

---

# When Dataflow Analysis Meets Large Language Models

---

Chengpeng Wang<sup>1</sup> Wuqi Zhang<sup>2</sup> Zian Su<sup>1</sup> Xiangzhe Xu<sup>1</sup> Xiaoheng Xie<sup>2</sup> Xiangyu Zhang<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Dataflow analysis is a powerful code analysis technique that reasons dependencies between program values, offering support for code optimization, program comprehension, and bug detection. Existing approaches require the successful compilation of the subject program and customizations for downstream applications. This paper introduces LLMDFA, an LLM-powered dataflow analysis framework that analyzes arbitrary code snippets without requiring a compilation infrastructure and automatically synthesizes downstream applications. Inspired by summary-based dataflow analysis, LLMDFA decomposes the problem into three sub-problems, which are effectively resolved by several essential strategies, including few-shot chain-of-thought prompting and tool synthesis. Our evaluation has shown that the design can mitigate the hallucination and improve the reasoning ability, obtaining high precision and recall in detecting dataflow-related bugs upon benchmark programs, outperforming state-of-the-art (classic) tools, including a very recent industrial analyzer.

## 1. Introduction

Dataflow analysis is a formal method that identifies the dependence between program values (Reps et al., 1995). Its primary objective is to determine whether the value of a variable defined at a particular line of code, referred to as a *source*, affects the value of another variable used at a subsequent line, referred to as a *sink*. This crucial information offers valuable insights into downstream applications, such as program optimization (Li et al., 1990; Bodík & Gupta, 1997) and bug detection (Arzt et al., 2014; Sui & Xue, 2016; Shi et al., 2018). In Figure 1, for example, we can regard  $x$  at line 9 as a source and the divisors at lines 4, 11, and 14 as sinks in the divide-by-zero (DBZ) detection. The intuition is that  $x$  at line 9 comes from user input and can be any integer. If it flows to the divisors, DBZ bugs may occur.

<sup>1</sup>Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, 47906, USA <sup>2</sup>The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong. Correspondence to: Chengpeng Wang <stephenw.wangcp@gmail.com>.

```
1 public class Demo {
2   public static int foo(int a, int b){
3     if (Math.abs(b) > 1)
4       System.out.println(a / b); //sink: b, safe
5     return b;
6   }
7   public static void main(String[] args){
8     assert(args.length >= 1);
9     int x = Integer.parseInt(args[0]); //source: x
10    int y = x * x + 1;
11    int z = x / y; //sink: y, safe
12    z = x;
13    y = foo(y, z);
14    System.out.println(x / y); //sink: y, buggy
15  }
16 }
```

Figure 1. A Java program with a divide-by-zero bug at line 14

Despite decades of effort, current dataflow analysis techniques have drawbacks in terms of applicability and usability. As shown in Figure 2(a), these techniques heavily rely on program intermediate representations (IRs) generated by *semantic analyzers* in the frontends of compilation infrastructures, such as LLVM IR (Lattner & Adve, 2004) produced by the Clang compiler. This reliance limits their applicability in analyzing incomplete programs that cannot be successfully compiled, leading to the failure of analysis. Second, specific downstream applications require customizing the analysis to fit specific needs, such as bug detection. Such customization requires substantial expert knowledge and manual effort (Christakis & Bird, 2016), which many users do not possess. In the DBZ detection, for example, the user of a dataflow analyzer has to customize the analysis to extract variables potentially assigned with zero as sources and variables used as the divisors of several expressions as sinks, which is a challenging task for non-experts. These limitations hinder the usability of classical approaches to effectively address the evolving software analysis needs in real-world scenarios.

In the past year, there has been a vast proliferation of software engineering applications built upon large language models (LLMs) (Shrivastava et al., 2023; Deng et al., 2023; Wei et al., 2023; Pei et al., 2023), from which we observe the exceptional performance of LLMs in comprehending code snippets. Specifically, by treating LLMs as code interpreters and devising appropriate prompts, we can directly obtain semantic properties from source code, eliminating the need to analyze any IRs produced during compilation. For instance, by constructing a prompt like “Does the value of the variable  $z$  used at line 13 depend on the value of variable  $x$  defined at line 9?”, we can ascertain the dataflow fact




Figure 2. Two different paradigms of dataflow analysis

between the two program values. Likewise, we can leverage LLMs to automate the extraction of specific sources and sinks for a downstream application (e.g., zero-valued variables and divisors in the DBZ detection, respectively) by describing the characteristics of such sources and sinks in natural language as prompts, which empowers developers to tailor dataflow analysis to their specific requirements. As shown in Figure 2(b), such LLM-powered dataflow analysis gets rid of compilation and avoids complicated customization, which can improve applicability and usability. In the rest of this paper, our demonstration is consistently within the context of a downstream application, and our references to sources and sinks specifically pertain to that application.

However, instantiating dataflow analysis for a downstream application using LLMs is far from trivial. First, the hallucination effect exhibited by LLMs (Zhang et al., 2023a; Ji et al., 2023) introduces a potential risk to the reliability of results when dealing with specific input texts, e.g., leading to incorrect extraction or omission of sources and sinks. Second, sources and sinks can be distributed across multiple functions. Any incorrect dataflow facts in single functions can accumulate and magnify, thereby impacting the precision and recall of analyzing the entire program. Third, the validity of a dataflow fact depends on the feasibility of the specific program path inducing the dataflow fact during execution. If the path condition is deemed unsatisfiable, no concrete execution will occur along that path (Shi et al., 2018). Regrettably, deciding the satisfiability of a logical constraint is a complex reasoning task that LLMs cannot effectively solve (Zhang et al., 2023b). In Figure 1, for example, `gpt-3.5-turbo-1106` reports a DBZ bug at line 4 as a false positive because it cannot discover that the branch condition at line 3 is not satisfied.

To address the challenges, we propose LLMDFA, an LLM-powered dataflow analysis that decomposes the whole analysis into three phases, namely source/sink extractor synthesis, dataflow summarization, and path feasibility validation. To mitigate the hallucination in extracting sources and sinks, we do not ask LLMs to produce the end results. Instead, we utilize them to synthesize script programs as new tools that leverage a parsing library to extract sources and sinks precisely. Besides, LLMDFA employs few-shot learning, combined with the Chain-of-Thought




Figure 3. The (partial) CFG of the program in Figure 1. Two dashed boxes show the assignment from arguments to parameters and the assignment from the return value to the output value.

(CoT) prompting strategy (Wei et al., 2022), to summarize potential dataflow facts for single functions. Moreover, we synthesize script programs that encode path conditions to logical constraints and validate them using an SMT solver (de Moura & Bjørner, 2008), which identifies spurious dataflow facts induced by infeasible paths. LLMDFA stands out thanks to its autonomy and applicability. First, it is capable of autonomously creating and using new tools with minimal human interference, requiring no particular expertise in implementing static analysis. Second, it is highly applicable, supporting the analysis of incomplete programs, such as those during development. Benefiting from our unique design, we substantially suppress hallucinations and improve the reasoning ability of LLMDFA.

We choose the DBZ (CWE, 2023a) and Cross-Site-Scripting (XSS) (CWE, 2023b) bugs<sup>1</sup> in Juliet Test Suite (Boland & Black, 2012) and evaluate LLMDFA upon dataflow analysis in the context of detecting these bugs. It detects the 1850 DBZ bugs with 73.75% precision and 92.16% recall and obtains 100.00% precision and 92.31% recall in detecting the 666 XSS bugs, substantially outperforming baselines, including a classic dataflow analyzer and new methods based on LLM prompting. We also conduct ablation studies to quantify the benefit of our designs. LLMDFA is the first trial to instantiate dataflow analysis with LLMs. It offers valuable insights into future works in analyzing programs using LLMs, such as program verification (Janßen et al., 2023; Pei et al., 2023) and program repair (Wei et al., 2023).

## 2. Problem Formulation

This section presents several preliminaries of dataflow analysis and states the problem we target in this work.

### 2.1. Preliminaries

**Control Flow Graph.** We first introduce *control flow graph*, which is an essential ingredient for dataflow analysis.

**Definition 1.** (Control Flow Graph) The control flow graph (CFG) of a given program  $P$  is a labeled directed graph  $G := (S, E_\ell)$ . Here,  $s \in S$  is a statement in the program. For any  $(s, s') \in S \times S$ ,  $E_\ell(s, s')$  is the boolean expression under which that  $s'$  is executed just after  $s$ .

