

VALTEST: Automated Validation of Language Model Generated Test Cases

HAMED TAHERKHANI, York University, Canada

HADI HEMMATI, York University, Canada

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated significant potential in automating software testing, specifically in generating unit test cases. However, the validation of LLM-generated test cases remains a challenge, particularly when the ground truth is unavailable. This paper introduces VALTEST, a novel framework designed to automatically validate test cases generated by LLMs by leveraging token probabilities. We evaluate VALTEST using nine test suites generated from three datasets—HumanEval, MBPP, and LeetCode—across three LLMs—GPT-4o, GPT-3.5-turbo, and LLama3.1 8b. By extracting statistical features from token probabilities, we train a machine learning model to predict test case validity. VALTEST increases the validity rate of test cases by 6.2% to 24%, depending on the dataset and LLM. Our results suggest that token probabilities are reliable indicators for distinguishing between valid and invalid test cases, which provides a robust solution for improving the correctness of LLM-generated test cases in software testing. In addition, we found that replacing the identified invalid test cases by VALTEST, using a Chain-of-Thought prompting results in a more effective test suite while keeping the high validity rates.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Software Testing, Test Case Generation, Large Language Models, Hallucination, Test Case Validation

1 Introduction

```

1 def max_area(height):
2     """ You are given an integer array height of length n. There are n vertical lines drawn such that the two
3         endpoints of the ith line are (i, 0) and (i, height[i]). Find two lines that together with the x-axis
4         form a container, such that the container contains the most water. Return the maximum amount of water
5         a container can store. ** Notice ** that you may not slant the container.
6     """
7     **Example 1:** Input: height = [1,8,6,2,5,4,8,3,7] Output: 49
8     **Explanation:** The above vertical lines are represented by array [1,8,6,2,5,4,8,3,7]. In this case, the max
9         area of water (blue section) the container can contain is 49.
10    **Example 2:** Input: height = [1,1] Output: 1 """

```

Tests Generated by GPT4o

	Function Input	Expected Output
1.	<code>assert max_area ([1,3,2,5,25,24,5])</code>	<code>== 24</code> ✓
2.	<code>assert max_area ([1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,1])</code>	<code>== 8</code> ✗
3.	<code>assert max_area ([1,2,3,4,5,6,7,1,8,9])</code>	<code>== 18</code> ✗
4.	<code>assert max_area ([1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1])</code>	<code>== 9</code> ✓

	Corresponding Token Probabilities
1.	[43,44,98,99,94,99,99], [99]
2.	[54,38,70,80,92,38,79,92,61,31], [46]
3.	[50,33,56,71,77,80,75,67,86,98], [35]
4.	[90,92,92,99,99,99,99,99,92], [99]

Fig. 1. An example of test case generation using GPT4o. The check mark indicates a valid test case and the cross mark indicates an invalid test case.

LLMs have been applied in various software development tasks, including software testing, design, requirements engineering, code generation, maintenance, deployment, and more [11, 42]. Automated generation of unit tests is crucial for ensuring the accuracy of individual software components. Unit tests examine isolated sections of code, helping developers detect issues early and

Authors' Contact Information: Hamed Taherkhani, hamedth@yorku.ca, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; Hadi Hemmati, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, hemmati@yorku.ca.

verify that each function operates as intended. LLMs are particularly promising for improving the efficiency of unit test case generation and its automation. This automation lessens the developers' burden and has the potential to improve both test coverage and quality [42]. In addition, unit test case generation is a critical component of many LLM-based code generation tools, such as Reflexion [33], LATS [51], AgentCoder [15], EPiC [36], and LDB [50].

Several studies have addressed the generation of valid test cases and the refinement of test suites [12, 21, 22, 34, 45]. These works typically rely on code execution to validate test cases and employ LLMs to enhance test suite quality. While previous studies address the refinement of test cases and, in some cases tackle the issue of generating invalid test cases using LLMs, to the best of our knowledge no study directly addresses this critical question: **How can we determine whether an LLM-generated test case is valid, when the code under test is either unavailable or its correctness is unknown?** Note that in most practical scenarios, the code under test during the testing phase might have bugs, thus a failed test case may indicate a bug in the code or an invalid test case. Therefore, the test's result is not enough as a verdict for test validation. In addition, there are scenarios where the code is not even available before the test case, e.g., in the Test Driven Development (TDD) process, as well as in many recent LLM-based code generation tools [33, 36], where the test cases are required as part of the code generation process.

Validating test cases is a preliminary step before evaluating their effectiveness. While test case evaluation involves determining whether the test cases are adequate, often using metrics such as code coverage or mutation testing, validation focuses on determining whether the test case verify the intended functionality. That is, the assertions correctly define the expected and the actual results. This distinction is crucial: validation precedes evaluation and is inherently more challenging because it requires an understanding of the expected behavior of the function.

LLMs frequently generate invalid test cases, even with state-of-the-art (SOTA) models, such as GPT-4o, and even in widely used benchmarks like HumanEval. For example, as discussed later in this paper, the ratio of valid test cases to total test cases generated by a SOTA model like GPT-4o on the MBPP dataset is as low as 0.71. This ratio is even lower for other LLMs and datasets, highlighting the difficulty LLMs face in generating valid test cases. Therefore, identifying and discarding or even fixing these invalid test cases is essential, before integrating them into the project. If invalid test cases are incorporated, they can mislead developers (or code generation tools) and lead to unintended consequences. For example, Figure 1 presents a sample of test cases generated by GPT-4o. In this example, the LLM produced two valid and two invalid assertion statements (while more tests can be generated, we present only four for brevity). The correct outputs for the second and third assertions should be 20 (not 8), and 25 (not 18), accordingly.

In this paper, we use a hallucination-aware approach to predict invalid test cases generated by LLMs. Hallucination in the context of Natural Language Generation refers to the phenomenon where models generate text that is either nonsensical or unfaithful to the provided source content [17]. One of the most common ways to detect hallucinations in LLMs is to use token probabilities as used in [10, 16, 18, 19, 25, 29, 40]. In LLMs, logits reflect the model's confidence in each token being the next in a sequence. To transform these scores into probabilities, the softmax function is applied, producing a probability distribution where each token is assigned a probability based on its logit. The token with the highest probability is typically selected as the next in the generated sequence.

In this paper, when we refer to a test case, we mean a unit test with a single assertion that verifies one behavior of the function under test. Therefore, we use "assertion" and "test case" interchangeably. In Figure 1, for each assertion, we extracted the token probabilities associated with the function input from the left-hand side of the assertion and the expected output from the right-hand side. For example, in the assertion `assert maxarea([1, 3, 2, 5, 25, 24, 5]) == 24`, the token probability of the expected output token 24 is 99, while the function input tokens

1, 3, 2, 5, 25, 24, 5 have probabilities of 43, 44, 98, 99, 94, 99, 99, respectively. Comparing the token probabilities of assertions 1 and 4 with those of assertions 2 and 3, we observe that invalid test cases exhibit lower token probability scores, either in the function input or the expected output tokens. This is expected, as LLMs are prone to generating invalid test cases when they are uncertain about the assertions' input/output, which is often the result of LLM's hallucination (generating assertions that contradict the function's description). This observation motivated us to develop VALTEST, a tool that leverages the token probabilities of an LLM-generated test case to predict its validity.

We utilized three datasets—HumanEval, MBPP, and LeetCode—and three LLMs—GPT-4o, GPT-3.5-turbo, and LLama3.1 8b—to generate nine test suites for evaluating VALTEST. These new test suites were necessary as existing test suites for these datasets in previous works do not include token probability information. After generating the tests, we extracted various feature sets representing the statistical measures of token probabilities for both the function input and the expected output of assertions. We executed each test case on its correct code under test to label each case as either valid or invalid. Using these labeled cases, we trained an ensemble machine learning model using a k-fold approach to predict the validity of each test case, in the evaluation set. Based on our predictions, we either discarded the invalid test cases identified by our model or applied a Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting technique to correct the invalid cases. We evaluated the test suites using validity rate, mutation score, and code coverage metrics both before and after applying VALTEST.

Our results demonstrate that VALTEST improves the validity rate from 6.2% up to 24% across different LLMs and datasets, accordingly. Token probabilities in the expected output section are key indicators for distinguishing valid from invalid test cases. Features extracted from these probabilities show significant differences between valid and invalid, with valid cases having higher token probabilities and fewer hallucinations. Furthermore, expected output features have a stronger impact on VALTEST's accuracy than function input features. Additionally, we highlight a trade-off between validity rate and mutation or code coverage scores in VALTEST. Moreover, combining CoT prompting with VALTEST to fix invalid test cases increases the mutation score by 2.9% to 6.7%, resulting in a more comprehensive test suite.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- (1) To the best of our knowledge, VALTEST is the first work to explore the validation of LLM-generated test cases using token probabilities.
- (2) We demonstrate the effectiveness of VALTEST in test case validation across three common benchmark datasets and three SOTA LLMs.
- (3) We show how VALTEST can be used to replace invalid test cases with valid ones to increase mutation score and code coverage of the LLM-generated test suites.

