
Beyond Code Generation: Assessing Code LLM Maturity with Postconditions

Fusen He
Nanjing University

Juan Zhai
University of Massachusetts, Amherst (UMass)

Minxue Pan
Nanjing University

Abstract

Most existing code Large Language Model (LLM) benchmarks, e.g., EvalPlus, focus on the code generation tasks. Namely, they contain a natural language description of a problem and ask the LLM to write code to solve the problem. We argue that they do not capture all capabilities needed to assess the quality of a code LLM. In this paper, we propose a code LLM maturity model, based on the postcondition generation problem, to assess a more complete set of code LLM capabilities. We choose the postcondition generation problem as it requires the code LLM to understand the code including semantics, natural language, and also have the capability to generate unambiguous postconditions in programming languages (i.e., the generation capability). Moreover, postconditions have various types, requiring different levels of these capabilities, making it suitable to evaluate the maturity of the code LLM. Based on our designed maturity model, we augment the EvalPlus dataset to a postcondition testing benchmark, and evaluated several open-sourced models. Our results highlight the necessary improvements needed for better LLMs for code. Code: <https://github.com/MatureModel/PostcondGen>

1 Introduction

The advent of Large Language Models (LLMs)[1] has significantly transformed the landscape of natural language processing ([2–4]) and code generation. For example, models such as OpenAI’s GPT-3 and Codex have demonstrated remarkable proficiency in generating human-like text and writing functional code snippets from natural language prompts[5]. The AI-powered coding assistant, GitHub Copilot has 1.3 million paid subscribers, a 30% quarter-over-quarter increase[6].

To understand the usefulness and limitations of code LLMs, there have been various benchmarks. Existing benchmarks, such as EvalPlus[7], have primarily focused on assessing the ability of LLMs to generate code from natural language descriptions of problems. These benchmarks typically involve providing a description of a programming task and evaluating the LLM based on its ability to generate a correct and functional code snippet that solves the problem[8]. While effective in gauging certain aspects of code generation, these benchmarks do not fully encompass the diverse capabilities required for a comprehensive evaluation of code LLMs.

Moreover, using code generation tasks to measure the maturity of code LLM, although insightful, overlooks other critical aspects of code understanding and generation capabilities that are important for a code LLM. For example, the understanding of data structures is a critical aspect of code LLM, which requires the understanding of data type (primitive and combined), logical reasoning, value or property understanding (which may require domain knowledge understanding), and many more.

In this paper, we propose a more holistic approach to evaluating code LLMs through a maturity model based on the postcondition generation problem. This approach aims to capture a broader spectrum of LLM capabilities. Postcondition generation requires LLMs to not only understand the semantics of the code and the accompanying natural language description but also to generate precise

and unambiguous postconditions in programming languages. These postconditions can take various forms, each demanding different levels of understanding and generation capabilities, making them an ideal metric for evaluating the maturity and robustness of code LLMs.

Our proposed maturity model expands upon the existing EvalPlus dataset, transforming it into a benchmark that includes postcondition testing. This enhanced benchmark allows for a more detailed assessment of LLM performance across multiple dimensions of code understanding and generation. Moreover, we have also designed few-shot prompting and category-based prompts that leverages the task and problem specific information to test the capability of code LLMs. We evaluated several open-sourced models using this augmented dataset, and our results underscore the areas where improvements are necessary to advance the capabilities of LLMs in code-related tasks. Results have also shown the effectiveness of our benchmark in capturing the necessary code LLM capabilities.

By incorporating postcondition generation into the evaluation framework, we provide a more comprehensive measure of LLM capabilities. This paper presents our findings and highlights the essential enhancements required to develop more proficient and versatile code LLMs.

Our contributions are threefold: ① **Proposal of a Code LLM Maturity Model:** We introduce a comprehensive maturity model based on the postcondition generation problem, which evaluates a broader set of capabilities in code LLMs beyond traditional code generation tasks; ② **Augmentation of the EvalPlus Dataset:** We expand the EvalPlus dataset to include postcondition testing, creating a more robust benchmark that assesses the LLMs’ ability to generate correct and diverse postconditions; and ③ **Evaluation of Open-Sourced Models:** We conduct extensive evaluations of several open-sourced LLMs using our augmented dataset, providing detailed insights into their performance and highlighting areas for improvement in their code generation and understanding capabilities.

2 Related Work

Large Language Model: Large Language Models (LLMs) have received increasing attention due to their "emergent abilities" which are not presented in small-scale models [9]. Their understanding and generation capabilities are commonly evaluated through various tasks spanning multiple domains including Question Answering, Reasoning, Math/Science and Coding [10, 11]. Some LLMs are specifically trained for coding, such as Starcoder [12], CodeGen [13] and CodeGen2 [14]. An increasing number of studies also explore LLMs’ potential in software development tasks, such as code generation [5, 7, 15, 16], code reparation [17, 18], test generation [19–21] and mutant generation [22, 23]. The LLM can be evaluated by “Levels of AGI” based on depth (performance) and breadth (generality) of capabilities [24]. Compared to these work, we focus on postcondition generation problem to further assess LLMs capabilities.

Formal Specification Generation: There has been a long line of research on formal specification generation. They can be broadly categorized into two types: code-based generation and natural language-based generation. Code-based generation are those generating formal specification from existing code. Most of these work use static analysis [25–27], and dynamic analysis such as DIDUCE system [28] and Daikon system [29] which generate formal specifications by capturing a program’s behaviors during execution. Machine learning-based approaches are increasingly explored to generate specifications from code, such as Code2Inv [30] and CLN2INV [31]. Molina et al. also presented a learning technique to construct data structure invariants based on artificial neural network [32]. Additionally, many recent work also leverage LLMs to generate formal specifications based on the program implementation. Ma et al. assessed LLMs capability on generating JML style specifications for Java programs [33]. Pei et al. finetuned language models to generate program invariants [34]. Janssen et al. use ChatGPT to generated loop invariants to support program verification [35]. Unlike these work, our work belongs to natural language-based generation, which aims to generate formal specifications from natural language(NL), such as documents and code comments. The most common techniques are heuristics, using predefined rules to analyze the program properties from natural language text [36–40]. There are also some efforts on exploring LLMs to produce specifications from NL. Endres et al. generated postconditions from NL with LLM to formalize program intents. [41]. Compared to these work, our approach delves deeper into the maturity level of LLMs by assessing their capabilities on generating different types of postconditions.

