

---

# AssertionBench: A Benchmark to Evaluate Large-Language Models for Assertion Generation

---

**Vaishnavi Pulavarthi, Deeksha Nandal**

Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering  
University of Illinois Chicago, Chicago IL 60607  
{vpulav2, dnanda6}@uic.edu

**Soham Dan**

IBM T.J. Watson Research Lab  
York Town, NY  
Soham.Dan@ibm.com

**Debjit Pal**

Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering  
University of Illinois Chicago, Chicago IL 60607  
dpa12@uic.edu

## Abstract

Assertions have been the de facto collateral for simulation-based and formal verification of hardware designs for over a decade. The quality of hardware verification, *i.e.*, detection and diagnosis of corner-case design bugs, is critically dependent on the quality of the assertions. There has been a considerable amount of research leveraging a blend of data-driven statistical analysis and static analysis to generate high-quality assertions from hardware design source code and design execution trace data. Despite such concerted effort, all prior research struggles to scale to industrial-scale large designs, generates too many low-quality assertions, often fails to capture subtle and non-trivial design functionality, and does not produce any easy-to-comprehend explanations of the generated assertions to understand assertions' suitability to different downstream validation tasks. Recently, with the advent of Large-Language Models (LLMs), there has been a widespread effort to model assertion generation as a sequence-to-sequence translation (S2St) and leverage prompt engineering to generate assertions. However, there is little effort to quantitatively establish the effectiveness and suitability of various LLMs for assertion generation. In this paper, we present AssertionBench, a novel benchmark to evaluate LLMs' effectiveness for assertion generation quantitatively. AssertionBench contains 100 curated Verilog hardware designs from OpenCores and formally verified assertions for each design generated from GOLDMINE and HARM. We use AssertionBench to compare state-of-the-art LLMs, *e.g.*, GPT-3.5, GPT-4o, CodeLLaMa 2, and LLaMa3-70B, to assess their effectiveness in inferring functionally correct assertions for hardware designs. Our experiments comprehensively demonstrate how LLMs perform relative to each other, the benefits of using more in-context exemplars in generating a higher fraction of functionally correct assertions, and the significant room for improvement for LLM-based assertion generators.

## 1 Introduction:

System-on-Chip (SoC) designs represent the building blocks for many safety-critical computing applications, including vehicular systems, infrastructure, military, and industrial automation. SoCs perform numerous complex computations, often using sensitive and users' private data. It is crucial for our national and personal well-being to ensure that the SoCs are functionally correct, safe, and secure to ensure that the SoC designs function as intended and are free from errors and vulnerabilities.

*Assertions* or *design invariants* are mathematical encoding (in Boolean logic) of desired design properties that should hold True in the design. Assertions are used for hardware design validation at different stages of hardware’s life cycle, *e.g.*, pre-silicon formal verification and simulation-based verification, emulation, and often synthesized in a fabricated chip for post-silicon validation and in-field debug and diagnosis. Assertion-based Verification (ABV) [1] has long emerged as the de facto standard to verify security and functional correctness of SoCs. However, crafting a succinct set of assertions for hardware designs is a tedious and time-consuming task, often require considerable amount of human ingenuity. Too many assertions can negatively affect verification performance with a prolonged verification closure, whereas too few assertions may result in insufficient design coverage causing corner case design bugs to escape to production and mass manufacturing. The ever increasing hardware design complexity and rapidly broadening target applications (*e.g.*, deep learning, AI) have only worsened the problem. Additionally, in sequential hardware designs (*i.e.*, designs containing flip-flops, memory elements, and latches), properties span across multiple clock cycles that are usually the source of subtle yet crucial bugs that often take many months to debug. Human mind fails to reason with such complicated temporal relations, thereby making the temporal assertion generation further challenging. **Consequently, it is crucial to develop an automated and scalable technique to rapidly generate a succinct set of hardware design properties targeting design functionality, safety, and security.**

There has been a considerable amount of research work that leverage two different paradigms – lightweight static analysis of design source code and formal verification [2, 3, 4, 5, 6], and data-driven statistical analysis, *e.g.*, data mining [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. While source code-based static analysis can generalize (and abstract) and capture corner-case design behaviors, it suffers from prohibitive computational complexity limiting its scalability to industrial-scale designs. On the other hand, data-driven dynamic analysis can scale to large designs with considerable amount of trace data due to its computational efficiency, however, it often generates spurious design properties due to the lack of design and domain context. GOLDMINE, for the first time developed a static analysis guided statistical analysis-based technique to generate hardware assertions in Linear Temporal Logic [16] in a fully automated way. While GOLDMINE and follow-up research work made assertions accessible beyond the elite group of hardware verification engineers, most of those methods still failed to scale to large industry-scale designs due to the algorithmic complexity of the underlying static analysis.

With recent advances in deep-learning (DL) models, especially Large-Language Models (LLMs), *e.g.*, GPT-3.5, GPT-4o, CodeLLaMa 2, and LLaMa3-70B, there is a renewed interest in the research community to harness the power of LLMs for assertion generation task. Most recent assertion generation approaches (*c.f.*, Section 3) treat a LLM model as a **black-box** and use *prompt engineering* to iteratively refine the set of generated assertions. However, there is no in-depth study nor a dataset to evaluate on how well different state-of-the-art (SOTA) LLM models perform on generating correct set of assertions without considerable amount of designer-developed prompts.

To address this gap, in this work, we propose AssertionBench, the first comprehensive benchmark to quantify the efficacy of SOTA and upcoming LLMs for the assertion generation task. The benchmark contains 100 curated designs of varying complexity encompassing a broad spectrum of design types, *e.g.*, receiver and transmitter of UART (Universal Asynchronous Receiver and Transmitter) protocol, encoders, decoders, and arithmetic operations such as addition, multiplication and two’s complement in FPU (Floating Point Unit), along with their formally verified assertions facilitating future research in exploring applicability of LLMs in assertion generation. Our primary focus is to quantify the quality (in terms of valid assertions, *c.f.* Section 2) of the generated assertions using a LLM trained on a collection of labeled designs and their formally verified assertions.