<sup>1</sup>In an XSS bug, a dataflow fact across variables denoting different websites allows undesirable execution of injected code.

Figure 3 shows an example CFG. It depicts several important program features, such as individual branch conditions and caller-callee relation. To simplify formulation, we use  $V_{par}^f$ ,  $V_{ret}^f$ ,  $V_{arg}^f$ , and  $V_{out}^f$  to indicate the sets of parameters (of the function), return values, arguments (passed to invoked functions), and output values in a function  $f$ , respectively, which can be easily derived from the CFG.

**Dataflow Fact.** Based on the CFG, we can examine how a program value propagates in the program via *dataflow facts*.

**Definition 2.** (Dataflow Fact) Consider a variable  $a$  defined at line  $m$  and a variable  $b$  utilized at line  $n$ . There is a dataflow fact from  $a$  at line  $m$  to  $b$  at line  $n$ , denoted by  $a@l_m \hookrightarrow b@l_n$ , if the value of  $a$  can affect the value of  $b$ .

In Figure 1, the variable  $z$  is assigned with the value of the variable  $x$  at line 12 and used as the second argument at line 13. Hence, we have the dataflow facts  $x@l_9 \hookrightarrow x@l_{12}$ ,  $z@l_{12} \hookrightarrow z@l_{13}$ , and  $x@l_9 \hookrightarrow z@l_{13}$ . Dataflow facts are fundamental program properties in many downstream tasks, such as bug detection (Shi et al., 2018) and program slicing (Reps et al., 1995). Specifically, sensitive information leakage, which often leads to XSS bugs (CWE, 2023b), can be detected by identifying dataflow facts from sensitive data to leaked data. For other bug types, additional restrictions need to be imposed on dataflow facts. When detecting DBZ or null-pointer-dereference bugs, for example, we need to constrain that a dataflow fact connects two equal values.

**Path Condition.** As shown in Definition 1, the execution of a statement  $s$  can be guarded by a condition. A precise dataflow analysis should be *path sensitive*, i.e., validating the feasibility of a dataflow fact-inducing path according to the *path condition*, which is defined as follows.

**Definition 3.** (Path Condition) The path condition of a program path  $p := s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_n}$  is the logical conjunction of  $E_\ell(s_{i_j}, s_{i_{j+1}})$ , where  $1 \leq j \leq n-1$ . Here,  $s_{i_j}$  represents the statement at line  $i_j$ .  $s_{i_{j+1}}$  can be executed just after  $s_{i_j}$ .

We have the dataflow fact  $x@l_9 \hookrightarrow b@l_4$  in Figure 1. However, the statement at line 4 is guarded by  $\text{Math.abs}(b) > 0$ . It is evaluated to be false as the parameter  $b$  is passed with 0. Hence, the dataflow fact  $x@l_9 \hookrightarrow b@l_4$  cannot occur in any concrete execution. A path-insensitive analysis would introduce a false positive at line 4 in the DBZ detection.

## 2.2. Problem Statement

In real-world downstream applications, dataflow analysis focuses on the dataflow facts between specific kinds of variables referred to as *sources* and *sinks*. For example, when we want to detect DBZ bugs (CWE, 2023a), we need to identify the variables that could potentially yield zero values as sources and set the divisors, i.e., the second operand of a division ( $/$ ) or a modulo operator ( $\%$ ), as sinks. Lastly, we formulate the **dataflow analysis problem** as follows.

Given the source code of a program  $P$  and its CFG  $G$ , identify the dataflow facts from user-specified sources and sinks in a path-sensitive manner.

**Limitations of Existing Techniques.** Although the problem has been studied for several decades, previous dataflow analysis techniques (Semmler, 2023; Sui & Xue, 2016; Shi et al., 2018) suffer two drawbacks. First, they heavily rely on IRs generated by semantic analyzers in compilation infrastructures. When applied to projects that cannot be successfully compiled, the techniques would fail due to the lack of valid input, which hampers their applicability and prolongs the presence of underlying bugs in the program. Second, it has been reported that the customization of the analysis often demands substantial manual effort and domain expertise (Christakis & Bird, 2016), such as implementing additional modules to extract sources and sinks. The difficulty of customization hinders the usability of the analysis in the presence of evolving development scenarios.

**Our Vision.** We aim to propose a new paradigm of dataflow analysis. Specifically, we realize the exceptional performance of LLMs in program comprehension (Rozière et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2021), highlighting the great potential for identifying dataflow facts. Besides, LLMs demonstrate a strong capability of understanding natural language (Brown et al., 2020; OpenAI, 2023), and thus, can effectively comprehend the developers’ intents when they provide natural language descriptions to specify sources and sinks. Moreover, LLMs have excellent program synthesis abilities, which support invoking external experts for domain-specific problems. Inspired by these observations, we attempt to instantiate dataflow analysis without laborious compilation steps and intricate customization procedures by harnessing the power of LLMs and domain-specific experts.

## 3. Method

We propose an LLM-powered dataflow analysis, LLMDFA, to provide a compilation-free and easily customizable solution. Inspired by summary-based dataflow analysis (Reps et al., 1995), we decompose the whole analysis into three sub-problems, namely source/sink extraction, dataflow summarization, and path feasibility validation. As shown by Figure 4, LLMDFA takes as input the program with the CFG and analyzes dataflow facts in the three phases sequentially.

- **Source/Sink Extraction:** For a dataflow analysis application, such as detecting DBZ bugs, LLMDFA first extracts the sources and sinks, which are the start and end points of dataflow facts of our interests.
- **Dataflow Summarization:** Based on the extracted sources and sinks of a given function  $f$ , LLMDFA identifies the dataflow facts from  $v \in V_{src}^f \cup V_{par}^f \cup V_{out}^f$




Figure 4. The workflow of LLMDFA consists of three phases

to  $v' \in V_{sink}^f \cup V_{arg}^f \cup V_{ret}^f$  as the summaries, which reflect the semantics of the function  $f$ .

- **Path feasibility Validation:** LLMDFA stitches the summaries to collect inter-procedural dataflow facts from sources to sinks, and particularly, validates the path feasibility based on path conditions.

The rest of this section demonstrates the detailed technical designs in the three phases (Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3).

### 3.1. Phase I: Source/Sink Extraction

Extracting sources and sinks is non-trivial with LLMs. First, querying LLMs whether each line of each function contains sources or sinks is expensive, especially when the code under analysis is large-scale. Second, LLMs may induce incorrect results of the source/sink extraction due to the hallucination effects on large programs. To tackle these issues, our intuition is that it would be a better choice to leverage LLMs to synthesize a standalone script program using parsing libraries as sources/sink extractors rather than extracting sources/sinks with LLMs directly. By traversing the abstract syntax tree (AST) of a given program, the script program can identify sources and sinks with specific patterns at a low cost, producing deterministic and explainable results.

Based on the above insight, we propose synthesizing source/sink extractors. As shown in the left part of Figure 4, the inputs include a specification  $\mathcal{S}$  depicting sources/sinks, example programs  $\mathcal{E}_{spec}$  with sources/sinks, and their ASTs  $\mathcal{T}$ . Given a phase description  $\mathcal{D}_1$ , an extractor  $\alpha_E := \alpha_E^{(t)}$  is generated by autoregressively sampling tokens from the conditional distribution induced by the language model  $p_\theta$ :

$$\alpha_E^{(0)} \sim p_\theta(\cdot | \mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}_{spec}, \mathcal{T}) \quad (1)$$

$$\alpha_E^{(i)} \sim p_\theta(\cdot | \mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}_{spec}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{O}^{(i-1)}), \quad 1 \leq i \leq t \quad (2)$$

$$\Phi(\alpha_E^{(i)}, \mathcal{E}_{spec}) = 0, \quad 0 \leq i \leq (t-1) \quad (3)$$

$$\Phi(\alpha_E^{(t)}, \mathcal{E}_{spec}) = 1 \quad (4)$$

$\Phi(\alpha_E^{(i)}, \mathcal{E}_{spec}) = 1$  if and only if the script synthesized in the  $i$ -th round identifies sources and sinks in  $\mathcal{E}_{spec}$  without any false positives and negatives. Otherwise,  $\Phi(\alpha_E^{(i)}, \mathcal{E}_{spec}) = 0$ . As formulated by the above equations, LLMDFA iteratively fixes a script via self-reflection, utilizing the execution result