We also release the data and source code for our experiments to facilitate replication and extension by other researchers (<https://github.com/HamedTaherkhani/VALTEST>).

2 Background and Related Work

2.1 LLM-based Test Case Generation

Traditional test case generation approaches utilize search-based [7, 13], constraint-based [43], or random-based [27] strategies to maximize code coverage. However, these methods are often sub-optimal in terms of creating maintainable test cases. With the advent of LLMs, recent studies have explored using LLMs for generating more human-readable unit test cases by learning from developer-written tests in their large training sets. Most of these studies focus on improving the effectiveness of generated test cases, e.g., by pre-training or fine-tuning on code-related tasks [1, 14, 31, 39], leveraging reinforcement learning [35], designing effective prompts [6, 44, 49], incorporating documentation [28, 41], and integrating with search-based methods [20]. Despite

initial successes, research indicates that LLM-generated test cases face challenges such as correctness issues [12, 22, 45], and low coverage on certain benchmarks highlighting the need for continued refinement and comparison with traditional methods like EvoSuite [4, 37] and Pynguin [4, 20]. More recent works provide notable examples of the advancements in automated test case generation. Liu et al. introduced AID [24], combining LLMs with differential testing to generate fault-revealing test cases for programs that have already passed traditional test suites. Alagarsamy et al.'s A3Test [1] utilizes domain adaptation to produce accurate, assertion-informed test cases, emphasizing test name consistency and verification. ChatTester [45] refines unit tests generated by ChatGPT through iterative feedback loops to improve test accuracy. Meanwhile, Ouédraogo et al. [26] compare various LLMs with EvoSuite, assessing test generation in terms of coverage, readability, and correctness.

2.2 Validating LLM-generated Test Cases

There are some papers in the literature that address the problem of generating valid test cases and test case refinement. Guilherme and Vincenzi, 2023 [12] conducted an initial investigation on test case generation using OpenAI's LLM for Java programs. They compared the generated test cases with traditional tools like EvoSuite, evaluating metrics such as code coverage and mutation testing scores. They noted that the LLM performed comparably well, but highlighted the importance of refinement to improve fault detection and efficiency. Yuan et al. [45] evaluated the unit test generation capabilities of ChatGPT and introduced ChatTester, an approach that refines test cases iteratively. They found that while ChatGPT could generate tests with high readability, its tests often suffered from correctness issues. ChatTester uses a two-step process: first, generating an initial test, then iteratively refining it based on compilation feedback. Li et al., 2024 [21] proposed a framework called TestChain, which decouples the generation of test inputs and outputs. This allows for a multi-agent system, where one agent generates test inputs, and another computes the expected outputs through a Python interpreter, thus improving the correctness of the outputs. Sollenberger et al. [34] introduced LLM4VV, which explores using LLMs as automated judges to evaluate compiler test suites for parallel programming models like OpenMP and OpenACC. The authors tested DeepSeek's deepseek-coder-33B-instruct model by introducing intentional errors (negative probing) to assess its ability to detect issues in code. These studies generally use code execution to validate test cases and leverage LLMs to improve test suite quality. In contrast, in VALTEST, we use a hallucination-aware approach to detect invalid tests without the need for the code under test or the test execution, making it more practical than the existing approaches.

2.3 Hallucination Detection

There are several metrics to detect hallucinations in LLMs, i.e., statistical metrics, information extraction-based metrics, natural language inference-based metrics, question-answering-based metrics, and model-based metrics [17]. Hallucinations in code generation by LLMs is addressed in multiple papers. De-Hallucinator [9] tackled the problem by iteratively refining prompts with relevant API references drawn from the model's initial output, reducing errors in API usage and improving accuracy. Rahman et al. [30] introduced HallTrigger, a technique that deliberately triggers arbitrary code hallucination in LLMs to analyze their frequency and impact. HALLUCODE [23] took a broader approach, creating a taxonomy of hallucinations across five categories and developing a benchmark to assess code LLMs' effectiveness in recognizing and mitigating hallucinations. CodeHalu [38] built on this by employing execution-based verification to detect hallucinations in generated code, classifying them into mapping, naming, resource, and logic errors. In this paper, we utilize token probabilities within LLMs to detect hallucinations. Unlike prior code generation studies that rely on task-specific hallucination definitions and mitigation strategies, our approach




Fig. 2. Overall approach of VALTEST

offers a generalizable method applicable to any task. To our knowledge, VALTEST is the first to use hallucination detection for invalid test case identification.

3 VALTEST

In this section, we introduce VALTEST, an approach designed to validate LLM-generated test cases and enhance test case generation for LLM-based systems. The overall methodology is illustrated in Figure 2. After preprocessing the datasets, VALTEST begins by generating test cases, along with the probability assigned to each token produced by the LLM. We then execute these test cases on the corresponding source code in the dataset, labeling each test case as either valid or invalid (an invalid test is a test case that fails on the correct ground truth code). Next, from the token probabilities, which are given by LLMs per generated token, we derive statistical features to use for training a machine learning model that predicts test case validity. The intuition is that lower probabilities increase the likelihood that the generated tokens are affected by LLM hallucinations, making the final test case invalid.

The model is trained and evaluated on the labeled dataset (valid/invalid) using a k-fold ensemble method that each time considers k-1 folds as the train set and the remaining fold as the evaluation set. To define a valid test case, we apply a *threshold* to the model's output, any test with lower output probability than the *threshold* is considered hallucinated and invalid.

To assess the effectiveness of VALTEST, beyond the validation rate, we also measure test case adequacy metrics, such as code coverage and mutation score. These metrics demonstrate that our approach not only reliably identifies invalid test cases, but also improves the effectiveness of LLM-based test case generation process. In the rest of this section, we provide a detailed step-by-step explanation of VALTEST.

In the first step, we preprocess the datasets to ensure they are in the same format for subsequent steps. The primary goal of this step is to execute the test cases provided in the dataset on their corresponding code (source code function) to verify their correctness. We discard instances where the code is incorrect, according to the provided (ground truth) test cases, as having correct ground truth is essential for evaluation in this research. As a result of the preprocessing, some instances in the LeetCode dataset are discarded. The output of this step is a clean dataset, where each instance contains a valid function, a ground truth test case, a valid function signature, and a docstring that describes the intended behavior of the function.

In the next step, we ask an LLM to generate multiple assertions using the provided function signature and docstring. Different functions vary in terms of difficulty, and thus they may require a different number of tests to fully validate the function. We set both a minimum (10) and maximum

(20) limit for the number of test cases and allow the LLM to decide how many test cases are necessary. As an optional step to leverage LLMs properly, we apply a simple prompt engineering method. We provide few-shot learning example (one example), from the ground truth test cases per function, to help the LLM better understand the expected input and output. With these few-shot examples, we ensure that the output is in the desired format for further processing. Additionally, to ensure that the assertions are in the desired format, we specify in the prompt that the LLM should not initialize any objects outside of the assertion. Instead, any object initialization should be placed within the assertion statement. This approach facilitates identifying the function input and expected output components of the assertion more easily in this research. Furthermore, each generated assertion is formatted as an independent test case in this step. Note that this formatting is only done to ease the token probability extraction process. In practice, one can opt for any format for their unit tests and write a separate script to extract function inputs and expected outputs' tokens.

After generating the test cases, we process them and check their abstract syntax tree (AST) using *ast* library in python to ensure they are syntactically correct. Test cases that are not syntactically correct are discarded. When generating test cases using the LLM, we obtain token probabilities from the API in addition to the text. We obtain the top 2 tokens and their probabilities, meaning that along with the predicted token, we also receive the next alternative token, chosen by LLM, with the highest probability. Both the OpenAI and transformer libraries provide options to retrieve token probabilities in the response. We enable this option to collect the probabilities for future use in this research.

In this step, we evaluate the generated test cases in terms of validity, mutation score, and code coverage. First, we run the test cases on their corresponding function's ground truth source code to annotate each test case with valid or invalid label and measure the validity rate for the entire dataset. A test case is considered to be valid if it does not produce any errors after running on the source code. Additionally, we measure the mutation score for the generated test cases as an evaluation metric, alongside code coverage. We use the Mutmut testing tool for the mutation process. Mutmut supports various types of mutations, such as operator mutation, number mutation, string mutation, lambda mutation, keyword mutation, etc.¹. In this research, we used the default setting which includes all types of mutations.