<pre> 1 def multiply(n1, n2): 2 """ 3 Return the product of two given 4 numbers. 5 """ </pre>	<pre> assert type(r_val) in [int, float] assert r_val is not None if n1 == 0 or n2 == 0: assert r_val == 0 assert r_val == n1 * n2 </pre>
---	---

Figure 1: An Example for Postconditions Generated by LLMs

Table 1: Postcondition Taxonomy Based on Check Objectives and Data Types (assert omitted)

Category	Explanation	Examples
Type	Check whether the type of variable is correct	<code>isinstance(var, str)</code>
NULL	Check whether variable is NULL	<code>var is None</code>
Boundary	Check whether variable is a boundary case	<code>age == 0</code>
Equality	Check if the value of a variable is expected	<code>pi == 3.14</code>
Arithmetic Bounds	Check if a numerical value is in expected range	<code>0 <= var <= 100</code>
Boolean Condition	Check if a Boolean variable value is correct	<code>leap==True if y==2000</code>
String Format	Check if a string’s format is expected	<code>s.startswith('a')</code>
Container Element	Check elements of a container are correct	<code>x!=0 for x in [1,2]</code>
Container Property	Check if container variable’s properties are satisfied	<code>len(l) = 5</code>
Other	All other types of postconditions	<code>isPrime(x)</code>

3 Postcondition & Taxonomy

Postcondition. Formal specification is critical to the correctness and safety of programs. It conveys programmers’ intentions and defines expected behaviors by providing a precise and unambiguous description written in formal languages. Depending on the location in the program, common specifications include pre- and post-conditions, and loop invariants[42]. Postcondition is an essential and most popular form of specifications. It is a condition that always holds true after the execution of a given code snippet, assuming that all preconditions are satisfied. An example is shown in Figure 1. The `multiply` function has multiple postconditions, checking different aspects of the program, such as `assert r_val == n1 * n2` where `r_val` is the returned value.

Postcondition generation is an effective metric for evaluating the maturity of code LLMs because it encompasses a comprehensive range of capabilities required for robust code understanding and generation. Postconditions require the model to understand the semantics of the code, accurately interpret natural language descriptions, and generate precise, unambiguous conditions that must hold true after code execution. This task tests the model’s proficiency in logical reasoning, domain knowledge, and syntactic correctness. By assessing an LLM’s ability to generate diverse postconditions, including type checks, boundary conditions, and complex logical assertions, we gain a holistic view of its strengths and limitations in handling real-world coding scenarios. This multifaceted approach ensures that the model is not only capable of generating syntactically correct code but also understands the underlying logic and requirements, thereby providing a reliable measure of its overall maturity and effectiveness.

Postcondition Taxonomy. Based on verification objectives and data types, postconditions can be categorized as ten types, as shown in Table 1. Every type of postconditions verifies different aspects of the program. In particular, *type*, *NULL*, *boundary*, and *equality* postconditions can be applied to all variables. Others including *arithmetic bounds*, *boolean condition*, *string format*, and *container elements/properties* postconditions can only be applied to specific variable types according to their definitions. We classify all other types of postconditions (i.e., reflecting concrete logic) in the other category.

4 Methodology

4.1 Maturity Model Design

We introduce a maturity model based on postcondition generation to evaluate the maturity levels of code LLMs (Table 2). This model provides deeper insights into the model capabilities of natural language understanding, logical reasoning, domain knowledge comprehension, and code generation.

Level 0: Preliminary Understanding. The LLM lacks the fundamental understanding necessary for the postcondition generation task. Its natural language understanding is severely limited, leading

Table 2: Capabilities and Postcondition Types Mapping

Level	Capabilities	Postcondition Types	Proficiency Level
Level 0	Natural Language Understanding Logical Reasoning Domain Knowledge Comprehension Code Generation	N/A	Low
Level 1	Basic Natural Language Understanding Basic Logical Reasoning Basic Domain Knowledge Comprehension Basic Code Generation	Type Checks NULL Checks	Low
Level 2	Intermediate Natural Language Understanding Intermediate Logical Reasoning Intermediate Domain Knowledge Comprehension Intermediate Code Generation	Boundary Checks Arithmetic Bounds Boolean Conditions Container Property	Medium
Level 3	Advanced Natural Language Understanding Advanced Logical Reasoning Advanced Domain Knowledge Comprehension Advanced Code Generation	Container Element Equality Checks	High
Level 4	Complete Natural Language Understanding Complete Logical Reasoning Complete Domain Knowledge Comprehension Complete Code Generation	All Types	High

to low accuracy in interpreting program descriptions or requirements. The LLM cannot infer logic, conditions, and outcomes of programs from descriptions, which are essential for generating postconditions. It has minimal or no knowledge of programming conventions or postcondition concepts, and its domain knowledge is inaccurate and incomplete. Additionally, the LLM is unable to generate coherent and expected code related to the descriptions.

Level 1: Basic Postcondition Generation. The LLM can generate simple and straightforward postconditions that capture the most fundamental program states and properties. It demonstrates a basic understanding of natural language, sufficient to comprehend major program functionality described in descriptions and requirements. The LLM can identify the most basic and common properties or states of the program from descriptions and handle straightforward logical conditions. It has a rudimentary comprehension of programming conventions and postcondition concepts, allowing it to generate simple postconditions. The LLM also has limited domain knowledge related to the program and can generate simple and coherent code that includes basic conditional logic.

For our postcondition taxonomy, *type* and *NULL* postcondition generation tasks are suitable to evaluate whether LLMs reach Level 1. These tasks involve basic checks that require the LLM to identify variable types and null values, which are fundamental skills necessary at this level.

Level 2: Comprehensive Postcondition Generation. The LLM can generate more comprehensive postconditions that reflect partial program logic and execution scenarios. It shows an enhanced understanding of natural language, with intermediate accuracy in interpreting the program’s intention and behavior from descriptions. The LLM can infer partial logic, conditions, and outcomes of the program from descriptions. It has an enhanced comprehension of programming conventions, postcondition concepts, and specific domain knowledge related to the program. The LLM can generate more complex code related to the program, involving control flow, nested conditions, loops, and other advanced constructs.

Boundary checks, *arithmetic bounds*, *Boolean conditions*, and *container property* postconditions are great for Level 2 evaluation. These tasks require the LLM to handle more complex conditions and ranges, reflecting an intermediate understanding of program logic and properties.

Level 3: Advanced Postcondition Generation. The LLM can handle a wide range of postconditions that cover the program logic and execution scenarios, including edge cases and exceptions. It demonstrates an advanced understanding of natural language, with high accuracy in extracting the program’s intention and behaviors from even more complex descriptions. The LLM can infer more complete and concrete logic, conditions, and outcomes of the program from descriptions. It has an advanced comprehension of programming conventions, postcondition concepts, and specific domain knowledge related to the program. The LLM is proficient in generating coherent code, dealing with complex data structures or logical implementations.