<pre>int x1 = 0; // src: x1 double x2 = 0.0; // src: x2 float x3 = 0.0f; // src: x3  var s = "0"; int x4 = parseInt(s); //src: x4  int z = 1; int a = z / x; // sink: x int b = z % y; // sink: y int c = x + y;</pre>	<pre>def is_interesting(node):     return (node.type=="binary_expr"             and (node.op == "/" or                  node.op == "%")) def traverse(node, sinks):     if is_interesting(node):         sinks.append(node.sec_operand)     return sinks for child in node.children:     sinks = traverse(child, sinks) sinks = traverse(ast_root, [])</pre>
--	--

Figure 5. An example program containing sources/sinks (left) and the synthesized sink extractor (right) for the DBZ detection

(denoted by  $\mathcal{O}^{(i-1)}$ ) of the script synthesized in the previous round, until the newly synthesized one correctly identifies sources and sinks in the example programs. We list our prompt template in Figure 11 of Appendix B. Notably, our extractor synthesis is a one-time effort. The synthesized extractors can be reused when analyzing different functions.

Figure 5 shows an example program with the sources/sinks and the synthesized sink extractor for the DBZ detection. In the sink extractor, the code highlighted in grey is generated by LLMs, while the rest is the skeleton provided manually. Due to the space limit, we do not show the ASTs of example programs, the specification, and the source extractor.

### 3.2. Phase II: Dataflow Summarization

Based on the dataflow analysis theory, an inter-procedural dataflow fact is the concatenation of multiple intra-procedural dataflow facts from  $v \in V_{src}^f \cup V_{par}^f \cup V_{out}^f$  to  $v' \in V_{sink}^f \cup V_{arg}^f \cup V_{ret}^f$  in single functions  $f$ . Hence, we concentrate on such a form of intra-procedural dataflow facts as function summaries. We notice that a summary can be induced by one or more operations with specific patterns, such as direct uses, assignments, and load/store operations upon pointers. For example, the summary  $x@l_9 \leftrightarrow z@l_{13}$  in Figure 1 is introduced by the assignment at line 12 and the direct use of the variable  $z$  at line 13. Offering code examples with detailed explanations would expose typical patterns of data flow facts that form function summaries, which can promote the ability of LLMs to identify dataflow facts in single functions.

Based on the insight, we propose a few-shot CoT prompting method to facilitate the dataflow summarization. The middle part of Figure 4 shows the workflow of the dataflow summa-




Figure 6. A summary discovered via few-shot CoT prompting

rization. Given the description of the phase  $\mathcal{D}_2$  and a list of examples with explanations  $\mathcal{E}_{flow}$ , the response obtained in this phase is generated by the conditional probability:

$$r \sim p_{\theta}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{E}_{flow}, v, v', P) \quad (5)$$

where  $v \in V_{src}^f \cup V_{par}^f \cup V_{out}^f$ ,  $v' \in V_{sink}^f \cup V_{arg}^f \cup V_{ret}^f$ , and  $P$  is the program under the analysis. By parsing the response  $r$ , we can determine the existence of the dataflow fact between  $v$  and  $v'$ . Concretely, we construct the prompt according to the template shown in Figure 12 of Appendix B. It is worth noting that the examples cover the typical patterns of dataflow facts, and meanwhile, the explanations provide a detailed reasoning process. Both designs are pretty crucial for the few-shot CoT prompting. Lastly, we ask LLMs to reason step by step and offer an explanation along with the Yes/No answer.

Consider  $x@l_9$  and  $z@l_{13}$  in the program shown in Figure 1. By construction, based on which we obtain the summary  $x@l_9 \leftrightarrow z@l_{13}$ . As shown in Figure 6, LLMDFA can discover intermediate program values, i.e.,  $x@l_{12}$  and  $z@l_{12}$ , and eventually obtain the dataflow fact step by step. It indicates that LLMs obtain the planning ability via the few-shot CoT prompting.

### 3.3. Phase III: Path Feasibility Validation

Validating path feasibility is a complicated reasoning task that involves determining the satisfiability of a path condition. It has been recognized that LLMs cannot achieve adequate performance when they are directly used to address complex reasoning tasks, including constraint solving (Zhang et al., 2023b). Nonetheless, there are several off-the-shelf domain-specific experts, such as SMT solvers, that can be utilized by LLMs. For example, the Z3 SMT solver has a Python binding, which enables us to construct and solve a logical constraint in a Python program. Hence, we propose to synthesize a Python script program using Z3 binding, which encodes and solves path conditions according to path information. In this way, we can decouple the solving task from the path condition collection, which substantially enhances the reasoning ability of LLMs for path feasibility validation.

The right part of Figure 4 shows the workflow of the path feasibility validation. Based on the dataflow facts stitched from summaries, LLMDFA first leverages a parser to extract

the path information, such as the branches exercised by the program path and the branch conditions. Notably, the parser receives the program lines appearing in the summaries as inputs and does not need to be reimplemented for different forms of sources and sinks. Based on the derived path info  $\mathcal{I}$  and the description of the phase  $\mathcal{D}_3$ , a script program validating path feasibility with the Z3 solver, denoted by  $\alpha_V := \alpha_V^{(t)}$ , is eventually generated after  $t$  fixes as follows:

$$\alpha_V^{(0)} \sim p_{\theta}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{D}_3, \mathcal{I}) \quad (6)$$

$$\alpha_V^{(i)} \sim p_{\theta}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{D}_3, \mathcal{I}, err^{(i-1)}), \quad 1 \leq i \leq t \quad (7)$$

$$err^{(t)} = \epsilon, \quad err^{(i)} \neq \epsilon, \quad 0 \leq i \leq (t-1) \quad (8)$$

Particularly, we utilize the error message of executing the script synthesized in a previous round ( $(i-1)$ -th round), denoted by  $err^{(i-1)}$ , and feed it to LLMs to conduct the fixing in the  $i$ -th round. Concretely, we design the prompt template shown by Figure 13 in Appendix B. It should be noted that the synthesis process has to be repeated for each dataflow fact from a source to a sink, which is different from the one-time effort paid in the extractor synthesis.

Consider  $x@l_9 \leftrightarrow b@l_4$  in Figure 1. We offer the branch condition `Math.abs(b) > 1` and other path information in a prompt and obtain a script in Figure 7. To ease the synthesis, we offer lines 1, 2, and 6 in a skeleton. We refine the script at most three times. If the script is buggy after three trials, LLMDFA enforces LLMs to determine path feasibility based on the path information.

```
from z3 import *
s = Solver()
b = Int('b')
s.add(b == 0)
s.add(Abs(b) > 1)
print(s.check())
```

Figure 7. A script invoking Z3 solver

## 4. Evaluation

We implement LLMDFA as a prototype analyzing Java programs. We choose `gpt-3.5-turbo-1106` in our implementation and set the temperature to 0 by default so that LLMDFA performs greedy decoding without any sampling strategy. Besides, LLMDFA utilizes the parsing library, namely `tree-sitter` (Brunsfield, 2018), to identify program constructs, such as function parameters, return values, caller/callee functions, and specific sources/sinks. Our implementation contains around 4,063 lines of Python code.

### 4.1. Experimental Subject

We evaluate LLMDFA upon the Juliet Test Suite (Boland & Black, 2012), a well-known benchmark used to evaluate static analysis tools. Specifically, we choose DBZ and XSS as two target bug types. As illustrated in Section 2.1, the dataflow facts inducing DBZ bugs have more restrictive forms than the ones inducing XSS bugs, as the values in the

Table 1. The results of LLM DFA

Bug type	Phase	Precision	Recall	F1 Score
DBZ	Extract	100.00%	100.00%	1.00
	Summarize	90.95%	97.57%	0.94
	Validate	81.58%	99.20%	0.90
	All	<b>73.75%</b>	<b>92.16%</b>	<b>0.82</b>
XSS	Extract	100.00%	100.00%	1.00
	Summarize	86.52%	96.25%	0.91
	Validate	100.00%	100.00%	1.00
	All	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>92.31%</b>	<b>0.96</b>

former should be equal instead of just being dependent. In total, there are 1,850 DBZ and 666 XSS bugs underlying the benchmark programs. The comments in the programs explicitly indicate the sources and sinks, based on which we can determine whether a bug report is an actual bug. Lastly, we remove all the comments and obfuscate function/variable names, as the comments and function names have indicated the potential buggy code, which may affect the analysis behaviors of LLM DFA and baselines.