In the next step, for each assertion, following our unified pre-processed assertion formatting, we first identify and extract the input of the function in the assertion from the left side of the assertion and the expected output in the assertion from the right side. For instance, given the assertion `assert histogram('a b c')== {'a':1, 'b':1, 'c':1}`, we are interested in 'a b c' from the left side and {'a':1, 'b':1, 'c':1} from the right side. After identifying the input and the expected output parts of the assertion, we match the strings to tokens (in the list of (token, probability)) to find the tokens that match the 'a b c' and {'a':1, 'b':1, 'c':1} strings. For example, we identify tokens *a*, *b*, and *c* for 'a b c' and tokens {', a, 1, b, 1, c, and 1} for {'a':1, 'b':1, 'c':1}. We use a greedy string matching algorithm to match strings to tokens, where it attempts to match substrings of one sequence with tokens from another sequence. This method is commonly utilized in lexical analysis and tokenization processes [2]. Each token includes its own token probability and also the second (next) token and its probability. For example, the token *a* includes its probability (99.78) and the second top token and its probability, which is) with a probability of 0.22. During the matching process, we ignore tokens that consist only of characters like double quotes, commas, single quotes, parentheses, etc. These tokens are considered noise as they do not contribute to the actual input or expected output of the assertions and may decrease the accuracy of the model.

¹link

Considering second token probabilities alongside the first token's probability reveals more about the LLM's confidence in its choice. For instance, if the first token has a 70% probability and second alternative token has a 29% probability, this suggests that the model is uncertain, as it views the second option somewhat likely. However, if the second token's probability is only 5%, it indicates that the model is much more certain about its primary choice over the second.

We create four lists of tokens and their probabilities, namely *first_function_input_probs*, *second_function_input_probs*, *first_expected_output_probs*, and *second_expected_output_probs*. The *first_function_input_probs* list contains the first tokens of the function input in the assertion, while the *second_function_input_probs* list contains the second (next) tokens of the function input in the assertion. Similarly, *first_expected_output_probs* and *second_expected_output_probs* contain the first and second top tokens for the expected output of the assertion. In the Feature Extraction step, we use statistical measures per set of tokens to summarize each token set as one feature value. We use *mean*, *max*, *min*, *total*, and *variance* for each set of tokens, resulting in a final list of $5 \times 4 = 20$ features per test case for training. Each test case is labeled as 0 if it is invalid, and 1 otherwise.

Next, we employ a k -fold cross-validation method to train and validate our test cases. In this method, the dataset is split into k folds. The model is trained on $k - 1$ folds and evaluated on the remaining fold. The split is function-based, meaning that for each validation iteration, the test cases corresponding to a subset of functions ($k - 1$ folds) are selected for training, while the remaining fold is used for evaluation. In this research, we use an ensemble model, which is comprised of several models, including *logistic regression*, *support vector machine*, *random forest*, *XGBoost*, *LightGBM*, *AdaBoost*, and *gradient boosting*. We observed that no single model consistently performs best across all datasets and LLMs. Thus, we adopted an ensemble voting approach to leverage the strengths of each model. While there might be models that outperform others in specific cases, identifying the best model is not the primary focus of this research; therefore, we did not devote additional effort to finding the optimal model for each dataset.

After training, the ensemble model is used to predict outcomes on the validation set. Using the k -fold validation approach, the model predicts whether each test case is valid or not. The model generates a score between 0 and 1 for each test case, and a *threshold* is set to determine validity. If the score exceeds this *threshold*, the test case is considered valid. We observed that some functions in the dataset may not have any test cases passing the *threshold*. To address this issue, we employed *topN* parameter to select the top N test cases for functions where fewer than N test cases pass the *threshold*. The *topN* parameter is essential as it allows us to select a non-empty subset of test cases for each function. If a function has no test cases, it will have a mutation score and coverage of zero, which is not an ideal outcome.

Finally, we apply the previously mentioned *topN* and *threshold* parameters to filter a subset of test cases from the initial set, selecting those that are most likely to be valid based on the model's predictions. This subset will undergo a final evaluation based on three key metrics: validity rate, mutation score, and code coverage. We also adopt an alternative approach using chain-of-thought prompting, asking the LLM to correct the identified invalid test cases. This method enables the LLM to reason through the expected values of assertions step by step, allowing it to adjust the expected values of the test cases where necessary. Using this approach, we correct invalid test cases rather than discarding them, thus preserving potentially valuable test cases. Once the invalid test cases have been corrected, we merge them with the previously identified valid test cases to form a new test suite. The final suite is then evaluated, and the results are compared with the previous results.

4 Empirical Evaluation

4.1 Research Questions

In this section, we explain and motivate our research questions:

- **RQ1: How effective is VALTEST in validating LLM-generated test cases? Motivation:** To assess the effectiveness of our proposed approach, we evaluate VALTEST using validity rate, mutation score, and code coverage metrics across different LLMs and datasets.
- **RQ2: What is the impact of the valid subset selection strategy on VALTEST’s effectiveness? Motivation:** To examine the trade-off between the validity rate and mutation and coverage scores when using different *threshold* values, in this RQ, we investigate how different test case subset selection strategies affect mutation score and validity rate, particularly when varying the algorithm’s *threshold* or the *top-N* parameters.
- **RQ3: What is the impact of different feature sets in VALTEST? Motivation:** To understand the impact of each feature used in VALTEST, in this RQ, we explore to what extent each selected predictive features, i.e., “function input” and “expected output”, contributes to the effectiveness of VALTEST.
- **RQ4: Can VALTEST help in correcting the invalid test cases and improve the final test suite’s effectiveness? Motivation:** To assess the ability of VALTEST in generating valid test cases, in this RQ, instead of filtering out invalid test cases, we implement an approach to correct the invalid test cases detected in the previous step using VALTEST and compare their mutation score and code coverage with the original LLM-generated test suite.

4.2 Datasets and Models

4.2.1 Datasets. Among the common benchmarks for code generation, we selected the *HumanEval* [5], *MBPP* [3], and *LeetCode*² datasets for this study based on specific criteria to ensure meaningful evaluation. Each dataset includes function signatures, docstrings explaining the intended behavior, and function implementations, with test cases provided where available. These elements allow for a comprehensive assessment of the LLMs’ ability to generate test cases based on the provided function signature and docstring. Other available datasets either lack valid docstrings or do not contain correct code implementations, rendering them unsuitable for this paper.

The *HumanEval* dataset consists of 164 programming problems created to assess the functional correctness of code generated by AI models. Each problem is structured with a function signature, a task description, the function’s body, and multiple unit tests to validate the solution.

The *Mostly Basic Programming Problems (MBPP)* dataset contains 974 Python programming tasks intended to be solvable by novice programmers. These tasks were crowd-sourced from individuals with basic Python knowledge, who contributed a problem statement, a standalone Python function as a solution, and three test cases to evaluate correctness. A subset of 427 tasks was manually reviewed and refined for consistency and accuracy, referred to as *mbpp-sanitized*. In this study, we utilized the *mbpp-sanitized* subset for our experiments.

LeetCode is an online platform that offers a large collection of coding challenges designed to help individuals improve their programming skills and prepare for job interviews. It covers a wide range of topics, including algorithms, data structures, dynamic programming, and databases. For this paper, we use a dataset available on Hugging Face, which contains more than 2,000 programming problems from the LeetCode platform. After preprocessing, 512 instances from this dataset were selected, as the remaining instances were determined to have incorrect solutions.

²<https://leetcode.com/problemset/>

4.2.2 Models. For our experiments in RQ1-RQ4, we selected three LLMs for this research to capture a diverse range of model sizes as well as open/close source models. These include GPT-3.5-turbo, GPT-4o, and LLaMA 3.1 (8B). GPT-3.5-turbo represents an older, large-scale model, while GPT-4o is a state-of-the-art, significantly larger model. LLaMA 3.1 (8B), an open-source model from Meta, serves as a more recent and smaller alternative, providing a balanced perspective across different model capabilities and advancements. In addition, we will use OpenAI’s o1-preview model in the discussion section, where a more powerful model with enhanced reasoning abilities is required for invalid test case categorization.

GPT-3.5 Turbo is a variant of OpenAI’s GPT-3.5 language model, optimized for speed and cost efficiency while maintaining high performance. It has a context window of 16,385 tokens. The maximum number of output tokens that GPT-3.5 Turbo can generate in one go is capped at around 4,096 tokens. Like other models in the GPT-3 series, it was trained on a wide range of publicly available internet text up until September 2021³.

GPT-4o is the next iteration of OpenAI’s advanced language models, known for its improved performance in natural language understanding and generation. It has a larger context window of 128,000 tokens, allowing it to handle more complex and lengthy conversations or tasks compared to its predecessors. While it shares many foundational characteristics with GPT-3.5, GPT-4o was trained on vast amounts of publicly available data up until Oct 2023 and demonstrates better reasoning, creativity, and contextual understanding.

