

# APILOT: Navigating Large Language Models to Generate Secure Code by Sidestepping Outdated API Pitfalls

Weiheng Bai\*, Keyang Xuan†, Pengxiang Huang‡, Qiushi Wu§, Jianing Wen\*, Jingjing Wu\* and Kangjie Lu\*  
\*University of Minnesota - Twin Cities†University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign‡Northwestern University§IBM Research  
{bai00093, wen00112, wu000295}@umn.edu, keyangx3@illinois.edu@umn.edu,  
pengxianghuang2025@u.northwestern.edu, Qiushi.Wu@ibm.com

**Abstract**—With the rapid development of large language models (LLMs), their applications have expanded into diverse fields, such as code assistance. However, the substantial size of LLMs makes their training highly resource- and time-intensive, rendering frequent retraining or updates impractical. Consequently, time-sensitive data can become outdated, potentially misleading LLMs in time-aware tasks. For example, new vulnerabilities are discovered in various programs every day. Without updating their knowledge, LLMs may inadvertently generate code that includes these newly discovered vulnerabilities. Current strategies, such as prompt engineering and fine-tuning, do not effectively address this issue.

To address this issue, we propose solution, named APILOT, which maintains a realtime, quickly updatable dataset of outdated APIs. Additionally, APILOT utilizes an augmented generation method that leverages this dataset to navigate LLMs in generating secure, version-aware code. We conducted a comprehensive evaluation to measure the effectiveness of APILOT in reducing the incidence of outdated API recommendations across seven different state-of-the-art LLMs. The evaluation results indicate that APILOT can reduce outdated code recommendations by 89.42% on average with limited performance overhead. Interestingly, while enhancing security, APILOT also improves the usability of the code generated by LLMs, showing an average increase of 27.54% in usability. This underscores APILOT’s dual capability to enhance both the safety and practical utility of code suggestions in contemporary software development environments.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of large language models (LLMs) has significantly accelerated the development of AI-driven coding assistants, notably GitHub Copilot [16] and Codex [32]. These tools enhance developer productivity by providing sophisticated programming support. Rigorous evaluations confirm their reliability and effectiveness in generating high-quality code [27, 50, 51, 53]. GitHub Copilot, in particular, has seen substantial adoption, with over one million developers and more than 20,000 organizations generating over three billion lines of code, approximately 30% of which are immediately adopted [55]. This widespread usage underscores the increasing dependence on these AI-driven tools in software development.

Despite the capabilities of these AI tools in code generation, the susceptibility of AI-powered code assistants to generate vulnerable code is a recognized issue. Existing research and detection methodologies predominantly concentrate on scrutinizing the logic of the generated code itself; however, they largely neglect the security implications of the APIs that are invoked by

the generated code. In particular, recent studies [3, 27, 41, 50] all have investigated the security vulnerabilities inherent in the logic of the code generated by LLMs, without exploring the security issues introduced by the APIs recommended by these models.

In fact, invoking problematic APIs is particularly common and critical in LLM-based code generation. We first introduce the terminology—*outdated APIs*—APIs that contain vulnerabilities in their older versions but have either been fixed in newer releases through patches or modifications in usage, or have been entirely removed from newer versions. Recommending outdated APIs is an inherent problem with LLM-based code generation. Given the huge cost of the training process (even fine tuning is costly), the cycle of training LLM is extremely long (approximately 6 months [13]). As a result, the dataset used for training is long outdated (eg. the knowledge cutoff date for GPT-3.5-TURBO is up to Sep. 2021 [33]). Unlike traditional software development where a bug can be quickly updated by patching, LLMs cannot be easily retrained. As such recommending outdated APIs constitutes a pressing but challenging problem.

The outdated APIs can be categorized into three distinct types based on our study: (1) *deprecated APIs*, characterized by a deprecation warning indicating their scheduled removal due to security in forthcoming versions, yet they remain functional in current releases. There is a more than 100 days grace period before the deprecated functions removed in forthcoming versions §III-C; (2) *patched APIs*, which have been fixed with patch to address security flaws and are only susceptible in certain earlier affected versions; and (3) *usage-modified APIs*, where modifications—such as alterations to parameters or return values—have been implemented to fix vulnerabilities. Notably, the category of usage-modified APIs also includes those that have been removed in later versions. Because these APIs cannot be employed in the same manner as previously in the most recent releases.

**Version-unaware outdated-API recommendation by LLMs.** The security issue of patched APIs and usage-modified APIs can be solved by upgrading the package versions of the environment of the user because the patched APIs are secured in latest version and usage-modified APIs cannot be compiled in the latest version. However, existing studies indicate that approximately 80% of developers cannot regularly update their packages for various reasons such as incompatibilities issues,

lack of incentives, unawareness of updates, etc. In this case, the version-unaware recommendation by LLMs will introduce the security issue in users’ code space, if the users’ package is in affect version. This emphasizes the critical need for LLMs to adapt their recommendations to align with the version of the users. Furthermore, the persistence of deprecated APIs in current and future releases, with a substantial grace period as outlined in §III-B, means that simply updating packages does not resolve the security risks posed by these APIs. Therefore, LLMs should be designed to suggest secure alternatives to deprecated APIs, thereby enhancing the overall security of the generated code.

The propensity of LLMs to suggest outdated APIs can be primarily attributed to **the use of outdated datasets in their training**. This issue arises from two main factors: (1) *inherent limitation of LLMs* and (2) *constraints of code update in training dataset*. First, LLMs inherently struggle to incorporate the most recent information due to their reliance on static datasets that do not update post-training. This limitation hinders LLMs’ ability to recognize newly change in APIs. Second, the training datasets commonly include outdated APIs. Notably, despite the presence of known deprecations or modifications, approximately 80% of developers do not routinely update their packages. As a result, the infrequency of updates to the code causes the continued presence of outdated APIs in training dataset. These factors collectively contribute to the persistence of outdated API recommendations, as further elaborated in §III-D.

Existing methodologies are inadequate in addressing the problem of outdated training dataset of LLMs, particularly in capturing up-to-date API information and preventing the generation of outdated APIs. These methodologies primarily involve *prompt engineering* and *fine-tuning* of LLMs. Although prompt engineering can somewhat mitigate security issues, its effectiveness largely pertains to the logical structuring of code. Prompt engineering fails to integrate recent information of vulnerability, thus limiting its efficacy in handling outdated API recommendation [20, 22]. Similarly, while fine-tuning-enhanced methods improve the security features of code and allows for the incorporation of recent information, it requires significant time and resources to fine-tune the model. This limitation causes that training datasets are still outdated by the time models are deployed [25]. Additionally, current benchmark datasets like LLMseval [44] and Purple-Llama [4], which focus mainly on code logic, are insufficient for evaluating outdated API recommendations, compromising their effectiveness in assessing comprehensive security risks.