Figure 2: Overview of Prompt Generation

Postcondition generation tasks like *container element* and *equality* postconditions assess whether LLMs reach Level 3. These tasks involve verifying the correctness of elements within containers and ensuring equality, requiring a deeper understanding of data structures and precise logical reasoning.

Level 4: Automated Postcondition Support. The LLM is able to support automated postcondition generation with absolute precision. It demonstrates complete understanding of natural language and is capable of extracting the correct program’s intention and behaviors from descriptions. The LLM can infer complete logic, conditions, and outcomes of programs from descriptions. It has deep and broad comprehension of programming conventions, postcondition concepts, and specific domain knowledge related to the program. The LLM can generate accurate code across all postcondition types, achieving high proficiency in every aspect of postcondition generation.

Performance across all postcondition generation tasks determines whether LLMs are weak at Level 0 or perfect at Level 4. Achieving Level 4 indicates the LLM’s ability to handle the full range of postcondition types with complete accuracy and precision.

4.2 Prompt Generation

The overview of our prompt generation approach is presented in Figure 2, which primarily consists of two generation logics: few-shot generation and category-based generation. In the few-shot generation, we generate postconditions for the targeted program using a basic prompt that includes a few examples. This approach leverages the model’s ability to learn from a small number of examples to generate relevant postconditions for the given program. In the category-based generation, we decompose the postcondition generation task into multiple simpler subtasks based on specific categories. For each postcondition category, we use a more specific prompt that explicitly instructs the LLMs to generate postconditions of that particular category. This targeted prompting ensures that the model focuses on generating accurate and relevant postconditions for each category. In postprocessing phase, we extract and identify expected postconditions from LLM-generated results which ensures the correctness and relevance of the postconditions generated for each prompt. Finally, we gather all the postconditions generated from the few-shot generation and each subtask in the category-based generation.

4.3 Few-shot Generation

Notice that most LLMs are not trained to generate postconditions. As such, we use the few-shot generation as the baseline method. The prompt consists of five components: an instruction, guidelines, detailed response format, few-shot examples, and a natural language description of the targeted program. We have manually experimented with many different prompts and chose the best one based on experts’ evaluation. The prompt is presented in Figure 3.

The instruction describes the task for the LLMs, which is to generate postconditions in the form of assertions. The guidelines include basic rules for generating postconditions, which aims to improve readability and accuracy of the postconditions. The response format ensures that these postconditions can be easily extracted.

Few-shot examples are included to enhance the LLMs’ performance and teach them the desired response format. These examples, written manually by researchers, include a natural language description of a program and the corresponding postconditions. The examples are designed to be simple, accurately describe the program’s intent and behaviors, be correct and consistent, and cover as many postcondition categories as possible to teach the models about different postcondition types. Finally, the last part of the prompt is the natural language description of the targeted program. Details of the prompts are explained in Appendix A.

4.4 Category-based Generation

Basic prompts may suffice for straightforward scenarios, but category-based prompts are crucial for capturing the nuances of different postcondition categories. In the category-based generation, we break down the complex task of generating postconditions into multiple simpler subtasks, each focusing on generating a specific category of postconditions. Simpler but more specific tasks help LLMs understand our requirements better and produce higher-quality outputs. Additionally, multiple category-specific subtasks facilitate more effective evaluation of the model’s capabilities across various postcondition types, ensuring a comprehensive assessment of its proficiency and robustness.

More specifically, we generate *type*, *NULL*, *boundary*, and *equality* postconditions for each program. Additionally, postconditions for *arithmetic bounds*, *boolean condition*, *string format* and *container elements or properties* check are generated selectively, based on the specific data type requirements of the variables in the program.

We leverage specialized prompt for each category, which also consists of five same components as basic prompt. However, these prompts provide clearer, more detailed instructions for specific category, improving the model’s ability to generate accurate and relevant postconditions. The guidelines and few-shots examples parts varies according to different postcondition categories. Some rules in guidelines are more strict as the expected postconditions are more specific. For few-shot examples, we only keep the postconditions that belong to the expected category.

5 Results

5.1 Experimental setups

Datasets: We employed the EvalPlus dataset [7] which comprises 164 coding problems, each featuring essential code context, a function signature, descriptive comments, a canonical solution, and a comprehensive set of legal test inputs. These test sets are meticulously designed to validate the accuracy of LLM-generated code, which are good for assessing LLM-generated postconditions. Following the standard approach, we generated code mutants embedded with potential errors to further evaluate the reliability of these postconditions. Specifically, we utilized the Gemma-7b-it [43] and Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 [44] models at a temperature setting of 0.9 in the mutant generation. We directly prompted the models to introduce bugs into the code. Each problem underwent at least 50 iterations of bug insertion, retaining only those mutants that failed the test sets. Subsequently, we removed duplicates among the failing mutants that exhibited identical failures across the same test cases. In total, we compiled 1,293 buggy code mutants, averaging approximately 8 bugs per problem.

Large Language Models: We selected three state-of-the-art, open-source LLMs for generating postconditions based on natural language descriptions.

Gemma: Both Gemma-7b-it and Gemma-1.1-7b-it are instruction-tuned versions of the Gemma-7b pre-trained model. The Gemma-1.1-7b-it model has undergone additional fine-tuning using Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback (RLHF), which has enabled it to achieve state-of-the-art performance in coding tasks compared to other models of similar size [43]. Access to both Gemma models is provided through HuggingFace’s APIs[45].

Mistral: The Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model is an instruction-tuned variant of the pre-trained Mistral 7B model. It has demonstrated exceptional performance across various tasks, particularly in reasoning, mathematics, and coding [44]. Access to this model is also facilitated via HuggingFace’s APIs[45].

Metrics: We employ four key metrics to evaluate the efficacy of LLMs in generating postconditions and to assess the quality of the generated postconditions.

Correct Postcondition Count (CPC): This metric quantifies the total number of problems for which the LLM has generated entirely correct postconditions.

Coverage@k (C@k): An extension of the traditional accept@k metric, this evaluates the probability of obtaining at least one correct postcondition in a sample of k responses. It is calculated by examining subsets of responses from the model, from size 1 to m, to determine the expected value of obtaining at least one valid postcondition. This metric helps assess the robustness of LLM performance across multiple trials and reduce the impact of the randomness of LLM-generated results.