The OpenAI o1-preview⁴ model is a large language model built for complex reasoning, capable of generating deep, multi-step thought processes before providing an answer. It specializes in scientific and mathematical reasoning, performing exceptionally well on tasks like competitive programming, advanced math, and science problems.

The Llama 3.1 8B model [8], a part of Meta’s Llama 3 series, is optimized for multilingual tasks, coding, and reasoning with enhancements for instruction-following and longer context support. Though smaller than the flagship 405B model, it delivers competitive performance with improvements over Llama 2 in data quality and efficiency.

4.3 Evaluation Metrics

To evaluate this work, we require two types of metrics: one to assess the validity of the generated test cases and another to evaluate test case adequacy (validity vs. effectiveness). For the former objective, we introduce a simple metric to assess a test suite’s validity.

Let $F = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n\}$ represent the set of functions, where n is the total number of functions. For each function f_i , let $T_i = \{t_{i1}, t_{i2}, \dots, t_{im_i}\}$ represent the set of m_i test cases designed to validate that function. We define a binary function $V(t_{ij})$, where:

$$V(t_{ij}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the test case } t_{ij} \text{ is valid for function } f_i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We define the *Validity Rate* (VR) across all functions as the rate of valid test cases across all functions to the total number of test cases for all functions. Formally, this is expressed as:

$$VR = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} V(t_{ij})}{\sum_{i=1}^n m_i}$$

For the test adequacy metrics, we employ two widely recognized classic metrics: Mutation Score (MS) and Average Line Coverage (LC), which are also commonly used for evaluating LLM-generated

³<https://platform.openai.com/docs/models>

⁴<https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/reasoning>

test cases [32]. Mutation testing is performed using the Mutmut mutation testing tool, which generates mutants through various operators, including operator mutation, number mutation, among others. Mutmut generates mutants for each function, and the MS is calculated as the percentage of killed mutants relative to the total mutants generated across all functions. We assess line coverage by executing test cases on each function, calculating line coverage for each function individually, and then averaging these values across all functions to report as the LC.

To compare the distributions of two independent samples, the Mann-Whitney U test was utilized. This non-parametric test evaluates differences in central tendencies by analyzing rank distributions. The p-value in this test indicates the likelihood of observing a test statistic as extreme as the calculated U value if the null hypothesis (no difference in distributions) holds. A small p-value (typically < 0.05) suggests that the rank differences are unlikely due to chance, supporting a statistically significant difference between the groups.

4.4 Experiment Design

In RQ1, we implement VALTEST and we use the *topN* and *threshold* parameters to filter a subset of test cases from the initial set, selecting those that are more likely to be valid based on the predictions made by our model. We generate a total of 9 test suites for three datasets (HumanEval, MBPP, and LeetCode datasets) using three LLMs (GPT4o, GPT3.5-turbo, and LLama 3.1 LLMs). We train and evaluate each test suite separately and measure the quality of test cases before and after applying VALTEST. We use VR, LC, and MS metrics to measure how effective is VALTEST across the datasets and LLMs. We use a *threshold* of 0.8 and a *topN* of 5 as hyper parameters for this research question.

In general, a trade-off exists between the validity rate and the mutation and coverage scores as the *threshold* and *topN* hyperparameters are adjusted. This trade-off is the focus of RQ2, where we select one test suite (GPT-3.5-turbo on HumanEval) and modify the hyperparameters to identify potentially optimal values. We do not exhaustively experiment on all test suites, as the goal of this RQ is not to find the best configuration across all datasets and LLMs, but rather to explore the trade-off and to show the potential impact of these hyperparameters. Please note that there are several hyperparameter optimization methods exist in the literature [46–48] and a proper study of these methods is not in the scope of this paper. For this RQ, we use *threshold* values of 0.5, 0.65, 0.8, and 0.85, and *topN* values of 1, 3, 5, and 7.

In RQ3, we investigate the impact of different feature sets in the model. Hereafter in this paper, we will use abbreviations for the feature sets. We define *FFI* as “First Function Input”, *SFI* as “Second Function Input”, *FEO* as “First Expected Output”, and *SEO* as “Second Expected Output” feature sets. First, we measure the significance of differences between valid and invalid test cases in terms of their feature set value distribution. To evaluate the distributional differences between valid and invalid test cases, we apply the Mann-Whitney U test to the feature sets associated with *FFI*, *SFI*, *FEO*, and *SEO*. For each feature set, we select one feature, defined as the mean of the probabilities. We denote these features as *first_function_input_mean* (*FFI_mean*), *first_expected_output_mean* (*FEO_mean*), *second_function_input_mean* (*SFI_mean*), and *second_expected_output_mean* (*SEO_mean*), respectively. This test allows us to address whether a statistically significant difference exists between valid and invalid test cases, with respect to those metrics. We used Python’s *SciPy* library to perform the Mann-Whitney U test. In the final ablation study of this RQ, we continue by examining the exact contribution of each feature set to the effectiveness of VALTEST, by training the model on (1) *FFI* and *SFI* feature sets, (2) *FEO* and *SEO* feature sets, (3) *FFI* and *FEO* features, and (4) all feature sets together. We use the 9 test suites from 3 LLMs and 3 datasets, as in RQ1.

In RQ4, rather than discarding invalid test cases, as done in RQ1, we apply a Chain-of-Thought (CoT) reasoning approach to correct them step by step. In this approach, we prompt the LLM with a step-by-step example demonstrating how to reason about a test case and, if necessary, correct the

test case output. The example we use in our prompts can be found in our replication package. This method allows us to correct the invalid test cases and add them to the set of predicted valid test cases. We then measure the validity rate, mutation score, and code coverage, again, and compare these results to those from RQ1. For this evaluation, we use GPT-4o with the 3 datasets, as GPT-4o is the largest model, which showed the best results in RQ1, and exhibits better reasoning abilities than the other two models, making it the most suitable LLM for this RQ.

4.5 Experiment Results

Table 1. Comparison of number of test cases (Tests), the percentage of identified valid test (%Tests), Validity Rate (VR), Line Coverage (LC), and Mutation Scores (MS), across datasets and LLMs under Base and VALTEST settings. Average values across LLMs are highlighted for each dataset, and percentage increases in validity rates are indicated in green.

Dataset	LLM	Base				VALTEST				
		#Tests	VR	LC	MS	#Tests	%Tests	VR	LC	MS
HE	GPT-4o	3157	0.83	0.969	0.86	2352	0.74	0.925(+9.5%)	0.966	0.84(-2%)
HE	GPT-3.5 Turbo	2707	0.74	0.967	0.83	1553	0.57	0.892(+15.2%)	0.963	0.79(-4%)
HE	LLaMA 3.1 8B	2471	0.63	0.946	0.80	598	0.24	0.756(+12.6%)	0.933	0.63(-17%)
HE	Average	2778	0.733	0.961	0.83	1501	0.54	0.858(+12.5%)	0.954	0.75(-8%)
LeetCode	GPT-4o	9047	0.75	0.983	0.852	5251	0.58	0.946(+19.6%)	0.983	0.845(-0.7%)
LeetCode	GPT-3.5 Turbo	8230	0.63	0.981	0.862	3250	0.40	0.870(+24%)	0.978	0.86(-0.2%)
LeetCode	LLaMA 3.1 8B	4999	0.46	0.968	0.785	1515	0.30	0.690(+23%)	0.958	0.744(-4.1%)
LeetCode	Average	7425	0.613	0.977	0.833	3339	0.46	0.835(+22.2%)	0.973	0.816(-1.9%)
MBPP	GPT-4o	7730	0.71	0.969	0.82	2555	0.33	0.796(+8.6%)	0.960	0.79(-3%)
MBPP	GPT-3.5 Turbo	5923	0.60	0.966	0.78	2088	0.35	0.667(+6.7%)	0.954	0.72(-6%)
MBPP	LLaMA 3.1 8B	4461	0.53	0.959	0.72	1876	0.42	0.592(+6.2%)	0.949	0.65(-7%)
MBPP	Average	6038	0.613	0.965	0.773	2173	0.37	0.685(+7.2%)	0.954	0.72(-5.3%)

4.5.1 RQ1: How effective is VALTEST in validating LLM-generated test cases? The results for this RQ are presented in Table 1, which is divided into two columns: “Base” and “VALTEST”. The “Base” column represents the original set of test cases without any filtering, while the “VALTEST” column represents the test suite after applying VALTEST, where a subset of test cases is selected from the original set. We compare the number of tests, VR, LC, and MS between the Base and VALTEST test suites. The number of tests in the VALTEST suite is smaller than in the Base suite, as VALTEST filters and selects a subset of test cases that are more likely to be valid. As a result, the VR increases across all experiments, while the MS and LC decrease. This trade-off between increased VR and decreased LC and MS depends on the selected *threshold* and *topN* hyperparameters. The decrease in LC and MS is due to the smaller number of test cases in the VALTEST suite compared to the Base suite. The reduction in LC across all experiments ranges from 0% (LeetCode - GPT-4o) to 1.3% (HE - LLama), while the decrease in MS ranges from 0.2% (LeetCode - GPT3.5-turbo) to 17% (HE - LLama). The datasets often have only a few lines of code and conditional statements, leading to already high LC values with minimal changes when using or not using VALTEST, making it less indicative of test suite quality. However, the changes in MS are more significant, suggesting that MS is a better metric for assessing the quality of test suites, in these datasets. Therefore, although, we report both MS and LC, in this research, we use MS as the primary measure of test adequacy and do not focus on LC.