## 2 Background

In this section, we provide a few definitions necessary to understand assertion generation and AssertionBench. For our discussion, we consider a Verilog RTL design  $\mathcal{D}$ .  $\mathcal{D}$  is a parallel composition of a set of concurrent processes  $P_i$  (always and assign blocks), and let  $V$  be the set of design signals. Let  $\mathcal{I} \subset V$  be the set of input signals,  $\mathcal{O} \subset V$  be the set of output signals, and  $\mathcal{R} \subset V$  be the set of internal registers. In Figure 1, we show a Verilog design  $\mathcal{D}$  of a 2-port Arbiter, consisting of two concurrent always processes  $P_1$  (line 6) and  $P_2$  (line 11), and  $V = \{clk, rst, req1, req2, gnt1, gnt2, gnt\_ \}$ ,  $\mathcal{I} = \{clk, rst, req1, req2\}$ ,  $\mathcal{O} = \{gnt1, gnt2\}$ , and  $\mathcal{R} = \{gnt\_ \}$ .

We define an *assertion* in a restricted manner as that of [17]. An assertion is a temporal formula in LTL [16] of the format  $P = \mathcal{G}(A \rightarrow C)$  where the antecedent  $A$  is of the form  $A = A_0 \wedge \mathcal{X}(A_1) \wedge \mathcal{X}\mathcal{X}(A_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \mathcal{X}^m(A^m)$  and consequent  $C$  is of the form  $C = \mathcal{X}^n(C^n)$ , where  $n \geq m$ . Each  $A_i$  ( $C_i$ ) is a proposition and is a  $(v, val)$  pair where  $v \in V$  and  $val \in \{0, 1\}$ .  $\mathcal{X}$  is called the next-cycle operator and  $\mathcal{X}^n$  ( $n \geq 0$ ) is equal to a delay of  $n$  clock cycles  $\underbrace{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{X}\dots\mathcal{X}}_{n \text{ times}}$ . We say an assertion

$P$  is True if  $\mathcal{D} \models P$  (read as  $\mathcal{D}$  models  $P$ ), in other words the assertion holds True globally (indicated by  $\mathcal{G}$  operator) on design  $\mathcal{D}$ . Otherwise, the assertion is False, i.e.,  $\mathcal{D} \not\models P$  and there exists a Boolean value assignment to design signals known as *cex* (counter example) that shows a refutation of assertion  $P$  on  $\mathcal{D}$ . The implication operator  $\rightarrow$  in  $P$  could be of two types, *overlapped* and *non-overlapped*. The *overlapped* implication operator denoted as  $\rightarrow$  implies *if there is a match on the antecedent  $A$ , then the consequent  $C$  is evaluated in the same clock cycle*. The *non-overlapped* implication operator denoted as  $\Rightarrow$  implies *if there is a match on the antecedent  $A$ , then the consequent  $C$  is evaluated in the next clock cycle*. Additionally, based on the evaluation condition of the pre-condition and the post-condition, an assertion can have different evaluation. In Figure 2, we show the assertion evaluation status. Note  $A \rightarrow C$  can be re-written as  $\neg A \vee C$ . Consequently, if pre-condition  $A$  is **unreachable** (or False), then the assertion  $P$  is vacuously True (i.e.,  $\neg \text{False} \vee C$ ). If pre-condition  $A$  is True and post-condition  $C$  is True as well, the assertion is reported to be Valid (i.e.,  $\mathcal{D} \models P$ ), otherwise, if the post-condition  $C$  is False, then a counter example *cex* is generated.

For the Arbiter design of Figure 1, consider two assertions  $P1 : \mathcal{G}((req1 == 1 \wedge req2 == 0) \rightarrow (gnt1 == 1))$  and  $P2 : \mathcal{G}((req2 == 0 \wedge gnt\_ == 1) \wedge \mathcal{X}(req1 == 1) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(gnt1 == 1))$ . The assertion  $P1$  will evaluate to True if  $req1$  is 1'b1 and  $req2$  is 1'b0 at the current clock cycle, then  $gnt1$  is 1'b1 in the current clock cycle. Note that  $P1$  contains the *overlapped* implication operator  $\rightarrow$ . The assertion  $P2$  will evaluate to True if  $req2$  is 1'b0 and  $gnt_$  is 1'b1 in the current cycle,  $req1$  is 1'b1 in the next cycle, then  $gnt1$  is 1'b1 in the cycle after (i.e., in the 2<sup>nd</sup> cycle). Note that  $P2$  can be re-written using the *non-overlapped* implication operator in the following way  $P2 : \mathcal{G}((req2 == 0 \wedge gnt\_ == 1) \wedge \mathcal{X}(req1 == 1) \Rightarrow (gnt1 == 1))$  where the  $\Rightarrow$  subsumes the  $\mathcal{X}$  operator in the consequent. When we try to discharge a proof for  $P1$  and  $P2$  using a formal property verification (FPV) engine, such as Cadence JasperGold [18], we find  $P1$  is a valid assertion, i.e.,  $\mathcal{D} \models P1$  whereas JasperGold finds a counterexample (CEX) for  $P2$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{D} \not\models P2$ . We will use the assertion evaluation criterion of Figure 2 to define our *goodness* metric while evaluating SOTA LLMs for assertion generation task.

### 3 Related Work

Automatic generation of assertions in software and hardware has been an active area of research since seventies. Assertion generation via static analysis of design source code has been studied in the context of deductive program verification [2, 3, 4]. Static analysis techniques have been used to learn and generate likely program invariants for software verification [5, 6]. Data Mining and data-driven dynamic analysis have also been used to generate software invariants. DAIKON is one of

```

1 module arb2(clk, rst, req1, req2,
2   gnt1, gnt2);
3   input clk, rst, req1, req2;
4   output gnt1, gnt2;
5   reg gnt_, gnt1, gnt2;
6   always @(posedge clk or posedge
7     rst)
8     if(rst)
9       gnt_ <= 0;
10    else
11      gnt_ <= gnt1;
12  always @(*)
13    if (gnt_)
14      begin
15        gnt1 = req1 & req2;
16        gnt2 = req2;
17      end
18    else
19      begin
20        gnt1 = req1;
21        gnt2 = req2 & ~req1;
22      end
23  endmodule

```

Figure 1: A Verilog code for a 2-port Arbiter.

|                |       | Pre-condition |             |
|----------------|-------|---------------|-------------|
|                |       | Covered       | Unreachable |
| Post-Condition | True  | Valid         | Vacuous     |
|                | False | CEX           |             |

Figure 2: Assertion status based on pre-condition and post-condition evaluation. CEX: Counter example.




