
CodeV: Empowering LLMs for Verilog Generation through Multi-Level Summarization

Yang Zhao^{1,2} Di Huang¹ Chongxiao Li^{1,2} Pengwei Jin^{1,2} Ziyuan Nan^{1,2}
 Tianyun Ma^{1,3} Lei Qi^{1,3} Yansong Pan^{1,2} Zhenxing Zhang^{1,3} Rui Zhang¹
 Xishan Zhang^{1,4} Zidong Du¹ Qi Guo¹ Xing Hu^{1,✉} Yunji Chen^{1,2,✉}

¹SKL of Processors, Institute of Computing Technology, CAS

²University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

³University of Science and Technology of China

⁴Cambricon Technologies

Abstract

The increasing complexity and high costs associated with modern processor design have led to a surge in demand for processor design automation. Instruction-tuned large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable performance in automatically generating code for general-purpose programming languages like Python. However, these methods fail on hardware description languages (HDLs) like Verilog due to the scarcity of high-quality instruction tuning data, as even advanced LLMs like GPT-3.5 exhibit limited performance on Verilog generation. Regarding this issue, we observe that (1) Verilog code collected from the real world has higher quality than those generated by LLMs. (2) LLMs like GPT-3.5 excel in summarizing Verilog code rather than generating it. Based on these observations, this paper introduces CodeV, a series of open-source instruction-tuned Verilog generation LLMs. Instead of generating descriptions first and then getting the corresponding code from advanced LLMs, we prompt the LLM with Verilog code and let the LLM generate the corresponding natural language description by multi-level summarization. Experimental results show that CodeV relatively surpasses the previous open-source SOTA by 14.4% (BetterV in VerilogEval) and 11.3% (RTLcoder in RTLLM) respectively, and also relatively outperforms previous commercial SOTA GPT-4 by 22.1% in VerilogEval.

1 Introduction

The design flow of processors is expensive and complex, especially the coding of the hardware description language (HDL) like Verilog. Researchers have therefore explored ways to automate this process. Traditional methods include agile hardware development like Chisel [3], and high-level synthesis (HLS), which compiles high-level programming languages such as C/C++ to Verilog [8, 20]. Recently, the rise of large language models (LLMs) has achieved excellent performance in text-to-code tasks for general-purpose programming languages (*e.g.*, Python) [29, 31, 33, 34, 51, 53, 56] and shows a new perspective on automatic Verilog generation from text or natural language descriptions.

A promising approach for adapting LLMs to Verilog generation is instruction tuning, which has been widely adopted in code generation [10, 29, 31, 41, 51, 53, 56]. Instruction tuning constructs high-quality datasets consisting of instruction-response (*i.e.* description-code) pairs and then fine-tunes LLMs on them. These datasets are constructed either from human-crafted resources or

✉ Corresponding author. Contact: {zhaoyang24s, huxing, cyj}@ict.ac.cn.




Figure 1: **The CodeV framework overview.** We first collect and filter high-quality Verilog modules from open-source codebases. The modules are then sent to GPT-3.5 to request multi-level summaries. Pairing high-level descriptions with corresponding modules, the high-quality dataset is utilized to fine-tune base LLMs, yielding CodeV models.

synthetic data [54], where human-crafted resources include public data collection [31, 41] and human annotating [34], and synthetic data means to obtain code responses by prompting advanced LLMs (e.g., GPT-3.5/4) with self-generated descriptions [10, 29, 41, 51, 53, 56]. In Verilog generation, for example, RTLCoder [26] synthesizes description-code pairs by prompting GPT-3.5 to generate and mutate descriptions and get the corresponding code from GPT-3.5. BetterV [35] uses pre-defined descriptions for collected and self-generated open-source Verilog code snippets.

However, there are still two challenges hindering the application of instruction tuning to Verilog generation tasks.

(1) The scarcity of human-crafted description-code pairs in Verilog.

The number of programming competitions and large open-source projects in Verilog is far less than that in general-purpose programming languages like Python [21]. Additionally, the cost of human annotation for Verilog is much higher than for languages like Python, as it requires annotators to be familiar with hardware circuits, making the construction of comprehensive datasets via annotation unfeasible. **(2) The difficulty in obtaining high-quality Verilog responses from advanced LLMs.**

Although advanced LLMs excel on general-purpose code generation tasks, they perform poorly in Verilog generation tasks. For example, GPT-4 achieves 88.4% pass@1 in the Python benchmark HumanEval [11, 22], but only achieves 43.5% pass@1 in the VerilogEval-human benchmark [24].

Regarding these issues, we have observed the following: **(1) Verilog code collected from the real world is of higher quality than that generated by LLMs.** Verilog code collected from the real world has fewer syntax errors, clearer semantics, and better conforms to the code distribution in practical applications compared to Verilog code generated by LLMs. Figure 2a-c illustrates an example observed from the GPT-generated Verilog dataset provided by Liu et al. [26]. Figure 2a shows a description obtained by combining two circuit descriptions. We draw a block diagram based on this description, and as shown in Figure 2b, this description leads to a loop in a combinational circuit, which is illegal. Figure 2c depicts the circuit generated by GPT-3.5 based on this incorrect description, which fails to integrate the shifter and multiplexer, and the internal implementation of the shifter module is also incorrect. **(2) LLMs excel in summarizing code rather than generating it.** Although GPT-3.5’s poor performance in generating Verilog (only 26.7% pass@1 in VerilogEval-human benchmarks), it indeed offers the ability to describe the functionality of given Verilog code.




Figure 2: GPT-generated Verilog dataset contains unrealistic code. (a) A synthetic description obtained from [26], which is unrealistic. (b) The circuit’s block diagram according to the description, contains illegal loops in the circuit. (c) The corresponding incorrect Verilog code in the dataset.