The average increase in VR for the HumanEval, LeetCode, and MBPP datasets are 12.5%, 22.2%, and 7.2%, respectively. The highest increase in VR is observed in the LeetCode dataset, followed by HumanEval and MBPP. Among the three datasets, LeetCode has the most detailed docstrings, while MBPP has much shorter, less informative docstrings. This difference in docstring quality may explain why VALTEST performs better on LeetCode and HumanEval compared to MBPP.

On the *HumanEval* dataset, the average MS decrease is 8%, with a decrease of only 2% for GPT-4o and 4% for GPT-3.5-turbo. However, for LLama 3.1, the MS decrease is 17%, indicating that the *threshold* value of 0.8 may not be optimal for this test suite. The number of selected test cases for this suite in VALTEST is 598, which is only 24% of the original test cases. In contrast, the selection rate for GPT-4o and GPT-3.5-turbo is 74% and 57%, respectively. For the LLama 3.1 model on HumanEval, a higher *threshold* could result in more balanced outcomes. We will explore the trade-off between VR and MS in RQ2, while keeping all hyperparameters consistent for this RQ. In summary, VALTEST shows a considerable improvement without compromising the quality of test cases if a proper *threshold* is selected.

On the *LeetCode* dataset, the average MS decrease is only 1.9%. The decrease for GPT-4o and GPT-3.5-turbo is less than 1%, while for LLama 3.1, it is 4.1%. This is due to the ratio of selected test cases for LLama 3.1 being only 30%, compared to 58% and 40% for GPT-4o and GPT-3.5-turbo, respectively. This suggests that, similar to LLama 3.1 test suite for HumanEval, using a lower *threshold* on the LLama 3.1 test cases for LeetCode dataset could lead to a better trade-off between MS and VR. Overall, the results on *LeetCode* show a significant improvement on the validity of test cases with a very low decrease in their MS.

On the *MBPP* dataset, the average MS decrease is 5.3%, while the VR increase is 7.2%. The results for MBPP are less promising than those for *HumanEval* and *LeetCode*. This may be due to the lower quality of docstrings in *MBPP*, which are generally shorter and lack detailed information about the code’s functionality. This limitation could negatively impact the performance of VALTEST.

Answer to RQ1: The results show that VALTEST improves the VR across all datasets, with an average increase of 12.5% for HumanEval, 22.2% for LeetCode, and 7.2% for MBPP. However, this comes with a decrease in MS and LC. On HumanEval, MS decreases by 8% on average, with GPT-4o and GPT-3.5-turbo showing minimal decreases (2% and 4%). For LeetCode, the average MS decrease is only 1.9%, and for MBPP, it’s 5.3%. These results suggest that VALTEST can improve VR without severely impacting test suite quality, particularly when the *threshold* is optimized.

Table 2. Impact of varying Threshold and topN parameters on VALTEST for GPT-3.5 Turbo on the HE dataset. Metrics include the number of tests generated (Tests), Validity Rate (VR), Line Coverage (LC), and Mutation Score (MS). Arrows indicate an increase (↑) or decrease (↓) compared to the baseline (Row 1). Cells highlighted in pink indicate parameter changes from the baseline.

Row	Dataset	LLM	Threshold	topN	Tests	VR	LC	MS
1	HE	GPT-3.5 Turbo	0.8	5	1553	0.892	0.963	0.79
2	HE	GPT-3.5 Turbo	0.5	5	2237	0.812 ↓ 8.0%	0.965 ↑	0.821 ↑ 3.1%
3	HE	GPT-3.5 Turbo	0.65	5	1958	0.843 ↓ 4.9%	0.964 ↑	0.816 ↑ 2.6%
4	HE	GPT-3.5 Turbo	0.85	5	1179	0.897 ↑ 0.5%	0.960 ↓	0.778 ↓ 1.2%
5	HE	GPT-3.5 Turbo	0.8	1	1392	0.899 ↑ 0.7%	0.960 ↓	0.769 ↓ 2.1%
6	HE	GPT-3.5 Turbo	0.8	3	1415	0.898 ↑ 0.6%	0.962 ↓	0.788 ↓ 0.2%
7	HE	GPT-3.5 Turbo	0.8	7	1603	0.867 ↓ 2.5%	0.964 ↑	0.815 ↑ 2.5%

4.5.2 RQ2: What is the impact of the valid subset selection strategy on VALTEST’s effectiveness? As explained earlier, we do not conduct exhaustive experiments across all test suites, as the objective of this RQ is not to identify the optimal configuration for all datasets and LLMs. Therefore, for this RQ, we limit our analysis to a single test suite (HE - GPT-3.5 turbo) out of the nine. We chose HE because we wanted a smaller test suite to have a manageable execution cost, and GPT-3.5 turbo for its better impact on VALTEST compared to GPT-4o and LLama. The results for this RQ are presented in Table 2. Row 1 shows the default configuration, where a *threshold* of 0.8 and a *topN* of 5 are selected. In row 2, we decrease the *threshold* to 0.5, a less restrictive choice. This results in an 8% decrease in the VR and a 3.1% increase in MS compared to the baseline in row 1. Setting the *threshold* to 0.65 (row 3) results in a 4.9% decrease in VR and a 2.6% increase in MS. In row 4, with the *threshold* set to 0.85, VR increases by 0.5%, but MS decreases by 0.2%. Overall, the results from rows 2 to 4 suggest that a higher *threshold* leads to lower VR but higher MS. This indicates that increasing the *threshold* yields more accurate but less diverse tests, as shown by the trade-off between these metrics.

In rows 5, 6, and 7, we vary the *topN* parameter. Reducing *topN* to 1 (row 5) or 3 (row 6) increases VR but decreases MS relative to the baseline. However, increasing *topN* to 7 (row 7) results in a decrease in VR but an increase in MS. This trend suggests that selecting more test cases (higher *topN*) leads to higher MS but lower VR, indicating a trade-off between test quality (VR) and test effectiveness (MS) as the number of selected cases increases.

The *threshold* should be adjusted based on the use case. In this RQ, we showed that a higher *threshold* and lower *topN* increase VR but reduce MS. Some may prefer to sacrifice MS to gain VR, while others may prioritize MS. With that in mind, and based on our datasets, we recommend a *threshold* of 0.8 and a *topN* of 5 as a default, as it provides a balanced trade-off between VR and MS. A *threshold* of 0.8 is sufficiently restrictive to maintain a high VR while sacrificing only a small portion of valid tests. Note that these default values by no means are meant to be the optimal values, thus, to get the best results for new datasets and/or models one may need to run their own hyperparameter tuning.

Answer to RQ2: Adjusting the *threshold* and *topN* parameters impacts the balance between VR and MS. Lower thresholds increase MS but reduce VR, while higher thresholds enhance VR but at the cost of MS, highlighting a trade-off between test diversity and accuracy. Similarly, increasing *topN* boosts MS but lowers VR, showing a trade-off between test quality and effectiveness.

4.5.3 RQ3: What is the impact of different feature sets in VALTEST? To address this research question, we first analyze whether there are differences in token probabilities between valid and invalid test cases. The hypothesis is when LLM is less confident in the generated tokens the test is more likely to be invalid, thus the first token probabilities are lower in invalid tests and the second token probabilities are higher in invalid tests. As explained in Section 4.4, we select four features (*FFI_mean*, *FEO_mean*, *SFI_mean*, and *SEO_mean*), representing the mean token probabilities from the four feature sets. Then, we apply the Mann-Whitney U test to compare the distributions of these features between valid and invalid test cases. This test helps determine whether there is a significant difference between each pair of distributions (in valid vs. invalid test cases), per feature. The results are presented in Table 3. We conduct this test on the four features across the nine test suites from all LLMs and datasets. Cells with a p-value less than 0.01 are highlighted in green. Typically, a p-value of less than 0.05 indicates a statistically significant difference between the two distributions.

