume now that by a control flow analysis of the passing and failing tests, line 6 is inferred as the fix location. The fix localization process is the same as the localization of search-based APR techniques. The exact process of fix localization is not shown here. It may involve finding out locations which appear with significantly greater frequency in failing tests, than in passing tests. Once the fix location is identified, the expression in that location is substituted as an unknown or a symbolic variable X .

```

...
6   else if (X)
7     return ISOSCELES;
...

```

Now, it is required to find out properties about X which would make the program pass the test cases that are given.

- the first two tests do not even reach line 6.
- among the remaining four tests that reach line 6, X should be true in the third, fourth, and fifth tests. Moreover, X should be false in the sixth test.

Getting the above-mentioned requirements, though put intuitively here, is not straightforward. It involves an analysis of the test executions for the given tests. Essentially it amounts to finding the desired value of X (in this case a boolean as it represents a boolean expression) so that it can make the test pass. This is captured by the *repair constraint*.

How to formally capture these requirements or constraints on X , which essentially is a placeholder for the code inserted in line 6? A formal way of understanding this repair constraint is that the unknown X is essentially an unknown function on the variables which are live in line 6. Thus essentially

$$X = f(a, b, c) \quad (1)$$

where f is an unknown function that is to be synthesized. The information about the function f is given by the following repair constraint.

$$f(2, 2, 3) \wedge f(3, 2, 2) \wedge f(2, 3, 2) \wedge \neg f(2, 3, 4) \quad (2)$$

This repair constraint can be fed to a program synthesis engine. The synthesis engine can be fed with the ingredients that can appear in the expression: the variables, the constants, and the operators. In this case, the variables are a, b, c , the constants are the integer constants and the operators are the relational operators and logical operators. With these ingredients and the provided repair constraint, a component-based synthesis engine [66] will yield the correct fix

$$f(a, b, c) = (a == b || b == c || a == c) \quad (3)$$

Let us now present the formal treatment of repair constraint computation. Statistical fault localization [152] or other offline analysis techniques are applied to identify potential fix locations. Such offline analysis may involve program dependency analysis, or simply control flow analysis of the passing / failing tests. Let us examine how the control flow analysis of passing / failing tests will proceed under the auspices of statistical fault localization. In such an approach, each statement s in the program is given a suspiciousness score based on the occurrences of s in the passing / failing tests. Constraint-based APR techniques also rely on fault localization to determine the line to be fixed. Once a fix line is decided, a repair constraint is then constructed. This is a constraint on the expression to be put in the corresponding line as a fix. For the purposes of explanation, let us assume that the fix is either a boolean expression or an arithmetic expression which is the right hand side of an assignment. How to construct the repair constraint? For a boolean expression, the expression can be simply replaced with a new symbolic variable X as follows.

$$\text{if}(e) \rightarrow \text{if}(X) \quad (4)$$

For an arithmetic expression, a new symbolic variable X is introduced as follows.

$$y = e \rightarrow y = X \quad (5)$$

Note here that y is a program variable and e is an expression made out of program variables, while X is a symbolic ghost variable which is introduced by us, for the purposes of automated program repair. Note that the symbolic variable X is introduced at the deemed fix location, and for now let us assume we are generating a one line fix.

Given such a ghost symbolic variable X , the repair constraint is defined in terms of X as follows. For a given test t , the path up to the fix location L is concrete. From the fix location L , there are several possible paths, depending on the value of X . Therefore, the path condition of a path π from L and the symbolic output along the path in terms of X can be defined. Let these be pc_π and out_π respectively, as illustrated at Figure 2. Then a constraint for path π can be represented as

$$pc_\pi \wedge out_\pi = oracle(t) \quad (6)$$




Fig. 2. Inferring Specifications for Program Repair (ack. unpublished article [41])

where $oracle(t)$ is the expected output for test case t . Considering the various paths from L for the execution of test t , repair constraint for test t to pass is

$$C_t \equiv \bigvee_{\pi} pc_{\pi} \wedge out_{\pi} = oracle(t) \quad (7)$$

The overall repair constraint is the conjunction of the repair constraint collected from all the given tests, since the repaired program is expected to pass all the given tests. In other words, the repair constraint C is given as follows.

$$C \equiv \bigwedge_t C_t \quad (8)$$

3.2 Language Model based Code Generation

Designing AI-based systems to automatically solve programming tasks has gained considerable attention in recent years. The most notable of these comes in the form of transformer-based large-scale language models, which used to transform natural language text. Large language models, such as Codex [16] and AlphaCode [85], have also successfully generated code for many programming tasks in Python, Java, C, etc.

Program Repair for fixing Code Generated by Language Model. Codex and AlphaCode have shown capability in generating correct solutions for many programming tasks. However, the success rate of existing language models remains low, especially for complex programming tasks. One of the reasons is that language models lack awareness of program semantics (e.g., type information, run-time program states, etc.), resulting in incorrect programs. A large part of bugs made by Codex are syntax errors or misaligned algorithms, i.e., uncompiled programs or programs with incorrect algorithms. Meanwhile, some bugs require small changes, e.g., changing operators, modifying expressions, or changing statements. For instance, Figure 3 shows an example program produced by Codex for an programming task in LeetCode¹. The comments in Figure 3 are the program descriptions, which are provided to Codex as prompt, and the code is automatically generated by Codex. Unfortunately, the produced program has a bug, causing the program to fail on some test cases. The correct fix is to change statement $i--=2$ at line 9 to $i--=1$. Compared to language models, typical repair tools generate patches by reasoning about the program semantics against the given specification. Hence,

¹<https://leetcode.com>

```

1 //A fancy string is a string where no three consecutive characters are equal.
2 Given a string s, delete the minimum possible number of characters from s to make it fancy.
3 Return the final string after the deletion. It can be shown that the answer will always be unique.
4 public String makeFancyString(String s) {
5     StringBuilder sb = new StringBuilder(s);
6     for (int i = 2; i < sb.length(); i++) {
7         if (sb.charAt(i) == sb.charAt(i-1) && sb.charAt(i) == sb.charAt(i-2)) {
8             sb.deleteCharAt(i);
9         }
10        i -= 1;
11    }
12 }
13 return sb.toString();
14 }

```

Fig. 3. The program for a LeetCode programming task generated by Codex.

the repair technique has the potential to increase the success rate of language models. In the above example, several existing repair tools can automatically fix the bug and make it pass all the test cases.

Language Model for Program Repair. Language models could also be used for fixing software bugs. In March 2022, a new version of Codex edit mode was released. Instead of just translating program descriptions to programs², the Codex edit model can change existing code in a complete program. This new feature makes it practical to use Codex for program repair. Codex edit mode requires users to provide instructions to guide the code change, such as “fix the bug at line 2”, or “fix the index-out-of-bound exception”. To fix a bug, users need to provide precise and clear instructions. The repair based on large language models could even produce better performance in fixing software bugs than learning based repair techniques. Compared to existing learning-based repair, e.g., SequenceR and Recoder, Codex is trained on a much larger dataset than Recoder, which helps Codex to learn more fix patterns (see [28] for comparison results). In fact, large language models learn code edit patterns from huge existing programming artifacts (including code, commits, comments and etc.). Nevertheless the task of repairing automatically generated code remains a challenge. A recent work [28] has shown that automatically generated code for even simple Leetcode problems contain large number of occurrences of “*misaligned algorithms*”. Such misaligned algorithms constitute cases where the programming of the task (or one of its sub-tasks) is incorrect even at an algorithmic level - so that the code needs to be completely re-written.

Using the latest LLMs. Prompting some of the largest commercial models, such as Gemini 1.5, GPT3.5, and GPT4, shows that the example generated by Codex can be successfully repaired. Providing no specific information about the bug (“fix the issue please”) or only the buggy line (“there is an error on line 9”) is sufficient to get a patch. Furthermore, these models are commonly used for chatting and generate a human-readable explanation of the fault. Figure 4 is an example of such an interaction with OpenAI’s GPT4 model. The flexibility and power of such models come at a (small) cost. With an imprecise prompt, the model may respond in an unexpected format, which cannot be used to repair the program automatically. A solution is to describe how the model should return the fix. An example modification is appending the string “Return the patched code in triple backticks and nothing else.” With the advancement of the models’ size and architecture, we postulate that syntax errors for common languages will occur less in the output of

²<https://openai.com/blog/gpt-3-edit-insert>

The given code snippet aims to remove characters from the string `s` to ensure no three consecutive characters are the same, thereby making it a "fancy string." However, there's an issue with the logic that might not always yield the correct result because of how the index `i` is managed after deletion. When you delete a character at index `i`, you do not need to decrement `i` by 2. Instead, you should decrement `i` by 1 to ensure the loop checks the next set of characters properly after a deletion.

Let's correct the code:

...

Here's the corrected version:

```

```java
public String makeFancyString(String s) {
 StringBuilder sb = new StringBuilder(s);
 for (int i = 2; i < sb.length(); i++) {
 if (sb.charAt(i) == sb.charAt(i-1) && sb.charAt(i) == sb.charAt(i-2)) {
 sb.deleteCharAt(i);
 i--; // Corrected to decrement i by 1 instead of 2
 }
 }
 return sb.toString();
}
```
...

```

Fig. 4. Example repair generated by GPT-4 (abbreviated)

large commercial models in the coming years. On the other hand, as natural language is inherently ambiguous, the issue of misaligned algorithms will remain problematic. Misaligned algorithms occur when while trying to write code for a task, a language model generates an incorrect solution even at algorithmic level for some of the sub-tasks [28]. Validation techniques must be defined to alleviate this, and guarantees of the model's response must be provided to ensure safe code integration.

Commentary on semantic approaches. We postulate that language model based code generation, as well as language model based repair approaches could play a role in future. At the same time, the relationship of the language model based repair approach with respect to program synthesis is not well-understood today. Since semantic repair approaches or constraint based repair approaches, rely on symbolic reasoning, there exist opportunities in combining semantic repair approaches with language model based repair in the future. Here we need to be careful about what kind of back-end we use for the constraint-based repair approach. *We note that the program synthesis back-end can be replaced by a generative AI model*, while the constraint-based repair can provide a systematic selection mechanism for selecting among patch candidates. These workflows can be examined in the future.

4 CODE LLMs, SOFTWARE QUALITY AND TRUSTWORTHINESS

The use of LLMs in automatic programming shows immense potential. However, this progress brings with it concerns about the trustworthiness of the code these models produce. For instance, Jesse et al. [65] found code LLMs tend to

introduce simple bugs in the codebase. Estimating correctness of the code generated by LLMs becomes problematic, especially in the absence of clear specifications. In fact, there have been instances where code generated by LLMs was found to contain security vulnerabilities [114, 116]. Identifying security flaws within the generated code is challenging; developers might not review every piece of code in detail, leading to overlooked errors. There is also a risk of LLMs being exploited by bad actors who may tamper with the training data or manipulate the prompts used during the query phase [46]. The opaque nature of LLMs adds another layer of complexity to the task of analyzing and debugging automatically generated code. The intricate algorithms that drive the code generation process are not fully transparent to developers, making it hard for them to grasp how the code comes to exist. This issue becomes even more pronounced in programming environments where code is continuously edited. The need for an Integrated Development Environment (IDE) that can not only generate code efficiently but also provide clear, non-intrusive explanations is critical.