Based on these observations, we introduce CodeV, a series of instruction-tuned Verilog generation LLMs that employ reverse instruction generation for dataset construction. Instead of generating descriptions first and then getting the corresponding code from an advanced LLM, we prompt the LLM with Verilog code and let the LLM generate the corresponding natural language descriptions. Figure 1 illustrates the CodeV’s framework overview. First, we crawl over 1500K Verilog codes from GitHub, filter them, and obtain a deduplicated, self-contained, and syntax-correct set containing 165K high-quality Verilog modules. Subsequently, we use a multi-level code summarization method to bridge the semantic gap between high-level requirement descriptions and low-level Verilog code. Specifically, we let GPT-3.5 to first generate fine-grained functional descriptions based on given Verilog modules, and then summarize high-level requirements, resulting in a dataset of high-quality description-code pairs. Finally, we fine-tune base LLMs including CodeLlama, DeepSeekCoder, and CodeQwen on this dataset to get CodeV.

Experimental results show that CodeV series achieve state-of-the-art (SOTA) results on the VerilogEval [24] and RTLLM [28] benchmarks, relatively averagely surpassing the ever-reported SOTA open-source instruction-tuned LLMs by 14.4% (BetterV [35] in VerilogEval) and 11.3% (RTL-Coder [26] in RTLLM) respectively, and also relatively surpassing the previous SOTA commercial LLM GPT-4 by 22.1% in VerilogEval. The major contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We propose an effective description-code dataset construction approach by providing GPT-3.5 with Verilog code to summarize corresponding descriptions in a multi-level manner. We show that this method outperforms prior data construction work on Verilog generation tasks.
- Based on this method, we present a series of SOTA Verilog generation LLMs, namely CodeV. Among them, CodeV-CodeQwen achieves 77.6% pass@1 on the VerilogEval-machine benchmark and 53.2% on the VerilogEval-human benchmark, outperforming GPT-4 and previous SOTA model BetterV, and also achieves a 93.1% syntax pass rate and 55.2% function pass rate on the RTLLM benchmark, outperforming previous SOTA model RTLCoder.
- We plan to open-source a series of CodeV models and an instruction tuning dataset containing 165K high-quality description-code pairs, to support the advancement and collaboration within the LLM, electronic design automation (EDA), and programming language communities.

2 Related Work

2.1 LLM-based Verilog Generation

Models for verilog generation. Thakur et al. [43] collected approximately 400MB of Verilog files from GitHub and textbooks to fine-tune CodeGen-16B [32]. However, the dataset was not refined, resulting in a blend of text and code, with some Verilog code potentially containing syntax errors. ChipNemo [23] used LLaMA2 [46] as its base model, performing domain-adaptive pre-training on public datasets and NVIDIA’s internal chip design files (including HDL code, EDA scripts, and configuration files, etc.), and fine-tuning on public instruction datasets and an expert-crafted domain dataset with 1430 examples. However, likely due to the dataset not being refined for Verilog generation tasks, the 70B version model of ChipNemo even underperforms its base model on the VerilogEval-Human benchmark. RTLCoder [25] uses GPT to synthesize instruction-code pairs, starting by generating instructions based on a keywords pool and a source code pool, then mutating these instructions to increase their number and diversity, and finally having GPT generate Verilog code based on these synthesized instructions to form a fine-tuning dataset. This approach may lead to unrealistic instructions, and the code quality is limited by GPT’s generation ability. BetterV [35] collects Verilog code from GitHub and expands its dataset by translating Verilog code into C to create C-Verilog pairs, leveraging the base model’s knowledge in C to enhance Verilog generation capabilities. However, they did not validate the effectiveness of this approach by experiments. In contrast to these methods, CodeV employs a novel dataset construction approach, utilizing multi-level summarization to generate high-quality instruction tuning datasets from high-quality Verilog code, achieving SOTA results.

Frameworks on verilog generation. Instead of training specific models, some work focuses on designing generation frameworks for Verilog tasks to improve general-purpose LLMs’ performance.

Chip-Chat [5] and ChipGPT [9] use multi-round EDA and human feedback to assist LLMs for Verilog generation but require excessive human intervention, hindering automation. Lu et al. [28] introduced a self-planning method to improve generation accuracy, where LLMs plan before generating Verilog. However, the improvement is limited due to the deficiency of general-purpose LLMs in Verilog Generation.

2.2 Instruction Tuning

Instruction tuning has emerged as a powerful strategy to enhance the capabilities of LLMs by fine-tuning them with a mixture of instructions and corresponding responses. Initially explored through models like T5 [36], which was trained on a diverse array of public NLP tasks, this approach has seen significant advancements over time. Notable developments include FLAN [50], ExT5 [1], T0 [38], and UnifiedQA [19], which expanded the range of tasks to improve cross-task generalization abilities of LLMs.

Using human annotators, OpenAI has developed models such as InstructGPT [34] and ChatGPT by training on a large corpus of human-generated instructions, aligning the model outputs more closely with real-world user intentions. This dataset, however, remains proprietary and not publicly accessible. Meanwhile, Vicuna [12] has explored using user-shared conversations from platforms like ShareGPT.com for training, illustrating a community-driven approach to data collection.

Without human annotators, SELF-INSTRUCT [47] utilize foundation LLMs like GPT-3 [7] to generate synthetic instruction-response pairs. This methodology allowed the same LLM to be instruction-tuned on its self-generated data, thereby distilling knowledge from advanced LLMs without external inputs. Following this, models like Alpaca [42] and Code Alpaca [10] applied SELF-INSTRUCT to fine-tune Llama [44] using ChatGPT-generated instructions. Furthermore, WizardLM [52] introduced Evol-Instruct to utilize heuristic prompts to guide ChatGPT, creating more complex and diverse datasets.