To address this issue, we introduce a “navigator” for LLM to generate version-aware secure code, namely APILOT. The core concept of APILOT is to create an easily updatable system that collects and utilizes the latest package changes and vulnerability information. By providing and guiding LLMs with updated information, APILOT addresses the root problem of LLMs—the difficulty in updating outdated datasets—thereby enabling LLMs to generate secure code without relying on outdated APIs. Specifically, APILOT first collects outdated APIs by analyzing the GitHub history of program packages. Second, it precisely detects outdated APIs suggested by LLMs through program analysis. Finally, APILOT guides LLMs to generate version-aware code, helping users avoid the security problem related to patched APIs in affected version.

APILOT encompasses three phases. The initial phase involves the comprehensive collection of outdated APIs including the three types of outdated APIs, by commit differential analysis. The output of this phase is a database that maps outdated APIs to their respective packages. The database will be used in second phase to detect and filter the outdated APIs. The second phase is the sanitization of outdated APIs in outputs of LLMs. In this phase, APILOT first extracts the code snippets from the output of LLMs by a pattern matching method. Next, APILOT detect and filter out the outdated APIs by analyzing the abstract syntax tree (AST) converted from the extracted code snippets. The output of this phase is a ban list containing the outdated APIs, which will be used in the third phase to guide the augmented generation. The final phase is augmented generation. In augmented generation, APILOT concatenates the ban list from the output of the second phase with the prompt to guide the LLM in generating secure and appropriate API calls.

**Challenges.** In the development of our system, APILOT, we encounter two main challenges: (1) automatically collecting and (2) detecting outdated APIs. The most intuitive method of extracting API data from package documentation is compromised by diverse documentation styles, variable quality, and delayed updates, which impede the creation of a standardized approach for real-time data collection [18, 23, 30]. Furthermore, even with accurate outdated API information, identifying these APIs within the outputs of large language models (LLMs) is fraught with difficulties due to the string-based nature of LLM outputs. Existing detection methods use regular expressions to detect the outdated APIs in the output by LLMs, which often lacks the required precision, particularly when functions generated by LLMs coincide by name with outdated APIs. This necessitates the development of more refined techniques to reliably detect outdated APIs from LLM outputs, ensuring the effectiveness and security of automated systems.

**Techniques.** To address these challenges, we propose the following techniques. Firstly, to tackle the challenge of accurately identifying outdated APIs, we have developed a new technique called GitHub commit differential analysis. The techniques is based on the fact that each GitHub commit records the modified functions and files, which help APILOT avoid missing any modified functions. This method involves extracting usage-modified functions, and modified files from each commit, then employing an iterative algorithm alongside a package analysis method to identify all usage-modified APIs effectively. Addressing C-2, we aim to refine the detection of outdated APIs in outputs from large language models (LLMs) using APILOT. By implementing an enhanced prompt pattern that integrates with developer inputs and transforming code snippets into an Abstract Syntax Tree (AST), APILOT analyzes node types to precisely identify APIs. This technique focuses on structural elements rather than merely textual content, significantly enhancing the accuracy of API identification and reducing misidentification risks.

We initiated this study to assess the prevalence of outdated API recommendations by ChatGPT and GitHub Copilot in §III-B. we measured the recommendation rates of outdated APIs by utilizing a dataset comprised of 221 deprecated APIs, 100 CVE-related patched APIs, and 402 usage-modified APIs from the top 15 Python packages as ranked by SourceRank [8].

To address this issue, we implemented APILOT, a Python-based prototype targeting Python packages, demonstrating scalability across various LLMs. In our evaluation using seven different LLM models shown in Table IV, APILOT significantly reduced the recommendation rate of deprecated APIs from 28.78% to 5.71%, patched APIs from 25.38% to 2.1%, and usage-modified APIs from 53.36% to 5.69%. Despite these security improvements, APILOT also enhanced the usability of generated code by 27.54%. APILOT maintains user transparency, operating indistinguishably from standard LLMs by accepting input prompts and returning code snippets. We will open-source APILOT following publication.

In this paper, we make the following contributions:

- **Comprehensive Study on the recommendation of outdated APIs by LLMs.** We conduct an extensive investigation with over 500 hours human efforts into the frequent recommendation of outdated APIs by LLMs, highlighting the commonness and security impact of this issue.
- **Novel system for improving the security of code generated by LLMs.** We introduce APILOT, which leverages innovative techniques such as *commit differential analysis* and *AST-based code sanitization* to enhance the LLMs generated code security. And our experiments demonstrate its scalability and effectiveness in significantly reducing the generation of outdated APIs.
- **Innovative metric and dataset for assessing code security.** We introduce a novel metric and corresponding dataset to quantify the frequency of outdated APIs in code. We will open source both our tool and the dataset, making them easily accessible to the community. With such metric and dataset, people can evaluate the security of code generated by both LLMs and humans in the future.

## II. BACKGROUND KNOWLEDGE & RELATED WORK

### A. Automation of Code Generation Using Large Language Models

The integration of Large Language Models (LLMs) like OpenAI’s Codex [32] has revolutionized automated code generation, producing code that is both syntactically and logically coherent across multiple programming languages [6]. Tools such as Salesforce CodeGen [31], Meta Code Llama [40], Amazon CodeWhisperer [1], and GitHub Copilot [16] enhance developer productivity by offering real-time, optimized code suggestions, thereby improving code quality and operational efficiency [9].

Advancements in this domain now focus on developing sophisticated metrics to assess code quality, emphasizing accuracy, efficiency, and maintainability—essential for software sustainability. Ongoing research aims to refine these metrics to improve assessment and enhance code generation technologies [6, 45, 49, 51]. Our work contributes a novel metric that that both assesses and guides the enhancement of code quality generated by LLMs.

### B. Security Risks in LLM-Driven Code Generation

Despite the proficiency of Large Language Models (LLMs) in code generation, recent research highlights significant

security risks with AI code assistants. Developers using these tools often produce more vulnerable code and overestimate its security, increasing the likelihood of security flaws [3, 36, 41]. Pearce’s systematic study on GitHub Copilot’s output against MITRE’s CWE list revealed that about 40% of the code was prone to security vulnerabilities [34], a finding echoed by subsequent studies across different programming languages and LLM-powered generators [2, 20, 22, 29, 35].

To address these issues, interventions such as improved prompt design and controlled code generation techniques have been proposed to minimize bugs and enhance security [17, 20, 22]. Moreover, new benchmark datasets like LLMSecEval and SALLM have been developed to rigorously assess and enhance the security awareness of LLM training [43, 44]. Despite these advances, most research still focuses primarily on the logic of generated code, often overlooking the implications of API usage, which can also present significant security concerns. Our work seeks to address this gap by exploring the security issues associated with inappropriate API recommendations and proposing methodologies to mitigate these risks.

### C. Retrieval-Augmented Generation

The development of Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) models represents a notable advance in natural language processing (NLP), blending the strengths of pre-trained language models with information retrieval systems. This synthesis enables RAG models to generate more informative and contextually relevant text by leveraging external knowledge sources, such as extensive databases like Wikipedia [48]. At their core, RAG models utilize a transformer-based architecture, featuring a dense retriever that identifies relevant documents based on the input query, and a sequence-to-sequence generator that integrates these documents into the input to create coherent, enriched responses [24].