4.1 Quality

To systematically access the software quality of automatically generated code by LLMs, we refer to ISO/IEC 25010 guidelines. Specifically, ISO/IEC 25010 includes eight quality characteristics: (1) functional suitability (i.e., functional completeness, functional correctness, and functional appropriateness), (2) performance efficiency, (3) compatibility, (4) usability, (5) reliability, (6) security, (7) maintainability, and (8) portability. Overall, we notice that most of the recent research focuses on studying functional suitability [28], usability [141], reliability [118, 170], security [116], and maintainability [95]. From these existing studies, we derive a few observations. Firstly, despite the recent advancement in LLMs like ChatGPT, LLMs still generally produce low-quality code based on recent evaluations that cover different quality characteristics. Secondly, *there exists a recent trend of studies to cover more quality characteristics by proposing new benchmarks*. For example, LMDefects [28] contains LLM-generated programs that are functionally incorrect, whereas NoFunEval benchmark [130] has been recently proposed to evaluate non-functional requirements including performance efficiency and security and the study on the benchmark has noted the low performances of code generation models in non-functional requirements. Thirdly, existing studies rely on traditional metrics for human-written code to access the quality of automatically generated code and these *traditional metrics are still generally applicable for automatically generated code*. For example, prior study relies on static analysis tools for measuring maintainability [95] and found that ChatGPT-generated code suffer from maintainability issues.

An experimental evaluation of Large Language Models for code appears in [15, 158] and we refer the reader to these articles. The evaluation includes the *Pass@1* rate for the code generated from these models, which is the percentage where a randomly generated code sample passes all given unit tests.

Despite many recent studies on LLM-generated code, we notice that *quality characteristics such as compatibility, and portability are still under-explored*. Notably, existing studies mostly focus on compatibility issues related to test scripts generation [165] and library-related issues [91]. For example, a recent approach [91] proposed to add awareness of third-party library information to improve the accuracy and the reusability of the generated code. As adding awareness of a quality characteristic have shown promising results in improving the quality of generated code [91], one viable solution would be to fuse all the eight quality characteristics into LLM to improve the overall quality of the generated code. However, as some of the characteristics may have conflicting requirements, one viable solution is to guide LLM to prioritize certain quality characteristics for different tasks or applications. For example, as secure code may be less efficient due to the additional security check, we need to encode the priority for security over performance efficiency when using LLM to generate code for certain safety-critical systems. Another viable solution is to define a set of

| Dimension | Explanation | |
|----------------|----------------|--|
| Code-specific | Security | The code generated by LLMs should not have any security vulnerabilities. |
| | Reliability | LLM generated code should be free of bugs. |
| | Privacy | Code LLMs will not leak unauthorized information. |
| Model-specific | Explainability | The model should be able to explain its rationale of producing certain code or decision. |
| | Robustness | Code LLMs should maintain their performances under diverse noisy inputs. |
| | Consistency | The models' outputs should be consistent and reproducible. |
| | Fairness | The model should not produce any code or decision exhibiting unethical or unfair behavior. |
| | Ethics | The model should not produce any code that intentionally causes harm to humanity. |

Table 1. Attributes of Trustworthiness for Code LLMs

anti-patterns [135] for various quality characteristics and encode these “bad patches” into LLMs as rules to improve the quality of the generated patches.

We now discuss the more specific issue of *trustworthiness* of LLM generated code, and what it would take to trust the integration of LLM generated code as methods into our software project.

4.2 Trustworthiness in integrating LLM generated Code

In the near future, ensuring the seamless integration of LLM-generated code into real-world code bases with greater reliability will be crucial. It is imperative to delve into the concept of trustworthiness specifically concerning code generated by LLMs and to develop systematic methods for evaluating this trustworthiness. This exploration will not only inform the future development of models but also shape the entire Software Engineering ecosystem surrounding them. By understanding and addressing these aspects, we can pave the way for more robust and dependable utilization of LLMs in coding applications.

To this end, we reviewed existing literature on the trustworthiness of software [11, 125] and trustworthiness of generic LLMs [132]. None of them individually is sufficient for our purpose. Drawing upon this research, we identified eight primary attributes essential for evaluating the trustworthiness of code LLMs, as outlined in Table 1. These attributes can be broadly categorized into two main groups: (i) those pertaining to the properties of the generated code and (ii) those broadly relevant to LLMs but they can be adopted for Code LLMs. By delineating these attributes, in the future, it will be essential to establish a comprehensive framework for assessing the trustworthiness of code generated by LLMs, thereby facilitating informed decisions regarding their utilization in real-world applications. In the following paragraph, we will elaborate on this, especially for code related attributes.

Security. Given that LLMs are trained on a vast amount of open-source code corpus, it is likely that the pre-trained code corpus contains unverified code that contain security vulnerabilities. The LLMs learn from such vulnerable and exploitable examples. This raises concerns about the security of the code it generates. To check this issue, Pearce et al. [114] methodically examine the prevalence and circumstances under which GitHub Copilot might generate insecure code. Their analysis involves prompting Copilot to generate code in situations relevant to high-risk cybersecurity vulnerabilities, such as those identified in MITRE’s “Top 25” Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE) list. They came up with 89 unique scenarios for Copilot to tackle, resulting in the creation of 1,689 programs. Among these, approximately 40% were found to be vulnerable to exploitation. Similar observations were found in other independent studies [8, 116].

Reliability. Code LLMs tend to produce subtle trivial bugs as well. In fact, Jesse et al. [65] reported that Codex and other LLMs produce verbatim single statement bugs up to twice as often as known, for verbatim correct code.

Privacy. A substantial amount of code data, which is required to train these models, becomes a hindrance, as companies are understandably hesitant to share such sensitive data. This reluctance stems from the fear of potential leaks of proprietary information, including sensitive information like names, emails, passwords, etc [109]. Even when considering third-party foundation LLMs, companies remain cautious about exposing their code to external entities. One of the central challenges in this context revolves around harnessing the capabilities of LLMs while ensuring the protection of proprietary information. Striking a balance between leveraging the power of these models for software engineering tasks and safeguarding sensitive data poses a significant hurdle that the research community must navigate. As the use of LLMs becomes more prevalent, addressing these security and privacy concerns will be crucial to realizing their full potential in the field of software engineering.

Potential Remedy. When incorporating code generated by LLMs into projects, it is crucial to ensure that the generated code is free from obvious vulnerabilities, errors, or leaks of sensitive information. Integrating the checks as part of the automated development process will be even more important for maintaining the security and integrity of the software. To achieve this, we outline few strategies:

- Firstly, we should prioritize using high-quality training data for the LLMs. This entails training the models on datasets that are thoroughly vetted and free from known vulnerabilities or bugs. By starting with clean and reliable data, the likelihood of the LLM generating flawed code can be significantly reduced.
- Additionally, developing and employing light-weight static analysis tools can be instrumental in evaluating the quality of the code generated by LLMs. These tools can automatically analyze the code for potential vulnerabilities, syntax errors, or other issues without the need to execute the code. By running static analysis on the LLM-generated code, developers can identify and address any issues before integrating it into their projects. Note that, such static analysis tools should be light-weight and fast as they need to be integrated with IDE and should not hinder developers' productivity significantly. The static analysis should be able to analyze even partial programs, as the code generated in the IDEs may not be complete. Further, last mile improvement of code generated from LLMs, can be enabled by automated program repair.
- To boost LLM intelligence and reliability, integrating step-by-step logical reasoning and self-debugging abilities is key. This equips models to better grasp code context, resulting in more accurate outputs. Self-debugging empowers LLMs to automatically identify and fix errors, potentially reducing vulnerabilities. These enhancements enhance overall model reliability, leading to higher-quality, secure code.
- Last but not the least, there exist enticing possibilities of generating verified code with the help of Large Language Models. This can take many forms, including (a) generating code from LLMs and systematically improving it to produce verified code, or (b) generating code in a verified programming language. We note that some efforts along these lines have already been started, such as [104] reporting the LLM-assisted synthesis of verified Dafny methods.

5 PROGRAMMER-LLM INTERACTION

Given the increasing capabilities of AI, particularly Large Language Models (LLMs), in automatic programming, there is a surge in the development and integration of tools based on code-fluent and LLMs to serve as programming assistants.

This section provides an overview of how humans can engage with AI models and Large Language Models (LLMs) for automatic programming. Specifically, we highlight two main common interaction patterns: *Autocompletion* and *Prompting*. We then discuss the challenges that programmers face when leveraging LLMs.

5.1 Interaction Patterns

Autocompletion. Autocompletion for code refers to the seamless integration of AI models into an Integrated Development Environment (IDE) without requiring explicit user invocation. Generally speaking, this tool continuously queries the AI model for code suggestions and promptly displays them to the user. Users engage with the AI model by selecting and validating the generated suggestions. A notable example is GitHub Copilot [12], which acts as an AI pair programmer. Copilot takes preceding code comments or source code (e.g., a function header or partial implementation) as input. It then offers suggestions to complete the remaining implementation whenever the user pauses. One outstanding advantage of AI-based autocompletion is its ability to complete multiple lines of code in one suggestion. This ability significantly improves usability compared to traditional completion tools, which typically suggest one subsequent token at a time. With this advantage, programmers can also utilize the tool as a substitute for internet searches [142]. This would reduce cognitive load as programmers can focus on tasks within the IDE.

Prompting: Instead of relying on AI models to infer tasks from code comments or preceding source code, programmers explicitly provide specialized input called prompts that provide instructions on how the LLMs should generate code. With the interaction pattern of explicit invocation by programmers, there are various ways that programmers can interact with the AI models. For example, GenLine [68] provides a command-like interaction style where programmers specify a command (e.g., “[html: make an OK button]”) within the code to invoke the AI models. Alternatively, AI models can serve as virtual coding assistants within the IDE, allowing programmers to provide instructions through a dedicated user interface like a textbox [76]. With this kind of interaction, programmers can provide structured instructions (e.g., chain-of-thoughts) as a prompt. To enable more engagement with the AI models, programmers can engage with the AI models via a conversational interaction where it takes the previous invocation as the additional context of the input prompts [122]. Two common intentions of developers to use these tools are 1) acceleration and 2) exploration [10]. In the acceleration mode, programmers intend to use the models when they have specific programming tasks in mind and leverage the AI model to promptly complete them instead of typing. The tasks are typically small and logical subtasks that demand less analysis and more straightforward coding, often perceived as just tedious work. Thus, to harness the acceleration potential of the AI models in coding, it is essential to first analyze and decompose the complex task into smaller logical subtasks. The exploration mode emerges when programmers encounter a new problem and are uncertain about how to decompose the task. As the tool can take code comments which is a natural text describing programming intent to generate suggestions, programmers to craft various code comments as inputs and then explore multiple implementation suggestions. Even if the suggestions are not entirely correct, they may still provide a code skeleton or starting point [142]. Alternatively, in the exploration mode, programmers use AI-based autocompletion instead of searching for solutions on the internet or StackOverflow [10].