Table 3. Mann-Whitney U Test p-values between distribution of valid and invalid tests. We used *first_function_input_mean* (*FFI_mean*), *first_expected_output_mean* (*FEO_mean*), *second_function_input_mean* (*SFI_mean*), and *second_expected_output_mean* (*SEO_mean*) features. Cells highlighted in green show a confidence level of more than 99%.

Dataset	LLM	FFI_mean	FEO_mean	SFI_mean	SEO_mean
MBPP	gpt-4o	0.0614	3.38e-201	0.3661	4.68e-195
	gpt-3.5-turbo	6.41e-07	6.60e-202	1.84e-13	6.88e-187
	llama3	3.72e-06	7.49e-96	1.53e-07	1.64e-82
HumanEval	gpt-4o	0.1846	1.03e-121	0.0660	8.12e-114
	gpt-3.5-turbo	6.10e-04	1.34e-133	4.41e-03	3.96e-128
	llama3	0.0365	5.31e-29	0.3382	3.18e-25
LeetCode	gpt-4o	8.85e-26	0.0	6.85e-22	0.0
	gpt-3.5-turbo	6.04e-40	0.0	6.90e-38	0.0
	llama3	0.0242	6.30e-04	4.63e-04	3.68e-29

Table 4. The average of feature differences between valid and invalid test cases. Higher intensity in cell shading indicates greater difference.

Dataset/LLM	Δ FFI_mean	Δ FEO_mean	Δ SFI_mean	Δ SEO_mean
MBPP/gpt-4o	0.8	8.4	-0.1	-3.8
MBPP/gpt-3.5-turbo	-1.8	11.0	1.5	-4.3
MBPP/llama3	-2.1	9.2	1.3	-3.7
HumanEval/gpt-4o	1.8	13.8	0.8	-6.9
HumanEval/gpt-3.5-turbo	2.5	13.1	-0.4	-6.6
HumanEval/llama3	-2.3	4.4	0.6	-2.5
LeetCode/gpt-4o	3.5	21.9	-1.4	-9.7
LeetCode/gpt-3.5-turbo	3.3	18.5	-1.5	-8.3
LeetCode/llama3	-0.6	-1.8	0.3	-2.3

Table 5. The impact of different feature sets on the validity rate of VALTEST. Higher intensity in cell shading indicates more impact.

Dataset	LLM	Base	FFI + SFI	FEO + SEO	FEO + FFI	All Features
HumanEval	gpt-3.5-turbo	0.74	0.803	0.882	0.889	0.892
	gpt-4o	0.83	0.850	0.916	0.922	0.925
	llama3	0.63	0.659	0.693	0.742	0.756
LeetCode	gpt-3.5-turbo	0.63	0.781	0.853	0.867	0.870
	gpt-4o	0.75	0.870	0.936	0.943	0.946
	llama3	0.46	0.630	0.668	0.697	0.690
MBPP	gpt-3.5-turbo	0.60	0.613	0.651	0.663	0.667
	gpt-4o	0.71	0.713	0.771	0.796	0.796
	llama3	0.53	0.548	0.595	0.595	0.592

The features *FEO_mean* and *SEO_mean* show significant differences between valid and invalid test cases in all test suites. This suggests that the token probabilities in the expected output section of a test case differ significantly between valid and invalid cases. In contrast, the features *FFI_mean* and *SEO_mean* show notable differences between valid and invalid test cases in some cases but not all. These observations suggest that LLMs exhibit different patterns when generating valid versus invalid test cases, particularly in the token probabilities of the function input and expected output sections of the assertions. The difference is more pronounced in the expected output tokens, where LLMs tend to “hallucinate” when uncertain, often producing invalid output.

To explore deeper into this finding, in Table 4, we present the differences in the average values of the four features between valid and invalid test cases. For instance, ΔFEO_mean represents the difference between the average of FEO_mean for valid test cases and the average of FEO_mean for invalid test cases, i.e., $AVG(FEO_mean_{valid}) - AVG(FEO_mean_{invalid})$. This table demonstrates that valid test cases tend to have higher token probabilities in FEO_mean compared to invalid ones. This suggests that when LLMs are less certain about the first generated output tokens (low probability) they start to hallucinate, which results in invalid test cases. In contrast, SEO_mean consistently shows lower probabilities in valid tests compared to invalid ones across all test suites. The second token’s lower probabilities in valid test cases reflect the model’s confidence in its choice of the first token—indicating that it strongly favored the first token over the second. In contrast, during hallucination, the LLM may give both the first and second tokens closer probabilities, signaling uncertainty and a less confident decision. However, these experiments did not fully reveal the actual impact of the feature sets on the performance of VALTEST.

In the final experiments for this research question, we conducted a proper ablation study to assess the impact of different feature sets— FEO , SEO , FFI , and SFI —on the performance of VALTEST. The results, presented in Table 5, report the VR for each experiment. Specifically, we evaluated the performance using FFI and SFI only, FEO and SEO only, FEO and FFI , and a combination of all feature sets across the nine test suites. The findings indicate that FEO and SEO feature sets consistently have a greater influence on the accuracy of VALTEST compared to FFI and SFI feature sets. Moreover, incorporating all feature sets yields better results than using FEO and SEO feature sets alone or FEO and FFI alone, demonstrating that all feature sets contribute to the overall performance of VALTEST. Incorporating SEO and SFI feature sets, though not significantly, modestly improves the performance of VALTEST. The lack of significant improvement may be due to their correlation with the FEO and FFI feature sets.

Answer to RQ3: Token probabilities in the expected output section are key indicators for distinguishing valid from invalid test cases. Features like FEO_mean consistently shows significant differences between valid and invalid cases across all nine test suites, with valid cases having higher token probabilities and fewer hallucinations. An ablation study further shows that FEO and SEO feature sets have a stronger impact on VALTEST’s accuracy, though using all feature sets yields the highest VR, demonstrating their combined importance.

Table 6. Comparison of test generation metrics for GPT-4o across datasets under VALTEST and VALTEST with Correction settings. Metrics include the number of tests generated (Tests), Validity Rate (VR), Line Coverage (LC), and Mutation Score (MS). Percentage changes are indicated with colored arrows: decreases in red and increases in green.

Dataset	LLM	VALTEST				VALTEST + Correction			
		#Tests	VR	LC	MS	#Tests	VR	LC	MS
HE	GPT-4o	2352	0.925	0.966	0.84	3157	0.911 (-1.4% ↓)	0.971	0.87 (+3% ↑)
LeetCode	GPT-4o	5251	0.946	0.983	0.845	9047	0.853 (-9.3% ↓)	0.987	0.874 (+2.9% ↑)
MBPP	GPT-4o	2555	0.796	0.960	0.79	7730	0.765 (-3.1% ↓)	0.969	0.857 (+6.7% ↑)

4.5.4 RQ4: Can VALTEST help in correcting the invalid test cases and improve the final test suite’s effectiveness. The results for this RQ are presented in Table 6. We compared these findings with the results from VALTEST in RQ1. In this RQ, we corrected the invalid test cases identified in RQ1, and

added the corrected cases to the already valid ones to form a new test suite. The number of test cases in these experiments matches the number of tests in the “Base” experiments from RQ1, as no tests were discarded; instead, they were corrected. Chain-of-thought (CoT) reasoning was employed to correct the identified invalid test cases. The results demonstrate a modest improvement in MS compared to VALTEST the VR eclines compared to VALTEST, they still improve relative to the “Base”, in RQ1. The MS shows an increase of 2.9% to 6.7% compared to VALTEST in RQ1, while the VR decreases by 1.4% to 9.3%. These results suggest that combining VALTEST with CoT prompting to correct test cases yields a richer test suite that enhances the MS without significantly compromising the VR of VALTEST, which makes VALTEST with Correction better than the “BASE” both in VR and MS.

Answer to RQ4: Combining CoT prompting with VALTEST to correct invalid test cases increases the MS by 2.9% to 6.7%, resulting in a more comprehensive test suite without a significant negative impact on the VR compared to VALTEST without correction. Furthermore, VALTEST with correction enhances both the VR and MS relative to the baseline results.

4.6 Discussion

Table 7. Categorization of invalid test cases generated by GPT4o on HumanEval. Accuracy column shows the accuracy of VALTEST in detecting invalid tests.