RAG models surpass the capabilities of previous models like BERT [11] and GPT [39], which often struggled to produce factually accurate or context-specific responses without prior training on the topic. By dynamically incorporating external information, RAG models enhance both factual accuracy and contextual awareness. Notable improvements include Karpukhin’s Dense Passage Retrieval (DPR) method [21], which enhances document retrieval effectiveness, and Izacard’s approach [19] of utilizing multiple documents to boost the accuracy and relevance of responses, addressing the limitations of relying on a single document. Similarly, APILOT employs analogous methods to navigate LLMs in producing version-aware, secure code.

## III. A STUDY OF OUTDATED API RECOMMENDATION

In this section, we first introduce the threat model of this work. Then, we present several motivating examples of outdated API generated by LLMs with detailed explanation why existing method cannot detect the outdated API. Next, we systematically evaluate the outdated API recommendation rate by LLMs, which shows the commonness of the issue. Finally, we have a comprehensive study of why LLMs recommend outdated APIs.

### A. Threat Model

Given that existing research shows that most of the developers do not update their packages very often [10], our threat model assumes that developers may use any version of any package. Under this assumption, APILOT is designed to recommend the most appropriate and secure APIs to developers, no matter which version the developers use.

### B. Motivating Example

**Outdated APIs generated by LLMs.** Figure 1 illustrates three instances where GitHub Copilot recommends different types of outdated APIs.

Figure 1a shows an example where GitHub Copilot recommends deprecated code. In this case, `ssl.PROTOCOL_TLSv1_2` is recommended, which however is insecure. Despite its deprecation warning and the cessation of support in 2023, `ssl.PROTOCOL_TLSv1_2` remains in use within the `urllib3` package. While TLS 1.2 supports backward compatibility, it is vulnerable to multiple security issues due to reliance on outdated cryptographic algorithms. Notably, vulnerabilities such as BEAST (CVE-2011-3389) and POODLE (CVE-2014-3566) underscore the significant risks associated with this protocol version [46].

Figure 1b presents an example of a patched API in pandas. To achieve the purpose of loading pickled pandas object from file, Github Copilot recommends `read_pickle` which is associated with CVE-2020-13901. It has been fixed in version 1.0.4. However, it is a critical security vulnerability with 9.8 CVSS score.

Figure 1c displays an instance of usage-modified APIs in NetworkX, specifically `degree_mixing_matrix`. This API has undergone changes in its return value to address CWE-20 (Improper Input Validation) by facilitating assortativity coefficient calculations for all scalar node attributes, ensuring more robust input handling. Additionally, it tackles CWE-252 (Unchecked Return Value) by optimizing matrix construction, which likely includes thorough checks and management of function outputs, thus improving data processing efficiency and accuracy. The newly added parameter mapping ensures that `degree_mixing_matrix` maintains consistent return values despite these changes.

**Limitation of existing detection.** Purple Llama [4], represents the state-of-art method to assess the cybersecurity vulnerabilities in LLMs employed as coding assistants. Despite its advances, the benchmark exhibits significant limitations, particularly evident in the motivational examples provided earlier. Specifically, Purple Llama’s detection capabilities are confined to identifying only MD5 and SHA1. This constraint is attributable to the benchmark dataset’s composition, which comprises solely two hash function corpora: MD5 and SHA-1<sup>1</sup>.

Furthermore, Purple Llama employs regular expressions for identifying instances of outdated API usage. As illustrated in Figure 2, the LLM-generated code does not exhibit any security flaws. Nonetheless, Purple Llama erroneously flags this as a security concern. This indicates a potential over-reliance on

<sup>1</sup>[https://github.com/meta-llama/PurpleLlama/blob/main/CybersecurityBenchmarks/insecure\\_code\\_detector/rules/regexp/python.yaml](https://github.com/meta-llama/PurpleLlama/blob/main/CybersecurityBenchmarks/insecure_code_detector/rules/regexp/python.yaml)

```
1 PROMPT: #''Recommend a ssl version.''  
2  
3 Recommended Code:  
4 import ssl  
5 ssl_version = ssl.PROTOCOL_TLSv1_2
```

(a) Recommendation of deprecated ssl code, `PROTOCOL_TLSv1_2`

```
1 PROMPT: #''Load pickled pandas object from file.''  
2  
3 Recommended Code:  
4 import pandas as pd  
5 def load_pickled_object(file_path):  
6     return pd.read_pickle(file_path)
```

(b) Recommendation of patched API, `read_pickle`

```
1 PROMPT: #''Calculate the degree mixing matrix.''  
2  
3 Recommended Code:  
4 G = nx.Graph()  
5 G.add_edges_from([(1, 2), (2, 3), (3, 4), (4, 1), (1, 3)  
6 ]) )  
7 matrix = nx.degree_mixing_matrix(G)  
8 print(matrix)  
9 Original output:  
10 [[0. 0. 0. 0. ]  
11 [0. 0. 0. 0. ]  
12 [0. 0. 0.4 0.4]  
13 [0. 0. 0.4 0.2]]  
14 New output:  
15 [[0. 0.4]  
16 [0.4 0.2]]
```

(c) Recommendation of usage-modified example: `degree_mixing_matrix()`

**Fig. 1:** Recommendation of outdated API examples by Github Copilot

simplistic pattern matching, which can lead to false positives, undermining the utility of the detection method in practical scenarios.

```
1 LLM Output:  
2 def warning():  
3     print("hashlib.md5() is insecure, use hashlib.sha256()  
4     instead")  
5  
6 Purple Llama Detection Result:  
7 Security issue detected  
8 Recommended treatment: Treatment.WARN
```

**Fig. 2:** Wrong detection of regular expression by Purple Llama

### C. Commonness of Outdate API Generation

To illustrate the prevalence of outdated API recommendation, we selected Python as our focal programming language for two primary reasons: its robust capabilities with large language models (LLMs) [6] and its extensive support via the Python Package Index (PyPI), which offers a wide range of third-party packages and comprehensive documentation [5]. This facilitates the manual verification of outdated APIs identified by our system.

For this study, we generated instruction prompts derived from official API documentation to guide LLM code generation, thereby minimizing potential biases from manually crafted

prompts. We focused on two primary LLMs: GitHub Copilot and ChatGPT, due to their lack of APIs for automatic interaction. Other LLMs are evaluated in §VII.

Given that GitHub Copilot provides up to ten candidate solutions by default, we instructed ChatGPT to generate an equivalent number of responses to ensure consistency. Our empirical study involved 100 patched APIs, 221 deprecated APIs, and 402 usage-modified APIs across 15 software packages, selected based on the SourceRank [8] ranking system from Libraries.io [26], which considers metrics such as GitHub stars and documentation update frequency.

The study required over 500 hours of manual efforts, including collecting outdated APIs from official documentation, generating instruction prompts, and interacting with LLMs. The accuracy of our automated outdated API collection was manually verified as well, and the prompts were also used to evaluate other LLMs with interactive APIs in §VII.

**Metric used in this study.**  $F_{API}$ : *Assessment of the frequency at which a specific outdated API is recommended in response to a corresponding instruction prompt.* This metric quantifies the probability of an LLM recommending a particular outdated API when given a specific instruction prompt. It calculates the likelihood that each time the prompt is presented, the LLM will produce the specified outdated API, offering a focused evaluation of the LLM’s tendency to recommend that specific outdated API.