5.2 Usability Challenges

While LLMs have shown promising results in coding assistance, offering programmers prompt completion of implementations or opening new avenues for exploring alternative programming solutions, new challenges emerge when programmers interact with them.

The first challenge lies in crafting the input. The models take a natural language text (e.g., code comments, prompt) which describes programming intentions as inputs. Several studies found that the AI models are sensitive to these inputs. A slight deviation can result in significantly different code generation [23, 142]. Hence, programmers may need to spend time exploring, crafting, and revising inputs to generate correct solutions [68]. Occasionally, programmers had to write extensive and detailed descriptions for the inputs to make the models generate correct solutions. However, this process may consume more time compared to writing the code directly [76]. With the current interactions with AI models, the ability to create effective prompts may potentially become an important skill in programming.

The second challenge centers around understanding and validating the generated code. Since the code is generated by the AI models, programmers' main focus has shifted from programming to assessing the suggestions. Unlike traditional code completion tools, which usually suggest one subsequent token at a time, LLMs can generate a lengthy sequence of tokens to complete the entire implementation. Consequently, understanding the generated code and validating whether it aligns with programming intentions could demand considerable time and cognitive load [68, 136]. Barke et al. [10] found that programmers tend to look for the presence of certain keywords or control structures to quickly validate suggestions. They may also execute the code or run a static analyzer to help them validate the suggestions. Herein also lies our hypothesis that with the arrival of LLM-based coding, the nature of *program comprehension* activity is likely to shift from manual code comprehension to an iterative dialogue with LLMs. The first step of such an iterative dialogue is of course a validation or disambiguation of artifacts produced by LLMs.

The third challenge involves debugging and fixing the generated code. Even though programmers can understand the generated code, it might still require fixing or improvement. However, the AI model may generate complex code that is difficult to debug [10]. Programmers also need to consider the time required in debugging and fixing the generated code; otherwise, they might get stuck in a time-consuming debugging process [142]. Additionally, constant context switching between programming and debugging modes can impose significant mental demands on programmers.

5.3 LLMs for Maintenance & Evolution

LLM and AI-based code models have demonstrated significant advancements in expediting coding within automatic programming. It is crucial, however, that automatic programming not only focuses on accelerating the coding process but also contributes to software maintenance and promotes future evolution. Considerable effort has been devoted to developing approaches for LLMs to achieve this goal in various ways. In this section, we will discuss AI-based approaches where source code is taken as input to generate non-source code artifacts that facilitate maintenance and evolution. Specifically, we focus on three main tasks that are closely related to the programming task, i.e., code summarization, code change summarization, and code review.

Code Summarization. Code summarization refers to the summarizing of the behaviour or purpose of the provided code snippets [3, 153]. This is particularly useful for developers when they need to understand the source code, especially the code they have not written themselves. Recent LLMs like GPT, Codex, CodeT5, CodeBERT, UniXCoder have been investigated for code summarization purposes as these models were trained with multimodal data [4, 7, 39, 47, 146]. Thus, the models can generate natural language descriptions from source code. Some studies also found that the performance of LLMs can be improved when the models learn few-shot exemplars (a.k.a in-context learning) [4, 39].

Code Change Summarization. Code change summarization refers to the process of summarizing a collection of code changes (e.g., commits or pull requests) made to the codebase. It involves describing an overview and purpose of the changes. This task is crucial for developers as it helps developers and other stakeholders understand and keep track of

the evolution of the code, improving the understandability of the code and facilitating the debugging process. The AI models have shown promising results to generate both description [74, 96, 107] and its title [62]. Recent studies also have demonstrated the capability of LLMs, e.g., ChatGPT and GitHub Copilot [156] to perform these summarization tasks.

Automated Code Review. Automated Code review refers to the process of automatically analyzing source code and providing feedback to adhere to coding standards and best practices. The focus can cover various aspects of code quality such as code style, formatting, performance, security, and maintainability. Automated code review can help developers catch issues early in the development process, improve code consistency across projects, and ensure that code meets quality standards. Several recent works have shown that various sub-tasks of code review can be automated. This includes estimating the quality of code [90], suggesting code refinement [137, 139], generating review comment [82, 90, 139], and suggesting review comment resolution [36, 90, 139, 140]. While most of the AI models for code reviews were trained with code review datasets, ChatGPT also has recently shown promising results for performing code review tasks [52, 138].

Summary. As discussed, research has demonstrated that LLMs and AI models can assist developers in enhancing the maintenance and evolution of their human-written code. This paves a new direction for further improving automatic programming techniques to generate code that meets the non-functional quality for maintenance and evolution. For instance, employing summarization techniques to automatically describe the behavior or the purposes of the generated code to aid developer comprehension. Furthermore, automating code review techniques can be beneficial in assessing the quality of the generated code.

6 ENHANCEMENTS OF AUTO-GENERATED CODING

LLMs are not just coding assistants; they have evolved to become versatile partners in the software development process. However, despite the significant strides made by current LLMs, the journey toward their full integration into real-world software development is still lined with challenges. The “last mile” of enhancement is crucial for the seamless application of LLMs in practical programming endeavors. As we explore the future progression of LLMs in automatic programming, our roadmap encompasses several pivotal areas of development, aimed at unleashing these intelligent systems to their utmost potential.

Multi-modal coding. The first area is multi-modal coding. Currently, code LLMs are limited to handling textual data. However, it is crucial to recognize that developers often work with multi-modal data during the development process. For example, The generation of software UI from images and videos requires LLMs to analyze visual elements, understand their context, and transform them into code. This capability would empower developers to streamline the UI design process by simply providing visual examples or prototypes and query LLMs to generate the corresponding code automatically. In addition to UI generation, multi-modal coding has broader implications for software development. Consider the use of figures, tables, and flowcharts in the requirement and design phases. LLMs equipped with multi-modal capabilities could analyze these visual representations and convert them into code snippets automatically. Moreover, multi-modal coding would enhance the interaction between developers and AI models. Developers could foster better collaboration with AI models by communicating their ideas and requirements using multi-modality information. This would enable a more natural and intuitive interaction. The integration of multi-modal coding in

LLMs has the potential to revolutionize the software development process. By bridging the gap between visual design and code implementation, LLMs can significantly improve productivity, code quality, and the overall user experience.

Domains. Secondly, we focus on the empowerment of large-scale domain-specific software. In practical development and maintenance processes, developers often encounter large-scale projects that require diverse domain knowledge. This necessitates customizing LLMs to effectively manage and navigate the complexities of these projects. Software developers frequently grapple with intricate software development challenges within specific business and technology domains, such as e-commerce and automotive. Generating code for such software demands that AI models comprehend various domain-specific concepts. By effectively incorporating specialized domain knowledge into LLMs, these models can provide developers with even more accurate and relevant support. However, handling large-scale projects presents an additional challenge. The current limitations in context length make it difficult for LLMs to process code within large-scale software projects. Even with longer context, comprehending and locating essential information within such extensive code remains a challenge [94]. Overcoming these limitations is crucial to maximize the potential of LLMs and ensure they can effectively meet the demands of complex projects in practical use.

Knowledge Update. The third strategic area involves the knowledge repair and updating capabilities of LLMs. LLMs are renowned for their large model size. For instance, GPT-3 has 175 billion parameters, requiring an investment of approximately 4.6 million dollars in training and emitting 552 tons of carbon dioxide, equivalent to the emissions of 123 gasoline-powered passenger vehicles driven for one year [113]. Nonetheless, the evolution of APIs and programming introduces a continuous stream of new knowledge, essential for providing up-to-date services to developers. Moreover, during the maintenance process of code repositories, pre-trained models can unintentionally encounter incorrect information that was previously undiscovered. This can occur when the training code contains undetected buggy codes, leading the model to learn and potentially incorporate inaccurate knowledge. Consequently, the quality of the generated code may be also degraded. Therefore, effectively editing the knowledge of large generative AI models, rather than resorting to periodic retraining of these models from scratch, represents a significant and relatively unexplored research area.

Reliability and Program Repair. The fourth focus area is the quality and reliability assurance for the content generated by LLMs. Despite language models' proficiency in code generation, their inherent black-box nature raises concerns about the correctness of the generated code. The increasing reliance on automated programming underscores the need for output that meets the highest standards of quality. This pursuit is not limited to the accuracy of the code; it extends to ensuring the code's maintainability, performance, and scalability. Therefore, enhancing the reliability of the code and creating automated methods to assess and verify the quality of the LLM-generated code is of vital importance.

Overall, we would like to make the following two projections:

- There is a place for last mile repair of auto-generated code using automated program repair techniques [29].
- There remains the enticing possibility of the last mile repair of auto-generated code providing evidence of correctness of the “improved” code. This evidence of correctness may be in the form of a test suite which is generated as a by-product of the automated program repair process. We note that such test suites generated in the literature as a by-product of automated program repair have been studied [127].

Security. The fifth area of improvement involves security alignment, which is a crucial component of the “last mile” of enhancement. It is imperative to address trust issues that arise due to the generation of sensitive or insecure content

and potential privacy risks. One of the primary concerns is the generation of insecure code that contains vulnerabilities, which could lead to the crash of software. Additionally, privacy protection is of utmost importance when utilizing code generated by LLMs. The vast amount of data and information processed by these models raises concerns about the handling and storage of sensitive user data. Users' privacy must be safeguarded to ensure that LLMs do not inadvertently leak or misuse personal information. The prevention of harmful content is not only a technical challenge, but also an ethical issue, ensuring that these powerful tools contribute positively to the software development community. Therefore, the objective of security alignment is to design LLMs in a way that avoids generating potentially harmful or insecure content, thus improving the trustworthiness of LLMs and facilitating their widespread adoption. We note that both the reliability and security of the LLM generated code are fundamental to the trustworthiness of LLM output examined in Section 4.2.

Datasets. Finally, as different LLMs are trained using different benchmarks, the preparation of high-quality and multidimensional data sets is the key to a fair evaluation of the code generated automatically. In general, current benchmarks focus mainly on highlighting the limitations of the code generated by LLMs. We foresee that the next milestone of LLMs is to generate more complex code and to resolve more complex GitHub issues. With the evolution and increasing capability of LLMs, we foresee newer benchmarks that focus on newer capabilities (e.g., generating code from multi-modal inputs) or newer domains (e.g., autonomous devices).

In conclusion, the roadmap for enhancing Large Language Models in automated programming is both ambitious and essential. By addressing these six key perspectives, we can anticipate a future where LLMs are not only more capable but also more aligned with the nuanced and evolving needs of software development.

7 DATASETS

We perform a literature review of the available datasets for evaluating and studying code generation models. Specifically, we started by doing a preliminary search with keyword "code generation dataset" on Google Scholar, we selected all relevant papers and then traced other related work using a backward snowballing approach. We further filter benchmarks that are collection of multiple datasets (e.g., CodeXGLUE [99]) as their characteristics will be captured by the original datasets in which the collection has been derived from.