## 4.2. Performance of LLM DFA

**Setup and Metrics.** We initially provide natural language descriptions that encompass all possible forms of sources and sinks. Apart from the precision and recall of the overall detection, we also measure the precision and recall of each phase to quantify the effectiveness of our technical design. Specifically, we diff the sets of all the sources/sinks and the sets of the identified ones to compute the precision and recall of source/sink extraction. Besides, we measure the precision and recall of dataflow summarization by manually examining the pairs of program values investigated by LLM DFA. Lastly, we examine the path conditions investigated by LLM DFA and compute the precision and recall of identifying feasible paths. Due to the lack of explicit ground truth in the benchmark programs, we would have to make laborious efforts to examine thousands of dataflow facts and program paths manually. To simplify the examination process, we choose 37 programs for the DBZ and XSS benchmarks, respectively, to quantify the performance of the last two phases, as the rest of the programs only differ from the selected ones in terms of sources and sinks.

**Performance of Bug Detection.** As shown in Table 1, LLM DFA achieves a high level of precision, recall, and F1 score for each phase and the overall detection. In the DBZ detection, the synthesized extractors extract all the sources/sinks correctly. The dataflow summarization and path feasibility validation achieve 90.95%/81.58% precision and 97.57%/99.20% recall, respectively. Overall, LLM DFA achieves 73.75% precision, 92.16% recall, and 0.82 F1 score in the DBZ detection. The false positives and negatives mainly stem from the inability to encode path condition accurately, which introduces spurious dataflow facts or missing valid ones. Similarly, LLM DFA extracts all the sources

Table 2. The statistics of fixing in source/sink extractor synthesis

Bug Type	Extractor	Ratio of No-Fix	Max Num of Fixes	Avg Num of Fixes
DBZ	Source	95%	655	14.11
	Sink	100%	0	0
XSS	Source	95%	10	0.14
	Sink	100%	0	0




Figure 8. The statistics of fixing in path feasibility validation

and sinks with no false positives in the XSS detection. The dataflow summarization and path feasibility validation achieve 86.52%/100.00% precision and 96.25%/100.00% recall, respectively. Overall, it attains 100.00% precision, 92.31% recall, and 0.96 F1 score in the XSS detection. The better performance can be attributed to the simpler benchmark programs, as the benchmark programs containing XSS bugs do not exhibit complex path conditions. It should be noted that spurious summaries may not introduce false positives in the bug detection, as they may not form inter-procedural dataflow facts from sources to sinks.

**Fix Number.** We measure the number of fixes in the source/sink extractor synthesis and path feasibility validation. Concretely, we repeatedly synthesize source/sink extractors 100 times. As shown in Table 2, all the sink extractors can be synthesized in one round without any fixes when the temperature is set to 0. In the DBZ detection, 95% of the source extractors are synthesized without any fixes, while the numbers of the fixes in the other five instances are 114, 187, 195, 260, and 655, which makes the average number of fixes 14.11. In the XSS detection, LLM DFA synthesizes the source extractor without any fixes in 95 instances and has to refine the extractors with one/ten fixes in four/one instances. Because the source extractor is more complex than the sink extractor, especially in the DBZ detection, LLM DFA may take many more fixes to refine the wrong source extractors.

In path feasibility validation, 75.20% and 96.43% of scripts are synthesized without any fixes in the DBZ and XSS detection, respectively, which is shown in Figure 8. Particularly, only 0.61% and 3.57% of the synthesized Python scripts fail after three rounds of fixing in the DBZ and XSS detection, respectively, eventually falling back to the strategy of directly utilizing LLMs for the path feasibility validation. It is also found that 78.57% and 88.68% of synthesized scripts in the DBZ and XSS detection correctly encode the path conditions, respectively. Although several path conditions are encoded incorrectly, their satisfiability remains

Table 3. The detection results of CodeFuseQuery

Bug Type	Precision	Recall	F1 Score
DBZ	29.41%	81.08%	0.43
XSS	92.26%	79.67%	0.86




Figure 9. The precision, recall, and F1 score of LLMDFFA and LLM-based end-to-end analysis

the same as the original ones. One typical example is that the LLM interprets `Math.abs(b) > 1` in Figure 1 as the constraint `And(b > 1, b < -1)`, while the correct encoding should be `Or(b > 1, b < -1)`. However, such wrongly encoded constraints still enable us to refute infeasible paths. We offer more case studies in Appendix C.

We also measure the token cost of LLMDFFA in each phase, which is summarized in Appendix D. Due to space limitations, we do not present detailed statistics in the paper.

### 4.3. Comparison with Baselines

**Classical Dataflow Analysis.** We first evaluate classical dataflow analysis upon our benchmark programs. Specifically, we choose an industrial static analyzer, namely CodeFuseQuery (Xie et al., 2024), as our baseline. Similar to LLMDFFA, CodeFuseQuery does not depend on any compilation process. The developers of the tool model program semantics and derive dataflow facts from the ASTs of programs with Datalog rules, which requires laborious implementation efforts along with substantial domain knowledge. As shown by Table 3, CodeFuseQuery achieves 29.41% precision, 81.08% recall, and 0.43 F1 score in detecting the DBZ bugs, and meanwhile, attains 92.26% precision, 79.67% recall, and 0.86 F1 score in the XSS detection. After investigating the bug reports, we discover that CodeFuseQuery does not support path-sensitive analysis, which induces a low precision in the DBZ detection. Also, it cannot support semantic analysis of complex program constructs. For example, the inability to analyze global variables causes missing dataflow facts, which causes more false negatives and yields a lower recall than LLMDFFA.

**LLM-based End-to-End Analysis.** We adopt the few-shot CoT prompting to detect the DBZ and XSS bugs with `gpt-3.5-turbo-1106` and `gpt-4-1106-preview`




Figure 10. The precision, recall, and F1 score of LLMDFFA(①), NoSynExt(②), NoCoT(③), and NoSynVal(④)

in an end-to-end manner. Specifically, we construct several examples to cover all the forms of sources and sinks, and meanwhile, explain the origin of a bug step by step with a bug trace. Figure 9 shows the precision, recall, and F1 score in detecting the two types of bugs. Specifically, `gpt-4-1106-preview` achieves better precision and recall than `gpt-3.5-turbo-1106` for both types of bugs, which is owing to its stronger ability of program understanding. However, the two models do not have superiority over LLMDFFA. Even if we utilize `gpt-3.5-turbo-1106` in our implementation, LLMDFFA achieves much higher precision and F1 score than using `gpt-4-1106-preview` in an end-to-end manner, which benefits from the assistance of the synthesized extractors and SMT solvers. Lastly, LLMDFFA has a slight disadvantage in recall compared with `gpt-4-1106-preview` in the XSS detection. However, it should be noted that LLMDFFA has achieved a recall of 92.31%, which is reasonably satisfactory.

### 4.4. Ablation Studies

**Setup and Metrics.** To quantify the benefit of our technical design, we introduce three ablations, namely NoSynExt, NoCoT, and NoSynVal and measure their performance in detecting the DBZ and XSS bugs. Specifically, NoSynExt directly leverages LLMs to extract sources and sinks. NoCoT provides the descriptions of dataflow facts for the two bug types in prompts and summarizes dataflow facts without few-shot CoT prompting. NoSynVal receives the path information and determines the path feasibility with LLMs directly without synthesizing programs invoking SMT solvers.