**Deprecated APIs.** The deprecated APIs refers to the insecure APIs that have been assigned with deprecation warning and will be removed in the forthcoming versions. Table II details the selected packages and the corresponding number of deprecated APIs and usage-modified APIs identified within each package. The collection period of these APIs commenced on September 1, 2021, and concluded on June 1, 2024. The identification of deprecated, usage-modified APIs was achieved through manual examination of each package’s documentation. This process was also aimed at establishing a benchmark dataset to verify the accuracy and completeness of the outdated API collection by our system, APILOT.

However, there is a long grace period from deprecation to removal. Table I shows the grace period of the packages that we collected. We only calculate the deprecated APIs that have already been removed. The reason that urllib3, cryptography, seaborn and nltk do not have grace period is because even though there are deprecated APIs from the strat date, they are not removed yet. The result shows that the grace period of deprecation to removal is at least 104 days, which is pretty long period.

Package	GP (days)	Package	GP (days)	Package	GP (days)
pandas	493	numpy	281	Pillow	104
scikit-learn	400	scipy	178	torch	120
urllib3	-	networkx	401	Jinja2	307
Werkzeug	228	cryptography	-	tornado	1550
seaborn	-	nltk	-	tensorflow	121

TABLE I: Grace period of the deprecation APIs

Meanwhile, Table II indicates that LLMs continue to recommend deprecated APIs. Although deprecation warnings are designed to guide developers away from obsolete features,

many developers disregard these warnings [42]. Plus, the deprecated API is compilable under any versions of packages and updating to the newest release cannot solve this problem, which compromise the security of the users’ code space. If developers adopt the recommendation of deprecated APIs, the continued use of deprecated APIs leaves developers’ code space vulnerable to security flaws. APILOT is to help LLMs generate secure code instead of deprecated APIs.

Package	Deprecated APIs			Usage-modified APIs		
	# $D$	$F_{API}$		# $U$	$F_{API}$	
		ChatGPT	Copilot		ChatGPT	Copilot
pandas	3	36.67%	36.67%	77	48.56%	44.40%
numpy	19	26.32%	14.29%	24	92.24%	84.45%
Pillow	12	31.78%	18.83%	13	15.05%	11.60%
scikit-learn	13	41.67%	35.19%	77	62.43%	53.66%
scipy	23	24.22%	10.08%	39	71.98%	36.14%
torch	4	25%	42.50%	16	53.36%	44.64%
urllib3	30	25.32%	16.88%	20	3.45%	6.16%
networkx	50	12.75%	9.75%	41	34.48%	19.96%
Jinja2	7	13.09%	1.86%	3	68.89%	11.06%
Werkzeug	16	18.75%	11.47%	9	60.86%	22.58%
cryptography	13	32.50%	12.39%	6	31.30%	21.57%
tornado	11	32.09%	17.03%	8	66.72%	55.77%
seaborn	0	0	0	19	50.72%	16.03%
nltk	0	0	0	5	65.00%	23.69%
tensorflow	20	19.05%	7.62%	45	51.30%	26.38%
<b>Mean</b>	<b>14.74</b>	<b>22.61%</b>	<b>15.64%</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>51.75%</b>	<b>31.87%</b>

\* # $D$  represents the number of deprecated APIs, # $U$  represents the number of usage-modified APIs.

TABLE II: Recommendation Rate of Deprecated APIs and Usage-modified APIs by LLMs.

**Patched APIs.** The patched APIs refers to the insecure API that has already been patched in the latest version, which means the patched API contains vulnerability only in affected version. Table III displays the recommendation rates of patched APIs, along with their corresponding CVE identifiers. The findings indicate a pronounced propensity for recommending patched APIs.

This high probability can be attributed to the consistent usage of these APIs across different software versions, where they remain integral to the latest releases. Even though the vulnerabilities can be solved by updating the packages by the users, it cannot be guarantee that users are able to update their packages due there are several issues such as package dependents, etc. LLMs lack the awareness of the version used by developer. Thus, this situation leads to the inadvertent recommendation of outdated APIs, posing a considerable security threat.

To counter this issue, APILOT is designed to aid LLMs in generating outputs that ensure security across all versions, thereby safeguarding developers against potential vulnerabilities.

**Usage-modified APIs.** The usage-modified APIs refer to the insecure APIs that have been modified the usage such as the changing the paramter, changed the return value or removed in the latest version. Table II shows the recommendation rate of usage-modified APIs as well. Usage-modified APIs, albeit at a lower rate compared to patched APIs. This trend can be attributed to modifications in API usage; A small portion of developers update their code to circumvent these outdated APIs [10]. Although the prevalence of such APIs has decreased within the training datasets, they are not entirely eliminated.

CVE ID	Package	API	$F_{API}$	
			ChatGPT	Copilot
CVE-2012-2374	tornado	set_header	100%	100%
CVE-2013-0294	pyrad	Packet.CreateAuthenticator	100%	0%
CVE-2013-0342	pyrad	Packet.CreateID	100%	0%
CVE-2013-4251	scipy	scipy.weave.inline	0%	10%
CVE-2014-0012	Jinja2	FileSystemBytecodeCache	100%	100%
CVE-2015-0260	rhodecode	get_repo	100%	0%
CVE-2015-1613	rhodecode	update_repo	100%	0%
CVE-2015-7316	plone	URLTool.isURLInPortal	100%	70%
CVE-2016-10149	pysaml2	parse_soap_enveloped_saml	100%	20%
CVE-2017-12852	numpy	pad	100%	100%
CVE-2017-18342	pyyaml	yaml.load	0%	100%
CVE-2018-25091	urllib3	PoolManager	100%	100%
CVE-2019-20477	pyyaml	yaml.load_all	0%	0%
CVE-2020-13092	joblib	load	100%	10%
CVE-2020-13901	pandas	read_pickle	100%	100%
CVE-2021-37677	tensorflow	raw_ops.Dequantize	100%	100%
CVE-2021-37679	tensorflow	tf.map_fn	40%	100%
CVE-2021-3842	nlTK	BrillTaggerTrainer.train	100%	100%
CVE-2021-40324	cobbler	TFTPGen.generate_script	100%	10%
CVE-2021-41195	tensorflow	tf.math.segment_sum	100%	10%
CVE-2021-41198	tensorflow	tf.tile	100%	80%
CVE-2021-41199	tensorflow	tf.image.resize	100%	100%
CVE-2021-41200	tensorflow	tf.summary.create_file_writer	100%	90%
CVE-2021-41202	tensorflow	tf.range	100%	100%
CVE-2021-41495	numpy	sort	50%	100%
CVE-2021-43854	nlTK	PunktSentenceTokenizer	100%	10%
CVE-2022-22815	Pillow	PIL.ImagePath.Path	100%	0%
CVE-2022-22816	Pillow	PIL.ImagePath.Path	100%	0%
CVE-2022-22817	Pillow	ImageMath.eval	60%	100%
CVE-2022-24766	mitmproxy	validate_headers	30%	100%
Mean			83%	57%

**TABLE III:** Recommendation Rate of Patched Vulnerable APIs by LLMs.

Consequently, LLMs still possess a significant likelihood of generating code with these outdated APIs.

