

Enhancing Repository-Level Code Generation with Integrated Contextual Information

Zhiyuan Pan
Zhejiang University
Hangzhou, China
zy_pan@zju.edu.cn

Xin Xia
Zhejiang University
Hangzhou, China
xin.xia@acm.org

Xing Hu*
Zhejiang University
Hangzhou, China
xinghu@zju.edu.cn

Xiaohu Yang
Zhejiang University
Hangzhou, China
yangxh@zju.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in code generation tasks. However, *repository-level code generation* presents unique challenges, particularly due to the need to utilize information spread across multiple files within a repository. Existing retrieval-based approaches sometimes fall short as they are limited in obtaining a broader and deeper repository context. In this paper, we present **CATCODER**, a novel code generation framework designed for statically typed programming languages. CATCODER enhances repository-level code generation by integrating relevant `code` and `type` context. Specifically, it leverages static analyzers to extract type dependencies and merges this information with retrieved code to create comprehensive prompts for LLMs. To evaluate the effectiveness of CATCODER, we adapt and construct benchmarks that include 199 Java tasks and 90 Rust tasks. The results show that CATCODER outperforms the RepoCoder baseline by up to 17.35%, in terms of $\text{pass}@k$ score. Furthermore, the generalizability of CATCODER is assessed using various LLMs, including both code-specialized models and general-purpose models. Our findings indicate consistent performance improvements across all models, which underlines the practicality of CATCODER.

KEYWORDS

Large Language Model, Code Generation, Repository Context

1 INTRODUCTION

Large language models (LLMs) [35, 38, 40, 48] have been widely applied in various software engineering-related fields, and they have shown remarkable performance in code generation tasks [16, 19]. Code generation tasks can be divided into two types: standalone code generation and repository-level code generation. For the standalone scenario, the function can be invoked independently, and the generation of LLMs is conditioned only on the *in-file* context (i.e., contents within the same file). However, for more practical repository-level code generation, LLMs struggle to generate correct code if only in-file context is provided, due to that relevant information usually lies in many different files in a repository, and the lack of *cross-file* context is likely to lead to hallucinations. Therefore, it is essential to fully utilize the repository information and

provide cross-file contexts for the LLMs to generate the correct repository-level code.

To utilize repository information, existing studies use retrieval-based approaches to find similar code for reference. Zan et al. [52] train a dual-encoder model to retrieve API information from library documentation. Lu et al. [36] build an external code database to retrieve similar code. Shrivastava et al. [41] propose RLPG, in which they train a classifier to predict prompt proposals taken from repository files. Zhang et al. [54] propose RepoCoder, which iteratively retrieves similar code in a repository. However, these approaches still have limitations. First, for approaches that use external sources or train models, they are not generalizable to new unseen repositories. Second, retrieved code cannot always cover the necessary logic and API invocations that correct code requires, especially when a code repository does not contain much duplicated code [54].

To address the latter limitation, we find that apart from code retrieval, in statically typed programming languages¹, the types related to a function can also provide valuable references to LLMs. In other words, they can provide a set of fields and methods for the LLM to select and use in the generated code. In this paper, we refer to this information as *type context*. The type context serves as a complement to the code retrieval and helps LLMs better understand the repository structure at a deep level. To extract such information, we utilize existing static analyzers.

Based on *type context*, we propose a new repository-level code generation framework named **CATCODER**, which exploits the combination of relevant `code` and `type` context for statically typed languages. It works on top of a frozen LLM and does not require external databases or model training. First, it retrieves relevant code from the repository. Then, CATCODER invokes a static analyzer to obtain dependent types for the function and creates textual representations of the type context. Finally, CATCODER merges two kinds of information into the prompt and generates the function code with an LLM.

To evaluate the effectiveness of CATCODER, we adapt and construct repository-level code generation benchmarks that include 199 Java tasks and 90 Rust tasks in total. We compare CATCODER with vanilla LLM, the In-File context, and RepoCoder [54], a state-of-the-art framework for repository-level code generation, in terms

*Corresponding Author

¹Statically typed programming languages are those where the data types of variables have to be declared during compile-time, such as C, C++, Java and Rust.




Figure 1: A scenario of developing a Java method `triu` in the *Apache Commons Math* [4] library. (1) The left part illustrates relevant code, whose patterns might be helpful when developers write current method code. (2) The right part illustrates the type context (i.e., the fields and method signatures of a class) related to the current method, which can be derived iteratively through static analysis, starting with the method signature.

of `pass@k` [19] scores. To validate the generalizability of CATCODER, we evaluate CATCODER with various LLMs, including code-specialized models and general purpose models. The results on the benchmarks indicate that CATCODER substantially outperforms the vanilla LLM and the In-File context. In addition, it outperforms RepoCoder by up to 17.35%. The results of the generalizability study demonstrate that CATCODER improves the performance of all selected LLMs.

In summary, we make the following contributions:

- (1) We propose a novel framework for statically-typed programming languages, CATCODER, to generate repository-level code by highlighting relevant code and type context in code repositories.
- (2) To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to construct a repository-level code generation benchmark for Rust, to evaluate the effectiveness of CATCODER on a minor programming language.
- (3) We evaluate CATCODER using Java and Rust benchmarks, and results indicate that CATCODER outperforms the baselines.

Paper Organization: The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces the motivation of CATCODER using an example. Section 3 presents the details of CATCODER. Section 4 describes the experimental setups, including baselines, evaluation metric, benchmarks, and implementation details. Section 5 analyzes the experimental results and provides answers to the research questions. Section 6 discusses the failure cases of CATCODER and threats to validity. Section 7 summarizes the related work. Section 8 concludes the paper with possible future work.

2 MOTIVATING EXAMPLE

In this section, we present a motivating example to illustrate the main idea of CATCODER. Figure 1 shows a scenario for developing

a Java method named `triu`, which takes a `RealMatrix` object and an `int` as input and returns a `RealMatrix` object.

From the perspective of human developers, to write repository-level code, we do not only refer to the method signature and the docstrings but also search for relevant code as references. In addition, for statically typed programming languages like Java, it is common to dive into related types (e.g., argument and return types) to seek available APIs. The two kinds of information can be concluded as follows:

Info.1 Relevant code with a similar name, parameters, return type, or docstrings. As similar code is more likely to perform similar or symmetric operations, we can learn from the patterns and write new code.