Table 2 shows the existing datasets for code generation. Among existing datasets, HumanEval [18] and MBPP [9] are one of the earliest benchmarks in which newer benchmarks have been derived from (e.g., MultiPL-E [13] extends HumanEval and MBPP by supporting more programming languages). The HumanEval benchmark contains manually written problems in which the OpenAI Codex model has been evaluated. Recently, SWE-Bench [72] was proposed to evaluate whether LLMs can be used to automatically resolve real-world GitHub issues. Based on the reported findings of studies conducted in these datasets, we notice that most of these datasets shows *the limitations of existing LLMs in solving code-related tasks*, highlighting the needs for revolutionary techniques that can further improve these LLMs. For example, the evaluation on SWE-Bench [72] shows that their fine-tuned model SWE-Llama can resolve only the simplest GitHub issues. We note that the SWE-bench is gaining attention from practitioners who attempt to automate software engineering beyond a single prompt. A very recent startup effort called Devin [79] reports reasonable efficacy on SWEbench in autonomously fixing GitHub issues (bug fixes and feature additions). The open-source agent AutoCodeRover [167] reports higher efficacy than Devin, by considering code structure in localization and fixing.

In general, we observe that most existing datasets require several software artifacts: (1) natural language descriptions (mostly English-centric), (2) code written in a commonly-used programming languages (mostly focus on Python and

Table 2. Datasets for Code Generation

| Benchmark | Natural Languages | Lan- | Programming Languages | Supported Tasks | Size | Test case | Unique Features |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| APPS [57] | English | | Python | Text-code | 10,000 problems | 130,000 total test cases | One of the earlier dataset with crowd-sourced questions for program synthesis |
| HumanEval [18] | English | | Python | Text-code | 164 problems | Average 7.7 tests per problem | Handwritten problems to evaluate functional correctness and measure problem-solving capabilities |
| MBPP [9] | English | | Python | Text-code | 974 python functions | 3 test cases for each problem | Measure the ability of these models to synthesize short Python programs |
| CONCODE [63] | English | | Java | Text-code | 100,000 (classes, NL, code) tuples | No test | Classes from diverse domains |
| PandasEval, NumpyEval [168] | English | | Python | Text-code | 101 programming problems | 20 tests for each problem | Library-oriented code generation |
| MCoNaLa [147] | Spanish, Japanese, and Russian | | Python | Text-code | 896 NL-Code pairs | No test | Support several natural languages beyond English |
| LLMDefects [28] | English | | Java | Text&code-code | 113 programming tasks from recent contests, 335 incorrect solutions | 1-3 public tests for each problem | Contains mistakes in code generated by LLMs. |
| ClassEval [26] | English | | Python | Text-code | 100 tasks | Contain method-level and class-level tests | Class-level code generation |
| AixBench [54] | English, Chinese | | Java | Text-code | 175 samples for automated Test, 161 NL Task Description | Contain hand-crafted tests | Contain hand-crafted automated test cases |
| MultiPL-E [13] | English | | 19 languages (e.g., Julia, Swift) | Text-code | 161 problems from HumanEval [18], 974 from MBPP [9] | Use tests from prior benchmarks [9, 18] | Extend HumanEval [18] and MBPP [9] to 18 languages by translating programs and unit tests |
| SWE-Bench [72] | English | | Python | Text&code-code | 2294 problems from 12 projects | Average 120.8 total tests for each problem | Evaluate the ability to resolve real-world GitHub |
| CodeScope [162] | English | | 43 languages | 8 tasks | 200–5,382 samples for each task | Contain tests for some tasks | Evaluate generated code on difficulty, efficiency, and length |
| NoFunEval [130] | English | | Python, Java, C, JavaScript, Kotlin | Text&code-code, classify correctness | 47–397 samples for each task | No test | Evaluate non-functional requirements (latency, security, efficiency) |
| LiveCodeBench [64] | English | | Python | Text&code-code | Collect new problems over time | Use tests from programming problems or LLM-generated tests | Mitigate contamination issues by crawling new problems |

Java), (3) test cases to verify the correctness of the generated programs. As shown in the “Supported Tasks” column, most existing datasets support text-to-code tasks (code generation from natural language description).



Fig. 5. Evolution of programmer roles captured by DALL-E; programmer role (a) as code composer and designer instead of code writer, (b) as quality assurance specialist instead of code writer.

Although some benchmarks [63, 147] use textual similarity between the ground truth program and the generated program for validating the correctness, the “Test case” column of Table 2 shows that most benchmarks rely on test cases for validating the correctness of generated programs. These test cases are either (1) hand-crafted or (2) translated from other programming languages. Overall, we observe that *a test-driven approach has been widely used for validating the correctness of the generated programs*. This indicates the importance of improving the quality of the test suites used for guiding the code generation. Based on the column “Unique Features”, we observe that recent data sets typically add a new dimension to study the effectiveness of LLMs under a specific condition (e.g. supporting diverse sets of natural languages [147], studying defects in automatically generated code [28]). Investigating the diverse perspectives of code generation models helps to point out the limitations and the potential bias of the LLMs.

As most LLMs are trained using programs from open-source repositories, one of the key challenges of a dataset for evaluating the effectiveness of code generation for LLMs is the data leakage problem (e.g., overfitting the training data). Existing datasets usually solve this by using (1) handwritten [18] or crowd-sourced problems [57], or (2) recently published problems [28]. Recently, LiveCodeBench [64] has been proposed to mitigate data leakage (known as the contamination problem in the article) by continuously crawling new problems from programming contest platforms (LEETCODE, ATCODER, and CODEFORCES).

8 FUTURE: PROGRAMMING ENVIRONMENT OF 2030-35 AND BEYOND

In the programming environment of 2030-35 where LLM-based auto-programming techniques have reached certain level of maturity, programmers may need to switch to different roles to fully utilize the power of auto-programming.

Programmer as code composer and designer instead of code writer. With the advancement of LLM-based auto-programming, many software maintenance tasks that require code writing can be automatically solved by invoking the appropriate LLMs. Figure 5(a) shows an AI-generated picture by Image Creator that uses DALL-E where programmers acts as code composer and designer instead of code writer. Instead of playing the traditional role of a programmer who meticulously writes code for solving different tasks, they can focus on tasks that require high-level understanding of the requirements (e.g., designing the overall structure of the program and tentative algorithms), allowing automated




Fig. 6. Automated repair of auto-generated code

tools to select the most effective model for the relevant maintenance tasks in which relevant code will be automatically generated. As current techniques mainly focus on specializing LLMs for a specific downstream task of auto-coding (e.g., program repair, log statement, test generation) to improve the effectiveness for the given task, a future programming environment will intelligently predict and select the appropriate model to invoke based on the context of the downstream task. There are two scenarios in which LLM-based auto-programming can change the future programming environment: (1) in an Integrated Development Environment (IDE) setting, (2) in a continuous integration (CI) workflow. For example, in the IDE setting that requires instant feedback from the auto-coding tool for efficient interaction, future techniques can design a lightweight tool that can automatically complete and suggest relevant code snippets based on the (1) current surrounding code and (2) the list of available tasks (e.g., suggest adding a JUnit test for the newly written Java method or adding a log statement before a graceful exit of a program). Meanwhile, in a CI workflow, certain event that represents abnormal behavior of a software system (e.g., test failures, build failures) can automatically trigger the need for a software maintenance task (e.g., the need for a repair can be triggered after a test failure). In this scenario, more sophisticated techniques can be used to further confirm the validity of the trigger (e.g., to distinguish between test failure or flaky test). These techniques include program analysis techniques (such as symbolic execution), test generation techniques (based on code changes within a commit), and log analysis (program monitoring).

Programmer as quality assurance specialist. Although many tasks can be automated, we foresee that concerns regarding the quality of the autogenerated code still remain. As some of the autogenerated code can be misaligned with the intention of the programmer, the programmer will need to play the role of a quality assurance specialist and spend more time in checking the validity of the generated code. Apart from using traditional testing and static analysis tools, more specialized automated program repair techniques can be designed (e.g., by referring to prior study [28] that investigated the mistakes of auto-generated code) to reduce the time and effort involving in checking the quality of auto-generated code. Figure 5(b) shows an AI-generated picture for programmer main role as quality assurance specialist. Figure 6 shows a schematic that concretizes this last-mile improvement of autogenerated code P produced

from natural language description using a tool like Copilot. The autogenerated code may be subject to program repair guided by a given test suite T . However, the process of repair inspects or examines (either explicitly or implicitly) a domain of program edits — trying to shrink the space of candidate edits which are suitable for improving program P . In this way, a repaired program P' is generated from P . In the process of examining the domain of program edits (and presumably ruling out a lot of candidate edits), the program repair process generates many additional tests T' over and above the test suite T which was used to guide the program repair process. The oracle (or expected behavior) of these additional tests T' can be obtained via some processing of the natural language description from which P is derived. The additional test inputs T' (along with their oracles) can then serve as evidence of "correctness" of the repaired program P' . We envision that code-generators of the future will not be only LLMs, but LLM agents augmented with program analysis / repair capabilities. These augmented code generators may then try to commit code like human programmers, while submitting evidence in the form of generated tests T' as evidence of correctness of (LLM-induced) code commits.

Programmer-assisted safe auto-coding. We envision that Large Language Model (LLM) generated code may be integrated into legacy code-bases of existing software projects. This could be in the form of libraries performing specific tasks, where the library code is generated with LLM. For safe integration of such LLM generated code in human-written software projects, one may need *sanitizer code* (e.g. [126]) so that the LLM generated code can be used by the bigger software project safely. Until we reach the stage of completely automating the generation of entire software projects, there may be a need to study (a) automated repair or improvement of LLM generated code, or (b) executing LLM generated code in a *contained* manner so that it can cause limited harm to the rest of the software system, or (c) generate verified LLM code whenever appropriate formal specifications are available. One first step towards verified LLM code can be to generate code in a programming language supporting verification (e.g., see [104]). We could also generate both programs and proofs (about the program satisfying some formal properties) from LLMs. Such formal properties may be obtained from natural language, in which there is some work [20]. Automated generation of proofs from LLMs has also been recently studied [32]. All of these works provide impetus in moving towards higher assurance code from LLMs.

Autonomous Program Improvement. We view the approach of program repair on unsafe code generated by LLMs to be a more *flexible* approach for automatically generating safe code (as it is based on code transformations), as compared to tuning or restriction of LLMs to generate safe outputs. Moving forward, researchers can examine this line of work, in addition to significant short-term efforts in prompt engineering and LLM tuning. Repair of the automatically generated code based on tests gives us more flexibility, partly because we can also choose the tests we use to guide the program repair. The repair as well as other tasks like feature addition can be achieved autonomously by LLM agents which are aware of the structure of the code. The recent work on AutoCodeRover [167] is an example work in this direction. In the near future, the focus will be to improve the efficacy of these agents. The combination of auto-coding from natural language and autonomous software improvement using LLMs, is an enticing possibility which can be achieved by 2030. This would shift the role of a future software engineer towards achieving *assured autonomy* by focusing on *trust* of the autonomous artifacts, instead of engineering software systems at *scale*. The scale of software systems is likely to be achieved automatically in future, thus shifting the attention to *trust*.