Figure 3: **Detail of the designs in the test set in terms of the number of lines of code (excluding comments and blank lines).**

the earliest and pioneering work on generating likely program invariants for software programs [7]. IODINE is one of the earliest work for hardware assertion generation by analyzing dynamic program behavior with respect to a set of standard property templates [8]. Prior works [9, 10, 11] have used static analysis for assertion generation whereas [12, 13, 14, 15] have used dynamic simulation execution data for assertion generation. GOLDMINE introduced the novel concept of data-driven statistical analysis guided by the lightweight static analysis of design source code to automatically generate assertions for a broad spectrum of hardware designs [19, 20]. Following GOLDMINE, researchers have developed a wide variety of assertion generation techniques using a combination of lightweight analysis of design source code and data-driven dynamic analysis targeting design functionality [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29] and design security [30, 31]. Additionally, researchers have proposed approaches to evaluate the quality of numerous assertions that automatic methods generate in terms of captured design functionality and security to induce a rank order to aid the downstream verification tasks [32, 22, 28, 33]. **However, all these works suffer from following shortcomings** – they (i) do not scale for industrial-scale designs, (ii) often require massive amount of trace data to generate properties, (iii) generate too many design properties, often redundant, without any explanation on their usability for verification tasks, (iv) fail to generalize the properties beyond what is seen in the trace, and (v) encompass an extremely small subset of SystemVerilog (SVA) grammar [34], limiting the expressibility and richness of the generated design properties.

Recently, massive success of Large-Language Models (LLMs), *e.g.*, GPT [35], LLaMa [36, 37], Gemini [38], in diverse applications have led researchers to investigate application of LLMs for hardware property generation [39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44]. **However, almost all recent works on property generation using LLMs suffer from the following shortcomings** – they (i) require considerable human efforts and deep understanding of the target hardware designs to devise *hand-crafted prompts* to generate and refine hardware properties, (ii) do not generalize the assertions, and (iii) do not consider execution traces, risking to potentially miss subtle incorrect design behaviors or security vulnerabilities that are not obvious in the design source code. In fact, there does not exist a systematic study in comparing the effectiveness of different commercial and open-source LLMs in generating valid assertions for an input Verilog hardware design.

In this paper, we address this gap and propose AssertionBench to evaluate the goodness of four different widely-used LLMs on generating valid assertions. AssertionBench can be used to evaluate the assertion generation capabilities of any future LLMs as well.

## 4 The AssertionBench Benchmark

In this section, we introduce the AssertionBench dataset.<sup>1</sup> We collect our training and test designs from OpenCores [45]. We provide representative details of our test designs in Figure 3 and Table 1. Our selected test designs cover a wide variety of hardware encompassing communication controllers, random number generators for security hardware, FPU, state machines, and flow control hardware.

<sup>1</sup>[https://github.com/achieve-lab/assertion\\_data\\_for\\_LLM](https://github.com/achieve-lab/assertion_data_for_LLM).

Table 1: Details of a few representative designs in the test set of AssertionBench benchmark.

| Verilog Design          | # of Lines | Design Type   | Design Functionality   |
|-------------------------|------------|---------------|--|
| ca_prng                 | 1144       | Sequential    | A compact Pattern Generator                                    |
| cavlc_read_total_coeffs | 1090       | Sequential    | Video Encoder for generic audio visual.                        |
| cavlc_read_total_zeros  | 637        | Combinational | Video Encoder for generic audio visual.                        |
| ge_1000baseX_rx         | 544        | Sequential    | Verilog implementation of Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS) type. |
| MAC_tx_Ctrl             | 504        | Sequential    | An Ethernet MAC controller.                                    |




Figure 4: Our evaluation framework. **JG**: Cadence® JasperGold Formal Property Verification Engine.

Our benchmark consists of five training examples for 1-shot and 5-shot learning, where each example is a tuple consisting of a Verilog design and its formally verified assertions, generated from GOLDMINE [19] and HARM [29], and verified using Cadence JasperGold [18]. The training set comprises fundamental designs such as Arbiter, Half Adder, Full Adder, T-flip-flop, and Full Subtractor. Among these designs, Arbiter and T flip-flop are sequential, while the others are combinational. Our training set assertions contains both overlapped and non-overlapped implication operators.

Our test set contains 100 Verilog designs from OpenCores [45] that are more complex than those in the training set, to evaluate LLMs’ 1-shot and 5-shot learning. Our test set contains both combinational and sequential designs with code sizes varying from 10 lines to 1150 lines (excluding blanks and comments). We use the `cloc` [46] to count the lines in the design source code.

## 5 Experimental Setup

Figure 4 shows our evaluation framework. We evaluated four state-of-the-art Large Language Models (LLMs), GPT-3.5 [47], GPT-4o [35], CodeLLaMa 2 [48], and LLaMa3-70B [49] using the proposed AssertionBench on the task of predicting correct or valid assertions.

**In-Context Learning/Compute Platform:** We use UIUC (University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign) NCSA’s (National Center for Supercomputing Applications) public Delta Cluster [50] containing multiple CPU and GPU compute nodes to run our experiments. We use GPU nodes containing 1-way, 4-way, and 8-way NVIDIA A40 (with 48GB GDDR6) and A100 (with 40GB SXM) GPUs to perform  $k$ -shot training and inference. Each 1-way and 4-way GPU computing node has 256 GB RAM and each 8-way GPU computing node has 2 TB RAM.

**In-Context Learning Hyperparameters:** In all models under consideration, the hyperparameters have been uniformly configured to their default settings. Specifically, the maximum output tokens have been established at 1024, employing a greedy decoding strategy and maintaining a *temperature* of 1.0, *top\_p* of 0.95. The *random seed* has been configured to 50.