Table 3: Correctness and Completeness of Generated Postconditions

Model	Approach	C@1 (%)	C@3 (%)	C@5 (%)	CPC	BCR(%)	BDR(%)
Gemma-7b-it	0-shot	47.44	65.73	71.34	117	10.37	27.84
	1-shot	98.54	99.94	100.00	164	18.90	50.19
	3-shots	99.76	100.00	100.00	164	15.24	46.71
	Category-based	–	–	–	164	18.90	60.23
	3-shots+	–	–	–	164	21.34	63.34
	Category-based	–	–	–	164	21.34	63.34
Gemma-v1.1-7b-it	0-shot	69.15	83.35	87.20	143	11.59	38.59
	1-shot	92.44	96.40	97.56	160	23.17	58.86
	3-shots	99.88	100.00	100.00	164	21.34	55.38
	Category-based	–	–	–	164	31.72	72.31
	3-shots+	–	–	–	164	34.15	75.72
	Category-based	–	–	–	164	34.15	75.72
Mistral-7B-Instruct	0-shot	69.27	89.27	92.68	152	15.24	44.62
	1-shot	90.61	97.26	98.78	162	23.78	53.52
	3-shots	98.41	100.00	100.00	164	25.61	54.52
	Category-based	–	–	–	164	29.88	75.56
	3-shots+	–	–	–	164	31.10	77.42
	Category-based	–	–	–	164	31.10	77.42

Bug Detection Rate (BDR): This measures the percentage of buggy code mutants that are accurately identified by the postconditions. It reflects the model’s ability to pinpoint errors within code.

Bug Coverage Rate (BCR): This metric calculates the proportion of test problems where the LLM-generated postconditions collectively identify all present bugs, thus providing a measure of the comprehensiveness of the model’s error detection.

Postcondition Generation: For each problem in the EvalPlus dataset, we generated responses five times per prompt for each LLM model. The sampling temperature was set to 0.7 to optimize the balance between the diversity and precision of the outputs from the LLMs. For few-shot generation, we utilized zero-shot, one-shot, and three-shot scenarios to facilitate a comparative analysis across few-shot settings. For category-based generation, we gather all the LLM-generated postconditions from each category as an overall result for a comparison to the few-shot generation. Lastly, we also combine the results of 3-shots and category-based generation for further evaluation.

5.2 Correctness of LLM-generated Postconditions

From Table 3, we observe that in all three models, the 3-shots approach and the category-based approach generated at least one correct postcondition for each problem in EvalPlus, significantly outperforming the 0-shot approach with only 117 problems solved when using Gemma-7b-it model and slightly better than the 1-shot approach with over 160 problems solved. The C@k metric, especially C@1, increases as the number of few-shot examples increases, indicating that LLMs are more likely to generate valid responses in few-shot settings. This result highlights the effectiveness of our few-shot examples. The combination the 3-shots and the category-based approach achieves the same performance as the two individual approaches, generating correct postconditions for all the problems.

Comparing LLM-generated postconditions among the 0-shot, few-shot approaches (both 1-shot and 3-shots), and the category-based approach, we find that the few-shot approaches generated a larger amount and more diverse types of postconditions than the 0-shot approach. For each model, we gathered over 3,000 postconditions in total from all responses in the few-shot approaches, whereas in the 0-shot approach, the number of generated postconditions was less than 2,000. This higher quantity likely contributed to more correct postconditions. Additionally, postconditions from the few-shot approaches covered more postcondition types, especially *type*, *NULL* checks, and *boundary case* checks. This diversity in postcondition types enhances the likelihood of generating correct postconditions in LLM generations based on the results in subsection 5.3.

Under the 0-shot settings in basic generation, the gemma-v1.1-7b-it ($C@1 = 69.15\%$) and Mistral-7B-Instruct models ($C@1 = 69.27\%$) are more likely to generate valid responses containing correct postconditions, generally outperforming the gemma-7b-it model with C@1 being 47.44%. But the

Table 4: Correctness Performance on Each Postcondition Category of Gemma-v1.1-7b-it. #Prob: the number of problems for which we generated postconditions, varies according to the category

Category	C@1(%)	C@3(%)	C@5(%)	#Prob	CPC
Type	97.20	98.84	99.39	164	163
NULL	95.37	97.38	97.56	164	160
Boundary	94.88	99.51	100.00%	164	164
Equality	22.20	30.00	34.15	164	56
Arithmetic Bounds	79.29	85.54	87.50	56	49
Boolean Conditions	41.43	64.64	78.57%	28	22
String Format	54.00	77.33	83.33%	30	25
Container Elements	50.00	67.60	72.00	50	36
Container Property	70.80	88.20	94.00	50	47
Overall				164	164

C@5 of gemma-7b-it model is relatively high as 77.34%, meaning that 77.34% of problems in POSTCONEVAL have a valid response. As for few-shot settings(both 1-shot and 3-shots), all three models perform very well, with C@1 always higher than 90%.

5.3 LLMs Capabilities on Generating Different Types of Postconditions

We present the correctness results of the gemma-v1.1-7b-it model on individual types of postconditions in Table 4 for further analysis. The data of the other two models is presented in Appendix D. According to Table 4, the gemma-v1.1-7b-it model exhibit significant variations in their correctness when generating different categories of postconditions. Specifically, for the three types of postconditions: *type*, *NULL*, and *boundary* checks, the gemma-v1.1-7b-it model performs exceptionally well, with all three C@k metrics above 90%. Particularly for *boundary* checks, the model generated correct postconditions for each problem in EvalPlus. In addition, for *arithmetic bounds* and *container properties*, the model also achieved a high C@1 over 70% and C@5 near 90%. This indicates the model’s high efficiency and accuracy in generating these types of postconditions. However, for *boolean conditions*, *string formats*, and *container elements* checks, the model performs poorly in C@1 around 50%, but achieves relatively high C@5, all above 70%. This suggests that the model may need multiple attempts to generate correct postconditions for these categories. Lastly, the model’s performance is worst for the *equality* type of postconditions, with C@k ranging from 22.20% to 34.15%, which suggests that the LLM are unlikely to generate correct postconditions equality check.

These results indicate the model are sufficient for the level 1 of our maturity model, with a high accuracy in generating *type* and *NULL* check postcondition. Also we believe that the capabilities of the model have reach the second maturity level, proficiently generating postconditions for *boundary*, *arithmetic bounds*, *boolean conditions*, and *container property*. However, the model’s performance on *container elements* and *equality* postcondition are relatively poor, which are related to level 4 of the maturity model. Therefore, the model is considered in the second maturity level.