**Performance of Ablations.** Figure 10 shows their performance comparison, from which we can obtain three findings. First, LLMDFFA has an overwhelming superiority over NoSynExt and NoCoT in terms of the precision and recall of the DBZ detection, respectively. Although NoCoT achieves 86.8% precision while LLMDFFA obtains 73.7% precision, LLMDFFA has much larger recall and F1 score than NoCoT. The key reason is that NoCoT is unable to identify complex dataflow facts, which causes the low recall of No-

CoT. We can also obtain a similar observation that NoCoT yields a low recall of 34.42% in the XSS detection. Second, NoSynExt introduces numerous false positives because of the low precision of source/sink extraction in both the DBZ and XSS detection. Third, it should be noted that LLMDFA does not show superiority over NoSynVal in the XSS detection because the corresponding benchmark programs do not contain any XSS bug-inducing infeasible paths. Also, LLMDFA may encode the path condition incorrectly and accept the infeasible path, eventually causing false positives. To sum up, LLMDFA achieves better overall performance than its ablations in detecting DBZ and XSS bugs.

#### 4.5. Limitations and Future Works

First, the prompts can be quite lengthy, particularly for the few-shot CoT prompting, which is demonstrated in Appendix D in detail. Due to the efficiency bottleneck of the LLM inference, frequent prompting can result in significant overhead. Hence, LLMDFA is better suited for analyzing specific program modules rather than the entire program. To make whole program analysis practical, it is necessary to either accelerate the inference or parallelize LLMDFA for improved efficiency. Second, dataflow summarization can be imprecise in the presence of large functions or sophisticated pointer operations, further leading to incorrect results in identifying dataflow facts across functions. A potential improvement is to fine-tune existing pre-trained LLMs with the dataflow facts discovered by classical dataflow analyzers. Third, LLMDFA may not accurately encode path conditions and, thus, potentially compromise the soundness. It is promising to investigate several patterns of path conditions and synthesize script programs to over-approximate them, which could effectively identify and discard infeasible paths while retaining high recall simultaneously.

## 5. Related Work

**Dataflow Analysis.** Current dataflow analysis predominantly relies on IR code generated by semantic analysis during the compilation, such as LLVM IR (Lattner & Adve, 2004) and Soot IR (Vallée-Rai et al., 1999). Typically, SVF (Sui & Xue, 2016) and Klee (Cadar et al., 2008) analyze C/C++ programs based on LLVM IR code. FlowDroid detects sensitive data leakage in Android apps by scanning their Soot IR code (Arzt et al., 2014). Even industrial analyzers like Infer (Calcagno et al., 2009) and Semmler (Semmler, 2023) require successful builds to obtain the necessary IR code for analysis. Consequently, the reliance on compilation infrastructures restricts the applicability when target programs cannot be compiled. Besides, existing techniques abstract the IR semantics with specific formal structures, such as graphs (Reps et al., 1995) and logical formulas (Yao et al., 2021), to compute the dataflow facts of interests via graph

traversal and logical computation, respectively. However, the semantic abstraction differs greatly depending on specific analysis demands, such as the choices of sources/sinks and the precision setting of the analysis. Hence, the customization of dataflow analysis requires laborious manual effort and expert knowledge, which hinders its widespread adoption in real-world scenarios (Christakis & Bird, 2016).

**Machine Learning-aided Program Analysis.** In recent years, there has been considerable research into integrating machine-learning approaches with program analyzers. Basically, they derive specific program properties, such as library specifications (Eberhardt et al., 2019; Rasthofer et al., 2014) and program invariants (Ernst et al., 2007; Le et al., 2019), to augment classical analyzers. For instance, USpec utilizes large codebases to predict potential aliasing relations between parameters and return values of library APIs, thereby benefiting downstream clients that rely on aliasing relations (Eberhardt et al., 2019). SuSi employs classification models to infer the sources and sinks of sensitive information (Rasthofer et al., 2014). Several program verification techniques leverage runtime information to learn program invariants, such as numeric and heap invariants (Ernst et al., 2007; Le et al., 2019), and subsequently prove verification conditions. While learning-aided approaches offer analyzers insightful guidance by incorporating additional program properties, they do not have any correctness guarantees due to the inherent limitations of learning techniques.

**LLMs for Program Analysis.** The emergence of LLMs has created exciting opportunities for various aspects of program analysis, including program testing (Deng et al., 2023; Meng et al., 2024; Xia et al., 2023), repair (Wei et al., 2023), and comprehension (Wang et al., 2023). While there has been considerable research on enhancing the reasoning abilities of LLMs through techniques such as CoT (Chain-of-Thought) (Wei et al., 2022), ToT (Tree-of-Thought) (Yao et al., 2023), and accumulative reasoning (Zhang et al., 2023b), only a few studies target domain-specific reasoning for classical program analysis problems. Typically, several studies have employed the CoT prompting strategy to infer program invariants (Pei et al., 2023; Kamath et al., 2023) and rank potential invariants (Chakraborty et al., 2023). In the context of library-aware bug detection, LLift retrieves function specifications through prompting (Li et al., 2023) to assist classical bug detectors. To the best of our knowledge, no previous studies have solely relied on LLMs for program analysis. Our work demonstrates the possibility of synthesizing new tools to avoid hallucinations in program analysis tasks. Moreover, our insight into utilizing LLMs as code interpreters can be generalized to other software engineering problems, including documentation generation (McBurney & McMillan, 2014), semantic search (Shi et al., 2022), and commit message summarization (Xu et al., 2019).



## 6. Conclusion

This paper presents LLMDFA, an LLM-powered dataflow analysis with high autonomy and adaptiveness. It employs few-shot CoT prompting to precisely reason about dataflow facts in single functions and synthesizes script programs invoking domain-specific experts as new tools to extract sources/sinks and validate path feasibility. LLMDFA shows remarkable performance in analyzing dataflow facts upon benchmark programs for bug detection without cumbersome compilation or complex customization. It demonstrates a promising paradigm for reasoning code semantics, with the potential for generalization to other code-related tasks.

## References

- Andersen, L. O. Program analysis and specialization for the c programming language. 1994.
- Arzt, S., Rasthofer, S., Fritz, C., Bodden, E., Bartel, A., Klein, J., Traon, Y. L., Outeau, D., and McDaniel, P. D. Flowdroid: precise context, flow, field, object-sensitive and lifecycle-aware taint analysis for android apps. In O’Boyle, M. F. P. and Pingali, K. (eds.), *ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI ’14, Edinburgh, United Kingdom - June 09 - 11, 2014*, pp. 259–269. ACM, 2014. doi: 10.1145/2594291.2594299.
- Bodík, R. and Gupta, R. Partial dead code elimination using slicing transformations. In Chen, M. C., Cytron, R. K., and Berman, A. M. (eds.), *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN ’97 Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI), Las Vegas, Nevada, USA, June 15-18, 1997*, pp. 159–170. ACM, 1997. doi: 10.1145/258915.258930.
- Boland, T. and Black, P. E. Juliet 1.1 C/C++ and java test suite. *Computer*, 45(10):88–90, 2012. doi: 10.1109/MC.2012.345.
- Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D. M., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., and Amodei, D. Language models are few-shot learners. In Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M., and Lin, H. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020.
- Brunsfeld, M. Tree-sitter-a new parsing system for programming tools. In *Strange Loop Conference*,. Accessed–. URL: <https://www.thestrangeloop.com/tree-sitter—a-new-parsing-system-for-programming-tools.html>, 2018.
- Cadar, C., Dunbar, D., and Engler, D. R. KLEE: unassisted and automatic generation of high-coverage tests for complex systems programs. In Draves, R. and van Renesse, R. (eds.), *8th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, OSDI 2008, December 8-10, 2008, San Diego, California, USA, Proceedings*, pp. 209–224. USENIX Association, 2008.
- Calcagno, C., Distefano, D., O’Hearn, P. W., and Yang, H. Compositional shape analysis by means of bi-abduction. In Shao, Z. and Pierce, B. C. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 36th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles*