Info.2 Type context, i.e., the field and method information of related classes, which provides hints on the possible ways to assign values or invoke APIs.

In Figure 1, the method `ones` is a relevant code snippet that returns `RealMatrix`. From this method, we can learn from the last line to create a new `Array2DRowRealMatrix` instance with a constructor. **(Info.1)** In addition, the right part of Figure 1 illustrates the type context that we can obtain from the class `CMAESOptimizer` and method `triu`. From the type context, we can learn about the available APIs, such as `getRowDimension`, `getColumnDimension` and `getEntry`, so that we can use them correctly in our code if necessary. **(Info.2)**

After obtaining such information, developers can write the code by selecting useful parts of the relevant code and the type context and combining them with some logic. Given the powerful in-context learning ability of LLMs, it is intuitive that LLMs can also benefit from such comprehensive information if we utilize it to augment the prompts.




Figure 2: Overview of our approach

To improve the performance of repository-level code generation with LLMs, existing work [36, 54] uses retrieval-augmented generation to retrieve relevant code as presented in **Info.1**. However, it is limited as it ignores **Info.2** (i.e., type context). For code repositories that do not contain many similar method pairs, the retrieved code would be less helpful. In this case, without type context, LLMs are more likely to hallucinate and generate non-existent field accesses or API calls.

Motivated by the aforementioned example, we illustrate the idea of our work CATCODER, which highlights the combination of **Info.1** and **Info.2**. CATCODER is carried out in the following steps:

- Step a. **Relevant Code Retrieval.** We retrieve similar code in a repository based on the query (i.e., the docstrings and signature of the function to be completed).
- Step b. **Type Context Extraction.** We utilize static analyzers to determine the dependent types and then create type context by extracting the fields and method signatures.
- Step c. **Code Generation via LLM.** We merge the results in Step a and Step b into a comprehensive prompt, and invoke an LLM to obtain the generated code.

3 PROPOSED APPROACH

The framework of CATCODER is presented in Figure 2. CATCODER takes a source code repository and an empty function (along with its docstrings, if it exists). The output of CATCODER is the completed code of the function.

In addition to Figure 2, Algorithm 1 presents the pseudocode of the workflow of CATCODER. CATCODER contains two core components: (1) *Relevant Code Retrieval* and (2) *Type Context Extraction*. By utilizing these components, CATCODER is able to gather two kinds of referential information for the LLM. After post-processing the raw output of the LLM, CATCODER returns the generated code.

Algorithm 1: CATCODER

Input: Code repository R , Empty function f
Output: The completed code of function f

- 1 $docs = code_retrieval(R, f)$ /* Section 3.1 */
 - 2 $contexts = type_context(R, f)$ /* Section 3.2 */
 - 3 $prompt = prepare(f, docs, contexts)$ /* Section 3.3 */
 - 4 $code = LLM(prompt)$
 - 5 **return** $postprocess(code)$
-

3.1 Relevant Code Retrieval

3.1.1 Code Splitting. We traverse all source code files in the repository and split them into smaller chunks. Starting with complete files, we set a maximum chunk size and recursively split larger fragments into smaller ones that fit in the chunk.

As the structure of the source code is often complex, we cannot split it at an arbitrary position. Otherwise, the resulting contents would be less meaningful and difficult to understand. Therefore, to better preserve the code structures, we split the code only before the following positions (sorted by priority in descending order):

- (1) *Type definitions*
- (2) *Function definitions*
- (3) *Control flow statements*
- (4) *New lines*

After splitting, we obtain a corpus of code chunks² to perform retrieval.

3.1.2 Hybrid Retrieving. In the second step, we build retrievers to search for relevant code. To achieve better search performance, we follow previous research [37] and ensemble two kinds of retrievers: a *sparse* one and a *dense* one. The sparse retriever corresponds

²We call them “documents” later in this subsection.

to keyword matching, and the dense retriever corresponds to semantic search. Each retriever searches and returns top- k ³ relevant documents (i.e., split code chunks), after a query is constructed by concatenating docstrings and the function signature.

❶ *Sparse Retrieval.* We choose bag-of-words model for sparse retrieval, and use the BM25 function [39, 44] to rank the set of documents, based on the query terms. Given a document D and a query Q with terms t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n , the BM25 score can be defined as follows:

$$\text{BM25}(D, Q) = \sum_{t \in Q} \text{IDF}(t, D) \cdot \frac{\text{TF}(t, D) \cdot (k_1 + 1)}{\text{TF}(t, D) + k_1 \cdot \left(1 - b + b \cdot \frac{|D|}{|D|_{\text{avg}}}\right)}$$

where $\text{IDF}(t, D)$ is the inverse document frequency weight, $\text{TF}(t, D)$ is the term frequency (i.e., the number of appearing times in the document), $|D|$ is the length of the document, and k_1 and b are hyperparameters. In default, the values of k_1 and b are set to 1.5 and 0.75. $\text{IDF}(t, D)$ can be calculated by:

$$\text{IDF}(t, D) = \log \frac{N_D - \text{DF}(t, D) + 0.5}{\text{DF}(t, D) + 0.5},$$

where N_D is the number of documents and $\text{DF}(t, D)$ is the document frequency (i.e., the number of documents that contain the term).

In practice, after splitting the code files from a repository, we apply the aforementioned BM25 function for a query and obtain a list of scores. After that, we select documents with top- k highest scores.

❷ *Dense Retrieval.* We employ an embedding model for dense retrieval. The model maps natural language sentences and code snippets into dense vector spaces. To select the most relevant documents, our intuitive idea is to find the nearest neighbors around the embedding vector of the query text. Thus, we use *Squared Euclidean Distance* to measure the proximity between embedding vectors in high-dimensional spaces, and this metric can be calculated by:

$$d^2(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (p_i - q_i)^2,$$

where n is the number of dimensions in the embedding vectors. A lower value of $d^2(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ indicates that \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} are more similar.

In practice, we utilize the embedding model and generate vector representations of all documents and query text. Then we calculate $d^2(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ between the query embedding and all document embeddings and select the top- k nearest documents.