For code generation, WizardCoder [29] introduced Code Evol-Instruct to adapt Evol-Instruct to coding problems. Codellama-Instruct [37] are finetuned from Codellama using SELF-INSTRUCT by prompting Llama 2 [45] for coding problems and then ask Codellama for unit tests filtering and code solutions. OctoPack [31] collects open-source commit information as a data source for instruction tuning. Taking into account the scenario of modifying code through multiple rounds of interaction, OpenCodeInterpreter [56] constructs a multi-turn instruction tuning dataset by using GPT-3.5/GPT-4 to simulate human feedback and incorporating execution feedback. Magicoder [51] integrates real-world code snippets into the instruction generation process to enhance the controllability, quality, and creativity in synthetic coding tasks.

However, due to the high cost of annotation and the generally poor performance of advanced LLMs like GPT-4, these methods fail on the task of Verilog generation. Our work aims to fill this gap using a reverse instruction method.

2.3 Code Generation Models for General-purposed Language

LLMs trained on extensive codebases have proven to be highly effective in code generation. Among them, closed-source models including Codex by OpenAI [11], PaLM-Coder by Google [13], and Code-Davinci by Microsoft [30] have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in popular code generation benchmarks like HumanEval [11] and MBPP [2]. On the other hand, there are also several notable open-source works like InCoder [15], CodeGen series [32], CodeT5 series [48, 49], CodeGeeX [55], StarCoder series [21, 27], CodeLlama-Series [37], PanGu-Coder series [14, 40], AIXCoder [17], Deepseek-Coder [16], CodeQwen [4]. Although these models perform well with general-purpose programming languages, they perform poorly with HDL like Verilog due to a lack of training data. To address this issue, our work proposes an instruction tuning method for fine-tuning these models on Verilog generation and introduces CodeV, a series of SOTA Verilog generation models.




Figure 3: An actual example of the prompt for multi-level summarization. (a) The prompt provided to GPT-3.5. (b) An example of the demonstrations, with code, low-level descriptions, and high-level summaries. (c) Summaries responded from GPT-3.5 with and (d) without multi-level summarization.

3 Methods

3.1 High-quality Verilog Code Collection

High-quality real-world Verilog code is the foundation of our approach. We first crawl Verilog and SystemVerilog files from GitHub, ensuring each file contains a complete module, i.e. contains at least one "module" and "endmodule" pair. Files with external references, i.e. code containing "include" or "import" keywords, are excluded. This is because reconstructing these reference relationships from the crawled files is challenging, and we do not want LLM to generate these non-self-contained Verilog codes after training. Then we deal with the comments interspersed throughout the files. These comments can be categorized into two types: those related to Verilog implementation, such as functional descriptions, test cases, etc.; and those unrelated to implementation, such as licenses, company and author information, logs, etc. The former is essential for LLMs to understand the code and should be kept, while the latter should be avoided. Therefore, we use regular expressions to delete these implementation-unrelated comments. Next, files exceeding 2096 characters are deleted, as longer files would be truncated during training, resulting in incomplete file content and degrading the dataset quality. Following Thakur et al. [43], we also use MinHash and Jaccard similarity to filter out duplicate code. Finally, we run syntax checks on all Verilog code and remove any that fail the check, to further enhance the quality of the dataset.

Through the above-mentioned effort, we obtain high-quality real-world Verilog code. Next, we will construct requirement descriptions for them.

3.2 Multi-level Code Summarization

Manual annotation is prohibitively time-consuming and costly. Hence, we employed GPT-3.5 to generate high-level summaries for each Verilog module as its requirement description. As analyzed in VerilogEval [24], when required for summarising, LLMs often produce verbose descriptions, preferring line-by-line explanations over high-level summaries. To address this issue, we introduce a multi-level summarization method, employing few-shot learning [6] to guide GPT-3.5 in first producing detailed descriptions and then abstracting high-level summaries. Figure 3 presents an example from our actual process, in-




Figure 4: The similarity distribution of our dataset against benchmark data. Data with Rouge-L scores greater than 0.5 are removed for decontamination.

volving the generation of requirement descriptions for a demultiplexer module collected from GitHub. Figure 3a illustrates our prompt, which includes n examples with code snippets, detailed descriptions, and problem summaries, followed by the demultiplexer code, and a request for GPT to imitate the examples by first providing a detailed description and then a problem summary. Figure 3b illustrates an example used for GPT’s few-shot learning. Figure 3c shows GPT’s response using multi-level summarization, while Figure 3d shows the response without multi-level summarization by deleting the detailed description in the demonstrations. We observe that the description in Figure 3c is more concise and aligns with actual Verilog development requirements. In contrast, the description in Figure 3d is verbose and even inaccurately counts the number of zeros in output signals, leading to a contradictory explanation.

3.3 Data Decontamination

To ensure a fair evaluation, we conduct decontamination for the training data to remove sequences similar to benchmarks. Specifically, we use Rouge-L, a widely used similarity metric, to measure the similarity between data. Rouge-L $\in [0, 1]$, with higher values indicating greater similarity. Following RTLCoder [26], we remove data from the training set that have a Rouge-L score greater than 0.5 with any of the benchmarks, thereby preventing test data leakage. The Rouge-L plot is shown in Figure ??.

3.4 Supervised Finetuning

Finally, we finetune base models on our dataset. Given a natural language description, the LLM with parameter θ generates code repeatedly drawing from $p_\theta(x_t|x_{<t})$ and using x_t as part of the input for the subsequent prediction. Following prior work, the LLM is designed to reduce the negative log-likelihood across the dataset $D = \{x^1, \dots, x^{|D|}\}$ [18]:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{|D|} \sum_{i=1}^{|D|} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \log p_\theta(x_t^i|x_{<t}^i). \tag{1}$$

4 Experiments

We conduct comprehensive experiments demonstrating that CodeV achieves SOTA results across diverse Verilog generation tasks, and we further analyze CodeV’s performance as detailed below.