**Pre-trained Models and EDA Tools:** We use pre-trained LLMs from the HuggingFace model repository [51] for AssertionBench evaluation. We have also used Python 3.11 and Cadence JasperGold version 2022.06p002 for formally verifying the assertions generated from the test Verilog designs. We use two state-of-the-art classical tools GOLDMINE [19, 22] and HARM [29] to generate assertions

```

1 You are an expert in SystemVerilog Assertions.
2 Your task is to generate the list of assertions to the given verilog
  design. An example is shown below. Generate only the list of
  assertions for the test program with no additional text.
3 Program 1: module arb2(clk, rst, req1, req2, gnt1, gnt2); input clk,
  rst; input req1, req2; output gnt1, gnt2; reg state; reg gnt1,
  gnt2; always @(posedge clk or posedge rst) if (rst) state <= 0;
  else state <= gnt1; always @ (*) if (state) begin gnt1 = req1 & ~
  req2; gnt2 = req2; end else begin gnt1 = req1; gnt2 = req2 & ~req1
  ; end endmodule
4 Assertions 1: (state == 1 & req2 == 1) |-> (gnt1 == 0);(req1 == 1 &
  state == 0) |-> (gnt1 == 1);(req1 == 0) |-> (gnt1 == 0);(req1 == 1
  & req2 == 0) |-> (gnt1 == 1);(req1 == 1 & state == 0) |-> (gnt2
  == 0);(req2 == 1 & state == 1) |-> (gnt2 == 1);(req2 == 0) |-> (
  gnt2 == 0);(req2 == 1 & req1 == 0) |-> (gnt2 == 1); (gnt2) |-> (
  req2); (gnt1) |-> (req1);
5 Test Program:
6 module fifo_mem #(parameter DEPTH=8, DATA_WIDTH=8, PTR_WIDTH=3) (
  input wclk, w_en, rclk, r_en, input [PTR_WIDTH:0] b_wptr, b_rptr,
  input [DATA_WIDTH-1:0] data_in, input full, empty, output
7 reg [DATA_WIDTH-1:0] data_out); reg [DATA_WIDTH-1:0] fifo[0:DEPTH-1];
  always@(posedge wclk) begin if(w_en & !full) begin fifo[b_wptr[
  PTR_WIDTH-1:0]] <= data_in; end end always@(posedge rclk) begin
  data_out <= fifo[b_rptr[PTR_WIDTH-1:0]]; end endmodule
8 Test Assertions:

```

Figure 5: An example of the prompt for 1-shot learning. The example consists of a tuple, a Verilog hardware design (Program 1) and a set of formally verified assertions for the design (Assertions 1). The Test Program is the Verilog hardware design for which we generate assertions using the trained LLM.

from different Verilog designs in the training set. Below, we summarize the four LLMs that we use to evaluate AssertionBench.


*GPT-3.5*: GPT-3.5 is a commercial LLM built using the GPT architecture. It is part of OpenAI’s GPT (Generative Pre-trained Transformer) series of models designed to understand and generate text based on the input it receives.

*GPT-4o*: GPT-4o (“o” for “omni”) is the newest model of OpenAI’s GPT, which accepts any combination of input audio, image, video, and text and responds with an output consisting of image, audio, video, and text. With larger training data, increased model size, and faster response compared to other GPT models, GPT-4o is a unified end-to-end model for text, vision, and audio.


*CodeLLaMa 2*: CodeLLaMa 2 is a collection of pre-trained and fine-tuned generative text models ranging in scale from 7B to 70B parameters developed by Meta. The input and output of the model are text only. It is an auto-regressive language model based on transformer architecture. The content window length for CodeLLaMa 2 is 4096 and all models are trained with 4M tokens. The large 70B model uses Grouped-Query Attention for improved inference scalability.

*LLaMa3-70B*: LLaMa3 is available in two sizes: 8B and 70B. The context window length for LLaMa3-70B is 8192 and is pre-trained with 15 Trillion tokens of publicly available data. LLaMa3-70B excels at language nuances, translation, contextual understanding, and dialogue generation. It has enhanced capabilities such as code generation, reasoning, and instruction following.


**Evaluation Protocol**: To evaluate effectiveness of the different LLMs, our few-shot testing regime consists of 1-shot and 5-shot in-context examples. Each in-context example is a tuple  $\langle \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$ , where  $\mathcal{D}$  is a Verilog design source code and  $\mathcal{A}$  is a set of formally verified assertions containing a minimum of two (2) and a maximum of 10 assertions with an average of 4.8 assertions per example. We use a prompt as shown in Figure 5 consisting of four parts – (i) an English language description of the task in hand, (ii) a training Verilog design with all newlines and comments removed, (iii) an assertion in SystemVerilog Assertion [34] format, and (iv) a test Verilog design with all new lines and comments removed. Followed by training, we provide each trained model 100 test Verilog programs to infer




(a) Assertion accuracy comparison for GPT-3.5.



(b) Assertion accuracy comparison for GPT-4o.



(c) Assertion accuracy comparison for CodeLLaMa 2.



(d) Assertion accuracy comparison for LLaMa3-70B.

Figure 6: Comparison of accuracy of generated assertions in terms of passing, failing (generating a counter example), and syntactically wrong assertions between 1-shot and 5-shot in-context learning per LLM. CEX: Counter example.

assertions. In our experiments, we have found all of the LLM models generate syntactically erroneous assertions, *i.e.*, each LLM fails to learn the SVA syntax from the training examples. Consequently, we use a syntax corrector (Assertion Syntax Corrector block in Figure 4) using GPT-3.5 and feed the output of the syntax corrector to Cadence JasperGold FPV engine to evaluate the quality of the generated assertions. Note any other FPV engine compatible with SVA will work as well.

*Metrics:* We evaluate the assertions generated from the test programs using following three metrics for each  $k$ -shot training for each LLM.

- **Pass:** It quantifies the fraction of generated assertions that FPV engine attests as valid for the design. This includes the Vacuous and the Pass cases from Figure 2.
- **Fail:** It quantifies the fraction of generated assertions that FPV engine attests as wrong for the design and generates a counterexample trace. This includes the Fail case from Figure 2.
- **Error:** It quantifies the fraction of generated assertions for which the FPV engine identifies one or more syntactic errors in the assertions even after syntax correction by the GPT-3.5.

## 6 Experimental Results

We show our overall experimental results in Figure 6 and Figure 7. We make following observations.