5.4 Completeness of LLM-generated Postconditions

From Table 3, we find that the approach combining 3-shots and category-based approach has the best performance among all the approaches, with achieving highest BCR as 34.15% in Gemma-v1.1-7b-it model and highest BDR as 77.42% in Mistral-7B-Instruct model. This indicates that postconditions generated by LLMs can effectively detect bugs. Additionally, category-based approach with a BCR ranging from 18.90% to 31.72% and a BDR ranging from 60.23% to 77.42%, outperforms all few-shot approaches ($10.37\% \leq BCR \leq 25.61\%$, $27.84\% \leq BDR \leq 58.86\%$) in all three models. This is also due to the larger amount and more diverse types of correct postconditions generated by category-based approach, as each postcondition detects a certain amount of bugs. Especially, *boundary* and *equality* check are more common in the results of category-based approach, which generally detects more bugs than the other categories. Lastly, both one-shot($18.90\% \leq BCR \leq 23.78\%$, $50.19\% \leq BDR \leq 58.86\%$) and three-shots($15.24\% \leq BCR \leq 31.72\%$, $46.71\% \leq BDR \leq 55.38\%$) approaches outperform zero-shot($10.37\% \leq BCR \leq 15.24\%$, $27.84\% \leq BDR \leq 44.62\%$) approach in both metrics significantly, which further prove the effectiveness of our few-shot examples.

As for different models, Gemma-v1.1-7b-it and Mistral-7B-Instruct perform relatively well in our approach, followed by Gemma-7b-it model. Both Gemma-v1.1-7b-it and Mistral-7B-Instruct detected all bugs for over 30% problems in EvalPlus while Gemma-7b-it model only solved 18.90% problems. Similarly, the first two models detected 75% of all bugs, outperforming Gemma-7b-it model with 63.34% detected bugs. These results also indicate that the Gemma-v1.1-7b-it and Mistral-7B-Instruct models generated postconditions that can effectively formalize programs' logic, which reach the second level of our maturity model. As for Gemma-7b-it model, its generated postconditions can only cover part of program logic with a relatively low bug coverage rate(18.90%) but medium high bug detection rate(63.34%). So this model is considered to be the level 1 of the maturity model.

5.5 Impacts of Individual Postcondition Types

We have also evaluated the model on individual types of postconditions, and the detailed numbers are presented in Appendix C and Appendix D. In summary, the results show that all models become less effective when the type of postcondition requires more advanced capabilities or a higher level of maturity in specific capabilities. These findings underscore the importance of developing a maturity model to accurately assess the quality of code LLMs.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we have introduced a novel maturity model for evaluating the capabilities of code LLMs through the lens of postcondition generation. By incorporating diverse postcondition types and augmenting the EvalPlus dataset, we enable a detailed evaluation of LLM performance across multiple dimensions of code understanding and generation. Our extensive evaluation of open-sourced models underscores the importance of advanced capabilities in generating correct and diverse postconditions, highlighting areas for improvement in current LLMs. Our work not only contributes to the development of more proficient and versatile code LLMs but also sets a new standard for the evaluation of AI models in software development, ultimately enhancing productivity and ensuring the responsible use of AI technology.

Limitations, Availability, Ethics, and Broader Impacts

Limitations: ① our maturity model incorporates a diverse set of postcondition types but may not cover all possible scenarios and edge cases encountered in real-world programming tasks, limiting generalizability; ② the approach relies heavily on few-shot examples, and the quality and diversity of these examples significantly influence model performance, potentially leading to suboptimal results if examples are inadequate; and ③ evaluations are limited to a selection of open-sourced LLMs, and proprietary models with advanced training techniques and larger datasets might perform differently. To mitigate potential harms and boost productivity, we have open-sourced our benchmark. By making our benchmark available to the public, we aim to foster transparency, encourage collaboration, and facilitate further research and development.

Our work has several broader impacts on both the research community and practical applications. ① By introducing a comprehensive maturity model for evaluating code LLMs, we provide a more nuanced and detailed framework for assessing the capabilities of these models, improving their design and training. ② The augmentation of the EvalPlus dataset to include postcondition testing sets a new standard for benchmark datasets, encouraging the development of more robust and versatile LLMs. ③ Open-sourcing our benchmark promotes transparency and collaboration within the AI and software development communities, enabling building upon our work and address any identified limitations or biases. ④ By facilitating the generation of more accurate and reliable code, our approach can significantly enhance productivity and reduce errors in software development, leading to more efficient and effective coding practices.

References

- [1] Alec Radford and Karthik Narasimhan. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:49313245>.

- [2] Biao Zhang, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. Prompting large language model for machine translation: A case study. *ArXiv*, abs/2301.07069, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:255942578>.
- [3] Xianjun Yang, Yan Li, Xinlu Zhang, Haifeng Chen, and Wei Cheng. Exploring the limits of chatgpt for query or aspect-based text summarization. *ArXiv*, abs/2302.08081, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:256901227>.
- [4] Stefan Hegselmann, Alejandro Buendia, Hunter Lang, Monica Agrawal, Xiaoyi Jiang, and David A. Sontag. Tabllm: Few-shot classification of tabular data with large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2210.10723, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:252992811>.
- [5] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde, Jared Kaplan, Harrison Edwards, Yura Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, David W. Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William H. Guss, Alex Nichol, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, Andrew Carr, Jan Leike, Joshua Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew M. Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *ArXiv*, abs/2107.03374, 2021. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:235755472>.
- [6] Github copilot drives revenue growth amid subscriber base expansion, 2024. <https://www.ciodive.com/news/github-copilot-subscriber-count-revenue-growth/706201/>.
- [7] Jiawei Liu, Chun Xia, Yuyao Wang, and Lingming Zhang. Is your code generated by chatgpt really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2305.01210, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258437095>.
- [8] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, Yifan Du, Chen Yang, Yushuo Chen, Z. Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Ruiyang Ren, Yifan Li, Xinyu Tang, Zikang Liu, Peiyu Liu, Jianyun Nie, and Ji rong Wen. A survey of large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.18223, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:257900969>.
- [9] Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, Ed Huai hsin Chi, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Oriol Vinyals, Percy Liang, Jeff Dean, and William Fedus. Emergent abilities of large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2206.07682, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:249674500>.
- [10] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin R. Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Daniel M. Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Cantón Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony S. Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel M. Kloumann, A. V. Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, R. Subramanian, Xia Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zhengxu Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *ArXiv*, abs/2307.09288, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:259950998>.