Looking even further. Autonomous improvement of automatically generated code need not be restricted to application level programming. We could examine the feasibility of automatically repairing probabilistic programs, which are generated automatically. Probabilistic programming succinctly expresses statistical inference tasks on probabilistic models [43], and are supported in the back-end by machine learning frameworks like Pytorch [112]. Recently symbolic execution of probabilistic programs was proposed [143] which raises the possibility of semantics-aware probabilistic

program repair, after an initial LLM guided automated generation of probabilistic program snippets. This line of work could help us progress towards automated self improvement of learning tasks, a speculative direction of future research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is partially supported by a Singapore Ministry of Education(MoE) Tier3 grant MOE-MOET32021-0001. The authors thank Prem Devanbu for his valuable comments about the article. The corresponding author Abhik Roychoudhury would like to thank Xiang Gao and Martin Mirchev for contributing some example programs to illustrate the issues with AI based coding.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2021. Application Compatibility Toolkit (ACT). <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/win7appqual/application-compatibility-toolkit--act->.
- [2] Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Saikat Chakraborty, Baishakhi Ray, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2021. Unified Pre-training for Program Understanding and Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2021, Online, June 6-11, 2021*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2655–2668.
- [3] Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Saikat Chakraborty, Baishakhi Ray, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2020. A Transformer-based Approach for Source Code Summarization. (5 2020). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.00653>
- [4] Toufique Ahmed, Kunal Suresh Pai, Premkumar Devanbu, and Earl T. Barr. 2023. Automatic Semantic Augmentation of Language Model Prompts (for Code Summarization). (4 2023). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2304.06815>
- [5] Rajeev Alur et al. 2018. Search-based Program Synthesis. *Commun. ACM* 61, 12 (2018).
- [6] Rajeev Alur, Rastislav Bodik, Garvit Juniwal, Milo MK Martin, Mukund Raghothaman, Sanjit A Seshia, Rishabh Singh, Armando Solar-Lezama, Emina Torlak, and Abhishek Udupa. 2013. *Syntax-guided synthesis*. IEEE.
- [7] Shushan Arakelyan, Rocktim Jyoti Das, Yi Mao, and Xiang Ren. 2023. Exploring Distributional Shifts in Large Language Models for Code Analysis. (3 2023). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.09128>
- [8] Owura Asare, Meiyappan Nagappan, and N Asokan. 2023. Is github’s copilot as bad as humans at introducing vulnerabilities in code? *Empirical Software Engineering* 28, 6 (2023), 129.
- [9] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. 2021. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732* (2021).
- [10] Shraddha Barke, Michael B. James, and Nadia Polikarpova. 2023. Grounded Copilot: How Programmers Interact with Code-Generating Models. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 7 (4 2023). Issue OOPSLA1. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3586030>
- [11] Steffen Becker, Wilhelm Hasselbring, Alexandra Paul, Marko Boskovic, Heiko Kozirolek, Jan Ploski, Abhishek Dhama, Henrik Lipskoch, Matthias Rohr, Daniel Winteler, et al. 2006. Trustworthy software systems: a discussion of basic concepts and terminology. *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes* 31, 6 (2006), 1–18.
- [12] Christian Bird, Denae Ford, Thomas Zimmermann, Nicole Forsgren, Eirini Kalliamvakou, Travis Lowdermilk, and Idan Gazit. 2023. Taking Flight with Copilot: Early insights and opportunities of AI-powered pair-programming tools. *Queue* 20 (2023), 35–57. Issue 6.
- [13] F. Cassano, J. Gouwar, D. Nguyen, S. Nguyen, L. Phipps-Costin, D. Pinckney, M. Yee, Y. Zi, C. Anderson, M. Q. Feldman, A. Guha, M. Greenberg, and A. Jangda. 2023. MultiPL-E: A Scalable and Polyglot Approach to Benchmarking Neural Code Generation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 49, 07 (jul 2023), 3675–3691. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2023.3267446>
- [14] ChatGPT. 2022. ChatGPT. <https://chat.openai.com/>.
- [15] M Chen et al. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. *arxiv* (2021).
- [16] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harrison Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Joshua Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. *CoRR abs/2107.03374* (2021). [arXiv:2107.03374](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03374) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03374>
- [17] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. *CoRR abs/2107.03374* (2021).
- [18] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374* (2021).

- [19] Zimin Chen, Steve Kommrusch, Michele Tufano, Louis-Noël Pouchet, Denys Poshyvanyk, and Martin Monperrus. 2021. SequenceR: Sequence-to-Sequence Learning for End-to-End Program Repair. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 47, 9 (2021), 1943–1959.
- [20] Translating code comments to procedure specifications. 2018. Arianna Blasi and Alberto Goffi and Konstantin Kuznetsov and Alessandra Gorla and Michael D. Ernst and Mauro Pezzè and Sergio Delgado Castellanos. In *International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (ISSTA)*.
- [21] Kalyanmoy Deb, Samir Agrawal, Amrit Pratap, and T. Meyarivan. 2002. A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: NSGA-II. *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.* 6, 2 (2002), 182–197.
- [22] DeepSeek. 2023. Deepseek coder: Let the code write itself. <https://github.com/deepseek-ai/DeepSeek-Coder>.
- [23] Paul Denny, Viraj Kumar, and Nasser Giacaman. 2022. Conversing with Copilot: Exploring Prompt Engineering for Solving CS1 Problems Using Natural Language. (10 2022). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2210.15157>
- [24] Yihong Dong, Xue Jiang, Zhi Jin, and Ge Li. 2023. Self-collaboration Code Generation via ChatGPT. *CoRR abs/2304.07590* (2023).
- [25] Xueying Du, Mingwei Liu, Kaixin Wang, Hanlin Wang, Junwei Liu, Yixuan Chen, Jiayi Feng, Chaofeng Sha, Xin Peng, and Yiling Lou. 2023. ClassEval: A Manually-Crafted Benchmark for Evaluating LLMs on Class-level Code Generation. *CoRR abs/2308.01861* (2023).
- [26] Xueying Du, Mingwei Liu, Kaixin Wang, Hanlin Wang, Junwei Liu, Yixuan Chen, Jiayi Feng, Chaofeng Sha, Xin Peng, and Yiling Lou. 2023. Classeval: A manually-crafted benchmark for evaluating llms on class-level code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01861* (2023).
- [27] Larry Ellison. 2023. Oracle’s vision for the future. Keynote at Oracle CloudWorld. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=63DmgBN1rSI>.
- [28] Zhiyu Fan, Xiang Gao, Martin Mirchev, Abhik Roychoudhury, and Shin Hwei Tan. 2023. Automated repair of programs from large language models. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 1469–1481.
- [29] Zhiyu Fan, Xiang Gao, Martin Mirchev, Abhik Roychoudhury, and Shin Hwei Tan. 2023. Automated Repair of Programs from Large Language Models. In *IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*.
- [30] Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Xiaocheng Feng, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Bing Qin, Ting Liu, Daxin Jiang, and Ming Zhou. 2020. CodeBERT: A Pre-Trained Model for Programming and Natural Languages. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020 (Findings of ACL, Vol. EMNLP 2020)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1536–1547.
- [31] Richard E Fikes and Nils J Nilsson. 1971. STRIPS: A new approach to the application of theorem proving to problem solving. *Artificial intelligence* 2, 3-4 (1971), 189–208.
- [32] Emily First, Markus Rabe, Talia Ringer, and Yuriy Brun. 2023. Baldur: Whole-Proof Generation and Repair with Large Language Models. In *ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE)*.
- [33] Stephanie Forrest, ThanhVu Nguyen, Westley Weimer, and Claire Le Goues. 2009. A genetic programming approach to automated software repair. In *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO 2009, Proceedings, Montreal, Québec, Canada, July 8-12, 2009*. ACM, 947–954.
- [34] Daniel Fried, Armen Aghajanyan, Jessy Lin, Sida Wang, Eric Wallace, Freda Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Wen-tau Yih, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2022. InCoder: A Generative Model for Code Infilling and Synthesis. *CoRR abs/2204.05999* (2022).
- [35] Zachary P. Fry, Bryan Landau, and Westley Weimer. 2012. A human study of patch maintainability. In *International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis, ISSTA 2012, Minneapolis, MN, USA, July 15-20, 2012*. ACM, 177–187.
- [36] Alexander Frömmgen, Jacob Austin, Peter Choy, Nimesh Ghelani, Lera Kharatyan, Gabriela Surita, Elena Khrapko, Pascal Lamblin, Pierre-Antoine Manzagol, Marcus Revaj, Maxim Tabachnyk, Daniel Tarlow, Kevin Vilella, Daniel Zheng, Satish Chandra, and Maniaty Google. 2024. Resolving Code Review Comments with Machine Learning. *International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice (ICSE-SEIP)*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3639477.3639746>
- [37] Shuzheng Gao, Wenxin Mao, Cuiyun Gao, Li Li, Xing Hu, Xin Xia, and Michael R. Lyu. 2024. Learning in the Wild: Towards Leveraging Unlabeled Data for Effectively Tuning Pre-trained Code Models. In *Proceedings of the 46th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2024, Lisbon, Portugal, April 14-20, 2024*. ACM.
- [38] Shuzheng Gao, Xin-Cheng Wen, Cuiyun Gao, Wenxuan Wang, Hongyu Zhang, and Michael R. Lyu. 2023. What Makes Good In-Context Demonstrations for Code Intelligence Tasks with LLMs?. In *38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2023, Luxembourg, September 11-15, 2023*. IEEE, 761–773.
- [39] Shuzheng Gao, Xin-Cheng Wen, Cuiyun Gao, Wenxuan Wang, Hongyu Zhang, and Michael R. Lyu. 2023. What Makes Good In-context Demonstrations for Code Intelligence Tasks with LLMs? (4 2023). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE56229.2023.00109>
- [40] Xiang Gao, Sergey Mehtaev, and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2019. Crash-avoiding Program Repair. In *ACM International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (ISSTA)*.
- [41] Xiang Gao, Yannic Noller, and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2023. Program Repair. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12787* (2023).
- [42] Xiang Gao, Bo Wang, Gregory J Duck, Ruyi Ji, Yingfei Xiong, and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2021. Beyond tests: Program vulnerability repair via crash constraint extraction. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)* 30, 2 (2021), 1–27.
- [43] A.D. Gordon, T.A. Henzinger, A.V. Nori, and S.K. Rajamani. 2014. Probabilistic Programming. In *Future of Software Engineering (FOSE), co-located with International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*.
- [44] Claire Le Goues, ThanhVu Nguyen, Stephanie Forrest, and Westley Weimer. 2012. GenProg: A Generic Method for Automatic Software Repair. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 38, 1 (2012), 54–72. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2011.104>
- [45] Cordell Green. 1969. Theorem proving by resolution as a basis for question-answering systems. *Machine intelligence* 4 (1969), 183–205.
- [46] Kai Greshake, Sahar Abdelnabi, Shailesh Mishra, Christoph Endres, Thorsten Holz, and Mario Fritz. 2023. More than you’ve asked for: A Comprehensive Analysis of Novel Prompt Injection Threats to Application-Integrated Large Language Models. *arXiv e-prints* (2023), arXiv–2302.