4.1 Experimental Setup

4.1.1 Instruction-tuning

We used CodeLlama-7b-Instruct [37], Deepseek-Coder-6.7b-Instruct [16], and CodeQwen1.5-7B-Chat [4] as our base models. We fine-tuned these models for 3 epochs using PyTorch’s Distributed Data Parallel (DDP) on 4 NVIDIA A100-80GB SMX GPUs. We employed the Adafactor optimizer [39] with a linear learning rate scheduler, setting the initial learning rate at $5e - 5$ with 15 warm-up steps. We set global batch size 256, with max sequence length 2048.

4.1.2 Benchmarks and Metrics

We conduct comprehensive evaluations on the VerilogEval [24] and RTLLM [28] benchmarks.

VerilogEval includes two parts: VerilogEval-machine and VerilogEval-human, with 143 GPT-generated and 156 hand-crafted Verilog generation problems, respectively. We follow the VerilogEval paper, using the pass@k metric to measure the Verilog generation accuracy. The pass@k metric estimates the proportion of problems that can be solved at least once in k attempts:

$$\text{pass@}k := \mathbb{E}_{\text{problems}} \left[\frac{1 - \binom{n-c}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} \right] \tag{2}$$

where $n \geq k$ represents the total number of trials for each problem, and c represents the number of trials that pass the functional check. We set $n = 20$ according to the original settings.

Table 1: Comparison of our CodeV models against various baseline models. Some data are missing due to the models being close-sourced and the data not being reported previously. The **best** results are highlighted in bold. In VerilogEval, CodeV outperforms all previous methods across all metrics, relatively surpassing previous open-source SOTA BetterV by 14.4% and GPT-4 by 22.1% on average. In RTLLM, CodeV relatively surpasses previous open-source SOTA RTLCoder by 11.3%.

| Type | Model | Open source | VerilogEval | | | | | | RTLLM v1.1 | |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| | | | Machine (%) | | | Human (%) | | | Syntax (%) | Func. (%) |
| | | | pass@1 | pass@5 | pass@10 | pass@1 | pass@5 | pass@10 | | |
| Foundation models | GPT-3.5 | ○ | 46.7 | 69.1 | 74.1 | 26.7 | 45.8 | 51.7 | 89.7 | 37.9 |
| | GPT4 | ○ | 60.0 | 70.6 | 73.5 | 43.5 | 55.8 | 58.9 | 100.0 | 65.5 |
| | StarCoder | ● | 46.8 | 54.5 | 59.6 | 18.1 | 26.1 | 30.4 | 93.1 | 27.6 |
| | CodeLlama | ● | 43.1 | 47.1 | 47.7 | 18.2 | 22.7 | 24.3 | 86.2 | 31.0 |
| | DeepSeek-Coder | ● | 52.2 | 55.4 | 56.8 | 30.2 | 33.9 | 34.9 | 93.1 | 44.8 |
| | CodeQwen | ● | 46.5 | 54.9 | 56.4 | 22.5 | 26.1 | 28.0 | 86.2 | 41.4 |
| IT baselines | ChipNeMo | ○ | 43.4 | - | - | 22.4 | - | - | - | - |
| | Thakur et al. | ● | 44.0 | 52.6 | 59.2 | 30.3 | 43.9 | 49.6 | 86.2 | 24.1 |
| | RTLCoder-Mistral | ● | 62.5 | 72.2 | 76.6 | 36.7 | 45.5 | 49.2 | 96.6 | 48.3 |
| | RTLCoder-DeepSeek | ● | 61.2 | 76.5 | 81.8 | 41.6 | 50.1 | 53.4 | 93.1 | 48.3 |
| | BetterV-CodeLlama | ○ | 64.2 | 75.4 | 79.1 | 40.9 | 50.0 | 53.3 | - | - |
| | BetterV-DeepSeek | ○ | 67.8 | 79.1 | 84.0 | 45.9 | 53.3 | 57.6 | - | - |
| | BetterV-CodeQwen | ○ | 68.1 | 79.4 | 84.5 | 46.1 | 53.7 | 58.2 | - | - |
| CodeV | CodeV-CodeLlama | ● | 78.1 | 86.0 | 88.5 | 45.2 | 59.5 | 63.8 | 93.1 | 62.1 |
| | CodeV-DeepSeek | ● | 77.9 | 88.6 | 90.7 | 52.7 | 62.5 | 67.3 | 89.7 | 55.2 |
| | CodeV-CodeQwen | ● | 77.6 | 88.2 | 90.7 | 53.2 | 65.1 | 68.5 | 93.1 | 55.2 |

RTLLM contains 29 Verilog generation problems. Following prior work [26], we test models on RTLLMv1.1 which is error-fixed. Also, following the original settings, we generate Verilog code for each problem 5 times and report the success rate (proportion of problems that at least one trial passes the syntax check and function check, respectively). We acknowledge that employing the pass@k metric with a greater number of trials (n in Eq. 2) yields less random results; therefore, we extend our evaluation on the RTLLM benchmark in Section 4.4.1, setting $n = 20$ for each generation task which is similar to VerilogEval.

Following RTLCoder [26], for all tests, we set the generation temperature of each model to 0.2, 0.5, 0.8, and report the best performance across different temperature settings, but we also present results on three temperatures separately in Section B.0.1.