**Observation 1: Most Large-Language Models generate valid assertions with increasing number of training examples.** For the assertion generation task, all language models produce more valid assertions when number of training examples is increased as seen in Figure 6. GPT-3.5, GPT-4o, and CodeLLaMa 2 show on average an improvement of  $2\times$ ,  $1.2\times$ , and  $1.12\times$  for valid assertion generation, respectively, when moved from 1-shot learning to 5-shot learning. However, LLaMa3-70B model loses accuracy from 31% to 24% on the same dataset. Our in-depth analysis shows in many cases, LLaMa3-70B either fails to generate assertions or generates syntactically wrong assertions (which even a syntax corrector fails to correct), or tries to generate codes in a new programming




Figure 7: Comparison of accuracy of generated assertions in terms of passing, failing, (generating a counter example), and syntactically wrong assertions between different LLMs per  $k$ -shot learning where  $k = 1$  and  $k = 5$ .

language (such as Java). This experiment shows that there is a considerable scope for improving LLaMa3-70B model for this task, likely via fine-tuning the pre-trained LLaMa3-70B model.

**Observation 2: An enhanced model does not necessarily ensure a better semantic or syntactic understanding.** In Figure 6, we do not see a clear correlation between the sophistication (in terms of number of model parameters) of the LLMs and its ability to predict good assertions. For GPT-3.5 (c.f., Figure 6a), with increase in the number of training examples, the LLM was able to produce more syntactically correct assertions, however, after such corrections majority of assertions (on average up to 24%) generated a counter example when verified with JasperGold. For GPT-4o, the results were more consistent in terms of syntactically correct assertions and failing assertions both in 1-shot and 5-shot learning (c.f., Figure 6b). For CodeLLaMa 2 and LLaMa3-70B, with increase in the number of training examples, the number of failed assertions decreased (on average up to 12% for CodeLLaMa 2 and LLaMa3-70B, c.f., Figure 6c and Figure 6d), however, both models generated more syntactically wrong assertions (on average up to 19% more for LLaMa3-70B). This observation is perplexing as one would expect with more number of parameters, LLaMa3-70B would be able to learn better to predict syntactically correct assertions. Our in-depth analysis shows that with 1-shot, the variation in types of assertions in examples were limited. Consequently, LLaMa3-70B learned the syntax. However, in 5-shot learning, we have more variations in assertion syntax which made LLaMa3-70B’s learning task difficult. This experiment suggests that increasing the training examples will not necessarily improve LLM’s consistency in generating passing, failing, and syntactically correct assertions.

**Observation 3: GPT-4o is relatively more consistent for assertion generation task.** In Figure 7 we compare different LLMs in terms of generating valid assertions for 1-shot and 5-shot learning. Our experiments show that GPT-4o is consistently superior in generating valid assertions for both 1-shot and 5-shot learning and generates on an average up to 15.6% more valid assertions as compared to other LLMs. This trend remains valid with respect to assertions generating counter examples and syntactically wrong assertions, *i.e.*, GPT-4o produced less counter examples generating assertions and syntactically incorrect assertions as compared to other LLMs. This experiment shows that GPT-4o performs relatively better as compared to the other LLMs.

**Observation 4: All LLM models need considerable improvement for assertion generation task:** In-depth analysis of Figure 6 and Figure 7 show that none of the LLM models can generate valid assertions with on average of no more than 44% accuracy whereas up to 63% generated assertions produces counter example and on average up to 33% of generated assertions are syntactically wrong. Clearly, for LLMs to be of practical usage for any realistic industrial-scale design, considerable improvement needs to be made. Specifically, the LLMs need to capture the semantic meaning of the Verilog designs for producing higher fraction of valid assertions automatically without iterative human prompting. Our insight from our prior work [19, 22] is that such critical insights are not directly available from the raw design source code and needs auxiliary artifacts, such as Control-Data Flow Graph (CDFG), Variable Dependency Graph (VDG), Cone of Influence (COI), etc. Future research in applying LLMs for assertion generation should consider such auxiliary artifacts to design assertion-specific LLMs.

## 7 Limitations

- **Dataset:** In the scope of this study, our primary focus is on Verilog designs, given its status as the predominant hardware design language. Moving forward, it will be intriguing to develop benchmarks for assertions in alternative hardware languages, thereby expanding the scope of our analysis to encompass a broader range of design paradigms.
- **Modeling:** In this paper, we assessed the few-shot assertion generation capabilities of state-of-the-art language models. In future work, it will be interesting to fine-tune language models for assertion generation and evaluate their performance on AssertionBench.
- **Evaluation:** In future work, it will be valuable to conduct a more detailed evaluation of model errors to better understand the specific limitations of each LLM for assertion generation.

## 8 Conclusion and Future Work

This work introduces AssertionBench to evaluate the current and future commercial and open-source LLMs for the assertion generation task. Although there is no LLM that consistently outperform other LLMs, we notice several promising trends and research direction to enhance practical applicability of LLMs for assertion generation task which will further accelerate SoC and hardware design verification. As LLM research is growing at a tremendous pace both in commercial and academic research, we plan to maintain the benchmark and augment its training and test set with more complex designs to further stress test the LLMs. Currently, AssertionBench considers only a few temporal assertions with shallow temporality. We plan to increase the temporal depth to capture design behaviors that cut across multiple clock cycles and evaluate LLM's ability to learn and generate assertions to capture such behaviors succinctly.