3.1.3 *Result Ranking.* In the third step, we ensemble the two retrievers and re-rank their outputs using the *Reciprocal Rank Fusion* (RRF) [20] algorithm. We assign weights to the retrievers and calculate the weighted RRF score⁴ for each retrieved document D :

$$\text{RRF}(D) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1(D) \cdot w_i}{r(D) + 60},$$

³ k is a hyperparameter, and we describe the settings in Section 4.4.4.

⁴We assume that a retriever does not output duplicate documents. However, duplicate documents across retrievers are acceptable.




Figure 3: The dependency graph of the Java class `CMAESOptimizer`

where w_i is the weight assigned to a certain retriever, $1(D)$ is an indicator function⁵, and $r(D)$ is the original rank (if exists) of D in the outputs of this retriever.

After applying the RRF algorithm, we deduplicate the documents and sort them in descending order based on the RRF scores. Now we obtain the results of the *Relevant Code Retrieval* component.

3.2 Type Context Extraction

Here, we present the type context and the way to extract type contexts from code repositories using static analyzers⁶.

3.2.1 *Type Context.* Figure 3 shows an undirected dependency graph $G = (V, E)$, in which each vertex corresponds to a type and each edge represents the dependency relationship. In particular, if type B occurs in the implementation of type A, there should be an edge between A and B, and vice versa. Thus, the dependency graph contains types that we are likely to use and refer to when writing code of method body.

In Figure 3, we build the dependency graph starting from class `CMAESOptimizer`. As the graph spans, the vertex set and the edge set will eventually converge, and we can obtain the types that are relevant to `CMAESOptimizer`. To pass such type information to the LLM, we create **type context** from the graph by extracting the fields and function signatures within the types and concatenating them into a string.

However, in large code repositories, the number of vertices could grow exponentially, making the resulting type context too long to fit in an LLM’s context window. In addition, higher-order neighbor vertices in the graph tend to have less relevance to each other. For the example in Figure 3, programmers are more likely to use the API of `RealMatrix` rather than `RealVector`, which is a higher-order neighbor of `CMAESOptimizer` compared to `RealMatrix`. Therefore, in practice, we limit the scope of type context creation

⁵The value is 1 if D is one of the outputs of this retriever, otherwise the value is 0.

⁶The word “type” is an abstract concept and might be different in various languages. For example, it refers to class, interface and enum in Java; whereas in Rust, it refers to struct and enum.

to one-order neighbors in the graph. Assuming that LLMs have knowledge of the standard libraries of many languages, we also prune the types in these libraries.

3.2.2 Building Type Context via Static Analyzer. To get detailed information (i.e., fields and methods) of a type from its name, some straightforward heuristics might be used, e.g., locating imports or looking for similar file names. However, these heuristics are not sound and do not work with all statically typed programming languages. Thus, we need to perform an analysis to accurately navigate to a type and find its definitions and implementations. Many language servers serve as static analyzers and provide this type-based analysis, such as clangd [2] for C++, Eclipse JDT [6] for Java, and rust-analyzer [12] for Rust.

Specifically, to build the type context for a function code generation task, we first determine the set of relevant types (as Section 3.2.1 describes). We start with the signature and form a set of types, and the initial element is the type to which the current function belongs. Then we implement a parser that works collaboratively with the static analyzer. The static analyzer provides detailed type information to the parser. The parser then searches for a new occurring type, adds it to the set, and queries the analyzer with its location (i.e., byte offset or line and column offsets in a file). This interaction ends when all one-order neighbors of the initial types are found. Finally, we concatenate the fields and method signatures within the set of types and obtain the type context.

3.3 Code Generation via LLM

You are given a blank {Java|Rust} function with type context, referential code snippet and docstrings. Complete the {Java|Rust} function ...

```
[CONTEXT] Contexts
public class CMAESOptimizer {
<FIELDS> .....
<METHOD SIGNATURES> .....
}
<CLASSES> .....

// optimization/direct/CMAESOptimizer.java
private static RealMatrix sumRows(final RealMatrix m) {
    final double[][] d = new .....
[/CONTEXT]

[CODE] Docstrings + Signature
/**
 * @param m Input matrix.
 * @param k Diagonal position.
 * @return Upper triangular part of matrix.
 */
private static RealMatrix triu(final RealMatrix m, int k)

Generation
{
    .....
    return new Array2DRowRealMatrix(d, false);
}
[/CODE]
```

Figure 4: Our prompt design. The actual prompt ends right after the signature.

Finally, we describe how to utilize the previous results and invoke the LLM to generate code. Figure 4 illustrates our prompt design,

in which there are two fields: `CONTEXT` and `CODE`. To construct a prompt, we fill the `CONTEXT` field with type context and retrieved code sequentially, and place the docstrings and the signature of the method at the beginning of the `CODE` field. The prompt serves as input to a frozen LLM⁷, and we expect the model to complete the `CODE` field by generating the method body (i.e., the **green** part in Figure 4). In addition, to post-process the raw output of the LLM, we employ several procedures⁸, including truncating texts, prepending function signatures, and removing Markdown syntaxes.

4 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

In this section, we first formulate three research questions (RQs). Based on the RQs, we describe the details of the baselines, evaluation metric, benchmarks, and implementation of our approach. We aim to answer the following research questions:

- RQ.1** How effective is our approach at generating function code in a repository, compared with the baselines?
- RQ.2** How do the two components in our approach (i.e., relevant code retrieval and type context extraction) contribute to the overall effectiveness respectively?
- RQ.3** Is our approach generalizable to various large language models? And how do different models perform on the benchmark?

In brief, we evaluate the **effectiveness** of our approach in RQ1, and then conduct an **ablation study** in RQ2. Finally, in RQ3 we study the **generalizability** of our approach and the performance across several LLMs. For implementation and evaluation, we select two statically typed programming languages, Java and Rust, since Java is one of the most widely used programming languages [14], and Rust is a new system-level language that attracts the attention of many developers [13].