- [11] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2302.13971, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:257219404>.
- [12] Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Jia Li, Jenny Chim, Qian Liu, Evgenii Zheltonozhskii, Terry Yue Zhuo, Thomas Wang, Olivier Dehaene, Mishig Davaadorj, Joel Lamy-Poirier, João Monteiro, Oleh Shliazhko, Nicolas Gontier, Nicholas Meade, Armel Zebaze, Ming-Ho Yee, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, Jian Zhu, Benjamin Lipkin, Muhtasham Oblokulov, Zhiruo Wang, Rudra Murthy, Jason Stillerman, Siva Sankalp Patel, Dmitry Abulkhanov, Marco Zocca, Manan Dey, Zhihan Zhang, Nourhan Fahmy, Urvashi Bhattacharyya, W. Yu, Swayam Singh, Sasha Luccioni, Paulo Villegas, Maxim Kunakov, Fedor Zhdanov, Manuel Romero, Tony Lee, Nadav Timor, Jennifer Ding, Claire Schlesinger, Hailey Schoelkopf, Jana Ebert, Tri Dao, Mayank Mishra, Alexander Gu, Jennifer Robinson, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, Danish Contractor, Siva Reddy, Daniel Fried, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Yacine Jernite, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Sean M. Hughes, Thomas Wolf, Arjun Guha, Leandro von Werra, and Harm de Vries. Starcoder: may the source be with you! *ArXiv*, abs/2305.06161, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258588247>.
- [13] Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Haiquan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:252668917>.
- [14] Erik Nijkamp, Hiroaki Hayashi, Caiming Xiong, Silvio Savarese, and Yingbo Zhou. Codegen2: Lessons for training llms on programming and natural languages. *ArXiv*, abs/2305.02309, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258461229>.
- [15] Ayush Kumar, Parth Nagarkar, Prabhav Nalhe, and Sanjeev Vijayakumar. Deep learning driven natural languages text to sql query conversion: A survey. *ArXiv*, abs/2208.04415, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:251442359>.
- [16] Naihao Deng, Yulong Chen, and Yue Zhang. Recent advances in text-to-sql: A survey of what we have and what we expect. *ArXiv*, abs/2208.10099, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:251719280>.
- [17] Nan Jiang, Kevin Liu, Thibaud Lutellier, and Lin Tan. Impact of code language models on automated program repair. *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 1430–1442, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:256808267>.
- [18] Yue Wang, Weishi Wang, Shafiq R. Joty, and Steven C. H. Hoi. Codet5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2109.00859, 2021. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:237386541>.
- [19] Michele Tufano, Dawn Drain, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, and Neel Sundaresan. Generating accurate assert statements for unit test cases using pretrained transformers. *2022 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automation of Software Test (AST)*, pages 54–64, 2020. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:221655313>.
- [20] Max Schäfer, Sarah Nadi, Aryaz Eghbali, and Frank Tip. Adaptive test generation using a large language model. *ArXiv*, abs/2302.06527, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:263896518>.
- [21] Mohammed Latif Siddiq, Joanna C. S. Santos, Ridwanul Hasan Tanvir, Noshin Ulfat, Fahmid Al Rifat, and Vinicius Carvalho Lopes. Using large language models to generate junit tests: An empirical study. 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258426857>.

- [22] Milos Ojdanic, Aayush Garg, Ahmed Khanfir, Renzo Degiovanni, Mike Papadakis, and Yves Le Traon. Syntactic vs. semantic similarity of artificial and real faults in mutation testing studies. *CoRR*, abs/2112.14508, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.14508>.
- [23] Milos Ojdanic, Ahmed Khanfir, Aayush Garg, Renzo Degiovanni, Mike Papadakis, and Yves Le Traon. On comparing mutation testing tools through learning-based mutant selection. pages 35–46, 2023. doi: 10.1109/AST58925.2023.00008. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/AST58925.2023.00008>.
- [24] Meredith Ringel Morris, Jascha Narain Sohl-Dickstein, Noah Fiedel, Tris Brian Warkentin, Allan Dafoe, Aleksandra Faust, Clément Farabet, and Shane Legg. Levels of agi: Operationalizing progress on the path to agi. *ArXiv*, abs/2311.02462, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:265033463>.
- [25] Junjie Chen, Yanwei Bai, Dan Hao, Lingming Zhang, Lu Zhang, Bing Xie, and Hong Mei. Supporting oracle construction via static analysis. *2016 31st IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 178–189, 2016. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:472942>.
- [26] Sharon Shoham, Eran Yahav, Stephen J. Fink, and Marco Pistoia. Static specification mining using automata-based abstractions. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 34:651–666, 2007. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:2483401>.
- [27] Cormac Flanagan and K. Rustan M. Leino. Houdini, an annotation assistant for esc/java. In *FME*, 2001. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:1534849>.
- [28] Sudheendra Hangal and Monica S. Lam. Tracking down software bugs using automatic anomaly detection. *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Software Engineering. ICSE 2002*, pages 291–301, 2002. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:11004588>.
- [29] Michael D. Ernst, Jeff H. Perkins, Philip J. Guo, Stephen McCamant, Carlos Pacheco, Matthew S. Tschantz, and Chen Xiao. The daikon system for dynamic detection of likely invariants. *Sci. Comput. Program.*, 69:35–45, 2007. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:17620776>.
- [30] Xujie Si, Aaditya Naik, Hanjun Dai, M. Naik, and Le Song. Code2inv: A deep learning framework for program verification. *Computer Aided Verification*, 12225:151 – 164, 2020. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:211027794>.
- [31] Gabriel Ryan, Justin Wong, Jianan Yao, Ronghui Gu, and Suman Sekhar Jana. Cln2inv: Learning loop invariants with continuous logic networks. *ArXiv*, abs/1909.11542, 2019. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:202749930>.
- [32] Facundo Molina, Renzo Degiovanni, Pablo Ponzio, Germán Regis, Nazareno Aguirre, and Marcelo Fabian Frias. Training binary classifiers as data structure invariants. *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 759–770, 2019. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:174799837>.
- [33] Lezhi Ma, Shangqing Liu, Yi Li, Xiaofei Xie, and Lei Bu. Specgen: Automated generation of formal program specifications via large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2401.08807, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:267028141>.
- [34] Kexin Pei, David Bieber, Kensen Shi, Charles Sutton, and Pengcheng Yin. Can large language models reason about program invariants? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:260871141>.
- [35] Christian Janssen, Cedric Richter, and Heike Wehrheim. Can chatgpt support software verification? *ArXiv*, abs/2311.02433, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:265033269>.