- [47] Jian Gu, Pasquale Salza, and Harald C. Gall. 2022. Assemble Foundation Models for Automatic Code Summarization. *Proceedings - 2022 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering, SANER 2022*, 935–946. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SANER53432.2022.00112>
- [48] Sumit Gulwani. 2011. Automating string processing in spreadsheets using input-output examples. In *Proceedings of the 38th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2011, Austin, TX, USA, January 26-28, 2011*. ACM, 317–330.
- [49] Sumit Gulwani, Oleksandr Polozov, Rishabh Singh, et al. 2017. Program synthesis. *Foundations and Trends® in Programming Languages* 4, 1-2 (2017), 1–119.
- [50] Suriya Gunasekar, Yi Zhang, Jyoti Aneja, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Allie Del Giorno, Sivakanth Gopi, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, Gustavo de Rosa, Olli Saarikivi, Adil Salim, Shital Shah, Harkirat Singh Behl, Xin Wang, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Adam Tauman Kalai, Yin Tat Lee, and Yuanzhi Li. 2023. Textbooks Are All You Need. *CoRR* abs/2306.11644 (2023).
- [51] Daya Guo, Shuai Lu, Nan Duan, Yanlin Wang, Ming Zhou, and Jian Yin. 2022. UniXcoder: Unified Cross-Modal Pre-training for Code Representation. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2022, Dublin, Ireland, May 22-27, 2022*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 7212–7225.
- [52] Qi Guo, Junming Cao, Xiaofei Xie, Shangqing Liu, Xiaohong Li, Bihuan Chen, and Xin Peng. 2024. Exploring the Potential of ChatGPT in Automated Code Refinement: An Empirical Study. Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597503.3623306>
- [53] Rahul Gupta, Soham Pal, Aditya Kanade, and Shirish K. Shevade. 2017. DeepFix: Fixing Common C Language Errors by Deep Learning. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, February 4-9, 2017, San Francisco, California, USA*. AAAI Press, 1345–1351.
- [54] Yiyang Hao, Ge Li, Yongqiang Liu, Xiaowei Miao, He Zong, Siyuan Jiang, Yang Liu, and He Wei. 2022. Aixbench: A code generation benchmark dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.13179* (2022).
- [55] Shirley Anugrah Hayati, Raphaël Olivier, Pravalika Avvaru, Pengcheng Yin, Anthony Tomasic, and Graham Neubig. 2018. Retrieval-Based Neural Code Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Brussels, Belgium, October 31 - November 4, 2018*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 925–930.
- [56] Pinjia He, Jieming Zhu, Zibin Zheng, and Michael R. Lyu. 2017. Drain: An Online Log Parsing Approach with Fixed Depth Tree. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Web Services, ICWS 2017, Honolulu, HI, USA, June 25-30, 2017*, Ilkay Altintas and Shiping Chen (Eds.). IEEE, 33–40.
- [57] Dan Hendrycks, Steven Basart, Saurav Kadavath, Mantas Mazeika, Akul Arora, Ethan Guo, Collin Burns, Samir Puranik, Horace He, Dawn Song, et al. 2021. Measuring coding challenge competence with apps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.09938* (2021).
- [58] Robert M. Hierons, Kirill Bogdanov, Jonathan P. Bowen, Rance Cleaveland, John Derrick, Jeremy Dick, Marian Gheorghe, Mark Harman, Kalpesh Kapoor, Paul J. Krause, Gerald Lüttgen, Anthony J. H. Simons, Sergiy A. Vilkomir, Martin R. Woodward, and Hussein Zedan. 2009. Using formal specifications to support testing. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 41, 2 (2009), 9:1–9:76.
- [59] Kai Huang, Xiangxin Meng, Jian Zhang, Yang Liu, Wenjie Wang, Shuhao Li, and Yuqing Zhang. 2023. An Empirical Study on Fine-Tuning Large Language Models of Code for Automated Program Repair. In *38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2023, Luxembourg, September 11-15, 2023*. IEEE, 1162–1174.
- [60] Z. Huang, D. Lie, G. Tan, and T Jaeger. 2019. Using safety properties to generate vulnerability patches. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*.
- [61] Yintong Huo, Yuxin Su, Cheryl Lee, and Michael R. Lyu. 2023. SemParser: A Semantic Parser for Log Analytics. In *45th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2023, Melbourne, Australia, May 14-20, 2023*. IEEE, 881–893.
- [62] Ivana Claire Irsan, Ting Zhang, Ferdian Thung, David Lo, and Lingxiao Jiang. 2022. AutoPRTTitle: A Tool for Automatic Pull Request Title Generation. *Proceedings - 2022 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution, ICSME 2022*, 454–458. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSME55016.2022.00058>
- [63] Srinivasan Iyer, Ioannis Konstas, Alvin Cheung, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. Mapping Language to Code in Programmatic Context. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 1643–1652.
- [64] Naman Jain, King Han, Alex Gu, Wen-Ding Li, Fanjia Yan, Tianjun Zhang, Sida Wang, Armando Solar-Lezama, Koushik Sen, and Ion Stoica. 2024. LiveCodeBench: Holistic and Contamination Free Evaluation of Large Language Models for Code. *arXiv:2403.07974 [cs.SE]*
- [65] Kevin Jesse, Toufique Ahmed, Premkumar T. Devanbu, and Emily Morgan. 2023. Large Language Models and Simple, Stupid Bugs. *arXiv:2303.11455 [cs.SE]*
- [66] Susmit Jha, Sumit Gulwani, Sanjit Seshia, and Ashish Tiwari. 2010. Oracle-guided Component-based Program Synthesis. In *International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*.
- [67] Susmit Jha, Sumit Gulwani, Sanjit A Seshia, and Ashish Tiwari. 2010. Oracle-guided component-based program synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering-Volume 1*. 215–224.
- [68] Ellen Jiang, Edwin Toh, Alejandra Molina, Kristen Olson, Claire Kayacik, Aaron Donsbach, Carrie J. Cai, and Michael Terry. 2022. Discovering the Syntax and Strategies of Natural Language Programming with Generative Language Models. *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3501870>
- [69] Nan Jiang, Thibaud Lutellier, and Lin Tan. 2021. CURE: Code-Aware Neural Machine Translation for Automatic Program Repair. In *43rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2021, Madrid, Spain, 22-30 May 2021*. IEEE, 1161–1173.
- [70] Zhihan Jiang, Jinyang Liu, Zhuangbin Chen, Yichen Li, Junjie Huang, Yintong Huo, Pinjia He, Jiazhen Gu, and Michael R. Lyu. 2023. LLMParser: A LLM-based Log Parsing Framework. *CoRR* abs/2310.01796 (2023).

- [71] Carlos E. Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. SWE-bench: Can Language Models Resolve Real-World GitHub Issues? *arXiv:2310.06770* (Oct 2023).
- [72] Carlos E. Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. SWE-bench: Can Language Models Resolve Real-World GitHub Issues? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06770* (2023).
- [73] Barbara Jobstmann, Andreas Griesmayer, and Roderick Bloem. 2005. Program Repair as a Game. In *Computer Aided Verification, 17th International Conference, CAV 2005, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, July 6-10, 2005. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 3576)*. Springer, 226–238.
- [74] Tae-Hwan Jung. 2021. Commitbert: Commit message generation using pre-trained programming language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14242* (2021).
- [75] Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models. *CoRR abs/2001.08361* (2020).
- [76] Majeed Kazemitabaar, Justin Chow, Carl Ka To Ma, Barbara J. Ericson, David Weintrop, and Tovi Grossman. 2023. Studying the effect of AI Code Generators on Supporting Novice Learners in Introductory Programming. *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3580919>
- [77] Dongsun Kim, Jaechang Nam, Jaewoo Song, and Sunghun Kim. 2013. Automatic patch generation learned from human-written patches. In *35th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE '13, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 18-26, 2013*. IEEE Computer Society, 802–811.
- [78] John R Koza. 1994. Genetic programming as a means for programming computers by natural selection. *Statistics and computing* 4 (1994), 87–112.
- [79] Cognition Labs. 2024. Devin, AI software engineer. <https://www.cognition-labs.com/introducing-devin>.
- [80] Claire Le Goues, Michael Pradel, and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2019. Automated Program Repair. *Commun. ACM* 62, 12 (2019).
- [81] Jia Li, Ge Li, Yongmin Li, and Zhi Jin. 2023. Enabling Programming Thinking in Large Language Models Toward Code Generation. *CoRR abs/2305.06599* (2023).
- [82] Lingwei Li, Li Yang, Huaxi Jiang, Jun Yan, Tiejian Luo, Zihan Hua, Geng Liang, and Chun Zuo. 2022. AUGER: automatically generating review comments with pre-training models. *ESEC/FSE 2022 - Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint Meeting European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, 1009–1021*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3540250.3549099>
- [83] Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Jia Li, Jenny Chim, Qian Liu, Evgenii Zheltonozhskii, Terry Yue Zhuo, Thomas Wang, Olivier Dehaene, Mishig Davaadorj, Joel Lamy-Poirier, João Monteiro, Oleh Shliazhko, Nicolas Gontier, Nicholas Meade, Armel Zebaze, Ming-Ho Yee, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, Jian Zhu, Benjamin Lipkin, Muhtasham Oblokulov, Zhiruo Wang, Rudra Murthy V, Jason Stillerman, Siva Sankalp Patel, Dmitry Abulkhanov, Marco Zocca, Manan Dey, Zhihan Zhang, Nour Moustafa-Fahmy, Urvashi Bhattacharyya, Wenhao Yu, Swamy Singh, Sasha Luccioni, Paulo Villegas, Maxim Kunakov, Fedor Zhdanov, Manuel Romero, Tony Lee, Nadav Timor, Jennifer Ding, Claire Schlesinger, Hailey Schoelkopf, Jan Ebert, Tri Dao, Mayank Mishra, Alex Gu, Jennifer Robinson, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, Danish Contractor, Siva Reddy, Daniel Fried, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Yacine Jernite, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Sean Hughes, Thomas Wolf, Arjun Guha, Leandro von Werra, and Harm de Vries. 2023. StarCoder: may the source be with you! *CoRR abs/2305.06161* (2023).
- [84] Yujia Li, David Choi, Junyoung Chung, Nate Kushman, Julian Schrittwieser, Rémi Leblond, Tom Eccles, James Keeling, Felix Gimeno, Agustin Dal Lago, et al. 2022. *Science* 378, 6624 (2022), 1092–1097.
- [85] Yujia Li, David Choi, Junyoung Chung, Nate Kushman, Julian Schrittwieser, Rémi Leblond, Tom Eccles, James Keeling, Felix Gimeno, Agustin Dal Lago, et al. 2022. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. *Science* 378, 6624 (2022), 1092–1097.
- [86] Yichen Li, Yintong Huo, Zhihan Jiang, Renyi Zhong, Pinjia He, Yuxin Su, and Michael R. Lyu. 2023. Exploring the Effectiveness of LLMs in Automated Logging Generation: An Empirical Study. *CoRR abs/2307.05950* (2023).
- [87] Yichen Li, Yintong Huo, Renyi Zhong, Zhihan Jiang, Jinyang Liu, Junjie Huang, Jiazhen Gu, Pinjia He, and Michael R Lyu. 2024. Go Static: Contextualized Logging Statement Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12958* (2024).
- [88] Yi Li, Shaohua Wang, and Tien N. Nguyen. 2020. DLFix: context-based code transformation learning for automated program repair. In *ICSE '20: 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering, Seoul, South Korea, 27 June - 19 July, 2020*. ACM, 602–614.
- [89] Zhenhao Li, Heng Li, Tse-Hsun Peter Chen, and Weiyi Shang. 2021. DeepLV: Suggesting Log Levels Using Ordinal Based Neural Networks. In *43rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2021, Madrid, Spain, 22-30 May 2021*. IEEE, 1461–1472.
- [90] Zhiyu Li, Shuai Lu, Daya Guo, Nan Duan, Shailesh Jannu, Grant Jenks, Deep Majumder, Jared Green, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Shengyu Fu, and Neel Sundaresan. 2022. Automating code review activities by large-scale pre-training. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE 2022, Singapore, Singapore, November 14-18, 2022*. ACM, 1035–1047.
- [91] Dianshu Liao, Shidong Pan, Qing Huang, Xiaoxue Ren, Zhenchang Xing, Huan Jin, and Qinying Li. 2023. Context-aware code generation framework for code repositories: Local, global, and third-party library awareness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05772* (2023).
- [92] Wang Ling, Phil Blunsom, Edward Grefenstette, Karl Moritz Hermann, Tomás Kociský, Fumin Wang, and Andrew W. Senior. 2016. Latent Predictor Networks for Code Generation. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2016, August 7-12, 2016, Berlin, Germany, Volume 1: Long Papers*. The Association for Computer Linguistics.
- [93] Changshu Liu, Pelin Cetin, Yogesh Patodia, Saikat Chakraborty, Yangruibo Ding, and Baishakhi Ray. 2023. Automated Code Editing with Search-Generate-Modify. *Transaction of Software Engineering* (2023).