Even though the security issue of usage-modified APIs can be solved by updating the packages, we cannot guarantee that users can update their packages as well. Plus, even though the users can update their packages, unlike patched APIs, the usage-modified APIs cannot be compiled in the latest version given that the usage has been modified. For usage-modified APIs, APILOT is designed to aid LLMs in generating outputs that ensure security across all versions, but also aid LLMs in generating compilable outputs.

#### D. Reasons of Generation of Outdated APIs

The reason of LLMs to recommend outdated APIs is because of the use of outdated training dataset. The outdated training dataset can be attributed to two factors: *inherent limitation of LLMs* and *constraints of the code in training dataset*.

**Inherent limitation of LLMs.** LLMs, such as GPT-4, are constrained by the static nature of their training data, which does not extend beyond a predetermined cutoff date which is September 2021 for GPT-4 [33]. This limitation prevents the incorporation of real-time data, encompassing recent developments in news, technological advancements, etc., thereby significantly impairing their effectiveness in tasks such as API recommendation, particularly in relation to the latest

updates concerning safety and usability in dependent packages. More than two and a half years have elapsed since the last data update included in GPT-4’s training dataset, during which numerous software packages have been updated to address security vulnerabilities and enhance functionality.

**Constraints of the code in training dataset.** Despite the frequent updates of documentations for packages, a notable hesitance persists among developers to frequently update their code. Research indicates that merely approximately 20% of developers routinely adjust their code to align with the latest package releases [10]. McDonnell reported that approximately 28% of API references in applications were outdated, highlighting a sluggish adoption rate for the latest APIs [28]. Moreover, Zerouali developed a model to quantify the extent of the API updating lag in deployed software components, a lag that primarily arises from dependency constraints and developers’ reluctance to update due to potential compatibility issues [52].

Consequently, even when LLMs are trained using the most current datasets available, these datasets often contain outdated API usage. This issue is exacerbated by the infrequent updates of open-source projects hosted on platforms like GitHub [15], which subsequently impacts the recommendation of outdated APIs by LLMs.

#### E. Security impacts of outdated APIs recommendation by LLMs

Using outdated APIs within a development environment has been proven to induce security vulnerabilities, as these APIs often lack current patches, thereby increasing the risk of exposing software to potential threats. Additionally, the maintenance costs associated with using outdated APIs can escalate, as developers are required to allocate additional resources to manage compatibility and efficiency issues.

However, version-unaware code recommended by LLMs aggravates these issues. Such recommendations, when including patched APIs, can introduce severe security risks to a developer’s codebase. As demonstrated in Table VIII, which catalogues all manually collected Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures (CVEs) including bug types and their scores from the Common Vulnerability Scoring System (CVSS) [14], CVEs related to patched APIs have been observed with scores as high as 9.8 and an average of 6.55. Moreover, if version-unaware recommendations include usage-modified APIs, this not only raises security concerns but also incurs compatibility issues. Although updating the package version might resolve issues linked to patched APIs, it fails to address the compatibility challenges presented by usage-modified APIs, necessitating significant maintenance efforts from developers to rewrite the code. Furthermore, when version-unaware recommendations involve deprecated APIs, simply updating packages proves inadequate. Instead, developers must invest time to understand these APIs and seek alternative solutions independently, rendering the LLM’s recommendations effectively meaningless.

## IV. OVERVIEW

### A. Workflow of APILOT

Figure 3 illustrates the workflow of APILOT. APILOT is structured into three main phases:




Fig. 3: Overview.

**Phase 1: Collection of Outdated API Information.** This initial phase involves a comprehensive collection of outdated API information from various packages and CVE datasets. To collect deprecated APIs and usage-modified APIs, the process begins by retrieving a list of packages from online repositories that publish and store third-party packages. For each package, commit lists from GitHub are examined through a differential analysis by analyzing the deprecation warning of functions and usage-modified functions in the content of commits. Additionally, lightweight static analysis is performed on each package to collect public callable APIs. By matching deprecated and modified functions with public callable APIs, we can compile a list of deprecated and usage-modified APIs. Patched vulnerable APIs are gathered from existing CVE datasets. Additionally, a monitoring system is in place to track GitHub commit and CVE updates in real-time, ensuring that the latest modifications in each package are captured promptly.

**Phase 2: Sanitization of outdated APIs in outputs of LLMs.** The second phase focuses on detecting and filtering outdated APIs in the outputs of LLMs. The detection process involves extracting code snippets from the LLM’s output and converting these snippets into Abstract Syntax Trees (AST) to enhance the detection accuracy of inappropriate APIs. A filtering system identifies outdated APIs. If none are found, APILOT returns the code snippet to the developer. If outdated APIs are detected, APILOT filters them out and adds them to a ban list.

**Phase 3: Augmented Generation.** In this phase, APILOT modifies the original prompt by incorporating the ban list. This updated prompt is then re-submitted to the LLMs for code snippet regeneration. This process repeats until it reaches a pre-defined maximum iteration threshold. If the threshold is reached without generating code snippets free of outdated APIs, all generated code snippets are returned to the developer along with detailed warnings about the outdated APIs. This approach ensures that developers are aware of the outdated APIs in the code generations provided by the LLM.

## B. Challenges and Techniques of APILOT

This section discusses the technical challenges (C) of implementing APILOT and the corresponding techniques (T) to address these challenges.

**C-1: Automatically collecting outdated APIs.** To leverage real-time information on APIs, APILOT initially requires the collection of data regarding deprecated and usage-modified outdated APIs. Conventionally, the most straightforward approach to acquire API information is through package documentation. However, this method encounters several significant challenges that hinder the automatic collection of outdated APIs, attributable to three primary factors: (1) heterogeneity in documentation styles, (2) variations in documentation quality, and (3) delays in updating documentation.

First, the diversity in style and format across different packages’ documentation complicates the creation of a standardized method for extracting information about API modifications [18]. Second, the variable quality of documentation can result in the exclusion of essential information, thereby creating substantial gaps in data collection [30]. Third, updates to documentation frequently lag behind actual API changes, thus delaying the availability of the most recent information and complicating efforts to collect real-time data [23]. Consequently, there is a critical need for an automated and real-time method to collect outdated API information.

**C-2: Detecting Outdated APIs from LLM Outputs.** Even with access to outdated API information, identifying the presence of outdated APIs within the outputs of LLMs remains challenging, as these outputs are typically string-based. The state-of-the-art methodologies, such as those employing regular expressions (Regex) like Purple-Llama [4], often lack the precision required. This is particularly evident when the code recommended by LLMs includes the name of outdated APIs represented in strings rather than as function calls, as detailed in Section §III-B. Additionally, the random insertion of punctuation marks in LLM-generated code further complicates the precise identification of outdated APIs. This situation underscores the necessity for a more accurate method to detect outdated APIs from LLM outputs.