- of *Programming Languages, POPL 2009, Savannah, GA, USA, January 21-23, 2009*, pp. 289–300. ACM, 2009. doi: 10.1145/1480881.1480917.
- Chakraborty, S., Lahiri, S. K., Fakhoury, S., Lal, A., Musuvathi, M., Rastogi, A., Senthilnathan, A., Sharma, R., and Swamy, N. Ranking llm-generated loop invariants for program verification. In Bouamor, H., Pino, J., and Bali, K. (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pp. 9164–9175. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- Christakis, M. and Bird, C. What developers want and need from program analysis: an empirical study. In Lo, D., Apel, S., and Khurshid, S. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 31st IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2016, Singapore, September 3-7, 2016*, pp. 332–343. ACM, 2016. doi: 10.1145/2970276.2970347.
- Clang. Clang: a C language family frontend for LLVM. <https://clang.llvm.org/>, 2023. [Online; accessed 23-Dec-2023].
- CWE. CWE-369: Divide By Zero. <https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/369.html>, 2023a. [Online; accessed 23-Dec-2023].
- CWE. CWE-80: Improper Neutralization of Script-Related HTML Tags in a Web Page (Basic XSS). <https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/80.html>, 2023b. [Online; accessed 23-Dec-2023].
- de Moura, L. M. and Bjørner, N. Z3: an efficient SMT solver. In Ramakrishnan, C. R. and Rehof, J. (eds.), *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, 14th International Conference, TACAS 2008, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2008, Budapest, Hungary, March 29-April 6, 2008. Proceedings*, volume 4963 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 337–340. Springer, 2008. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-78800-3\_24.
- Deng, Y., Xia, C. S., Peng, H., Yang, C., and Zhang, L. Large language models are zero-shot fuzzers: Fuzzing deep-learning libraries via large language models. In Just, R. and Fraser, G. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis, ISSTA 2023, Seattle, WA, USA, July 17-21, 2023*, pp. 423–435. ACM, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3597926.3598067.
- Eberhardt, J., Steffen, S., Raychev, V., and Vechev, M. T. Unsupervised learning of API alias specifications. In McKinley, K. S. and Fisher, K. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 40th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2019, Phoenix, AZ, USA, June 22-26, 2019*, pp. 745–759. ACM, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3314221.3314640.
- Ernst, M. D., Perkins, J. H., Guo, P. J., McCamant, S., Pacheco, C., Tschantz, M. S., and Xiao, C. The Daikon system for dynamic detection of likely invariants. *Science of Computer Programming*, 69(1–3):35–45, December 2007.
- Janßen, C., Richter, C., and Wehrheim, H. Can chatgpt support software verification? *CoRR*, abs/2311.02433, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2311.02433.
- Ji, Z., Yu, T., Xu, Y., Lee, N., Ishii, E., and Fung, P. Towards mitigating LLM hallucination via self reflection. In Bouamor, H., Pino, J., and Bali, K. (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pp. 1827–1843. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- Kamath, A., Senthilnathan, A., Chakraborty, S., Deligiannis, P., Lahiri, S. K., Lal, A., Rastogi, A., Roy, S., and Sharma, R. Finding inductive loop invariants using large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2311.07948, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2311.07948.
- Lattner, C. and Adve, V. S. LLVM: A compilation framework for lifelong program analysis & transformation. In *2nd IEEE / ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO 2004), 20-24 March 2004, San Jose, CA, USA*, pp. 75–88. IEEE Computer Society, 2004. doi: 10.1109/CGO.2004.1281665.
- Le, T. C., Zheng, G., and Nguyen, T. SLING: using dynamic analysis to infer program invariants in separation logic. In McKinley, K. S. and Fisher, K. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 40th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2019, Phoenix, AZ, USA, June 22-26, 2019*, pp. 788–801. ACM, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3314221.3314634.
- Li, H., Hao, Y., Zhai, Y., and Qian, Z. The hitchhiker’s guide to program analysis: A journey with large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2308.00245, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2308.00245.
- Li, Z., Yew, P., and Zhu, C. An efficient data dependence analysis for parallelizing compilers. *IEEE Trans. Parallel Distributed Syst.*, 1(1):26–34, 1990. doi: 10.1109/71.80122.
- McBurney, P. W. and McMillan, C. Automatic documentation generation via source code summarization of method context. In Roy, C. K., Begel, A., and Moonen, L. (eds.),

- 22nd International Conference on Program Comprehension, ICPC 2014, Hyderabad, India, June 2-3, 2014, pp. 279–290. ACM, 2014. doi: 10.1145/2597008.2597149.
- Meng, R., Mirchev, M., Böhme, M., and Roychoudhury, A. Large language model guided protocol fuzzing. NDSS, 2024.
- Møller, A. and Schwartzbach, M. I. Static program analysis. *Notes*. Feb, 2012.
- OpenAI. GPT-4 technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2303.08774, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2303.08774.
- Pei, K., Bieber, D., Shi, K., Sutton, C., and Yin, P. Can large language models reason about program invariants? In Krause, A., Brunskill, E., Cho, K., Engelhardt, B., Sabato, S., and Scarlett, J. (eds.), *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 27496–27520. PMLR, 2023.
- Rasthofer, S., Arzt, S., and Bodden, E. A machine-learning approach for classifying and categorizing android sources and sinks. In *21st Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2014, San Diego, California, USA, February 23-26, 2014*. The Internet Society, 2014.
- Reps, T. W., Horwitz, S., and Sagiv, S. Precise interprocedural dataflow analysis via graph reachability. In Cytron, R. K. and Lee, P. (eds.), *Conference Record of POPL'95: 22nd ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, San Francisco, California, USA, January 23-25, 1995*, pp. 49–61. ACM Press, 1995. doi: 10.1145/199448.199462.
- Rozière, B., Gehring, J., Gloeckle, F., Sootla, S., Gat, I., Tan, X. E., Adi, Y., Liu, J., Remez, T., Rapin, J., Kozhevnikov, A., Evtimov, I., Bitton, J., Bhatt, M., Canton-Ferrer, C., Grattafiori, A., Xiong, W., Défossez, A., Copet, J., Azhar, F., Touvron, H., Martin, L., Usunier, N., Scialom, T., and Synnaeve, G. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *CoRR*, abs/2308.12950, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2308.12950.
- Semmler. GitHub Code Scanning. <https://lgtm.com>, 2023. [Online; accessed 23-Dec-2023].
- Shi, Q., Xiao, X., Wu, R., Zhou, J., Fan, G., and Zhang, C. Pinpoint: fast and precise sparse value flow analysis for million lines of code. In Foster, J. S. and Grossman, D. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 39th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2018, Philadelphia, PA, USA, June 18-22, 2018*, pp. 693–706. ACM, 2018. doi: 10.1145/3192366.3192418.
- Shi, Y., Yin, Y., Wang, Z., Lo, D., Zhang, T., Xia, X., Zhao, Y., and Xu, B. How to better utilize code graphs in semantic code search? In Roychoudhury, A., Cadar, C., and Kim, M. (eds.), *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*, pp. 722–733. ACM, 2022. doi: 10.1145/3540250.3549087.
- Shrivastava, D., Larochelle, H., and Tarlow, D. Repository-level prompt generation for large language models of code. In Krause, A., Brunskill, E., Cho, K., Engelhardt, B., Sabato, S., and Scarlett, J. (eds.), *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 31693–31715. PMLR, 2023.
- Steensgaard, B. Points-to analysis in almost linear time. In Boehm, H. and Jr., G. L. S. (eds.), *Conference Record of POPL'96: The 23rd ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, Papers Presented at the Symposium, St. Petersburg Beach, Florida, USA, January 21-24, 1996*, pp. 32–41. ACM Press, 1996. doi: 10.1145/237721.237727.
- Sui, Y. and Xue, J. SVF: interprocedural static value-flow analysis in LLVM. In Zaks, A. and Hermenegildo, M. V. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Compiler Construction, CC 2016, Barcelona, Spain, March 12-18, 2016*, pp. 265–266. ACM, 2016. doi: 10.1145/2892208.2892235.
- Vallée-Rai, R., Co, P., Gagnon, E., Hendren, L. J., Lam, P., and Sundaresan, V. Soot - a java bytecode optimization framework. In MacKay, S. A. and Johnson, J. H. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 1999 conference of the Centre for Advanced Studies on Collaborative Research, November 8-11, 1999, Mississauga, Ontario, Canada*, pp. 13. IBM, 1999.
- Wang, C., Lou, Y., Liu, J., and Peng, X. Generating variable explanations via zero-shot prompt learning. In *38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2023, Luxembourg, September 11-15, 2023*, pp. 748–760. IEEE, 2023. doi: 10.1109/ASE56229.2023.00130.
- Wang, Y., Wang, W., Joty, S. R., and Hoi, S. C. H. Codet5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation. In Moens, M., Huang, X., Specia, L., and Yih, S. W. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 7-11 November, 2021*,