4.1.3 Baseline Methods

In our experiment, we compare our results with baseline methods, including: (1) foundation models not tailored for Verilog generation tasks, including closed-source commercial LLMs such as GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, and four open-source models specialized in code generation tasks: StarCoder [21], CodeLlama-7b-Instruct [37], DeepSeek-Coder-6.7b-Instruct [16], and CodeQwen1.5-7B-Chat [4]; (2) models fine-tuned for Verilog generation tasks, including Thakur et al. [43], RTLCoder [25] and BetterV [35].

4.2 Main Results

Table 1 compares the main results of our CodeV with baseline methods on the VerilogEval and RTLLM benchmarks. We test CodeLlama, DeepSeek-Coder, and CodeQwen on RTLLM, while other baseline results are sourced from RTLCoder [26] or BetterV [35] paper. For a fair comparison, we also evaluate our models trained on comparable-size datasets against RTLCoder. The results show that:

CodeV achieves SOTA on both benchmarks. In the VerilogEval benchmark, CodeV outperforms all previous baseline methods across all metrics, particularly in the most challenging pass@1 metric where CodeV-CodeLlama achieves 78.1% in VerilogEval-machine, and CodeV-CodeQwen achieves 53.1% in VerilogEval-human, significantly outperforming both GPT-4 and BetterV-CodeQwen. In the RTLLM v1.1 benchmark, CodeV-CodeLlama nearly matches GPT-4’s functional check success rate, failing in just 1 more case out of 29 circuits compared to GPT-4, and significantly outperforms all other models. These results demonstrate that, contributed by a high-quality instruction tuning dataset, CodeV exhibits significant superiority in Verilog generation tasks.

Table 2: Comparison under same training set size. Trained with a randomly chosen 27K dataset, CodeV outperforms RTLCoder in 5 out of 8 metrics and fully surpasses its directly-trained version.

| Model | VerilogEval | | | | | | RTLLM v1.1 | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Machine (%) | | | Human (%) | | | Syntax (%) | Func. (%) |
| | pass@1 | pass@5 | pass@10 | pass@1 | pass@5 | pass@10 | | |
| RTLCoder-DeepSeek | 61.2 | 76.5 | 81.8 | 41.6 | 50.1 | 53.4 | 93.1 | 48.3 |
| RTLCoder-DeepSeek-Direct | 59.8 | 73.6 | 77.2 | 39.1 | 48.3 | 51.3 | 86.2 | 44.8 |
| CodeV-DeepSeek-27K | 72.3 | 82.2 | 85.6 | 39.1 | 53.4 | 58.3 | 89.6 | 44.8 |

The differences among the base models decrease after fine-tuning. This is reasonable because the base models are trained on different training data but use the same instruction tuning data, which reduces their differences. Additionally, we find that after fine-tuning, CodeQwen surpasses DeepSeek-Coder, and CodeLlama also outperformed the other two models on VerilogEval-Machine pass@1 after fine-tuning. This indicates that the performance of a base model in specific domains does not necessarily align with its performance after instruction tuning.

There is still a large gap between Human and Machine on VerilogEval. This stays the same as prior work. There are two reasons for this: First, the descriptions for Machine are generated by GPT, so they are closer to the distribution of LLMs compared with Human. Second, some of the Human descriptions contain tabular data like truth tables, which are difficult to obtain from the open-source codebase or generate from GPT, leading to a more significant distribution difference in the descriptions.

Our method yields better data. As shown in Table 2, under the same data size (*i.e.* 27K), the results obtained from our approach surpass those of RTLCoder, especially for its directly trained version. It is worth noting that in addition to data distillation, RTLCoder also proposes a training method based on syntax checking, which is orthogonal with our method. We cannot compare with BetterV because its data size has not been disclosed. More analytical results on data size are shown in Section 4.4.2.

4.3 Ablation Study

In this section, we measured the effectiveness of multi-level summarization. Due to budget constraints, we conducted this experiment only on a 10K dataset. We sampled 10K data from the multi-level summarization dataset and generated single-level summarization (*i.e.* summarize directly) for the same Verilog code. The results in Table 3 show that the instruction data obtained through multi-level summarization can effectively enhance model performance which is consistent with our expectations.

Table 3: Ablation study on multi-level summarization (MLS). The models are trained on 10K datasets due to budget constraints. Using multi-level summarization methods, the performance of the CodeV increases in all metrics.

| Model | Temp. | VerilogEval | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Machine (%) | | | Human (%) | | |
| | | pass@1 | pass@5 | pass@10 | pass@1 | pass@5 | pass@10 |
| CodeV-CodeLlama without MLS | 0.2 | 59.0 | 66.3 | 68.9 | 28.3 | 37.5 | 40.3 |
| | 0.5 | 59.5 | 72.1 | 75.8 | 25.1 | 40.4 | 45.7 |
| | 0.8 | 54.7 | 72.7 | 77.5 | 21.4 | 39.2 | 45.0 |
| CodeV-CodeLlama with MLS | 0.2 | 63.0 | 71.2 | 72.9 | 31.7 | 38.1 | 39.8 |
| | 0.5 | 60.9 | 73.1 | 76.5 | 29.2 | 41.4 | 45.7 |
| | 0.8 | 58.5 | 73.9 | 78.1 | 25.7 | 41.5 | 47.6 |

4.4 Further Analysis

4.4.1 Evaluating RTLLM with pass@k metric

As shown in Eq. 2, the pass@k metric provides more unbiased estimations. In this section, we set $n = 20$ to further evaluate our models on RTLLM using pass@k metrics and conduct varying comparisons with baselines. It is noteworthy that, even with 5 trials for each problem, the success rate metric in original RTLLM settings does not equal pass@5 metric, hence one cannot directly

Table 4: Evaluations on RTLLM using pass@k metrics. CodeV models still surpass all baseline models with a more unbiased pass@k metric, especially for functional correctness.