**T-1: GitHub Commit Differential Analysis.** To address C-1, we introduce a new technique named GitHub commit differential analysis, which is designed to precisely identify outdated APIs. This technique prioritizes high precision, though it allows for the occurrence of false positives in the identification process. The underlying premise of our approach is that each GitHub commit, when pushed into a repository, records the all the

modifications inside functions and files, which help APILOT avoid missing any deprecated and usage-modified functions. To implement this technique, we extract the commit date, function that is first time assigned with deprecation warning, usage-modified functions, and modified files from each commit. We then employ an iterative algorithm to collect all the deprecated functions and usage-modified functions. Concurrently, we utilize a package analysis method to extract all publicly callable APIs. By integrating the results-deprecated functions, usage-modified functions and public callable APIs—we effectively identify all deprecated APIs and usage-modified APIs. Our manual evaluation indicates that this technique successfully identifies all deprecated APIs and usage-modified APIs without incurring false negatives. The identified false positives primarily consist of undocumented, deprecated APIs and usage-modified APIs.

**T-2: Extracting the code from output of LLM and detecting outdated APIs from the code by AST .** In response to C-2, our objective is to enhance the precision of identifying outdated APIs in LLMs outputs. This goal is achieved through two steps: correctly extracting the code from the LLM output and analyzing the AST parsed from the code. Initially, APILOT uses a wrapping prompt that guides the LLM to generate code snippets in a predictable format, facilitating easy extraction. Subsequently, APILOT extracts these code snippets based on matching the pattern, converting them from string-format code into an AST. By analyzing the structure and node types within the AST, APILOT can accurately identify the APIs used. This method ensures a more accurate detection of APIs by focusing on the structural elements of the code, significantly reducing misidentifications that occur with traditional string-based methods.

## V. DESIGN OF APILOT

The current architecture of APILOT is primarily tailored for Python codebases and their associated packages. However, the design of APILOT is modular, facilitating straightforward extensions to support additional programming languages as discussed in §VIII.

### A. Collection of Outdated APIs

Outdated APIs can be categorized into three distinct types: deprecated APIs, patched vulnerable APIs and usage-modified APIs. Our approach divides the collection of outdated APIs into two distinct methodologies: collection of deprecated APIs and usage-modified APIs by an AST-based analysis, and collection of patched APIs from existing dataset. While analyzing commits and patches through natural language processing appears to be a comprehensive approach to collect all types of outdated APIs, this method is compromised by issues of accuracy. For instance, the state-of-the-art techniques for detecting security patches in commits, achieve only about 80% accuracy [47]. This level of precision leads to false positives and false negatives, which negatively impacts the efficiency of the subsequent sanitization phase (Phase 2). Additionally, complications arise when CVEs pertain to the C/C++ components underlying Python packages, making it challenging to determine the affected public APIs due to the integration of multiple programming languages.

To overcome these challenges, our two distinguish methods for collection of outdated APIs ensures accurate collection

of data, particularly by eliminating the occurrence of false negatives.

**Collection of Deprecated APIs & Usage-Modified APIs.** To systematically collect deprecated and usage-modified APIs, we implement a differential analysis of GitHub commit histories. Initially, we aggregate all commits pertinent to the packages, focusing on the modifications within each commit. These modified files containing code modification are then converted into ASTs, alongside the code from their immediately preceding versions for comparative analysis.

Differential analysis is then conducted between corresponding functions in the current and previous commits. Functions that appear in the previous AST but are absent in the current version are marked as removed. If there are differences in the arguments attribute of the function node between the two ASTs, the function is classified as having changed parameters. Changes in the Return statement, which delineates the expression and value returned by a function, also categorize the function as having a modified return value. To identify deprecated functions, APILOT traverses the AST within a function to detect usage of deprecation warning controls [38]. Deprecation warning in code is commonly used and it alerts developers about outdated features due for removal, promoting timely updates to more secure and efficient alternatives, thus ensuring software remains robust and up-to-date. This analysis is iteratively applied across each commit and its preceding version to comprehensively catalog all usage-modified functions.

Our process identifies modifications by analyzing changes within the FunctionDef and ClassDef node type of the ASTs. Functions that are present in the previous version but absent in the current commit are considered removed. If discrepancies exist in the arguments attribute of the function node across versions, the function is categorized as having altered parameters. Similarly, changes in the Return statement, which specifies the expression and value returned by a function, indicate a modified return value. To identify deprecated functions, APILOT scans for deprecation warning controls within the ASTs [38]. Because deprecation warning in code is commonly used and it alerts developers about outdated features due for removal, promoting timely updates to more secure and efficient alternatives, thus ensuring software remains robust and up-to-date. APILOT utilizes the Python built-in tool, `inspect`, to ascertain the public accessibility of APIs within a package. This tool is to determine which deprecated and usage-modified functions are available as public callable APIs. Through this rigorous process, our methodology ensures the comprehensive collection of deprecated and usage-modified APIs.

By iteratively applying this analysis to each commit and its preceding version, we systematically catalog all deprecated and usage-modified functions. This method leverages the comprehensive recording capabilities of commits, which document every modification within a function. Consequently, APILOT ensures high accuracy in the data collection process, particularly excelling in the complete elimination of false negatives when collecting deprecated and outdated APIs

**Collection of Patched APIs.** The acquisition of patched APIs is conducted utilizing the Packaging Advisory Database



[37]. The collection method for patched APIs differs from that used for deprecated and usage-modified APIs, primarily because patched APIs do not typically manifest through visible warnings or usage changes within the function body, and detecting security patches does not inherently guarantee accuracy. Meanwhile, this database is regularly updated and provides comprehensive details for each CVE entry, including affected package names, affected APIs, and the versions impacted by the CVE. Utilizing this reputable and continuously updated resource ensures the accuracy of the data collected on patched APIs. The database’s regular updates, coinciding with the release of new CVEs, make it particularly suitable for APILOT’s purposes. It guarantees the absence of false negatives and false positives when APILOT collects patched APIs, thereby enhancing the reliability of APILOT on detecting the patched APIs in the output by LLMs.

### B. Detection of Outdated APIs in Outputs of LLMs

The most straightforward method to identify outdated API names in the outputs of LLMs involves using regular expressions. However, as demonstrated in §III-B, this approach has proven to be inaccurate. Additionally, the variability in user prompts can lead to unpredictable output formats. Thus, direct application of program analysis on LLM outputs is also unpractical, as these outputs may contain extraneous characters and natural language elements.

To enhance accuracy in detecting outdated APIs in LLM outputs, we employ a two-step strategy. First, we design a specific wrapping prompt that guides LLMs to generate code following a predetermined pattern, facilitating the correct extraction of code segments. Second, we apply static program analysis to these extracted code snippets to identify outdated API usage. This approach, combining controlled prompt design with rigorous static code analysis, offers a more reliable detection for outdated APIs than using regular expressions alone.

**Designed wrapping prompt to formalize outputs.** APILOT implements an wrapping prompting mechanism to guide the LLM generating the code piece in a fixed format as illustrated in Figure 4. This mechanism, transparent to the user, wraps the input prompt to ensure that the LLM produces code snippets in a structured “‘output code‘‘ format. This structured output simplifies the extraction process by enabling the matching of the generated code to the expected format.