- pp. 8696–8708. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021. doi: 10.18653/V1/2021.EMNLP-MAIN.685.
- Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Ichter, B., Xia, F., Chi, E. H., Le, Q. V., and Zhou, D. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- Wei, Y., Xia, C. S., and Zhang, L. Copiloting the copilots: Fusing large language models with completion engines for automated program repair. In Chandra, S., Blincoe, K., and Tonella, P. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE 2023, San Francisco, CA, USA, December 3-9, 2023*, pp. 172–184. ACM, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3611643.3616271.
- Xia, C. S., Paltenghi, M., Tian, J. L., Pradel, M., and Zhang, L. Universal fuzzing via large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2308.04748, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2308.04748.
- Xie, X., Fan, G., Lin, X., Zhou, A., Li, S., Zheng, X., Liang, Y., Zhang, Y., Yu, N., Li, H., Chen, X., Chen, Y., Zhen, Y., Dong, D., Fu, X., Su, J., Pan, F., Luo, P., Feng, Y., Hu, R., Fan, J., Zhou, J., Xiao, X., and Di, P. Codefusequery: A data-centric static code analysis system for large-scale organizations. *CoRR*, abs/2401.01571, 2024. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2401.01571.
- Xu, S., Yao, Y., Xu, F., Gu, T., Tong, H., and Lu, J. Commit message generation for source code changes. In Kraus, S. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2019, Macao, China, August 10-16, 2019*, pp. 3975–3981. ijcai.org, 2019. doi: 10.24963/IJCAI.2019/552.
- Yang, K., Liu, J., Wu, J., Yang, C., Fung, Y. R., Li, S., Huang, Z., Cao, X., Wang, X., Wang, Y., Ji, H., and Zhai, C. If LLM is the wizard, then code is the wand: A survey on how code empowers large language models to serve as intelligent agents. *CoRR*, abs/2401.00812, 2024. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2401.00812.
- Yao, P., Shi, Q., Huang, H., and Zhang, C. Program analysis via efficient symbolic abstraction. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 5(OOPSLA):1–32, 2021. doi: 10.1145/3485495.
- Yao, S., Yu, D., Zhao, J., Shafran, I., Griffiths, T. L., Cao, Y., and Narasimhan, K. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2305.10601, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2305.10601.
- Zhang, Y., Li, Y., Cui, L., Cai, D., Liu, L., Fu, T., Huang, X., Zhao, E., Zhang, Y., Chen, Y., Wang, L., Luu, A. T., Bi, W., Shi, F., and Shi, S. Siren’s song in the AI ocean: A survey on hallucination in large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2309.01219, 2023a. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2309.01219.
- Zhang, Y., Yang, J., Yuan, Y., and Yao, A. C. Cumulative reasoning with large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2308.04371, 2023b. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2308.04371.

## A. Broader Impact

This paper presents work whose goal is to advance the field of Machine Learning, targeting a complicated code-reasoning task, namely dataflow analysis. We demonstrate the limitations of our work above. We do not expect our work to have a negative broader impact, though leveraging LLMs for code-reasoning tasks may come with certain risks, e.g., the leakage of source code in private organizations and potential high token costs. Additionally, we offer the detailed statistics of token costs in Appendix D. Meanwhile, it is worth more discussions to highlight that our work has the potential to dramatically change the field of software engineering with the power of LLMs. Specifically, LLM-powered dataflow analysis not only enables the analysis of incomplete programs with little customization but addresses other challenges in classical dataflow analysis.

First, classical dataflow analyzers mainly depend on specific versions of IRs. As a compilation infrastructure evolves, the version of IR code can change, requiring migration of the implementation to support the analysis of new IRs. For example, the Clang compiler has undergone ten major version updates in the past decade (Clang, 2023), resulting in differences between IRs generated by different compiler versions. The IR differences necessitate tremendous manual efforts to migrate the dataflow analysis implementation for each version update in the long term. However, an LLM-powered dataflow analysis directly operates on the source code and supports different language standards.

Second, classical dataflow analysis lies in the various abstractions and precision settings (Møller & Schwartzbach, 2012), especially pointer analysis, a fundamental pre-analysis in the classical dataflow analysis workflow. Specifically, the developers of dataflow analyzers have to consider different precision settings, such as Anderson-style pointer analysis (Andersen, 1994) and Steensgaard’s pointer analysis (Steensgaard, 1996), and implement the analysis algorithms accordingly. This process demands significant implementation effort. In contrast, LLMs, being aligned with program semantics, serve as interpreters of program semantics and eliminate the need for proposing abstractions and implementing analysis under specific precision settings. Instead, we can interact with LLMs via prompting to query the program facts of interests very conveniently.

Third, classical dataflow analysis requires reasoning about the semantics of IRs and reimplementing the same algorithm for different languages. In contrast, LLMs serve as general code interpreters and have exceptional performance in understanding short code snippets (Yang et al., 2024), no matter which programming languages are used. By following similar prompting strategies, we can easily extend LLMDFA to analyze programs in other languages, including but not limited to C/C++, Python, and JavaScript.

## B. Prompt Templates

In what follows, we offer detailed prompt templates in Figure 11, Figure 12, and Figure 13.

<p><b>Role:</b> You are a good programmer and familiar with AST of programs.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Please write the Python script traversing AST and identify sources/sinks for data flow analysis.</p>
<p><b>Source/Sink Info:</b> There are several forms of sources/sinks: [Spec]. Also, we offer several example programs containing sources/sinks and their corresponding ASTs: [Example Programs + ASTs]</p>
<p><b>Synthesis Task:</b> Please write a Python script to extract the sources/sinks on AST. You may refer to the AST structure of the example programs, and a skeleton AST traverser program. [skeleton]</p>
<p><b>Fixing Task:</b> Here is the synthesized result of last round: [script]. When executing the script, we encounter the following error: [error message]. The following sources/sinks are missed: [missed ones]. The following variables/expressions are mis-identified as sources/sinks: [incorrect ones]. Please fix the bug and return a runnable script.</p>

Figure 11. The prompt template in the source/sink extractor synthesis. The green/red zones instantiate the synthesis/fix task.

<p><b>Role:</b> You are a good programmer. <b>Description:</b> Determine whether two variables at two lines have the same value.</p>
<p>Here are several <b>rules</b>:</p> <p>(1) If they are the same variable and not overwritten between two lines, the answer should be yes.</p> <p>(2) If the variable a is assigned with the value of the variable b, then answer should be yes. [...]</p>
<p>Here are several <b>examples</b>:</p> <p>Example 1: User: [Program] [Question] System: [Answer: Yes/No] [Explanation: y is assigned with x at line 2 and not over-written between lines 2 and 3. Hence, the value of y at line 3 is the same as x defined at line 1. The answer is Yes.] [Other examples]</p>
<p>Now I give you a <b>function</b>: [FUNCTION] Please answer the <b>question</b>: Does [VAR1] used at line [L1] have the same value as [VAR2] defined at line [L2] ? Please think it step by step. Return Yes/No with the explanation.</p>

Figure 12. The prompt template in the dataflow summarization. The function and variable info should be filled in the green zones. The text with yellow shading guides the reasoning process.

<p><b>Role:</b> You are a good programmer and familiar with Z3 python binding.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Please write the python program using Z3 python binding to encode the path condition of a given program line.</p>
<p><b>Path Info:</b> Here is a path: [path]. Note that the value of [variable] is 0. Line [line number] is in the [true/false] branch of the if-statement, of which the condition is [branch condition].</p>
<p><b>Synthesis Task:</b> Please write a Python script to solve the path condition using Z3 python binding. You can refer to the skeleton: [skeleton]</p>
<p><b>Fixing Task:</b> Here is the synthesized result of last round: [script]. When executing the script, we encounter the following error: [error message]. Please fix the bug and return a runnable script.</p>

Figure 13. The prompt template in the path feasibility validation. The green/red zones are filled with path information and previous scripts with error messages.

## C. Case Study of Path Feasibility Validation

We present several examples to show the limitations of LLM DFA in path feasibility validation. Specifically, we discuss three complex forms of path conditions.