Row	Category	Correct Prediction		Incorrect Prediction		Accuracy (%)
		Count	Percentage (%)	Count	Percentage (%)	
1	Misunderstanding of Function Logic	213	61.7	98	55.4	68.5
2	Off-by-One or Range Errors	45	13.0	22	12.4	67.2
3	Ambiguities or Incompleteness in the Docstring	48	13.9	30	16.9	61.5
4	Incorrect Input-Output Mapping	23	6.7	5	2.8	82.1
5	Edge Case Misinterpretation	10	2.9	4	2.3	71.4
6	Rounding Expectations	6	1.7	10	5.6	37.5
7	Others	0	0	8	4.5	0.0
Total		345	100.0	177	100.0	66.1

To go deeper into the results and understand when VALTEST is effective and in when it is not, in this section, we analyze the types of invalid test cases generated by LLMs. Specifically, we categorize invalid test cases based on the root cause of their failure and identify which categories are detectable by VALTEST and which are not. Similar to RQ3, we use the HE-GPT4o test suite as a case study for this section. To define these categories, we initially conducted a manual analysis of 30 random test cases (out of 522 total invalid tests), to create a preliminary categorization scheme. Subsequently, we selected another 30 random test cases and categorized them using OpenAI’s o1-preview model, either fitting them into our initial categories or expanding the scheme as necessary. Following a manual verification (sanity check) of the 30 samples’ labels, we ended up with six categories that encompass all primary causes of failure for tests generated by GPT4o on the HumanEval dataset. We then tasked the o1-preview model with classifying all test cases into these defined categories, instructing it to select the closest match for cases that could reasonably fit multiple categories. The prompt provided to the model includes the function docstring, code implementation, and the specific failed test cases.

The six categories are: “Misunderstanding of Function Logic”, “Off-by-One or Range Errors”, “Ambiguities or Incompleteness in the Docstring”, “Incorrect Input-Output Mapping”, “Edge Case

Misinterpretation”, and “Rounding Expectations”. The “Misunderstanding of Function Logic” category (Category 1) includes cases where the LLM overlooks aspects of the function docstring, generating tests that contradict the specifications, leading to invalid tests. This category contains the highest number of cases overall. Categories 2 and 3 follow the first category in terms of frequency. “Off-by-One or Range Errors” (Category 2) occurs when the test case expects results that are slightly off due to an off-by-one or range-related misunderstanding. “Ambiguities or Incompleteness in the Docstring” (Category 3) arises when the docstring is ambiguous, incomplete, or lacks details, causing the LLM to generate test cases based on incorrect assumptions, leading to assertion errors when run on the function implementation. Although the final LLM-generated categories might not be perfect, looking at the accuracy of VALTEST per category, still gives us an understanding on the underlying reasons where VALTEST is not effective. Table 7 presents the categorization results and the accuracy of VALTEST in detecting invalid tests per category. Category 4 has the best accuracy on VALTEST, while Category 3, where ambiguities in the docstring lead the LLM to make incorrect assumptions, has the lowest accuracy after Category 6. This finding indicates that ambiguous docstrings impair VALTEST’s detection effectiveness more than categories where the docstring is clear. For example, consider the function `vowels_count`:

```

1 def vowels_count(s):
2     """Write a function vowels_count which takes a string representing a word as input and returns the number
3     of vowels in the string. Vowels in this case are 'a', 'e', 'i', 'o', 'u'. Here, 'y' is also a vowel,
4     but only when it is at the end of the given word."""
5     vowels = "aeiouAEIOU"
6     n_vowels = sum(c in vowels for c in s)
7     if s[-1] == 'y' or s[-1] == 'Y':
8         n_vowels += 1
9     return n_vowels

```

And the generated tests:

```

1 Test Case1: assert vowels_count("") == 0
2 Test Case2: assert vowels_count("crypt") == 1

```

Both tests fail when applied to the `vowels_count` implementation. Note that the tests are generated using only the docstring and function signature; the LLM has not accessed the function’s implementation during test generation. Test case 1 is categorized under Category 3. Here, the LLM assumes that an empty string should yield 0, as there are no vowels. However, in the function implementation, an empty string input raises an exception at line 5. Since this behavior is not described in the docstring, the test falls into Category 3 due to the ambiguity. In test case 2, the LLM incorrectly treats the letter `y` in `crypt` as a vowel, contradicting the explicit instructions in the docstring, placing it in Category 1 due to a misunderstanding of function logic.

VALTEST does not detect the invalidity of the first test case because the generated test case does not conflict with the function docstring, providing no indication of hallucination. However, VALTEST correctly identifies the second test case as invalid since it contradicts the docstring, resulting an indication of hallucination. This example illustrates that VALTEST effectively detects invalid tests associated with hallucination indicators but struggles with cases that lack these indicators.

5 Limitations and Threats to Validity

Limitation 1 (false negatives): Some test cases may be invalid (should have been detected positives) but they are not detectable by the token probabilities used in VALTEST. Thus they show as negatives, falsely. We found that VALTEST performed well on well-defined problems in LeetCode and HumanEval. In contrast, it showed only mediocre results on MBPP, which lacks well-structured

docstrings—a key aspect VALTEST relies on. Therefore, providing well-defined docstrings may significantly enhance the applicability of VALTEST.

Limitation 2 (false positives): While filtering out invalid tests, there is a risk of unintentionally discarding valid ones as well. However, through our analysis, we demonstrated that this issue is minimal. In most cases, the mutation scores did not drop significantly, indicating that only a few high-quality test cases were discarded. Additionally, in RQ2, we explored the trade-off between validity and mutation score, illustrating that our tool (VALTEST) can be adjusted to prioritize either aspect as needed.

External validity threat: The three datasets used in this study (HumanEval, MBPP, and LeetCode) are specific to the Python programming language. Consequently, the results may not fully generalize to other languages such as Java, JavaScript, or PHP. However, given the nature of the LLMs and the language-independent design of VALTEST, the findings could extend to other programming languages with minimal adaptation.

Conclusion validity threat: The thresholds applied for filtering test cases based on model predictions may cause overfitting to specific datasets. Therefore, the results might be biased on these benchmarks. Thus the thresholds may need to be adjusted according to the particular use case to ensure broader applicability. In addition, during the training we used a k-fold cross-validation so the results are not by chance biased toward the specific train-test splits of the benchmark.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

This paper presents VALTEST, a novel approach designed to improve the validity of test cases generated by LLMs through the analysis of token probabilities. By extracting statistical features from the token probabilities and using machine learning models, VALTEST effectively predicts the validity of LLM-generated test cases and use that to replace invalid test with valid ones. The approach was evaluated across three datasets (HumanEval, MBPP, LeetCode) and three LLMs (GPT-4o, GPT-3.5-turbo, Llama 3.1 8b), showing an increase in the validity rate of test cases from 6.2% up to 24% while maintaining a balance with mutation score and code coverage. Moreover, combining chain-out-thought prompting with VALTEST enhances the mutation score from 2.9% up to 6.7%. The findings also suggest that token probabilities are a strong indicator of test case validity.

Future work can focus on further refining the token probability-based prediction model to improve test case validity without compromising mutation score and code coverage. Investigating how VALTEST performs under different code generation scenarios and incorporating dynamic test case correction methods might also enhance its applicability in real-world software testing environments. Furthermore, integrating VALTEST with test generation frameworks that allow continuous feedback loops may further improve the correction of invalid test cases, enabling iterative improvement of test suites.

References

- [1] Saranya Alagarsamy, Chakkrit Tantithamthavorn, and Aldeida Aleti. 2024. A3test: Assertion-augmented automated test case generation. *Information and Software Technology* 176 (2024), 107565.
- [2] V Aho Alfred, S Lam Monica, and D Ullman Jeffrey. 2007. *Compilers principles, techniques & tools*. pearson Education.
- [3] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. 2021. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732* (2021).
- [4] Shreya Bhatia, Tarushi Gandhi, Dhruv Kumar, and Pankaj Jalote. 2024. Unit test generation using generative ai: A comparative performance analysis of autogeneration tools. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Large Language Models for Code*. 54–61.
- [5] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser,

- Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. *arXiv:2107.03374* [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03374>
- [6] Arghavan Moradi Dakhel, Amin Nikanjam, Wahid Majdinasab, Foutse Khomh, and Michel C Desmarais. 2024. Effective test generation using pre-trained large language models and mutation testing. *Information and Software Technology* 171 (2024), 107468.
 - [7] Pedro Delgado-Pérez, Aurora Ramírez, Kevin J Valle-Gómez, Inmaculada Medina-Bulo, and José Raúl Romero. 2022. Interevo-tr: Interactive evolutionary test generation with readability assessment. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 49, 4 (2022), 2580–2596.
 - [8] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783* (2024).
 - [9] Aryaz Eghbali and Michael Pradel. 2024. De-hallucinator: Iterative grounding for llm-based code completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01701* (2024).
 - [10] Ekaterina Fadeeva, Aleksandr Rubashevskii, Artem Shelmanov, Sergey Petrakov, Haonan Li, Hamdy Mubarak, Evgenii Tsymbalov, Gleb Kuzmin, Alexander Panchenko, Timothy Baldwin, et al. 2024. Fact-checking the output of large language models via token-level uncertainty quantification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04696* (2024).
 - [11] Angela Fan, Beliz Gokkaya, Mark Harman, Mitya Lyubarskiy, Shubho Sengupta, Shin Yoo, and Jie M. Zhang. 2023. Large Language Models for Software Engineering: Survey and Open Problems. In *2023 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering: Future of Software Engineering (ICSE-FoSE)*. 31–53. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE-FoSE59343.2023.00008>
 - [12] Vitor Guilherme and Auri Vincenzi. 2023. An initial investigation of ChatGPT unit test generation capability. In *Proceedings of the 8th Brazilian Symposium on Systematic and Automated Software Testing*. 15–24.
 - [13] Mark Harman and Phil McMinn. 2009. A theoretical and empirical study of search-based testing: Local, global, and hybrid search. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 36, 2 (2009), 226–247.
 - [14] Sepehr Hashtroudi, Jiho Shin, Hadi Hemmati, and Song Wang. 2023. Automated test case generation using code models and domain adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08033* (2023).
 - [15] Dong Huang, Qingwen Bu, Jie M Zhang, Michael Luck, and Heming Cui. 2023. Agentcoder: Multi-agent-based code generation with iterative testing and optimisation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.13010* (2023).
 - [16] Yuheng Huang, Jiayang Song, Zhijie Wang, Shengming Zhao, Huaming Chen, Felix Juefei-Xu, and Lei Ma. 2023. Look before you leap: An exploratory study of uncertainty measurement for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10236* (2023).
 - [17] Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2023. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *Comput. Surveys* 55, 12 (2023), 1–38.
 - [18] Saurav Kadavath, Tom Conerly, Amanda Askell, Tom Henighan, Dawn Drain, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Nova DasSarma, Eli Tran-Johnson, et al. 2022. Language models (mostly) know what they know. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05221* (2022).
 - [19] Grant Ledger and Rafael Mancinni. 2024. Detecting LLM Hallucinations Using Monte Carlo Simulations on Token Probabilities. (2024).
 - [20] Caroline Lemieux, Jeevana Priya Inala, Shuvendu K Lahiri, and Siddhartha Sen. 2023. Codamosa: Escaping coverage plateaus in test generation with pre-trained large language models. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 919–931.
 - [21] Kefan Li and Yuan Yuan. 2024. Large Language Models as Test Case Generators: Performance Evaluation and Enhancement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13340* (2024).
 - [22] Vincent Li and Nick Doiron. 2023. Prompting code interpreter to write better unit tests on quixbugs functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00483* (2023).
 - [23] Fang Liu, Yang Liu, Lin Shi, Houkun Huang, Ruifeng Wang, Zhen Yang, and Li Zhang. 2024. Exploring and evaluating hallucinations in llm-powered code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00971* (2024).
 - [24] Kaibo Liu, Yiyang Liu, Zhenpeng Chen, Jie M Zhang, Yudong Han, Yun Ma, Ge Li, and Gang Huang. 2024. LLM-Powered Test Case Generation for Detecting Tricky Bugs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.10304* (2024).
 - [25] Hadas Orgad, Michael Tokor, Zorik Gekhman, Roi Reichart, Idan Szepkter, Hadas Kotek, and Yonatan Belinkov. 2024. LLMs Know More Than They Show: On the Intrinsic Representation of LLM Hallucinations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02707* (2024).

- [26] Wendkúuni C Ouédraogo, Kader Kaboré, Haoye Tian, Yewei Song, Anil Koyuncu, Jacques Klein, David Lo, and Tegawendé F Bissyandé. 2024. Large-scale, Independent and Comprehensive study of the power of LLMs for test case generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.00225* (2024).
- [27] Carlos Pacheco, Shuvendu K Lahiri, Michael D Ernst, and Thomas Ball. 2007. Feedback-directed random test generation. In *29th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '07)*. IEEE, 75–84.
- [28] Laura Plein, Wendkúuni C Ouédraogo, Jacques Klein, and Tegawendé F Bissyandé. 2024. Automatic generation of test cases based on bug reports: a feasibility study with large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings*. 360–361.
- [29] Ernesto Quevedo, Jorge Yero, Rachel Koerner, Pablo Rivas, and Tomas Cerny. 2024. Detecting Hallucinations in Large Language Model Generation: A Token Probability Approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19648* (2024).
- [30] Mirza Masfiquur Rahman and Ashish Kundu. 2024. Code Hallucination. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.04831* (2024).
- [31] Nikitha Rao, Kush Jain, Uri Alon, Claire Le Goues, and Vincent J Hellendoorn. 2023. CAT-LM training language models on aligned code and tests. In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 409–420.
- [32] Jiho Shin, Hadi Hemmati, Moshi Wei, and Song Wang. 2024. Assessing evaluation metrics for neural test oracle generation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (2024).
- [33] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. 2024. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [34] Zachariah Sollenberger, Jay Patel, Christian Munley, Aaron Jarmusch, and Sunita Chandrasekaran. 2024. LLM4VV: Exploring LLM-as-a-Judge for Validation and Verification Testsuites. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.11729* (2024).
- [35] Benjamin Steenhoek, Michele Tufano, Neel Sundaresan, and Alexey Svyatkovskiy. 2023. Reinforcement learning from automatic feedback for high-quality unit test generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02368* (2023).
- [36] Hamed Taherkhani, Melika Sepindband, Hung Viet Pham, Song Wang, and Hadi Hemmati. 2024. EPiC: Cost-effective Search-based Prompt Engineering of LLMs for Code Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.11198* (2024).
- [37] Yutian Tang, Zhijie Liu, Zhichao Zhou, and Xiapu Luo. 2024. Chatgpt vs sbst: A comparative assessment of unit test suite generation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (2024).
- [38] Yuchen Tian, Weixiang Yan, Qian Yang, Qian Chen, Wen Wang, Ziyang Luo, and Lei Ma. 2024. CodeHalu: Code Hallucinations in LLMs Driven by Execution-based Verification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00253* (2024).
- [39] Michele Tufano, Dawn Drain, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Shao Kun Deng, and Neel Sundaresan. 2020. Unit test case generation with transformers and focal context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.05617* (2020).
- [40] Neeraj Varshney, Wenlin Yao, Hongming Zhang, Jianshu Chen, and Dong Yu. 2023. A stitch in time saves nine: Detecting and mitigating hallucinations of llms by validating low-confidence generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03987* (2023).
- [41] Vasudev Vikram, Caroline Lemieux, and Rohan Padhye. 2023. Can large language models write good property-based tests? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04346* (2023).
- [42] Junjie Wang, Yuchao Huang, Chunyang Chen, Zhe Liu, Song Wang, and Qing Wang. 2024. Software Testing With Large Language Models: Survey, Landscape, and Vision. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 50, 4 (2024), 911–936. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2024.3368208>
- [43] Xusheng Xiao, Sihan Li, Tao Xie, and Nikolai Tillmann. 2013. Characteristic studies of loop problems for structural test generation via symbolic execution. In *2013 28th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 246–256.
- [44] Zhuokui Xie, Yinghao Chen, Chen Zhi, Shuiguang Deng, and Jianwei Yin. 2023. ChatUniTest: a ChatGPT-based automated unit test generation tool. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04764* (2023).
- [45] Zhiqiang Yuan, Yiling Lou, Mingwei Liu, Shiji Ding, Kaixin Wang, Yixuan Chen, and Xin Peng. 2023. No more manual tests? evaluating and improving chatgpt for unit test generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04207* (2023).
- [46] Shayan Zamani and Hadi Hemmati. 2019. Revisiting hyper-parameter tuning for search-based test data generation. In *Search-Based Software Engineering: 11th International Symposium, SSBSE 2019, Tallinn, Estonia, August 31–September 1, 2019, Proceedings 11*. Springer, 137–152.
- [47] Shayan Zamani and Hadi Hemmati. 2020. A cost-effective approach for hyper-parameter tuning in search-based test case generation. In *2020 IEEE international conference on software maintenance and evolution (ICSME)*. IEEE, 418–429.
- [48] Shayan Zamani and Hadi Hemmati. 2021. A pragmatic approach for hyper-parameter tuning in search-based test case generation. *Empirical Software Engineering* 26 (2021), 1–35.
- [49] Ying Zhang, Wenjia Song, Zhengjie Ji, Na Meng, et al. 2023. How well does llm generate security tests? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00710* (2023).
- [50] Li Zhong, Zilong Wang, and Jingbo Shang. 2024. Ldb: A large language model debugger via verifying runtime execution step-by-step. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16906* (2024).
- [51] Andy Zhou, Kai Yan, Michal Shlapentokh-Rothman, Haohan Wang, and Yu-Xiong Wang. 2023. Language agent tree search unifies reasoning acting and planning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04406* (2023).