- [36] Rahul Pandita, Xusheng Xiao, Hao Zhong, Tao Xie, Stephen Oney, and Amit M. Paradkar. Inferring method specifications from natural language api descriptions. *2012 34th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 815–825, 2012. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:7449460>.
- [37] Arianna Blasi, Alberto Goffi, Konstantin Kuznetsov, Alessandra Gorla, Michael D. Ernst, Mauro Pezzè, and Sergio Delgado Castellanos. Translating code comments to procedure specifications. In *ISSTA 2018, Proceedings of the 2018 International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, pages 242–253, Amsterdam, Netherlands, July 2018.
- [38] Lin Tan, Ding Yuan, Gopal Krishna, and Yuanyuan Zhou. */*iccomment: bugs or bad comments?*/*. In *Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, 2007. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:1843404>.
- [39] Lin Tan, Yuanyuan Zhou, and Yoann Padioleau. *acomment: mining annotations from comments and code to detect interrupt related concurrency bugs*. *2011 33rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 11–20, 2011. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:11340188>.
- [40] Shin Hwei Tan, Darko Marinov, Lin Tan, and Gary T. Leavens. *@tcomment: Testing javadoc comments to detect comment-code inconsistencies*. *2012 IEEE Fifth International Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation*, pages 260–269, 2012. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:11189276>.
- [41] Madeline Endres, Sarah Fakhoury, Saikat Chakraborty, and Shuvendu K. Lahiri. Formalizing natural language intent into program specifications via large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2310.01831, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:263608443>.
- [42] David J. Pearce, Mark Utting, and Lindsay J. Groves. An introduction to software verification with whiley. In *International School on Engineering Trustworthy Software Systems*, 2018. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:121285504>.
- [43] Gemma Team Thomas Mesnard, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Surya Bhupatiraju, Shreya Pathak, L. Sifre, Morgane Riviere, Mihir Kale, J Christopher Love, Pouya Dehghani Tafti, L’eonard Hussenot, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Adam Roberts, Aditya Barua, Alex Botev, Alex Castro-Ros, Ambrose Slone, Am’elie H’eliou, Andrea Tacchetti, Anna Bulanova, Antonia Paterson, Beth Tsai, Bobak Shahriari, Charline Le Lan, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Cl’ement Crepy, Daniel Cer, Daphne Ippolito, David Reid, Elena Buchatskaya, Eric Ni, Eric Noland, Geng Yan, George Tucker, George-Christian Muraru, Grigory Rozhdestvenskiy, Henryk Michalewski, Ian Tenney, Ivan Grishchenko, Jacob Austin, James Keeling, Jane Labanowski, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Jeff Stanway, Jenny Brennan, Jeremy Chen, Johan Ferret, Justin Chiu, Justin Mao-Jones, Katherine Lee, Kathy Yu, Katie Millican, Lars Lowe Sjoesund, Lisa Lee, Lucas Dixon, Machel Reid, Maciej Mikula, Mateo Wirth, Michael Sharman, Nikolai Chinaev, Nithum Thain, Olivier Bachem, Oscar Chang, Oscar Wahltinez, Paige Bailey, Paul Michel, Petko Yotov, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Rahma Chaabouni, Ramona Comanescu, Reena Jana, Rohan Anil, Ross McIlroy, Ruibo Liu, Ryan Mullins, Samuel L Smith, Sebastian Borgeaud, Sertan Girgin, Sholto Douglas, Shree Pandya, Siamak Shakeri, Soham De, Ted Klimenko, Tom Hennigan, Vladimir Feinberg, Wojciech Stokowiec, Yu hui Chen, Zafarali Ahmed, Zhitao Gong, Tris Brian Warkentin, Ludovic Peran, Minh Giang, Cl’ement Farabet, Oriol Vinyals, Jeffrey Dean, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Demis Hassabis, Zoubin Ghahramani, Douglas Eck, Joelle Barral, Fernando Pereira, Eli Collins, Armand Joulin, Noah Fiedel, Evan Senter, Alek Andreev, and Kathleen Keanealy. Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology. *ArXiv*, abs/2403.08295, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:268379206>.
- [44] Albert Qiaochu Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Deven-dra Singh Chplot, Diego de Las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lam-ple, Lucile Saulnier, L’elio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothée Lacroix, and William El Sayed. Mistral 7b. *ArXiv*, abs/2310.06825, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:263830494>.

- [45] HuggingFace. Huggingface. URL <https://huggingface.co/>.
- [46] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeff Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. *ArXiv*, abs/2005.14165, 2020. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:218971783>.

A Prompt Templates

Figure 3 shows the prompt we use to perform the few-shot prompting.

```
<Instruction>
We will give you the code context, function stub and natural language specification (in the form of a
code comment) for a specific function.
Please write symbolic [SPECIFIC POSTCONDITION CATEGORY] postconditions for the function using
assert statements.
[SPECIFIC POSTCONDITION CATEGORY EXPLANATION]

<Guidelines>
Please adhere to the following guidelines:
1. When writing the postconditions, only use the function's input parameters and a hypothetical
return value variable, which we will assume is stored in a variable named return_val.
2. If the postconditions call any function external to the program context, they should only be those
from the functional subset of [PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE]. By this, we mean functions that are
pure (i.e., no side effects) such as [PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE-SPECIFIC EXAMPLE].
3. Avoid using logical operators "and" in the assertion. Simplify the expression by breaking it down
into smaller, more manageable parts.

<Response Format>
The format of your answer SHOULD be:
* [POSTCONDITIONS]:
``[PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE]
list of assert statements for postconditions
...

<Few-shot Examples>
Write postconditions for [EXAMPLE FUNCTION NAME].
* [CODE CONTEXT, FUNCTION STUB, AND CODE COMMENT]:
[EXAMPLE CODE COMMENTS]
* [POSTCONDITIONS]:
``[PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE]
[EXAMPLE POSTCONDITIONS]
...

[OTHER EXAMPLES]

<Natural Language Description for Targeted Program>
Write postconditions for [TARGETED FUNCTION NAME].
* [CODE CONTEXT, FUNCTION STUB, AND CODE COMMENT]:
[TARGETED CODE COMMENTS]
```

Figure 3: Prompt template for our approach. Underline text would be replaced by concrete contents specific to the programming language, targeted program and postcondition category that we are handling. *Italicized* text would only be included in category-specific prompts.

The instruction aims to describe our task to the LLMs, which is to generate postconditions in the form of assertions. The response format specifies the required format of LLMs' responses, which helps us to extract postconditions from them.

The guidelines demonstrate some basic rules for generating postconditions. The first two rules were included in the original prompt. The third rule requires avoiding complex postconditions and breaking them down into atomic postconditions. An atomic postcondition should check only one specific aspect of the program. However, postconditions generated by LLMs usually consist of multiple atomic postconditions conjoined using && (logical AND). If any atomic postcondition within a postcondition fails the test, the whole postcondition would be considered incorrect, even though the other atomic postconditions are correct. Thus, adopting the third rule not only helps generate simpler and more readable postconditions but also extracts possible correct atomic ones from complex postconditions.