4.1 Baselines

As described in Section 3.3, Figure 4 shows the prompt template used in our evaluation. As the `CONTEXT` field is the only variable, we compare our approach with methods that fill different contexts in the prompt. For the repository-level code generation task, there are three types of context: (1) *No context*, (2) *Local context*, and (3) *Cross-file context*. Therefore, we design the following baselines for comparison in RQ1:

- (1) **VANILLA**: In this method, we prompt the LLMs without any repository context. In this case, all natural language descriptions are given, but the `CONTEXT` field in Figure 4 is left empty.
- (2) **IN-FILE**: In this method, we consider code generation as a left-to-right file completion task. We extract code before the function to be generated, and put it in the `CONTEXT` field.
- (3) **REPOCODER**: RepoCoder [54] is an approach that augments the prompt by iteratively retrieving referential code fragments, and it is originally proposed for Python code repositories. We adopt their idea and implement this baseline for Java and Rust based on our retrieval pipeline. Specifically, the initial iteration uses natural language descriptions (i.e.,

⁷We discuss the details of selected models and model access in Section 4.4.

⁸The post-processing procedures may vary with different LLMs and programming languages.

docstrings) as the query for code retrieval, and the second iteration uses previously generated code for retrieval.

4.2 Evaluation Metric

For function code generation task, we argue metrics based on text similarity are not accurate, and it is essential to use metrics based on execution results. Therefore, to evaluate the functional correctness of the generated code, we follow Chen et al. [19] and use the unbiased $\text{pass}@k$ as a metric. This metric is defined as

$$\text{pass}@k = \mathbb{E}_{\text{Tasks}} \left[1 - \frac{\binom{n-c}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} \right],$$

where n is the number of code samples generated per task, c is the number of functional correct code samples, and k is the parameter in “ $\text{pass}@k$ ” ($n \geq k$). Here, a code sample is functionally correct if and only if it passes the tests in the benchmark or dataset. We calculate $\text{pass}@k$ values for each task, and the final $\text{pass}@k$ for a benchmark is the mean value of all $\text{pass}@k$ values.

4.3 Benchmarks

4.3.1 Java Benchmark. There are several publicly available repository-level benchmarks for Java [15, 21, 51, 53]. However, it is challenging to use many of them to evaluate CATCODER because they either lack the raw repository code or are not designed for function code generation tasks. Considering the challenges, the CoderUJB [53] benchmark is a suitable base benchmark that contains 238 code generation tasks, and we successfully adapt it for our evaluation. In the adaptation process, we filter out a few functions that satisfy the following patterns:

- (1) The length of function code exceeds max output limit (i.e., 512 tokens in our settings).
- (2) The function is standalone, which means that it can be moved to a new class⁹ and still compiles. The removal of standalone functions helps better evaluate the performance of repository-level code generation.
- (3) The function does not have any modifiers and annotations. This helps us perform post-processing more easily.

After filtering, we finally obtain 199 coding tasks. As the methods in the benchmark are mined by the CoderUJB authors from the Defects4J [29] dataset, it is convenient to test the correctness of the generated code utilizing the existing unit test methods. Specifically, we “patch” the repository with generated code and run the `defects4j test -t ...` command.

4.3.2 Rust Benchmark. To our knowledge, the only code generation benchmark for the Rust programming language is MultiPLE [18], which translates the original HumanEval [19] and MBPP [16] benchmarks. However, this benchmark is designed for standalone function code generation tasks and thus is unsuitable for our evaluation. In this case, we construct a new benchmark named **RustEval**.

As shown in Table 1, we collect 13 repositories of various categories from *crates.io* [5], the official Rust package registry. In these repositories, we obtain 90 functions with docstrings that satisfy the official guidelines [8] (i.e., have detailed descriptions and at

⁹We assume that all Java standard libraries are imported in advance when applying this rule.

Table 1: The crates used in our Rust benchmark

Crate	# Downloads	Crate	# Downloads
bit-vec	54M	sdl2	1.7M
curv-kzen	161K	splay_tree	72K
dlv-list	14M	sshkeys	189K
gptman	514K	unix_path	86K
mathru	202K	vec_map	81M
multiset	99K	without-alloc	259K
rocket_http	4.2M		

least one documentation test). To test the correctness of the generated code, we utilize the documentation tests in the docstrings by running the `cargo test --doc ...` command.

4.4 Implementation

4.4.1 Approach. We implement CATCODER for Java and Rust, and the source code is written in Python and Rust. Specifically in *Relevant Code Retrieval*, we use MPNet V2 [1] as the embedding model. It is an open-source model fine-tuned from the base MPNet [42] model using massive training data, including the popular CodeSearchNet [27]. In *Type Context Extraction*, we use Eclipse JDT.LS [6] and rust-analyzer [12] as the static analyzers. For Java, our approach interacts with Eclipse JDT.LS through the Language Server Protocol [11]. For Rust, we use rust-analyzer as a third-party library and implement a binding between Rust and Python.

Table 2: Models used for evaluation in RQ3. The model acronyms correspond to the x-axis labels in Figure 6.

	Model ID	Acronym	Open-Source?
	Code Specialized		
[40]	<i>CodeLlama-7b-Instruct</i>	CL-7B	✓
[40]	<i>CodeLlama-13b-Instruct</i>	CL-13B	✓
[40]	<i>CodeLlama-34b-Instruct</i>	CL-34B	✓
[25]	<i>deepseek-coder-6.7b-instruct</i>	DS-6.7B	✓
[3]	<i>codegemma-7b-it</i>	CG-7B	✓
[17]	<i>CodeQwen1.5-7B-Chat</i>	CQ-7B	✓
[35]	<i>starcoder2-15b</i>	SC-15B	✓
	General Purpose		
[10]	<i>Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct</i>	ML-8B	✓
[7]	<i>gpt-3.5-turbo-0125</i>	GPT-3.5	✗

4.4.2 Model Selection. For RQ1 and RQ2, we perform the evaluation using *CodeLlama-13B-Instruct* [40] as the default LLM, due to its state-of-the-art performance among models of medium size. For RQ3, to evaluate the generalizability of CATCODER, we select a variety of state-of-the-art LLMs with different sizes, including code-specialized models and general-purpose models. The details of the models are listed in Table 2, in which the model IDs are taken from the official releases at HuggingFace[9] or the API documentations.