**Case I: Usage of Library Functions.** Figure 14 shows the code snippet in the benchmark file `CWE369_DBZ_float_connect_tcp_divide_09.java`. As shown in the second if-statement, the branch condition is `Math.abs(data) > 0.000001`, which is apparently not satisfied when `data` is equal to 0.

In our evaluation, we find that LLM DFA tends to take `Math.abs(data)` as a constraint and append it to a Z3 instance directly, which yields a crash in the execution of the synthesized script. After several rounds of fixing, LLM DFA can generate a script program encoding the path condition correctly. However, we still observe that LLM DFA can fail to synthesize the correct script programs for several benchmark programs. As demonstrated at the end of Section 4.2, LLM DFA can wrongly interpret the semantics of `Math.abs(data) > 0.000001` with the conjunction `And(data > 0.000001, data < -0.000001)`, while the correct interpretation should be the disjunction `Or(data > 0.000001, data < -0.000001)`. It shows one of the limitations of LLM DFA. When a branch condition contains a library function, LLM DFA may offer a wrong interpretation of its semantics. Although interpreting `Math.abs(data) > 0.000001` as `And(data > 0.000001, data < -0.000001)` also makes LLM DFA identify the path as an infeasible one, the path is not discarded in a correct way.

```
public class CWE369_DBZ_float_connect_tcp_divide_09 {
    public void goodB2G1() {
        if (IO.STATIC_FINAL_TRUE) {
            data = 0.0f;
        } else {
            data = 2.0f;
        }
        if (Math.abs(data) > 0.000001) {
            int result = (int)(100.0 / data);
            IO.writeLine(result);
        }
    }
}
```

Figure 14. `CWE369_DBZ_float_connect_tcp_divide_09`

### Case II: Usage of User-defined Functions

Figure 15 shows an example of using a user-defined function in a branch condition. Specifically, the function `staticReturnsTrueOrFalse` randomly generates `True` or `False` as the return value. Actually, the branch condition should be symbolized with an unconstrained variable in a Z3 instance. In our current implementation of LLM DFA, we do not support the retrieval of the function definition of `staticReturnsTrueOrFalse`, and the LLMs may directly interpret the branch condition as `True` or `False` incorrectly. For the program shown in

Figure 15, LLM DFA would cause a false negative if the branch condition is interpreted as `False`.

```
public class CWE369_DBZ_float_connect_tcp_divide_12 {
    public void bad() {
        if (IO.staticReturnsTrueOrFalse()) {
            data = 0.0f;
        } else {
            data = 2.0f;
        }
        if (IO.staticReturnsTrueOrFalse()) {
            int result = (int)(100.0 / data);
            IO.writeLine(result);
        }
    }

    public boolean staticReturnsTrueOrFalse() {
        return (new java.util.Random()).nextBoolean();
    }
}
```

Figure 15. `CWE369_DBZ_float_connect_tcp_divide_12`

### Case III: Usage of Global Variables

Figure 16 shows an example where the branch condition is guarded by a static member field `badPublicStatic`, which can be regarded as a global variable for the member functions, such as the functions `bad` and `badSink`. Initially, `badPublicStatic` is set to `False`. The function `bad` further sets it to `True`. Hence, the branch condition `badPublicStatic` is satisfied when the function `badSink` is invoked after the statement `badPublicStatic = true` in the function `bad`.

In our implementation of LLM DFA, we just retrieve the initialization of each class field via simple parsing. LLM DFA can introduce a false negative in this example, as it is not aware that `badPublicStatic` is set to `True`. By simple parsing, we cannot obtain the precise value of a global variable that can be modified at multiple program locations. Once the global variables are used to construct a branch condition, LLM DFA may determine the feasibility of the program path incorrectly, introducing false positives or false negatives. To prune the infeasible path with high recall, we can concentrate on the branch conditions in simple forms. For example, if we encounter a branch condition using a global variable, we can assume that it can be satisfied. Although this strategy may introduce false positives, we still have the opportunity to reject many infeasible paths.

```
public class CWE369_DBZ_float_connect_tcp_divide_22a {
    public static boolean badPublicStatic = false;
    public void bad() {
        badPublicStatic = true;
        int data = 0;
        badSink(data);
    }
    public void badSink(int data) {
        if (badPublicStatic) {
            int result = (int)(100.0 / data);
            IO.writeLine(result);
        }
    }
}
```

Figure 16. `CWE369_DBZ_float_connect_tcp_divide_22a`

Table 4. The token cost of source/sink extractor synthesis.  $p_t$  is the  $t$ -quantile.

Bug Type	Extractor Type	Input Token Cost						Output Token Cost					
		Min	$p_{0.1}$	$p_{0.5}$	Avg	$p_{0.9}$	Max	Min	$p_{0.1}$	$p_{0.5}$	Avg	$p_{0.9}$	Max
DBZ	Source	3,231	3,231	3,231	25,366.2	3,231	856,729	470	470	477	3,202.5	495	112,802
	Sink	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500.0	2,500	2,500	258	266	266	267.7	275	293
XSS	Source	3,303	3,303	3,303	3,621.9	3,303	28,706	301	301	436	481.8	469	4,510
	Sink	1,774	1,774	1,774	1,774.0	1,774	1,774	255	255	260	261.0	262	338

Table 5. The token cost of dataflow summarization (Phase II) and path feasibility validation (Phase III).  $p_t$  is the  $t$ -quantile.

Bug Type	Phase	Input Token Cost						Output Token Cost					
		Min	$p_{0.1}$	$p_{0.5}$	Avg	$p_{0.9}$	Max	Min	$p_{0.1}$	$p_{0.5}$	Avg	$p_{0.9}$	Max
DBZ	II	4,677	9,274	19,268	18,252.4	23,865	154,098	98	235	517	516.1	698	5243
	III	405	461	1,638	4,124.9	9,080	126,584	93	138	508	1,260.7	2,976	31,064
XSS	II	1,013	1,118	1,542	4,971.0	13,347	33,274	42	61	120	300.7	787	2,051
	III	336	336	354	649.3	808	4,771	84	99	101	183.3	256	1,489

#### D. Token Cost of LLM DFA

We measure the token costs of LLM DFA in the LLM inference during the three phases. We summarize the results in Table 4 and Table 5. Specifically, more than 90% source extractors can be synthesized with no more than 4,000 input tokens, and all the sink extractors can be synthesized with no more than 3,000 input tokens. Meanwhile, more than 90% source extractors can be synthesized with no more than 500 output tokens, and all the sink extractors can be synthesized with no more than 400 output tokens. As demonstrated in Section 4.2 and Table 2, LLM DFA has to iteratively fix the synthesized scripts 655 times in the extreme case, which introduces huge input/output token costs. Hence, the token costs shown in the columns **Avg** and **Max** are quite high. However, such extreme cases do not frequently happen in our evaluation. The two sub-columns  $p_{0.9}$  demonstrate the low token costs of LLM DFA in most of the cases.

As shown in Table 5, the token costs of LLM DFA in the other two phases are much higher in the DBZ detection than the ones in the XSS detection. The reason is that the benchmark programs with XSS bugs have fewer sources and sinks than the benchmark programs with DBZ bugs. Hence, LLM DFA prompts the LLM fewer times for the dataflow summarization in the XSS detection than in the DBZ detection. Also, LLM DFA consumes fewer tokens for the path feasibility validation in the XSS detection than the DBZ detection, as the branch conditions in the benchmarks with XSS bugs have more simple forms than the ones in the benchmark programs with DBZ bugs. Similar to the extractor synthesis, we can find that LLM DFA has to consume many more tokens in a small proportion of cases than the others. In 90% cases, the input and output token costs of the dataflow summarization do not exceed 24,000 and 800, respectively, while the input and output token costs of the path feasibility validation do not exceed 10,000 and 3,000, respectively. Notably, the high input token costs in the dataflow summarization are mainly caused by the

lengthy examples with explanations used for few-shot CoT prompting. Also, the high input token costs in the path feasibility validation are introduced by the description of path information and hints for the path constraint encoding.

In our implementation, LLM DFA invokes the online models via OpenAI APIs. The time cost of the LLM inference can be affected by a lot of factors, such as network status, server scheduling, and runtime traffic. Hence, we do not measure the time cost of LLM DFA to quantify the efficiency of LLM DFA.