| Type | Model | RTLLM v1.1 | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Syntax (%) | | | Func. (%) | | |
| | | pass@1 | pass@5 | pass@10 | pass@1 | pass@5 | pass@10 |
| foundation models | CodeLlama | 57.4 | 78.4 | 83.8 | 16.1 | 28.9 | 35.4 |
| | DeepSeek-Coder | 73.1 | 86.0 | 89.1 | 28.8 | 38.8 | 43.3 |
| | CodeQwen | 73.1 | 86.0 | 89.1 | 28.8 | 38.8 | 43.3 |
| IT baselines | RTLCoder-Mistral | 64.6 | 73.7 | 78.3 | 24.5 | 37.3 | 42.3 |
| | RTLCoder-DeepSeek | 73.4 | 83.9 | 86.2 | 35.8 | 40.3 | 43.1 |
| CodeV | CodeV-CodeLlama | 79.0 | 89.2 | 89.9 | 39.4 | 50.3 | 53.1 |
| | CodeV-DeepSeek | 78.3 | 87.4 | 89.1 | 42.4 | 51.5 | 53.2 |
| | CodeV-CodeQwen | 78.8 | 89.5 | 92.4 | 36.6 | 53.3 | 61.3 |




Figure 5: Analysis on dataset sizes. We train CodeV on different-size datasets and evaluate them on VerilogEval. The performance of models improves with the increase in training set size, but the returns gradually diminish.

compare these two metrics. Table 4 illustrates that, CodeV exhibits huge superiority compared to other baseline models, especially for functional correctness.

4.4.2 Impact of Data Size Scaling

We randomly sampled subsets of various sizes (27K, 50K, 100K) from the complete 165K dataset and fine-tuned all three baseline models, reporting their evaluation results on VerilogEval as shown in Figure 5. Except for CodeV-CodeQwen on VerilogEval-machine, which peaks on 100K-size, we observed that model performance generally improves as training set size increases, but with diminishing returns. This suggests that for 7B models, the benefits of further increasing the training set size may be limited, and future efforts should focus more on enhancing the quality of the dataset.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we present CodeV, a series of Verilog generation LLMs. By collecting Verilog code from the real world and utilizing multi-level summarization to generate high-level descriptions, we successfully construct a high-quality dataset and train multiple CodeV models based on it. Our experimental results have shown CodeV’s effectiveness, showcasing superior performance over both previous open-source and commercial state-of-the-art models by significant margins. Specifically, CodeV relatively exceeds GPT-4 in VerilogEval by 22.1%. This highlights its practical utility in the domain of circuit design automation.

6 Limitations

Our work has two main limitations: first, CodeV is unable to directly generate complex circuits without the assistance of a framework, such as the one proposed by Lu et al. [28]; second, CodeV

lacks the capability for circuit optimization. However, our approach is orthogonal to theirs, as our model can serve as the core of a Verilog Generation Agent or produce functionally correct Verilog code for subsequent optimization. We acknowledge these limitations and believe there is an opportunity to further enhance the model’s performance in real-world Verilog generation applications, leaving these improvements for future work.

References

- [1] Vamsi Aribandi, Yi Tay, Tal Schuster, Jinfeng Rao, Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Sanket Vaibhav Mehta, Honglei Zhuang, Vinh Q Tran, Dara Bahri, Jianmo Ni, et al. Ext5: Towards extreme multi-task scaling for transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.10952*, 2021.
- [2] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*, 2021.
- [3] Jonathan Bachrach, Huy Vo, Brian Richards, Yunsup Lee, Andrew Waterman, Rimas Avižienis, John Wawrzynek, and Krste Asanović. Chisel: constructing hardware in a scala embedded language. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Design Automation Conference*, pages 1216–1225, 2012.
- [4] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*, 2023.
- [5] Jason Blocklove, Siddharth Garg, Ramesh Karri, and Hammond Pearce. Chip-chat: Challenges and opportunities in conversational hardware design. In *2023 ACM/IEEE 5th Workshop on Machine Learning for CAD (MLCAD)*. IEEE, sep 2023. doi: 10.1109/mlcad58807.2023.10299874. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109%2Fmlcad58807.2023.10299874>.
- [6] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [7] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [8] Andrew Canis, Jongsok Choi, Mark Aldham, Victor Zhang, Ahmed Kammoona, Jason H Anderson, Stephen Brown, and Tomasz Czajkowski. Legup: high-level synthesis for fpga-based processor/accelerator systems. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM/SIGDA international symposium on Field programmable gate arrays*, pages 33–36, 2011.
- [9] Kaiyan Chang, Ying Wang, Haimeng Ren, Mengdi Wang, Shengwen Liang, Yinhe Han, Huawei Li, and Xiaowei Li. Chipgpt: How far are we from natural language hardware design, 2023.
- [10] Sahil Chaudhary. Code alpaca: An instruction-following llama model for code generation. <https://github.com/sahil280114/codealpaca>, 2023.
- [11] 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. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- [12] Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E Gonzalez, et al. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality. See <https://vicuna.lmsys.org> (accessed 14 April 2023), 2(3):6, 2023.
- [13] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(240): 1–113, 2023.