4.4.3 Environment and Model Access. The experiments are performed on a Linux server with 2 Intel® Xeon® Platinum 8358P

CPUs and 8 NVIDIA A800 GPUs. For open-source LLMs, we deploy a local API server based on vLLM [30], a unified inference and serving engine for LLMs. The weights of open-source models are available at HuggingFace [9]. To facilitate future research, we list URLs of the models in our replication package. For closed-source GPT models, we invoke the OpenAI API.

4.4.4 Configurations. In *Relevant Code Retrieval*, we set the maximum chunk size to 2,000 and k (i.e., the number of documents that a retriever should return) to 4 for Java repositories. We set the chunk size to 1,000 and k to 8 for Rust repositories. This is due to the observation that functions and docstrings in our Java repositories are generally longer. In addition, when performing re-ranking, we set the weights of the sparse and dense retrievers to 30% and 70%, respectively.

In evaluations, we set n in $\text{pass}@k$ to 10 and k to 1, 3, and 5. To control the randomness of the generated code [19], we set the temperature to 0.6 and the nucleus sampling [26] parameter (top_p) to 0.7. In addition, we set the maximum number of generated tokens to 512.

5 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, we analyze the experiment results in detail and answer the research questions.

5.1 RQ1: Effectiveness

Table 3: Evaluation results of different methods on two benchmarks, using *CodeLlama-13B-Instruct*

Method	Java			Rust		
	$\text{pass}@k$ (%)			$\text{pass}@k$ (%)		
	$k=1$	$k=3$	$k=5$	$k=1$	$k=3$	$k=5$
VANILLA	14.92	22.07	25.21	10.78	15.81	18.15
IN-FILE	35.28	43.77	47.58	41.56	55.70	61.60
REPOCODER	40.95	46.91	49.04	49.44	59.47	63.04
CATCODER	44.67	53.97	57.55	52.67	62.00	65.89

5.1.1 Results. The overall result is presented in Table 3. According to Table 3, we observe that the VANILLA baseline performs poorly as expected because the lack of repository context is likely to cause hallucinations. Next, we can conclude that the IN-FILE baseline performs worse than REPOCODER and CATCODER, as in-file context is not enough to provide key information such as cross-file type structures and API usage. In addition, CATCODER outperforms REPOCODER. In terms of the Java benchmark, the $\text{pass}@k$ scores increase by up to 17.35%. For the Rust benchmark, the $\text{pass}@k$ scores increase by up to 7.14%.

5.1.2 Qualitative Analysis. To show the advantages of CATCODER over REPOCODER, we also perform a qualitative analysis of the results. Figure 5 presents two cases, in which REPOCODER fails to generate the correct function code while CATCODER succeeds.

❶ **Case 1** (method `addSerializer`): The code generated by REPOCODER compiles but fails to pass unit tests because it uses the wrong field `_keySerializers` instead of the correct one (i.e., `_serializers`).

Upon checking the context provided to the LLM, we find that REPOCODER retrieves a similar method named `addKeySerializers`, which uses the field `_keySerializers` in its body. The LLM simply copies the code from `addKeySerializer` and causes the code to fail in unit tests. For CATCODER, it also retrieves the method `addKeySerializer`, and the pattern of its generated code is the same as the code generated by REPOCODER. However, with the type context extracted by CATCODER, the LLM knows the existence of pairs (field `_serializers`, method `addSerializer`) and (field `_keySerializers`, method `addKeySerializers`). Therefore, we believe that this makes the LLM filter out some misleading reference code and choose the right field for usage.

❷ **Case 2** (method `_findWellKnownSimple`): The code generated by REPOCODER causes many compilation errors, as it contains non-existent fields and methods in the current scope. In detail, we find that the non-existent `CLASS_XXX` fields come from another file and REPOCODER retrieves them as context. Without knowing the type context of `JavaType` and current class (i.e., `TypeFactory`), the LLM accepts misleading references and generates a non-existent API call `stringType()`.

Answer to RQ1: CATCODER is effective at generating repository-level function code, and it outperforms the REPOCODER baseline by up to 17.35% in terms of $\text{pass}@k$ score.

5.2 RQ2: Ablation Study

Table 4: Evaluation results of different variants of our approach on two benchmarks, using *CodeLlama-13B-Instruct*

Variant	Java			Rust		
	$\text{pass}@k$ (%)			$\text{pass}@k$ (%)		
	$k=1$	$k=3$	$k=5$	$k=1$	$k=3$	$k=5$
FULL	44.67	53.97	57.55	52.67	62.00	65.89
-CR	27.54	38.84	43.66	23.33	35.40	41.04
-TC	39.50	49.48	53.38	49.89	59.61	63.80

To investigate the contribution of the components (as described in Section 3) to the effectiveness of CATCODER, we create the following variants:

- (1) FULL: The complete version of CATCODER, exactly as Section 3 illustrates.
- (2) -CR: *Relevant Code Retrieval* is removed.
- (3) -TC: *Type Context Extraction* is removed.

We evaluate the above three variants on the same benchmarks as RQ1, also using *CodeLlama-13B-Instruct* as the underlying LLM. We compare the incomplete ones with FULL, and the results are illustrated in Table 4. We can conclude that CATCODER benefits from the two components, as the $\text{pass}@k$ scores of both incomplete variants drop noticeably. In detail, for the -CR variant, the $\text{pass}@k$ scores decrease by up to 38.35% on the Java benchmark and by up to 56.03% on the Rust benchmark. And for the -TC variant, the $\text{pass}@k$ scores drop by up to 11.57% on the Java benchmark and by up to 5.3% on the Rust benchmark.



Figure 5: Two tasks in the Java benchmark, where REPOCODER fails but CATCODER succeeds.

Answer to RQ2: The two components of CATCODER, namely *Relevant Code Retrieval* and *Type Context Extraction*, improve the effectiveness of CATCODER.

5.3 RQ3: Generalizability

5.3.1 Results on Generalizability. As described in Section 4.4.2, we select a variety of LLMs for the generalizability study, and the details of the models are listed in Table 2. Figure 6 shows the pass@1 scores of CATCODER on the Java benchmark using the selected LLMs. From the plot, we can notice that CATCODER is able to improve the performance of every model, compared with the IN-FILE context. On average, pass@1 scores increase by 32.9%. Therefore, we can conclude that CATCODER can be generalized to different LLMs.