Table 5: Keywords for Each Postcondition Category

Category	Keywords
Type	isinstance, type
NULL	None
Boundary	if, ==, is
Equality	is, ==
Arithmetic Bounds	<, >, <=, >=, in
Boolean Condition	if, is, ==, True, False
String Format	for...in..., in, len, startswith, ...
Container Element	for...in..., array[...], ...
Container Property	len, sum, count, ...

Table 6: Completeness on Postcondition Categories of Gemma-v1.1-7b-it. #Prob: the number of problems for which we generated postconditions. #Bugs: the total number of bugs.

Category	#Prob	BCC	BCR(%)	#Bugs	BDC	BDR(%)
Type	164	5	3.05	1293	273	21.11
NULL	164	2	1.22	1293	155	11.99
Boundary	164	25	15.24	1293	743	57.46
Equality	164	34	20.73	1293	263	20.34
Arithmetic Bounds	56	5	8.93	376	144	38.30
Boolean Conditions	28	2	7.14	234	103	44.02
String Format	30	1	3.33	279	116	41.58
Container Elements	50	4	8.00	404	140	34.65
Container Property	50	0	0.00	404	174	43.07
Overall	164	52	31.71%	1293	935	72.31

Furthermore, we add some few-shot examples to the prompt. The reasons are twofold. First, few-shot examples can help improve the LLMs’ performance in various tasks [46]. Second, LLMs can learn how to respond in the desired format from these examples. All few-shot examples are written manually by researchers and consist of two parts: a natural language description of a program and the corresponding postconditions.

When constructing the few-shot examples, we adhere to the following guidelines: ① the program’s functionality should be relatively simple; ② the corresponding description needs to convey the program’s intent and behaviors accurately and clearly; ③ the postconditions should be correct, consistent with the program’s description, and complete enough to cover all the important aspects of the program; and ④ the postconditions are expected to cover as many postcondition categories as possible. We hope that models can learn the characteristics of different categories of postconditions and cover diverse categories, as each category checks different aspects of programs.

The last part of the prompt is the natural language description of the targeted program.

B Refining Answers

Even though we specify the expected postcondition category in our prompt, it is still possible for LLMs to generate postconditions that do not belong to that category. To adjust the results for later analysis, we design a strategy to filter out such postconditions. First, we list some common key words for each postcondition category, which is shown in Table 5. we select out the psotconditions assertions that matches with the keywords of expected category. Then, we conduct manual judgment on the results to make them more in line with our expectations.

C Contributions of Individual Category in Bug Detection

From Table 6, we find that bug detection capability of different categories of LLM-generated postconditions also varies significantly. *Bounds* Check achieve relatively high in both BCR and BDR

Table 7: Correctness Performance on Each Postcondition Category of Gemma-7b-it. #Prob: the number of problems for which we generated postconditions, varies according to the category

Category	C@1	C@3	C@5	#Prob	CPC
Type	94.27	98.23	98.78	164	162
NULL	97.68	98.17	98.17	164	161
Boundary	77.80	94.82	98.17	164	161
Equality	18.04	27.20	33.54	164	55
Arithmetic Bounds	79.29	84.64	85.71	56	48
Boolean Conditions	56.43	78.93	85.71	28	24
String Format	60.00	80.67	83.33	30	25
Container Elements	40.71	58.40	66.00	50	33
Container Property	62.00	76.60	80.00	50	40
Overall				164	164

Table 8: Completeness on Postcondition Categories of Gemma-7b-it. #Prob: the number of problems for which we generated postconditions. #Bugs: the total number of bugs.

Category	#Prob	BCC	BCR(%)	#Bugs	BDC	BDR(%)
Type	164	4	2.44	1293	236	18.22
NULL	164	2	1.22	1293	149	11.51
Boundary	164	12	7.32	1293	474	36.60
Equality	164	16	9.76	1293	186	14.36
Arithmetic Bounds	56	4	7.14	376	116	30.85
Boolean Conditions	28	4	14.29	234	113	47.88
String Format	30	2	6.67	279	96	34.41
Container Elements	50	2	4.00	404	107	26.49
Container Property	50	1	2.00	404	131	32.43
Overall	164	31	18.90	1293	780	60.23

metrics. This suggest that it captures important behaviors of program. *Equality* check have a highest BCR as 20.73%, but a rather low BDR. This might be caused by the poor performance in correctness. In contrast, other categories like *Arithmetic Bounds*, *Boolean Conditions*, *String Format*, *Container Elements/property*, have a low BCR but a relatively high BDR. Such postcoditions might not cover all the behaviors and states, but verify the important ones in some degree. Lastly, *type* and *Null* check work poorly in both metrics, as they only focus on some small properties of programs.

Different categories of postconditions focus on various aspects of a program, thus leading to significant differences in the types and quantity of bugs they can detect. For some simpler postcondition categories, such as *type* and *NULL* checking, their focus is relatively narrow, targeting specific attributes and states within the program. In contrast, other postconditions, like *equality* and *boundary* check, are more capable of reflecting the complex logic and exceptional situations within the program, often uncovering more potential issues during defect detection. This also confirms our rational of different levels of the maturity model.

D Category-based Generation Results of Gemma-7b-it and Mistral-7B-Instruct

Table 9: Correctness Performance on Each Postcondition Category of Mistral-7B-Instruct. #Prob: the number of problems for which we generated postconditions, varies according to the category

Category	C@1(%)	C@3	C@5	#Prob	CPC
Type	97.20	98.54	98.78	164	162
NULL	89.51	97.68	98.17	164	161
Boundary	84.15	94.39	96.34	164	158
Equality	34.51	50.24	56.71	164	93
Arithmetic Bounds	81.79	92.14	94.64	56	53
Boolean Conditions	73.57	93.21	96.43	28	27
String Format	62.67	83.33	90.00	30	27
Container Elements	63.60	85.60	94.00	50	47
Container Property	90.40	95.60	96.00	50	48
Overall				164	164

Table 10: Completeness on Postcondition Categories of Mistral-7B-Instruct. #Prob: the number of problems for which we generated postconditions. #Bugs: the total number of bugs.

Category	#Prob	BCC	BCR(%)	#Bugs	BDC	BDR(%)
Type	164	3	1.83	1293	221	17.09
NULL	164	5	3.05	1293	235	18.17
Boundary	164	31	18.90	1293	719	55.61
Equality	164	33	20.12	1293	500	38.67
Arithmetic Bounds	56	7	12.50	376	153	40.69
Boolean Conditions	28	10	35.71	234	151	64.53
String Format	30	2	6.67	279	114	40.86
Container Elements	50	3	6.00	404	180	44.55
Container Property	50	1	2.00	404	222	54.95
Overall	164	49	29.88	1293	977	75.56