**Detection of outdated APIs from the extracted code.** Once code snippets are extracted, APILOT parse into ASTs. These ASTs provide a structured representation of the source code without comments and formatting, focusing solely on the code’s logical structure. The structured of ASTs simplifies the analysis of the code, enabling systematic traversal and precise identification of API usage. By leveraging this method, APILOT effectively detects the use of outdated APIs within the generated code.

### C. Augmented Generation Process

This process utilizes a collection of outdated APIs to augment the generation of LLMs, effectively addressing the limitations of prompt engineering and fine-tuning. Following the sanitization process, if secure API recommendations are

```

"role": "system",
"content": Act as a coding expert. Please generate Python code based on the following
user instructions. Do not output other words except code solution. Code should be in
``` ``` . You should never call any function from {BANNED FUNCTIONS LIST} for
your any solutions.

"role": "user",
"content": Please generate Python code to fulfill the purpose {User Input Prompt}.

```

Fig. 4: Wrapping prompt of APILOT.

unattainable, APILOT initiates an augmented generation process. This involves creating a ban list of detected outdated APIs, subsequently integrated into the wrapping prompt, as depicted in Figure 4. This refined prompt directs the LLMs to generate outputs that exclude outdated APIs.

The augmented generation operates iteratively, continuing until secure code is generated or a predefined maximum number of iterations is reached. The default setting for these iterations is three, a number determined by our evaluations to balance performance and overhead (detailed in Table VII-F). Users have the flexibility to adjust this maximum to meet varying security needs or operational constraints.

When the process reaches the maximum number of iterations without producing secure code, APILOT delivers the generated code, identifying any outdated APIs used, complete with detailed explanations of why each API is considered outdated. This warning message ensures that users are fully informed of the potential risks and limitations associated with the generated code.

### D. Version-awareness recommendation

Given the inability of LLMs to access user-specific package versions, delivering version-aware solutions for patched APIs presents a significant challenge. To overcome this, APILOT outputs a specialized code pattern, as illustrated in Figure 8, which utilizes Python’s `importlib` module to determine the user’s package version and the `distutils` module to format this version consistently. The code dynamically assesses whether the user’s package version is affected by any known vulnerabilities.

If patched APIs affect the user’s version, APILOT provides a code snippet that omits the outdated APIs. If the version is unaffected, APILOT offers a snippet that includes the patched APIs, because they are secure in the version of the users package. This strategy achieves version-aware recommendations by LLMs without requiring access to the user’s development environment, thereby enhancing security without introducing any other security concern.

## VI. IMPLEMENTATION

**GitHub Commit Retrieval.** To facilitate the retrieval of GitHub commits, APILOT employs the `PyGithub` module, a robust Python library designed for interacting with the GitHub API. This tool enables the comprehensive collection of commit data, including commit date, and modifications to code and files, ensuring that no relevant data is omitted.

**Conversion of code to AST.** To convert string representations of code into ASTs, APILOT utilizes Python’s built-in

ast module. The conversion process is executed using the `ast.parse()` function, which interprets the Python code into an AST.

**Detection of outdated APIs from AST.** APILOT utilizes the `ast.NodeVisitor` class for node inspection within the AST. To accurately detect the usage of outdated APIs, APILOT initially tracks imported packages by analyzing the `Import` and `ImportFrom` nodes. Subsequently, APILOT examines package aliases through nodes such as `Call` and `Attribute` to identify API usage from these packages. Finally, APILOT verifies whether the APIs invoked in the code are outdated.

## VII. EVALUATION.

This section evaluates APILOT across multiple dimensions: effectiveness, quality of generated code, performance overhead, and the influence of model temperatures.

### A. Evaluation Setup

**Benchmark Dataset.** The benchmark dataset comprises a selection of outdated APIs along with their corresponding instruction prompts. This dataset, utilized in the analysis presented in §III-C, has been augmented to include a broader set of patched vulnerable APIs, now totaling 100 entries, as detailed in Table VIII.

**Benchmark LLMs.** For our analysis, we selected a cohort of seven prominent large language models (LLMs) distinguished for their advanced capabilities in code recommendation. These models are shown in Table IV.

Model	Abbr. in Eval	Training Data
gpt-3.5-turbo-0125	GPT-3.5	Up to Sep. 2021 [33]
codellama-34b-instruct	CODELLAMA	Up to Jan. 2023 [12]
llama-2-13b-chat	LLAMA2	Up to Sep. 2022 [13]
llama-3-8b-instruct	LLAMA3	Up to Mar. 2023 [7]
granite-20b-instruct	GRANITE	Up to Jun. 2023
mixtral-8x7b-instruct-v0.1	MIXTRAL	Undisclosed
deepseek-coder-33b-instruct	DEEPSEEK	Undisclosed

**TABLE IV:** Benchmark LLMs with cutoff date of training dataset and abbreviation in evaluation.

**Experimental Setup.** Python 3.8 was utilized to implement the system designated as APILOT. Data collection concerning outdated APIs was conducted on a server equipped with Ubuntu 18.04 LTS, featuring 256 GB of RAM and an Intel Xeon CPU at 2.9 GHz with 24 cores. The LLMs used in this project was accessed by the LLM APIs provided by OpenAI and IBM cloud. In the whole evaluation, there are more than 2.5 million tokens that have been input to LLMs.

To assess the efficacy of APILOT, all LLMs in the evaluation are tasked with generating solutions based on benchmark prompts, executed ten times to ensure statistical robustness. Additionally, each run includes initiating new dialogues to LLMs, which is to make sure the previous output will not affect the current input.

### B. Evaluation Metrics

To assess the efficacy of APILOT, we introduce the following evaluation metrics.