5.3.2 Comparison of different LLMs. We can also learn some facts from pass@1 scores across different LLMs¹⁰:

❶ Although the selected general purpose LLMs claim to be powerful in many aspects [10], they fall behind all code-specialized models except for *CG-7B* in our benchmarks. One example is *ML-8B* versus *CL-7B*. Although *CL-7B* is fine-tuned from an older foundation model, i.e., Llama 2 [43], it outperforms the new model *ML-8B* (Llama 3 [10]). This indicates that code generation tasks benefit a lot from fine-tuning models using high-quality code datasets.

❷ From the trend in Figure 6, although larger models tend to have a better absolute performance than smaller models, the improvement by CATCODER is more on smaller models. For example, the pass@1 scores of *CG-7B*, *ML-8B*, *CQ-7B*, *DS-6.7B* increase more, compared with *SC-15B* and *CL-34B*. This fact provides an insight that we can deploy smaller LLMs on personal devices and use CATCODER to keep up with larger models.

❸ In addition, we can notice that some smaller models even achieve higher performance than larger models. For example, as shown in Figure 6, the performance of two smaller models (i.e., *CQ-7B* and *DS-6.7B*) outperforms *SC-15B* while *SC-15B* has over twice amount of parameters. This highlights the importance of model architecture and training datasets.

Answer to RQ3: CATCODER is generalizable to many different LLMs, as it improves the pass@1 scores of all selected LLMs in our evaluation. In addition, the performance of different LLMs on the benchmark provides valuable insights.

6 DISCUSSION

In this section, we discuss the limitation of our approach CATCODER and the threats to validity.

6.1 When CATCODER fails

Figure 7 shows an example of a failure case generated by CATCODER. The generated code uses all APIs correctly and looks similar to the ground truth code but fails to pass some unit tests because it lacks the logic to handle the null pointers (i.e., the green part in Figure 7). From this case, we can see that function code generation is a complex task, and successful usage of repository context does not always lead to correct code. CATCODER is limited in improving the logical reasoning ability of LLMs, and possible future work could be fine-tuning LLMs with code repositories or using reinforcement learning-based approaches [31].

6.2 Threats to Validity

6.2.1 Support for More Languages. Our implementation of CATCODER is limited as it only supports Java and Rust. However, the proposed approach does not rely on detailed language specifications

¹⁰Here, we use the model acronyms in Table 2 to refer to the models.



Figure 6: Evaluation results of the IN-FILE and CATCODER methods on the Java benchmark, using various large language models. The model acronyms on the x -axis corresponding to the ones in Table 2. The results are sorted in ascending order based on the values of CATCODER, and the “Average” bar shows the average pass@1 score of all evaluated models.

```

public PeriodConverter
addPeriodConverter(PeriodConverter converter) throws
SecurityException {
    checkAlterPeriodConverters();
    ConverterSet set = iPeriodConverters;
    Converter[] removed = new Converter[1];
    set = set.add(converter, removed);
    if (removed[0] != null) {
        return (PeriodConverter) removed[0];
    } else {
        return null;
    }
}

public PeriodConverter
addPeriodConverter(PeriodConverter converter) throws
SecurityException {
    checkAlterPeriodConverters();
    if (converter == null) {
        return null;
    }
    PeriodConverter[] removed = new PeriodConverter[1];
    iPeriodConverters =
iPeriodConverters.add(converter, removed);
    return removed[0];
}

```

Figure 7: A case that CATCODER fails to generate correct code. The first code is generated by CATCODER, and the second one is the ground truth.

and is applicable to any statically typed programming language. In the future, to make CATCODER more practical, we plan to extend it to support more statically typed languages, for example, C++ and C#.

6.2.2 Potential Data Leakage. Our experiments are conducted on the latest state-of-the-art LLMs, and their knowledge cutoff dates are very recent. It is possible that the code repositories in our benchmarks have been included in the training corpora. Thus, the potential data leakage problem could affect the rigor of our results

and findings. For example, in this case, it could make the pass@ k scores of all approaches higher, as the LLM could output memorized code without having to understand the repository context. In the future, possible improvements may include:

- (1) Replacing the benchmarks with the most up-to-date ones [32, 34] and re-evaluating the approach.
- (2) Refactoring the benchmarks by renaming the identifiers in the dataset repositories without changing the semantics [52].

6.2.3 Efficiency Issue. As CATCODER requires the retrieval and analysis of the source code, there is a noticeable latency from input to output, especially when processing large repositories. Thus, CATCODER is less efficient than commercial tools such as Github Copilot. However, compared to methods that require multiple iterations of model generation, CATCODER’s efficiency is still competitive. In the future, we plan to mitigate this issue by making the components concurrent and caching intermediate data (e.g., embedding vectors and results of type analysis).

7 RELATED WORK

7.1 Large Language Models for Code

Large language models for code (i.e. code LLMs) refer to a family of Transformer [46] models pre-trained or fine-tuned on massive code datasets. Previous work has shown the exceptional performance of code LLMs in various code-related tasks, such as code generation [19], test case generation [45] and program repair [50]. In general, pre-trained language models for code can be categorized into the following three types:

- (1) **Encoder-only models**, such as CodeBERT [23] and GraphCodeBERT [24]. These models are pre-trained using Masked Language Modeling (MLM) techniques, and are popular and effective for tasks like classification, where a deep understanding of input data is required.
- (2) **Encoder-Decoder models**, such as the CodeT5 family [47, 48]. These models first encode the input into an internal representation and then decode this representation into an output sequence.

- (3) **Decoder-only models**, such as Codex [19], CodeGen [38], StarCoder [33] and CodeLlama [40]. These models are pre-trained using Next Token Prediction tasks, and are powerful in generative tasks.

In our experiments, we select a variety of state-of-the-art code LLMs, all of which are decoder-only.

7.2 Benchmarks for Repository-Level Code Generation

Iyer et al. [28] are among the first to highlight the importance of the programmatic context and introduce the task of generating class member functions with natural language descriptions and class contexts. In summary, they construct Concode, a large training dataset consisting of Java classes from online code repositories, and propose an encoder-decoder model for code generation. With the development of large language models, many subsequent repository-level code generation benchmarks arise in academia. Du et al. [22] make an attempt to evaluate LLMs in the more challenging class-level code generation scenario and manually construct a benchmark named ClassEval, which consists of 100 class-level Python code generation tasks.