## References

- [1] Hasini Witharana, Yangdi Lyu, Subodha Charles, and Prabhat Mishra. A Survey on Assertion-based Hardware Verification. *ACM Comput. Surv. (CS)*, 2022.
- [2] Saddek Bensalem, Yassine Lakhnech, and Hassen Saidi. Powerful Techniques for The Automatic Generation of Invariants. *Int'l Conf. on Computer-Aided Verification (CAV)*, 1996.
- [3] Michel Caplain. Finding Invariant Assertions for Proving Programs. *Int'l Conf. on Reliable Software (ICRS)*, 1975.
- [4] Jayadev Misra. Prospects and Limitations of Automatic Assertion Generation for Loop Programs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 1977.
- [5] A. Tiwari, H. Rueß, H. Saïdi, and N. Shankar. A Technique for Invariant Generation. *Int'l Conf. on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems (TACAS)*, 2001.
- [6] Corina S. Păsăreanu and Willem Visser. Verification of Java Programs Using Symbolic Execution and Invariant Generation. *Int'l SPIN Workshop on Model Checking of Software (SPIN)*, 2004.
- [7] Michael D. Ernst, Adam Czeisler, William G. Griswold, and David Notkin. Quickly Detecting Relevant Program Invariants. *Int'l Conf. on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, 2000.
- [8] Sudheendra Hangal, Sridhar Narayanan, Naveen Chandra, and Sandeep Chakravorty. IODINE: A Tool to Automatically Infer Dynamic Invariants for Hardware Designs. *Design Automation Conf. (DAC)*, 2005.
- [9] G. Pinter and I. Majzik. Automatic Generation of Executable Assertions for Runtime Checking Temporal Requirements. 2005.
- [10] L.-C. Wang, M.S. Abadir, and N. Krishnamurthy. Automatic Generation of Assertions for Formal Verification of PowerPC/sup TM /microprocessor Arrays Using Symbolic Trajectory Evaluation. *Design Automation Conf. (DAC)*, 1998.
- [11] A. Hekmatpour and A. Salehi. Block-based Schema-driven Assertion Generation for Functional Verification. 2005.
- [12] Frank Rogin, Thomas Klotz, Gorschwin Fey, Rolf Drechsler, and Steffen Rulke. Automatic Generation of Complex Properties for Hardware Designs. *Design, Automation, and Test in Europe (DATE)*, 2008.
- [13] Andrew DeOrio, Adam B. Bauserman, Valeria Bertacco, and Beth C. Isaksen. Inferno: Streamlining Verification With Inferred Semantics. *IEEE Trans. on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems (TCAD)*, 2009.
- [14] Po-Hsien Chang and Li.-C Wang. Automatic Assertion Extraction via Sequential Data Mining of Simulation Traces. *Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conf. (ASP-DAC)*, 2010.
- [15] Chih-Neng Chung, Chia-Wei Chang, Kai-Hui Chang, and Sy-Yen Kuo. Applying Verification Intention for Design Customization via Property Mining Under Constrained Testbenches. *Int'l Conf. on Computer Design: VLSI in Computers and Processors, (ICCD)*, 2011.
- [16] Amir Pnueli. The Temporal Logic of Programs. *Annual Symp. on Foundations of Computer Science (SFCS)*, 1977.
- [17] Viraj Athavale, Sai Ma, Samuel Hertz, and Shobha Vasudevan. Code Coverage of Assertions Using RTL Source Code Analysis. *Design Automation Conf. (DAC)*, 2014.
- [18] Cadence JasperGold Apps. [https://www.cadence.com/en\\_US/home/tools/system-design-and-verification/formal-and-static-verification/jasper-gold-verification-platform.html](https://www.cadence.com/en_US/home/tools/system-design-and-verification/formal-and-static-verification/jasper-gold-verification-platform.html). Accessed: June 28, 2024.
- [19] GOLDMINE: An Automatic Assertion Generation Tool. <http://goldmine.csl.illinois.edu/>. Accessed: June 28, 2024.
- [20] Samuel Hertz, David Sheridan, and Shobha Vasudevan. Mining Hardware Assertions With Guidance From Static Analysis. *IEEE Trans. on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems (TCAD)*, 2013.
- [21] Samuel Hertz, Debjit Pal, Spencer Offenberger, and Shobha Vasudevan. A Figure of Merit for Assertions in Verification. *Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conf. (ASP-DAC)*, 2019.

- [22] Debjit Pal, Spencer Offenberger, and Shobha Vasudevan. Assertion Ranking Using RTL Source Code Analysis. *IEEE Trans. on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems (TCAD)*, 2020.
- [23] Jan Malburg, Tino Flenker, and Görschwin Fey. Property Mining Using Dynamic Dependency Graphs. *Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conf. (ASP-DAC)*, 2017.
- [24] Mohammad Reza Heidari Iman, Gert Jervan, and Tara Ghasempouri. ARTmine: Automatic Association Rule Mining with Temporal Behavior for Hardware Verification. *Design, Automation, and Test in Europe (DATE)*, 2024.
- [25] Mohammad Reza Heidari Iman, Jaan Raik, Maksim Jenihhin, Gert Jervan, and Tara Ghasempouri. A Methodology for Automated Mining of Compact and Accurate Assertion Sets. *IEEE Nordic Circuits and Systems Conference (NorCAS)*, 2021.
- [26] Alessandro Danese, Nicolò Dalla Riva, and Graziano Pravadelli. A-TEAM: Automatic Template-based Assertion Miner. *Design Automation Conf. (DAC)*, 2017.
- [27] Samuele Germiniani and Graziano Pravadelli. Exploiting Clustering and Decision-Tree Algorithms to Mine LTL Assertions Containing Non-boolean Expressions. *IFIP/IEEE Int'l Conf. on Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI-SoC)*, 2022.
- [28] Mohammad Reza Heidari Iman, Jaan Raik, Gert Jervan, and Tara Ghasempouri. IMMizer: An Innovative Cost-Effective Method for Minimizing Assertion Sets. *Euromicro Conference on Digital System Design (DSD)*, 2022.
- [29] Samuele Germiniani and Graziano Pravadelli. HARM: A Hint-Based Assertion Miner. *IEEE Trans. on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems (TCAD)*, 2022.
- [30] Calvin Deutschbein, Andres Meza, Francesco Restuccia, Ryan Kastner, and Cynthia Sturton. Isadora: Automated Information Flow Property Generation for Hardware Designs. 2021.
- [31] Hasini Witharana, Aruna Jayasena, Andrew Whigham, and Prabhat Mishra. Automated Generation of Security Assertions for RTL Models. *ACM Journal on Emerging Technologies in Computing Systems (JETC)*, 2023.
- [32] Avinash Ayalasomayajula, Nusrat Farzana, Debjit Pal, and Farimah Farahmandi. Prioritizing Information Flow Violations: Generation of Ranked Security Assertions for Hardware Designs. *IEEE Int'l Symp. on Hardware Oriented Security and Trust (HOST)*, 2024.
- [33] Tara Ghasempouri and Graziano Pravadelli. On The Estimation of Assertion Interestingness. *IFIP/IEEE Int'l Conf. on Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI-SoC)*, 2015.
- [34] 1800-2017 - IEEE Standard for SystemVerilog—Unified Hardware Design, Specification, and Verification Language. <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8299595>. Accessed: June 28, 2024.
- [35] OpenAI, Josh Achiam, and et al. GPT-4 Technical Report. *arXiv*, 2024.
- [36] 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*, 2023.
- [37] Introducing LLaMA: A foundational, 65-billion-parameter large language model. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/large-language-model-llama-meta-ai/>. Accessed: June 28, 2024.
- [38] Google Gemini. <https://gemini.google.com/app>. Accessed: June 28, 2024.
- [39] Mingjie Liu, Nathaniel Pinckney, Brucec Khailany, and Haoxing Ren. VerilogEval: Evaluating Large Language Models for Verilog Code Generation. *arXiv*, 2023.
- [40] Marcelo Orenes-Vera, Margaret Martonosi, and David Wentzlaff. Using LLMs to Facilitate Formal Verification of RTL. *arXiv*, 2023.
- [41] Rahul Kande, Hammond Pearce, Benjamin Tan, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, Shailja Thakur, Ramesh Karri, and Jeyavijayan Rajendran. LLM-assisted Generation of Hardware Assertions. *arXiv*, 2023.
- [42] Wenji Fang, Mengming Li, Min Li, Zhiyuan Yan, Shang Liu, Hongce Zhang, and Zhiyao Xie. AssertLLM: Generating and Evaluating Hardware Verification Assertions from Design Specifications via Multi-LLMs. *arXiv*, 2024.