- [94] Nelson F Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranjape, Michele Bevilacqua, Fabio Petroni, and Percy Liang. 2024. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 12 (2024), 157–173.
- [95] Yue Liu, Thanh Le-Cong, Ratnadira Widyasari, Chakkrit Tantithamthavorn, Li Li, Xuan-Bach D Le, and David Lo. 2023. Refining ChatGPT-generated code: Characterizing and mitigating code quality issues. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* (2023).
- [96] Zhongxin Liu, Xin Xia, Christoph Treude, David Lo, and Shanning Li. 2019. Automatic Generation of Pull Request Descriptions.
- [97] Fan Long and Martin Rinard. 2015. Staged Program Repair with Condition Synthesis. In *Joint Meeting of the European Software Engineering Conference and the ACM SIGSOFT Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE)*.
- [98] Fan Long and Martin Rinard. 2016. Automatic Patch Generation by Learning Correct Code. In *43rd Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages* (St. Petersburg, FL, USA) (POPL '16). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 298–312.
- [99] Shuai Lu, Daya Guo, Shuo Ren, Junjie Huang, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Ambrosio Blanco, Colin Clement, Dawn Drain, Daxin Jiang, Duyu Tang, et al. 2021. CodeXGLUE: A Machine Learning Benchmark Dataset for Code Understanding and Generation. In *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks 1, NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks 2021, December 2021, virtual*, Joaquin Vanschoren and Sai-Kit Yeung (Eds.).
- [100] Ziyang Luo, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Qingfeng Sun, Xiubo Geng, Wenxiang Hu, Chongyang Tao, Jing Ma, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. 2023. WizardCoder: Empowering Code Large Language Models with Evol-Instruct. *CoRR* abs/2306.08568 (2023).
- [101] Thibaud Lutellier, Hung Viet Pham, Lawrence Pang, Yitong Li, Moshi Wei, and Lin Tan. 2020. CoCoNuT: combining context-aware neural translation models using ensemble for program repair. In *ISSTA '20: 29th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis, Virtual Event, USA, July 18-22, 2020*. ACM, 101–114.
- [102] Sergey Mechtaev, Jooyong Yi, and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2015. DirectFix: Looking for Simple Program Repairs. In *37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2015, Florence, Italy, May 16-24, 2015, Volume 1*. IEEE Computer Society, 448–458.
- [103] Sergey Mechtaev, Jooyong Yi, and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2016. Angelix: scalable multiline program patch synthesis via symbolic analysis. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2016, Austin, TX, USA, May 14-22, 2016*. ACM, 691–701.
- [104] Md Rakib Hossain Misu, Cristina V Lopes, Iris Ma, and James Noble. 2024. Towards AI Assisted Synthesis of Verified Dafny Methods. *PACM-SE, Proceedings of International Conference on Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE) (2024)*.
- [105] Hoang Duong Thien Nguyen, Dawei Qi, Abhik Roychoudhury, and Satish Chandra. 2013. SemFix: program repair via semantic analysis. In *35th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE '13, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 18-26, 2013*. IEEE Computer Society, 772–781.
- [106] Hoang Duong Thien Nguyen, Dawei Qi, Abhik Roychoudhury, and Satish Chandra. 2013. SemFix: Program Repair via Semantic Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2013 International Conference on Software Engineering (San Francisco, CA, USA) (ICSE '13)*. IEEE Press, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 772–781. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2013.6606623>
- [107] Lun Yiu Nie, Cuiyun Gao, Zhicong Zhong, Wai Lam, Yang Liu, and Zenglin Xu. 2021. Coregen: Contextualized code representation learning for commit message generation. *Neurocomputing* 459 (2021), 97–107.
- [108] Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Huan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. 2022. Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13474* (2022).
- [109] Liang Niu, Shujaat Mirza, Zayd Maradni, and Christina Pöpper. 2023. {CodexLeaks}: Privacy leaks from code generation language models in {GitHub} copilot. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*. 2133–2150.
- [110] OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. *arXiv:2303.08774 [cs.CL]*
- [111] Md. Rizwan Parvez, Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Saikat Chakraborty, Baishakhi Ray, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2021. Retrieval Augmented Code Generation and Summarization. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 16-20 November, 2021*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2719–2734.
- [112] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Köpf, Edward Yang, Zach DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. 2019. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- [113] David A. Patterson, Joseph Gonzalez, Quoc V. Le, Chen Liang, Lluís-Miquel Munguia, Daniel Rothchild, David R. So, Maud Texier, and Jeff Dean. 2021. Carbon Emissions and Large Neural Network Training. *CoRR* abs/2104.10350 (2021).
- [114] Hammond Pearce, Baleegh Ahmad, Benjamin Tan, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Ramesh Karri. 2022. Asleep at the keyboard? assessing the security of github copilot’s code contributions. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 754–768.
- [115] Yun Peng, Shuzheng Gao, Cuiyun Gao, Yintong Huo, and Michael R. Lyu. 2024. Domain Knowledge Matters: Improving Prompts with Fix Templates for Repairing Python Type Errors. In *Proceedings of the 46th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2024, Lisbon, Portugal, April 14-20, 2024*. ACM, 4:1–4:13.
- [116] Neil Perry, Megha Srivastava, Deepak Kumar, and Dan Boneh. 2023. Do users write more insecure code with AI assistants?. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 2785–2799.
- [117] Amir Pnueli and Roni Rosner. 1989. On the synthesis of a reactive module. In *POPL*.
- [118] Gabriel Poesia, Aleksandr Polozov, Vu Le, Ashish Tiwari, Gustavo Soares, Christopher Meek, and Sumit Gulwani. 2022. Synchronesh: Reliable code generation from pre-trained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11227* (2022).