Compared with previous benchmarks, for example HumanEval [19] and MBPP [16], ClassEval is more pragmatic. However, it is still limited because, although the methods in the tasks are not standalone, the programmatic contexts are still restricted to very common libraries and methods within the same file. In real-world scenarios, a code repository generally spans a large number of files, making cross-file contexts essential for LLMs to generate the correct code [21].

Toward more realistic evaluation, subsequent benchmarks such as CoderEval [51], CrossCodeEval [21] and CoderUJB [53] are proposed, all of which are built on a set of real-world open-source repositories and utilize cross-file context for evaluation. A key novelty of CoderEval and CrossCodeEval lies in their ability to support multilingual code generation tasks, while CoderUJB innovatively spans five kinds of practical programming tasks.

As LLMs evolve, Liu et al. [34] point out data leakage and memorization problems, which may affect the integrity and trustworthiness of model evaluation results. To mitigate this issue, they propose RepoBench and regularly update the dataset to keep code samples up-to-date. Similarly, Li et al. [32] propose EvoCodeBench, which includes an automatic pipeline to evolve itself.

7.3 Repository-Level Code Generation with LLMs

Many existing approaches for repository-level code generation perform retrieval. Some work, such as [36, 52], searches for useful information from documentation or external databases. Specifically, Zan et al. [52] train a dual-encoder model, which encodes the natural language descriptions and API information, respectively, to retrieve possible APIs from the documentation of the library. Lu et al. [36] propose a retrieval-augmented generation approach named ReAcc, which retrieves similar code from a code database they built. However, these approaches are not flexible and general as their retrieval sources (e.g., API documentation and external databases) may not be available in other repositories.

Other retrieval-based approaches explore retrieving similar code snippets within the repositories. Shrivastava et al. [41] propose a framework named Repo-Level Prompt Generator to complete the code for holes in single lines. In the framework, they train a prompt proposal classifier that takes the repository files and a set of prompt proposals and outputs the predicted prompt proposal. Zhang et al. [54] propose RepoCoder, which utilizes repository information by iteratively retrieving similar code. In the initial iteration, it uses the natural language descriptions as query input, and in subsequent iterations, it uses previously generated code for query.

Our work CATCODER combines retrieval-based techniques with a new kind of information called type context, and the comparison with RepoCoder in Section 5 shows that type context serves as essential auxiliary information for statically typed languages. In addition, CATCODER does not require model training or multiple generation iterations, making it more practical in real-world settings.

In addition to the above work, which mainly performs prompt engineering, several model training frameworks [25, 49] and decoding strategies [15] have been proposed to support repository-level code generation. As our approach CATCODER does not modify the underlying LLM, it can be combined with these frameworks to improve effectiveness.

8 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we aim to address the lack of type dependency information for statically typed programming languages in repository-level code generation. We propose CATCODER, a code generation framework for statically typed programming languages, which improves the performance of LLMs by retrieving relevant code and extracting type context using static analyzers. CATCODER is systematically evaluated on Java and Rust benchmarks that are built from real-world open-source repositories. The results show that CATCODER outperforms the REPOCODER baseline by up to 17.35%. In addition, we evaluate CATCODER with various LLMs. CATCODER improves the performance of all selected LLMs and therefore is generalizable. In future work, possible research attempts include investigating the data leakage problem of the benchmarks and improving the efficiency of CATCODER. These investigations may help further improve the applicability of our proposed approach in practical scenarios.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2024. all-mpnet-base-v2. Available at: <https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-mpnet-base-v2>. Last accessed May 2024.
- [2] 2024. clangd. Available at: <https://clangd.lvm.org>. Last accessed May 2024.
- [3] 2024. CodeGemma: Open Code Models Based on Gemma. Available at: <https://goo.gle/codegemma>. Last accessed May 2024.
- [4] 2024. Commons Math: The Apache Commons Mathematics Library. Available at: <https://commons.apache.org/proper/commons-math/>. Last accessed May 2024.
- [5] 2024. crates.io: Rust Package Registry. Available at: <https://crates.io/>. Last accessed May 2024.
- [6] 2024. Eclipse JDT LS. Available at: <https://projects.eclipse.org/projects/eclipse.jdt.ls>. Last accessed May 2024.
- [7] 2024. GPT-3.5 Turbo - OpenAI API. Available at: <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-3-5-turbo>. Last accessed May 2024.
- [8] 2024. How to write documentation - The rustdoc book. Available at: <https://doc.rust-lang.org/rustdoc/how-to-write-documentation.html>. Last accessed May 2024.
- [9] 2024. Hugging Face. Available at: <https://huggingface.co/>. Last accessed May 2024.