- [43] Bhabesh Mali, Karthik Maddala, Sweeya Reddy, Vatsal Gupta, Chandan Karfa, and Ramesh Karri. ChIRAAG: ChatGPT Informed Rapid and Automated Assertion Generation. *arXiv*, 2024.
- [44] Kexin Pei, David Bieber, Kensen Shi, Charles Sutton, and Pengcheng Yin. Can Large Language Models Reason About Program Invariants? *Int’l Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2023.
- [45] OpenCores. <https://opencores.org/>. Accessed: June 28, 2024.
- [46] CLOC. <https://github.com/AlDanial/cloc>. Accessed: June 28, 2024.
- [47] Junjie Ye, Xuanning Chen, Nuo Xu, Can Zu, Zekai Shao, Shichun Liu, Yuhan Cui, Zeyang Zhou, Chao Gong, Yang Shen, Jie Zhou, Siming Chen, Tao Gui, Qi Zhang, and Xuanjing Huang. A Comprehensive Capability Analysis of GPT-3 and GPT-3.5 Series Models. *arXiv*, 2023.
- [48] Baptiste Rozière, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Romain Sauvestre, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, Artyom Kozhevnikov, Ivan Evtimov, Joanna Bitton, Manish Bhatt, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Aaron Grattafiori, Wenhan Xiong, Alexandre Défossez, Jade Copet, Faisal Azhar, Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Nicolas Usunier, Thomas Scialom, and Gabriel Synnaeve. Code Llama: Open Foundation Models for Code. 2024.
- [49] Introducing Meta Llama 3: The most capable openly available LLM to date. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>. Accessed: June 28, 2024.
- [50] GOLDMINE: An Automatic Assertion Generation Tool. Accessed: June 28, 2024.
- [51] Hugging Face Model Repository. <https://huggingface.co/>. Accessed: June 28, 2024.

## A Appendix

Table 2: Comparative results for four different commercial and open-source LLMs using 1-shot and 5-shot learning for the assertion generation task. P: Fraction of proven assertions. C: Fraction of failed assertions with a counter example. E: Fraction of assertions which have syntax errors.