- [119] Yuhua Qi, Xiaoguang Mao, Yan Lei, Ziyang Dai, and Chengsong Wang. 2014. The strength of random search on automated program repair. In *36th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE '14, Hyderabad, India - May 31 - June 07, 2014*. ACM, 254–265.
- [120] Zichao Qi, Fan Long, Sara Achour, and Martin Rinard. 2015. An analysis of patch plausibility and correctness for generate-and-validate patch generation systems. In *Proceedings of the 2015 International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 24–36.
- [121] Maxim Rabinovich, Mitchell Stern, and Dan Klein. 2017. Abstract Syntax Networks for Code Generation and Semantic Parsing. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2017, Vancouver, Canada, July 30 - August 4, Volume 1: Long Papers*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1139–1149.
- [122] Steven I. Ross, Fernando Martinez, Stephanie Houde, Michael Muller, and Justin D. Weisz. 2023. The Programmer’s Assistant: Conversational Interaction with a Large Language Model for Software Development. *International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces, Proceedings IUI*, 491–514. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3581641.3584037>
- [123] Baptiste Rozière, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, Artyom Kozhevnikov, Ivan Evtimov, Joanna Bitton, Manish Bhatt, Cristian Canton-Ferrer, Aaron Grattafiori, Wenhan Xiong, Alexandre Défossez, Jade Copet, Faisal Azhar, Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Nicolas Usunier, Thomas Scialom, and Gabriel Synnaeve. 2023. Code Llama: Open Foundation Models for Code. *CoRR abs/2308.12950* (2023).
- [124] Gabriel Ryan, Siddhartha Jain, Mingyue Shang, Shiqi Wang, Xiaofei Ma, Murali Krishna Ramanathan, and Baishakhi Ray. 2024. Code-Aware Prompting: A study of Coverage Guided Test Generation in Regression Setting using LLM. *CoRR abs/2402.00097* (2024).
- [125] Fred B Schneider, National Research Council, et al. 1999. *Trust in cyberspace*. National Academy Press Washington, DC.
- [126] Konstantin Serebryany, Derek Bruening, Alexander Potapenko, and Dmitry Vyukov. 2012. -AddressSanitizer: a fast address sanity checker. In *USENIX conference on Annual Technical Conference*.
- [127] Ridwan Shariffdeen, Yannic Noller, Lars Grunsk, and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2021. Concolic Program Repair. In *42nd ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI)*.
- [128] Disha Shrivastava, Hugo Larochelle, and Daniel Tarlow. 2023. Repository-Level Prompt Generation for Large Language Models of Code. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 202)*. PMLR, 31693–31715.
- [129] Mohammed Latif Siddiq, Joanna C. S. Santos, Ridwanul Hasan Tanvir, Noshin Ulfat, Fahmid Al Rifat, and Vinicius Carvalho Lopes. 2023. Exploring the Effectiveness of Large Language Models in Generating Unit Tests. *CoRR abs/2305.00418* (2023).
- [130] Manav Singhal, Tushar Aggarwal, Abhijeet Awasthi, Nagarajan Natarajan, and Aditya Kanade. 2024. NoFunEval: Funny How Code LMs Falter on Requirements Beyond Functional Correctness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15963* (2024).
- [131] Giriprasad Sridhara, Ranjani H. G., and Sourav Mazumdar. 2023. ChatGPT: A Study on its Utility for Ubiquitous Software Engineering Tasks. *CoRR abs/2305.16837* (2023).
- [132] Lichao Sun, Yue Huang, Haoran Wang, Siyuan Wu, Qihui Zhang, Chujie Gao, Yixin Huang, Wenhan Lyu, Yixuan Zhang, Xiner Li, et al. 2024. Trustllm: Trustworthiness in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05561* (2024).
- [133] Zeyu Sun, Qihao Zhu, Yingfei Xiong, Yican Sun, Lili Mou, and Lu Zhang. 2020. TreeGen: A Tree-Based Transformer Architecture for Code Generation. In *The Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2020, The Thirty-Second Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference, IAAI 2020, The Tenth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2020, New York, NY, USA, February 7-12, 2020*. AAAI Press, 8984–8991.
- [134] Shin Hwei Tan and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2015. relifix: Automated Repair of Software Regressions. In *37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2015, Florence, Italy, May 16-24, 2015, Volume 1*. IEEE Computer Society, 471–482.
- [135] Shin Hwei Tan, Hiroaki Yoshida, Mukul R Prasad, and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2016. Anti-patterns in search-based program repair. In *Proceedings of the 2016 24th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Foundations of Software Engineering*. ACM, 727–738.
- [136] Ningzhi Tang, Meng Chen, Zheng Ning, Aakash Bansal, Yu Huang, Collin McMillan, and Toby Jia-Jun Li. 2023. An Empirical Study of Developer Behaviors for Validating and Repairing AI-Generated Code. In *PLATEAU Workshop*.
- [137] Patanamon Thongtanunam, Chanathip Pornprasit, and Chakkrit Tantithamthavorn. 2022. AutoTransform: Automated Code Transformation to Support Modern Code Review Process. *Proceedings - International Conference on Software Engineering 2022-May*, 237–248. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3510003.3510067>
- [138] Rosalia Tufano, Ozren Dabic, Antonio Mastropaolo, Matteo Ciniselli, and Gabriele Bavota. 2023. Code Review Automation: Strengths and Weaknesses of the State of the Art. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (2 2023).
- [139] Rosalia Tufano, Simone Masiero, Antonio Mastropaolo, Luca Pascarella, Denys Poshyvanyk, and Gabriele Bavota. 2022. Using Pre-Trained Models to Boost Code Review Automation. *Proceedings - International Conference on Software Engineering 2022-May*, 2291–2302. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3510003.3510621>
- [140] Rosalia Tufano, Luca Pascarella, Michele Tufano, Denys Poshyvanyk, and Gabriele Bavota. 2021. Towards automating code review activities. *Proceedings - International Conference on Software Engineering*, 163–174. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE43902.2021.00027>
- [141] Priyan Vaithilingam, Tianyi Zhang, and Elena L Glassman. 2022. Expectation vs. experience: Evaluating the usability of code generation tools powered by large language models. In *Chi conference on human factors in computing systems extended abstracts*. 1–7.
- [142] Priyan Vaithilingam, Tianyi Zhang, and Elena L. Glassman. 2022. Expectation vs. Experience: Evaluating the Usability of Code Generation Tools Powered by Large Language Models. *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491101>

- 3519665
- [143] E Voogd, EB Johnsen, A Silva, ZJ Susag, and A Wąsowski. 2023. Symbolic semantics for probabilistic programs. In *International Conference on Quantitative Evaluation of Systems (QEST)*.
 - [144] Richard J. Waldinger and Richard C. T. Lee. 1969. PROW: A Step Toward Automatic Program Writing. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Washington, DC, USA, May 7-9, 1969*. William Kaufmann, 241–252.
 - [145] Yuepeng Wang, James Dong, Rushi Shah, and Isil Dillig. 2019. Synthesizing database programs for schema refactoring. In *Proceedings of the 40th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2019, Phoenix, AZ, USA, June 22-26, 2019*, Kathryn S. McKinley and Kathleen Fisher (Eds.). ACM, 286–300.
 - [146] Yue Wang, Weishi Wang, Shafiq R. Joty, and Steven C. H. Hoi. 2021. CodeT5: Identifier-aware Unified Pre-trained Encoder-Decoder Models for Code Understanding and Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2021*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 8696–8708.
 - [147] Zhiruo Wang, Grace Cuenca, Shuyan Zhou, Frank F Xu, and Graham Neubig. 2022. Mconala: a benchmark for code generation from multiple natural languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.08388* (2022).
 - [148] Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. 2022. Emergent Abilities of Large Language Models. *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.* 2022 (2022).
 - [149] Yuxiang Wei, Zhe Wang, Jiawei Liu, Yifeng Ding, and Lingming Zhang. 2023. Magicoder: Source Code Is All You Need. *CoRR* abs/2312.02120 (2023).
 - [150] Westley Weimer, Zachary P. Fry, and Stephanie Forrest. 2013. Leveraging program equivalence for adaptive program repair: Models and first results. In *2013 28th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2013, Silicon Valley, CA, USA, November 11-15, 2013*. IEEE, 356–366.
 - [151] Martin White, Michele Tufano, Matias Martinez, Martin Monperrus, and Denys Poshyvanyk. 2019. Sorting and Transforming Program Repair Ingredients via Deep Learning Code Similarities. In *26th IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering, SANER 2019, Hangzhou, China, February 24-27, 2019*. IEEE, 479–490.
 - [152] WE Wong, R Gao, Y Li, R Abreu, and F Wotawa. 2016. A survey on software fault localization. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 42, 8 (2016).
 - [153] Hongqiu Wu, Hai Zhao, and Min Zhang. 2020. Code Summarization with Structure-induced Transformer. (12 2020). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2012.14710>
 - [154] Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuxiang Wei, and Lingming Zhang. 2023. Automated Program Repair in the Era of Large Pre-trained Language Models. In *45th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2023, Melbourne, Australia, May 14-20, 2023*. IEEE, 1482–1494.
 - [155] Chunqiu Steven Xia and Lingming Zhang. 2023. Keep the Conversation Going: Fixing 162 out of 337 bugs for \$0.42 each using ChatGPT. *CoRR* abs/2304.00385 (2023).
 - [156] Tao Xiao, Hideaki Hata, Christoph Treude, and Kenichi Matsumoto. 2024. Generative AI for Pull Request Descriptions: Adoption, Impact, and Developer Interventions. (2 2024). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3643773>
 - [157] Zhuokui Xie, Yinghao Chen, Chen Zhi, Shuiguang Deng, and Jianwei Yin. 2023. ChatUniTest: a ChatGPT-based automated unit test generation tool. *CoRR* abs/2305.04764 (2023).
 - [158] F. Xu, U. Alon, G. Neubig, and V. Hellendoorn. 2022. A Systematic Evaluation of Large Language Models of Code. In *6th ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on Machine Programming*.
 - [159] Frank F. Xu, Zhengbao Jiang, Pengcheng Yin, Bogdan Vasilescu, and Graham Neubig. 2020. Incorporating External Knowledge through Pre-training for Natural Language to Code Generation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2020, Online, July 5-10, 2020*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 6045–6052.
 - [160] Junjielong Xu, Ruichun Yang, Yintong Huo, Chengyu Zhang, and Pinjia He. 2023. Prompting for Automatic Log Template Extraction. *CoRR* abs/2307.09950 (2023).
 - [161] Jifeng Xuan, Matias Martinez, Favio Demarco, Maxime Clement, Sebastian R. Lamelas Marcote, Thomas Durieux, Daniel Le Berre, and Martin Monperrus. 2017. Nopol: Automatic Repair of Conditional Statement Bugs in Java Programs. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 43, 1 (2017), 34–55.
 - [162] Weixiang Yan, Haitian Liu, Yunkun Wang, Yunzhe Li, Qian Chen, Wen Wang, Tingyu Lin, Weishan Zhao, Li Zhu, Shuiguang Deng, et al. 2023. CodeScope: An Execution-based Multilingual Multitask Multidimensional Benchmark for Evaluating LLMs on Code Understanding and Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08588* (2023).
 - [163] He Ye, Matias Martinez, and Martin Monperrus. 2022. Neural Program Repair with Execution-based Backpropagation. In *44th IEEE/ACM 44th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2022, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, May 25-27, 2022*. ACM, 1506–1518.
 - [164] Pengcheng Yin and Graham Neubig. 2018. TRANX: A Transition-based Neural Abstract Syntax Parser for Semantic Parsing and Code Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2018: System Demonstrations, Brussels, Belgium, October 31 - November 4, 2018*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 7–12.
 - [165] Shengcheng Yu, Chunrong Fang, Yuchen Ling, Chentian Wu, and Zhenyu Chen. 2023. Llm for test script generation and migration: Challenges, capabilities, and opportunities. In *2023 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability, and Security (QRS)*. IEEE, 206–217.
 - [166] Yuan Yuan and Wolfgang Banzhaf. 2020. ARJA: Automated Repair of Java Programs via Multi-Objective Genetic Programming. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 46, 10 (2020), 1040–1067.

- [167] Zhiyu Fan, Abhik Roychoudhury, Yuntong Zhang, Haifeng Ruan. 2024. AutoCodeRover: Autonomous Program Improvement. *arXiv:2404.05427* (April 2024).
- [168] Daoguang Zan, Bei Chen, Dejian Yang, Zeqi Lin, Minsu Kim, Bei Guan, Yongji Wang, Weizhu Chen, and Jian-Guang Lou. 2022. CERT: Continual Pre-training on Sketches for Library-oriented Code Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.06888* (2022).
- [169] Jiyang Zhang, Sheena Panthaplackel, Pengyu Nie, Junyi Jessy Li, and Milos Gligoric. 2022. CoditT5: Pretraining for Source Code and Natural Language Editing. In *37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2022, Rochester, MI, USA, October 10-14, 2022*. ACM, 22:1–22:12.
- [170] Li Zhong and Zilong Wang. 2023. A study on robustness and reliability of large language model code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10335* (2023).
- [171] Jieming Zhu, Pinjia He, Qiang Fu, Hongyu Zhang, Michael R. Lyu, and Dongmei Zhang. 2015. Learning to Log: Helping Developers Make Informed Logging Decisions. In *37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2015, Florence, Italy, May 16-24, 2015, Volume 1*. IEEE Computer Society, 415–425.
- [172] Jieming Zhu, Shilin He, Jinyang Liu, Pinjia He, Qi Xie, Zibin Zheng, and Michael R. Lyu. 2019. Tools and benchmarks for automated log parsing. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice, ICSE (SEIP) 2019, Montreal, QC, Canada, May 25-31, 2019*. IEEE / ACM, 121–130.
- [173] Qihao Zhu, Zeyu Sun, Yuan-an Xiao, Wenjie Zhang, Kang Yuan, Yingfei Xiong, and Lu Zhang. 2021. A syntax-guided edit decoder for neural program repair. In *ESEC/FSE '21: 29th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, Athens, Greece, August 23-28, 2021*. ACM, 341–353.