- [10] 2024. Introducing Meta Llama 3: The most capable openly available LLM to date. Available at: <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3>. Last accessed May 2024.
- [11] 2024. Language Server Protocol Specification - 3.17. Available at: <https://microsoft.github.io/language-server-protocol/specifications/lsp/3.17/specification/>. Last accessed May 2024.
- [12] 2024. rust-analyzer. Available at: <https://rust-analyzer.github.io/>. Last accessed May 2024.
- [13] 2024. Rust Programming Language. Available at: <https://www.rust-lang.org>. Last accessed May 2024.
- [14] 2024. TIOBE Index. Available at: <https://www.tiobe.com/tiobe-index/>. Last accessed May 2024.
- [15] Lakshya A Agrawal, Aditya Kanade, Navin Goyal, Shuvendu Lahiri, and Sriram Rajamani. 2024. Monitor-Guided Decoding of Code LMs with Static Analysis of Repository Context. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [16] 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).
- [17] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. 2023. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609* (2023).
- [18] Federico Cassano, John Gouwar, Daniel Nguyen, Sydney Nguyen, Luna Phipps-Costin, Donald Pinckney, Ming-Ho Yee, Yangtian Zi, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Molly Q Feldman, et al. 2023. MultiPL-E: a scalable and polyglot approach to benchmarking neural code generation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (2023).
- [19] 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).
- [20] Gordon V Cormack, Charles LA Clarke, and Stefan Buettcher. 2009. Reciprocal rank fusion outperforms condorcet and individual rank learning methods. In *Proceedings of the 32nd international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. 758–759.
- [21] Yangruibo Ding, Zijian Wang, Wasi Ahmad, Hantian Ding, Ming Tan, Nihal Jain, Murali Krishna Ramanathan, Ramesh Nallapati, Parminder Bhatia, Dan Roth, et al. 2024. Crosscodeeval: A diverse and multilingual benchmark for cross-file code completion. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [22] 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).
- [23] Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Xiao Cheng Feng, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Bing Qin, Ting Liu, Daxin Jiang, et al. 2020. Codebert: A pre-trained model for programming and natural languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08155* (2020).
- [24] Daya Guo, Shuo Ren, Shuai Lu, Zhangyin Feng, Duyu Tang, Shujie Liu, Long Zhou, Nan Duan, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Shengyu Fu, et al. 2020. Graphcodebert: Pre-training code representations with data flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.08366* (2020).
- [25] Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Y Wu, YK Li, et al. 2024. DeepSeek-Coder: When the Large Language Model Meets Programming—The Rise of Code Intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196* (2024).
- [26] Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Li Du, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. 2019. The curious case of neural text degeneration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09751* (2019).
- [27] Hamel Husain, Ho-Hsiang Wu, Tiferet Gazit, Miltiadis Allamanis, and Marc Brockschmidt. 2019. Codesearchnet challenge: Evaluating the state of semantic code search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.09436* (2019).
- [28] Srinivasan Iyer, Ioannis Konstas, Alvin Cheung, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. Mapping language to code in programmatic context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.09588* (2018).
- [29] René Just, Darioush Jalali, and Michael D Ernst. 2014. Defects4J: A database of existing faults to enable controlled testing studies for Java programs. In *Proceedings of the 2014 international symposium on software testing and analysis*. 437–440.
- [30] Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. 611–626.
- [31] Hung Le, Yue Wang, Akhilesh Deepak Gotmare, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Chu Hong Hoi. 2022. Coderl: Mastering code generation through pretrained models and deep reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 21314–21328.
- [32] Jia Li, Ge Li, Xuanming Zhang, Yihong Dong, and Zhi Jin. 2024. EvoCodeBench: An Evolving Code Generation Benchmark Aligned with Real-World Code Repositories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00599* (2024).
- [33] Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Jia Li, Jenny Chim, et al. 2023. StarCoder: may the source be with you! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06161* (2023).
- [34] Tianyang Liu, Canwen Xu, and Julian McAuley. 2023. Repobench: Benchmarking repository-level code auto-completion systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03091* (2023).
- [35] Anton Lozhkov, Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Federico Cassano, Joel Lamy-Poirier, Nouamane Tazi, Ao Tang, Dmytro Pykhtar, Jiawei Liu, Yuxiang Wei, et al. 2024. StarCoder 2 and The Stack v2: The Next Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19173* (2024).
- [36] Shuai Lu, Nan Duan, Hojate Han, Daya Guo, Seung-won Hwang, and Alexey Svyatkovskiy. 2022. Reacc: A retrieval-augmented code completion framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.07722* (2022).
- [37] Yi Luan, Jacob Eisenstein, Kristina Toutanova, and Michael Collins. 2021. Sparse, dense, and attentional representations for text retrieval. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 9 (2021), 329–345.
- [38] 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).
- [39] Stephen E Robertson, Steve Walker, Susan Jones, Micheline M Hancock-Beaulieu, Mike Gatford, et al. 1995. Okapi at TREC-3. *Nist Special Publication Sp 109* (1995), 109.
- [40] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950* (2023).
- [41] Disha Shrivastava, Hugo Laroche, and Daniel Tarlow. 2023. Repository-level prompt generation for large language models of code. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 31693–31715.
- [42] Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Jianfeng Lu, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2020. Mpnnet: Masked and permuted pre-training for language understanding. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 16857–16867.
- [43] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruiti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288* (2023).
- [44] Andrew Trotman, Xiangfei Jia, and Matt Crane. 2012. Towards an Efficient and Effective Search Engine. In *OSIR@ SIGIR*. 40–47.
- [45] Michele Tufano, Dawn Drain, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Shao Kun Deng, and Neel Sundaresan. 2020. Unit test case generation with transformers and focal context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.05617* (2020).
- [46] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [47] Yue Wang, Hung Le, Akhilesh Deepak Gotmare, Nghi DQ Bui, Junnan Li, and Steven CH Hoi. 2023. Codet5+: Open code large language models for code understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07922* (2023).
- [48] Yue Wang, Weishi Wang, Shafiq Joty, and Steven CH Hoi. 2021. Codet5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00859* (2021).
- [49] Di Wu, Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Dejiao Zhang, Murali Krishna Ramanathan, and Xiaofei Ma. 2024. Repoformer: Selective Retrieval for Repository-Level Code Completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10059* (2024).
- [50] Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuxiang Wei, and Lingming Zhang. 2023. Automated program repair in the era of large pre-trained language models. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 1482–1494.
- [51] Hao Yu, Bo Shen, Dezhi Ran, Jiaxin Zhang, Qi Zhang, Yuchi Ma, Guangtai Liang, Ying Li, Qianxiang Wang, and Tao Xie. 2024. Codereval: A benchmark of pragmatic code generation with generative pre-trained models. In *Proceedings of the 46th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1–12.
- [52] Daoguang Zan, Bei Chen, Zeqi Lin, Bei Guan, Yongji Wang, and Jian-Guang Lou. 2022. When language model meets private library. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.17236* (2022).
- [53] Zhengran Zeng, Yidong Wang, Rui Xie, Wei Ye, and Shikun Zhang. 2024. CoderUJB: An Executable and Unified Java Benchmark for Practical Programming Scenarios. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19287* (2024).
- [54] Fengji Zhang, Bei Chen, Yue Zhang, Jacky Keung, Jin Liu, Daoguang Zan, Yi Mao, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. 2023. RepoCoder: Repository-Level Code Completion Through Iterative Retrieval and Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 2471–2484.