| Designs                       | ChatGPT 3.5 |      |        |      |      | ChatGPT 4.0 |      |        |      |      | CodeLLaMa2 |      |        |      |      | LLaMa3-70B |      |        |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|-------------------------------|-------------|------|--------|------|------|-------------|------|--------|------|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                               | 1-shot      |      | 5-shot |      |      | 1-shot      |      | 5-shot |      |      | 1-shot     |      | 5-shot |      |      | 1-shot     |      | 5-shot |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|                               | P           | C    | E      | P    | C    | E           | P    | C      | E    | P    | C          | E    | P      | C    | E    | P          | C    | E      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| fh_t_1d_x8                    | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0           | 0.98 | 0.02   | 0.00 | 0.91 | 0.09       | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 0.96 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.89 | 0.11 | 0.00 |
| fh_t_8x8_core                 | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0           | 0.92 | 0.08   | 0.00 | 0.89 | 0.11       | 0.00 | 0.92   | 0.08 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| fh_t_bfly                     | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0           | 0.50 | 0.50   | 0.00 | 0.67 | 0.33       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.25 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| fh_t_bfly_noFF                | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0           | 0.25 | 0.75   | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.40       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| mtx_trps_8x8_dpsram           | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.75 | 0.25 | 0           | 0.93 | 0.07   | 0.00 | 0.93 | 0.07       | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 0.75 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.80 | 0.20 | 0.00 |
| signed_mult_const_asic        | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.75 | 0.25 | 0           | 0.63 | 0.38   | 0.00 | 0.63 | 0.38       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.43       | 0.57 | 0.00   | 0.40 | 0.60 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| signed_mult_const_fpga        | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0           | 0.20 | 0.80   | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.80       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| accumulatorMUX                | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1           | 0.86 | 0.14   | 0.00 | 0.86 | 0.14       | 0.00 | 0.67   | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.67       | 0.33 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| bitNegator                    | 0.67        | 0.33 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0           | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.25   | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |      |
| ramBit                        | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0           | 0.17 | 0.83   | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.75       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.80 |
| byteNegator                   | 1.00        | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0           | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| ramByte                       | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 0.25 | 0.75   | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.75       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| inputReg                      | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.01   | 0.99 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| outputReg                     | 0.33        | 0.67 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0           | 0.57 | 0.43   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.75       | 0.25 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| ppReg1                        | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| tcLoad                        | 0.75        | 0.25 | 0.00   | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.63       | 0.38 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.84 | 0.00 |      |
| tcReset                       | 1.00        | 0.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 0.75 | 0.25   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.14   | 0.86 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |      |
| uartRec                       | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.18 | 0.82 | 0           | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.36   | 0.64 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.14   | 0.86 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.92 | 0.08 |      |
| uartTrans                     | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0           | 0.86 | 0.14   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 0.35   | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 0.68   | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.47 | 0.00 |      |
| host_interface_aes            | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.21 | 0.79 | 0           | 0.64 | 0.36   | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.40       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 0.31   | 0.69 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.88 | 0.00 |      |
| key_expander                  | 0.38        | 0.63 | 0.00   | 0.29 | 0.71 | 0           | 0.60 | 0.40   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.28   | 0.72 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 0.33   | 0.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |      |
| clc_fsm                       | 1.00        | 0.00 | 0.00   | 0.91 | 0.09 | 0           | 0.93 | 0.07   | 0.00 | 0.93 | 0.07       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| clc_len_gen                   | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |      |
| clc_read_lcls                 | 0.25        | 0.75 | 0.00   | 0.64 | 0.36 | 0           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 1.00 | 0.31 | 0.69       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.94 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |      |
| clc_read_total_coeffs         | 0.74        | 0.26 | 0.00   | 0.36 | 0.64 | 0           | 0.64 | 0.36   | 0.00 | 0.74 | 0.26       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |      |
| clc_read_total_zeros          | 0.14        | 0.86 | 0.00   | 0.03 | 0.97 | 0           | 0.39 | 0.61   | 0.00 | 0.39 | 0.61       | 0.00 | 0.35   | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.14       | 0.86 | 0.00   | 0.04 | 0.96 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |      |
| ca_prng                       | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1           | 0.89 | 0.11   | 0.00 | 0.41 | 0.59       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.81 |      |
| mux4to1                       | 0.33        | 0.67 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0           | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.29   | 0.71 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.80 | 0.00 |      |
| PSGBusArb                     | 1.00        | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.89       | 0.00 | 0.50   | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.94       | 0.06 | 0.00   | 0.56 | 0.44 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |      |
| PSGChannelSummer              | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |      |
| PSGFilter                     | 1.00        | 0.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 0.09 | 0.91   | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.91       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |      |
| PSGMasterVolumeControl        | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 0.17 | 0.83   | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.92       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |      |
| PSGOutputSummer               | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.50 |      |
| PSGShaper                     | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |      |
| bit_rersal                    | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.88       | 0.00 | 0.25   | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.20 | 0.80 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.75 |      |
| crc_comb                      | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 0.94 | 0.06   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.80 | 0.00 |      |
| crc_control_unit              | 0.59        | 0.41 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.93 | 0.07       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.84   | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.93 | 0.07 | 0.00 |      |
| host_interface                | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.20 | 0.80 | 0           | 0.75 | 0.25   | 0.00 | 0.79 | 0.21       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.63       | 0.38 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.64 | 0.36 |      |
| fpu_exceptions                | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.68 | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |      |
| fpu_sub                       | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.17 | 0.83 | 0           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.97       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |      |
| qadd                          | 1.00        | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0           | 0.80 | 0.20   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 0.75   | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.75       | 0.25 | 0.00   | 0.75 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |      |
| qmult                         | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0           | 0.89 | 0.11   | 0.00 | 0.78 | 0.22       | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.95   | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.71 | 0.00 |      |
| qtwsComp                      | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0           | 0.10 | 0.90   | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.83       | 0.00 | 0.50   | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.50       | 0.50 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |      |
| diff_3_pipe                   | 1.00        | 0.00 | 0.00   | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0           | 0.50 | 0.50   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50       | 0.50 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.50 |      |
| node                          | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1           | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.00 |      |
| dpil                          | 0.36        | 0.64 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.90       | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.50   | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.24 | 0.76 | 0.00 |      |
| freqdider                     | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.17 | 0.83 | 0           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.80       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |      |
| variableresetrandomwalkfilter | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.73 | 0.27 | 0           | 0.37 | 0.63   | 0.00 | 0.41 | 0.59       | 0.00 | 0.39   | 0.61 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.83 | 0.17 |      |
| clean_rst                     | 0.50        | 0.50 | 0.00   | 0.67 | 0.33 | 0           | 0.33 | 0.67   | 0.00 | 0.40 | 0.60       | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.60   | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.71 | 0.00 |      |
| decoder_sb10b                 | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.97       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.33   | 0.67 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.81 | 0.00 |      |
| encoder_sb10b                 | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.19 | 0.81 | 0           | 0.25 | 0.75   | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.89       | 0.00 | 0.42   | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.79       | 0.21 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |      |
| ge_1000baseX_mdio             | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.71   | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |      |
| ge_1000baseX_rx               | 0.19        | 0.81 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0           | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.64 | 0.36       | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |      |
| ge_100                        |             |      |        |      |      |             |      |        |      |      |            |      |        |      |      |            |      |        |      |      |      |      |      |      |

Table 3: **Comparative results for four different commercial and open-source LLMs using 1-shot and 5-shot learning for the assertion generation task. P: Fraction of proven assertions. C: Fraction of failed assertions with a counter example. E: Fraction of assertions which have syntax errors.**

| Designs         | ChatGPT 3.5 |      |      |        |      |   | ChatGPT 4.0 |      |      |        |      |      | CodeLLaMa2 |      |      |        |      |      | LLaMa3-70B |      |      |        |      |      |      |      |
|-----------------|-------------|------|------|--------|------|---|-------------|------|------|--------|------|------|------------|------|------|--------|------|------|------------|------|------|--------|------|------|------|------|
|                 | 1-shot      |      |      | 5-shot |      |   | 1-shot      |      |      | 5-shot |      |      | 1-shot     |      |      | 5-shot |      |      | 1-shot     |      |      | 5-shot |      |      |      |      |
|                 | P           | C    | E    | P      | C    | E | P           | C    | E    | P      | C    | E    | P          | C    | E    | P      | C    | E    | P          | C    | E    | P      | C    | E    |      |      |
| fpu_add         | 0.17        | 0.83 | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0 | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.92   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.85   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |      |
| control_unit    | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.93   | 0.07 | 0 | 0.95        | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.95   | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.99 | 0.01       | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |      |
| phasecomparator | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0 | 0.00        | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |      |
| wptr_handler    | 0.71        | 0.29 | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.90   | 0.10 | 0.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.75   | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.83   | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| rptr_handler    | 1.00        | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.86   | 0.14 | 0 | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00       | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00   | 0.00 | 0.89 | 0.11       | 0.00 | 0.86 | 0.14   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |      |
| synchronizer    | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0 | 0.60        | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.33   | 0.67 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.13       | 0.88 | 0.00 | 0.11   | 0.89 | 0.00 | 0.00 |      |
| fifo_mem        | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0 | 0.00        | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |      |
| MAC_tx_Ctrl     | 0.18        | 0.82 | 0.00 | 0.00   | 1.00 | 0 | 0.67        | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.74   | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.00       | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00   | 0.00 | 0.58 | 0.42       | 0.00 | 0.55 | 0.45   | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |      |