- [14] Fenia Christopoulou, Gerasimos Lampouras, Milan Gritta, Guchun Zhang, Yinpeng Guo, Zhongqi Li, Qi Zhang, Meng Xiao, Bo Shen, Lin Li, et al. Pangu-coder: Program synthesis with function-level language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.11280*, 2022.
- [15] Daniel Fried, Armen Aghajanyan, Jessy Lin, Sida Wang, Eric Wallace, Freda Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Wen-tau Yih, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. Incoder: A generative model for code infilling and synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05999*, 2022.
- [16] Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Y Wu, YK Li, et al. Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming—the rise of code intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196*, 2024.
- [17] Yiyang Hao, Ge Li, Yongqiang Liu, Xiaowei Miao, He Zong, Siyuan Jiang, Yang Liu, and He Wei. Aixbench: A code generation benchmark dataset. <https://github.com/aixcoder-plugin/aiXcoder-7B>, 2022.
- [18] Nitish Shirish Keskar, Bryan McCann, Lav R Varshney, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. Ctrl: A conditional transformer language model for controllable generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05858*, 2019.
- [19] Daniel Khashabi, Sewon Min, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Oyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Unifiedqa: Crossing format boundaries with a single qa system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00700*, 2020.
- [20] Sakari Lahti, Panu Sjövall, Jarno Vanne, and Timo D Hämäläinen. Are we there yet? a study on the state of high-level synthesis. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 38(5):898–911, 2018.
- [21] Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Jia Li, Jenny Chim, et al. Starcoder: may the source be with you! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06161*, 2023.
- [22] Jiawei Liu, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuyao Wang, and Lingming Zhang. Is your code generated by chatgpt really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [23] Mingjie Liu, Teodor-Dumitru Ene, Robert Kirby, Chris Cheng, Nathaniel Pinckney, Rongjian Liang, Jonah Alben, Himyanshu Anand, Sanmitra Banerjee, Ismet Bayraktaroglu, et al. Chip-nemo: Domain-adapted llms for chip design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00176*, 2023.
- [24] Mingjie Liu, Nathaniel Pinckney, Brucec Khailany, and Haoxing Ren. Verilogeval: Evaluating large language models for verilog code generation. In *2023 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer Aided Design (ICCAD)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2023.
- [25] Shang Liu, Wenji Fang, Yao Lu, Qijun Zhang, Hongce Zhang, and Zhiyao Xie. Rtlcoder: Outperforming gpt-3.5 in design rtl generation with our open-source dataset and lightweight solution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.08617*, 2023.
- [26] Shang Liu, Wenji Fang, Yao Lu, Qijun Zhang, Hongce Zhang, and Zhiyao Xie. Rtlcoder: Outperforming gpt-3.5 in design rtl generation with our open-source dataset and lightweight solution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.08617*, 2023.
- [27] Anton Lozhkov, Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Federico Cassano, Joel Lamy-Poirier, Noumane Tazi, Ao Tang, Dmytro Pykhtar, Jiawei Liu, Yuxiang Wei, et al. Starcoder 2 and the stack v2: The next generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19173*, 2024.
- [28] Yao Lu, Shang Liu, Qijun Zhang, and Zhiyao Xie. Rtlm: An open-source benchmark for design rtl generation with large language model. In *2024 29th Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference (ASP-DAC)*, pages 722–727. IEEE, 2024.
- [29] Ziyang Luo, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Qingfeng Sun, Xiubo Geng, Wenxiang Hu, Chongyang Tao, Jing Ma, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. Wizardcoder: Empowering code large language models with evol-instruct. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08568*, 2023.

- [30] Microsoft. Azure openai service models. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/cognitive-services/openai/concepts/models>, 2023.
- [31] Niklas Muennighoff, Qian Liu, Armel Zebaze, Qinkai Zheng, Binyuan Hui, Terry Yue Zhuo, Swayam Singh, Xiangru Tang, Leandro Von Werra, and Shayne Longpre. Octopack: Instruction tuning code large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07124*, 2023.
- [32] Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Huan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13474*, 2022.
- [33] R OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. arxiv 2303.08774. *View in Article*, 2023.
- [34] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- [35] Zehua Pei, Hui-Ling Zhen, Mingxuan Yuan, Yu Huang, and Bei Yu. Betterv: Controlled verilog generation with discriminative guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03375*, 2024.
- [36] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67, 2020.
- [37] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*, 2023.
- [38] Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, et al. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08207*, 2021.
- [39] Noam Shazeer and Mitchell Stern. Adafactor: Adaptive learning rates with sublinear memory cost. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4596–4604. PMLR, 2018.
- [40] Bo Shen, Jiaxin Zhang, Taihong Chen, Daoguang Zan, Bing Geng, An Fu, Muhan Zeng, Ailun Yu, Jichuan Ji, Jingyang Zhao, et al. Pangu-coder2: Boosting large language models for code with ranking feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.14936*, 2023.
- [41] Alexander Shypula, Aman Madaan, Yimeng Zeng, Uri Alon, Jacob Gardner, Milad Hashemi, Graham Neubig, Parthasarathy Ranganathan, Osbert Bastani, and Amir Yazdanbakhsh. Learning performance-improving code edits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07867*, 2023.
- [42] Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model, 2023.
- [43] Shailja Thakur, Baleegh Ahmad, Zhenxing Fan, Hammond Pearce, Benjamin Tan, Ramesh Karri, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Siddharth Garg. Benchmarking large language models for automated verilog rtl code generation. In *2023 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2023.
- [44] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [45] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [46] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.

- [47] Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10560*, 2022.
- [48] Yue Wang, Weishi Wang, Shafiq Joty, and Steven CH Hoi. Codet5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00859*, 2021.
- [49] Yue Wang, Hung Le, Akhilesh Deepak Gotmare, Nghi DQ Bui, Junnan Li, and Steven CH Hoi. Codet5+: Open code large language models for code understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07922*, 2023.
- [50] Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*, 2021.
- [51] Yuxiang Wei, Zhe Wang, Jiawei Liu, Yifeng Ding, and Lingming Zhang. Magicoder: Source code is all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02120*, 2023.
- [52] Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12244*, 2023.
- [53] Zhaojian Yu, Xin Zhang, Ning Shang, Yangyu Huang, Can Xu, Yishujie Zhao, Wenxiang Hu, and Qiufeng Yin. Wavecoder: Widespread and versatile enhanced instruction tuning with refined data generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14187*, 2023.
- [54] Shengyu Zhang, Linfeng Dong, Xiaoya Li, Sen Zhang, Xiaofei Sun, Shuhe Wang, Jiwei Li, Runyi Hu, Tianwei Zhang, Fei Wu, et al. Instruction tuning for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10792*, 2023.
- [55] Qinkai Zheng, Xiao Xia, Xu Zou, Yuxiao Dong, Shan Wang, Yufei Xue, Zihan Wang, Lei Shen, Andi Wang, Yang Li, et al. Codegeex: A pre-trained model for code generation with multilingual evaluations on humaneval-x. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17568*, 2023.
- [56] Tianyu Zheng, Ge Zhang, Tianhao Shen, Xueling Liu, Bill Yuchen Lin, Jie Fu, Wenhui Chen, and Xiang Yue. Opencodeinterpreter: Integrating code generation with execution and refinement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14658*, 2024.




Figure 6: Analysis on generation temperature. We test our models on VerilogEval, setting different temperatures. As temperature rises, the pass@1 metric decreases while pass@5 and pass@10 increase.




Figure 7: Token Count Distribution of instructions generated by GPT-3.5, with and without multi-level summarization, as well as corresponding code. Utilizing multi-level summarization, the generated instructions are more concise.

A Broader Impacts

Compared to existing models, CodeV has the highest accuracy in Verilog generation tasks. This demonstrates that our proposed instruction tuning dataset construction method and CodeV can further push the boundaries of circuit design automation and lower the barrier to circuit design.

However, like other code models, CodeV may generate code that does not align with user intentions and could be misused. On this point, we refer readers to the comprehensively discussed broader impacts and hazard analysis in Chen et al. [11]. Due to the lower usage threshold of code LLMs compared to programming languages, there may be certain security issues. Therefore, we recommend users conduct a thorough functionality verification and security review of the code generated by CodeV to avoid potential losses.

B Additional Experimental Results

B.0.1 Impact of Generation Temperature

Figure 6 further analyzes the VerilogEval results of our models when setting on different generation temperatures. Generally, as the temperature increases, the pass@1 metric decreases while pass@5 and pass@10 increase. This is because when the temperature rises, the model tends to generate more uncertain and diverse responses, which has two effects: on the one hand, uncertain responses are




Figure 8: The field distribution of our dataset summarized with GPT-3.5.

more likely to produce incorrect results, lowering the accuracy of individual Verilog codes; on the other hand, the diversity enhances the exploration of various potential responses, thereby increasing the probability of at least one correct result being present among multiple Verilog codes.

B.1 Instructions token count distributions with and without multi-level summarization

Figure 7 illustrates the token count distributions of 10K descriptions generated by GPT-3.5, with or without multi-level summarization, and that of the corresponding code. It shows that employing multi-level summarization results in descriptions with fewer tokens, exhibiting a more left-skewed distribution compared to those without summarization, which aligns better with actual Verilog design tasks, demonstrating the effectiveness of our approach.

B.2 The field distribution of our dataset.

We sampled 27K data and utilized GPT to analyze the distribution of Verilog code within our dataset and depict the statistics in Figure 8. It is evident that the Verilog code we collected covers a wide range of fields, including signal processing circuits, and arithmetic circuits, among others, reflecting the high quality of our data set.

C Dataset Examples From the Study

There are some examples given by CodeV in Table 5.

Table 5: Instruction and response examples of CodeV.

| Instruction | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>Design a 16-to-1 multiplexer (MUX16) using Verilog. The multiplexer should take 16 input signals (I0-I15) and a 4-bit select signal (S3, S2, S1, S0). The output signal O should be the selected input signal based on the select signal. Use a case statement to implement the multiplexer logic.</p> | <pre> module MUX16 (input I0, I1, I2, I3, I4, I5, I6, I7, I8, input I9, I10, I11, I12, I13, I14, I15, input S0, S1, S2, S3, output reg O); always @ (*) begin case ({S3, S2, S1, S0}) 4'b0000 : O = I0; 4'b0001 : O = I1; 4'b0010 : O = I2; 4'b0011 : O = I3; 4'b0100 : O = I4; 4'b0101 : O = I5; 4'b0110 : O = I6; 4'b0111 : O = I7; 4'b1000 : O = I8; 4'b1001 : O = I9; 4'b1010 : O = I10; 4'b1011 : O = I11; 4'b1100 : O = I12; 4'b1101 : O = I13; 4'b1110 : O = I14; 4'b1111 : O = I15; endcase end endmodule </pre> |
| <p>Implement a Verilog module for a relu (Rectified Linear Unit) function. The module should take a clock signal, a reset signal, and a 32-bit signed input signal sum-in. It should output three signals - done, sum-out, and relu-out. The relu function should set all negative values in the input sum-in to zero and leave positive values unchanged. The done signal should indicate when the relu operation is completed, sum-out should pass through the input sum-in, and relu-out should be the result of the relu function.</p> | <pre> module relu(input clock, input reset, input signed [31:0] sum_in, output reg done, output signed [31:0] sum_out, output [31:0] relu_out); reg [31:0] relu_out_reg; reg [31:0] sum_out_reg; always @(posedge clock or posedge reset) begin if (reset) begin relu_out_reg <= 32'b0; done <= 1'b0; end else begin sum_out_reg <= sum_in; if (sum_in < 0) relu_out_reg <= 32'b0; else begin relu_out_reg <= sum_in; done <= 1'b1; end end end assign relu_out = relu_out_reg; assign sum_out = sum_out_reg; endmodule </pre> |