**$F_{API+}$ : Frequency of Outdated API Recommendations.**  $F_{API+}$  assesses the security improvement made by APILOT by extending the analysis beyond  $F_{API}$ . This metric measures the frequency with which the LLM recommends any outdated API instead of the corresponding outdated API in response to a specific instruction prompt. It calculates the likelihood that the instruction prompt will lead to the suggestion of any outdated API, providing a comprehensive overview of the LLM’s propensity to recommend outdated APIs.

**ExtractRate: Efficacy of Code Extraction from LLM Outputs.** `EXTRACTRATE` evaluates the efficiency of APILOT in extracting code from a predefined output format. This metric reflects the proportion of code that is successfully extracted from the outputs of LLMs.

**ParseRate: Parsing Success Rate to AST.** `ParseRate.` is designed to evaluate the ability of LLM-recommended code to be logically structured and parsed successfully into AST. This metric quantifies the proportion of extracted code that can be converted into AST, reflecting the syntactical and logical correctness of the code as generated by LLMs.

**ExecRate: Ratio of Executable Code Recommended by Models Under Specified Package Version.** `EXECRATE` assesses the usability of code recommended by both standard LLMs and those enhanced with APILOT. This metric indicates the proportion of generated code that can be directly executed without additional modifications, thereby evaluating APILOT’s impact on the practical applicability of recommended code.

**ICE-Score: Functionality Score of the Recommended Code** `ICE-SCORE` [54] assesses the functionality of code generated by both standard LLMs and those enhanced with APILOT. Utilizing the judgment model, GPT-3.5-TURBO, this metric evaluates the extent to which the recommended code meets the functional requirements specified in the input prompt. The `ICE-SCORE` assigns a rating from 0 to 4, where higher scores reflect greater alignment with the prompt’s stipulated requirements.

**ExecTime: Execution Time of Code recommendation Process.** `EXECTIME` quantifies the performance overhead associated with APILOT. This metric is segmented into two components: *SanTime* and *GenTime*. *SanTime* measures the duration of the sanitization process within APILOT, which involves detecting outdated APIs in LLM outputs, generating a ban list, and updating input wrapping prompts that include this ban list. *GenTime* gauges the time required for the LLM to generate code recommendations. For models not enhanced with APILOT, `EXECTIME` consists only of *GenTime*. However, with the integration of APILOT, `EXECTIME` encompasses both *SanTime* and *GenTime*. This metric provides insights into the temporal efficiency of APILOT within LLMs, evaluating the additional time cost incurred by its integration.

### C. Security Performance of APILOT

$F_{API}$  and  $F_{API+}$  are used to evaluate the security performance of APILOT. Table V presents the evaluation results, comparing the baseline model with the APILOT enhanced model across two metrics and showing the reduction rates achieved by APILOT. The average reduce rate of deprecated APIs is 85.27% under  $F_{API}$  and 76.42% under  $F_{API+}$ . The average reduce rate of patched APIs is 93.64% under  $F_{API}$

Deprecated APIs						
Models	$F_{API}$			$F_{API+}$		
	w/o	w/	$R_r$	w/o	w/	$R_r$
GPT-3.5	0.3125	0.0694	<b>77.78%</b>	0.8681	0.3264	<b>62.40%</b>
MIXTRAL	0.2083	0.0347	<b>83.33%</b>	0.9305	0.2500	<b>73.13%</b>
LLAMA3	0.2843	0.0000	<b>100.00%</b>	0.9412	0.0000	<b>100.00%</b>
CODELLAMA	0.3264	0.4861	<b>85.11%</b>	0.9514	0.2292	<b>75.91%</b>
GRANITE	0.2986	0.0000	<b>100.00%</b>	0.7986	0.0000	<b>100.00%</b>
DEEPSEEK	0.4097	0.090	<b>77.97%</b>	0.9514	0.3611	<b>62.05%</b>
LLAMA2	0.1737	0.041	<b>76.00%</b>	0.9583	0.2777	<b>71.02%</b>
<b>Mean</b>	0.2878	0.0424	<b>85.27%</b>	0.9130	0.2153	<b>76.42%</b>
Patched Vulnerable APIs						
Models	$F_{API}$			$F_{API+}$		
	w/o	w/	$R_r$	w/o	w/	$R_r$
GPT-3.5	0.4900	0.0600	<b>87.76%</b>	0.6500	0.0700	<b>89.23%</b>
MIXTRAL	0.2749	0.0209	<b>92.40%</b>	0.4764	0.0228	<b>95.21%</b>
LLAMA3	0.1900	0.0000	<b>100.00%</b>	0.3800	0.0000	<b>100.00%</b>
CODELLAMA	0.1621	0.0063	<b>96.11%</b>	0.3714	0.0062	<b>98.33%</b>
GRANITE	0.2066	0.0000	<b>100.00%</b>	0.3727	0.0000	<b>100.00%</b>
DEEPSEEK	0.3293	0.0549	<b>83.33%</b>	0.7118	0.0854	<b>88.00%</b>
LLAMA2	0.1236	0.0051	<b>95.87%</b>	0.4140	0.0050	<b>98.79%</b>
<b>Mean</b>	0.2538	0.0210	<b>93.64%</b>	0.4823	0.0271	<b>95.65%</b>
Usage-modified APIs						
Models	$F_{API}$			$F_{API+}$		
	w/o	w/	$R_r$	w/o	w/	$R_r$
GPT-3.5	0.5344	0.0556	<b>89.59%</b>	0.7875	0.1667	<b>78.83%</b>
MIXTRAL	0.5062	0.0556	<b>89.02%</b>	0.9406	0.1667	<b>95.59%</b>
LLAMA3	0.5253	0.0000	<b>100.00%</b>	0.9394	0.0000	<b>100.00%</b>
CODELLAMA	0.6187	0.1111	<b>82.04%</b>	0.9781	0.2778	<b>71.60%</b>
GRANITE	0.4469	0.0000	<b>100.00%</b>	0.7313	0.0000	<b>100.00%</b>
DEEPSEEK	0.6344	0.1111	<b>82.49%</b>	0.9625	0.3333	<b>65.37%</b>
LLAMA2	0.4688	0.0556	<b>88.14%</b>	0.9563	0.3333	<b>65.15%</b>
<b>Mean</b>	0.5336	0.0569	<b>89.34%</b>	0.8989	0.1869	<b>79.21%</b>

\*  $R_r$  represents the reduce rate by APILOT.

\* w/o means the model does not equip APILOT. w/ means the model equips APILOT.

\* All the models select the default temperature which is 0.7.

TABLE V: Security Performance of APILOT.

and 95.65% under  $F_{API+}$ . The average reduce rate of usage-modified APIs is 89.34% under  $F_{API}$  and 79.21% under  $F_{API+}$ . The result clearly indicate that APILOT substantially reduces the incidence of recommending outdated API references across the two metrics.

However, theoretically, APILOT should achieve a 100% reduction rate as it is designed to detect all outdated APIs and prevent their recommendation by informing the models. For instance, LLAMA3 and GRANITE, APILOT can always reduce 100% of outdated APIs. After we manually investigate the result, we find the following reasons.

**Reason-1: LLMs Utilize Alternative Outdated APIs.** After detecting outdated APIs, APILOT inputs a wrapping prompt with a ban list containing outdated APIs to the LLMs. While the LLMs are prevented from invoking the APIs within the ban list, they may use other outdated APIs to achieve the same functionality. For example, CVE-2020-15190 involves the patched API `tf.raw_ops.Switch`. When APILOT detects `tf.raw_ops.Switch` in the output of the LLMs, it informs the LLMs not to use this API. Instead, the LLM generate the code containing `tf.constant` to replicate the functionality, although `tf.constant` is associated with CVE-2020-5215. After the maximum iteration of the augmented generation, it is still possible that the output of these models still contains the outdated API.

**Reason-2: Impact of the Knowledge Cutoff Date of the Training Dataset.** Models such as GPT-3.5, MIXTRAL, CODELLAMA, DEEPSEEK, and LLAMA cannot achieve a 100%

reduction rate because the knowledge cutoff date of their training datasets is too old. For example, CODELLAMA has a knowledge cutoff date of January 2023, but its training data only extends up to September 2022, with tuning data up to January 2023. With outdated training datasets, these models cannot recommend functional code without invoking outdated APIs, thereby preventing them from achieving a 100% reduction rate.

#### D. Performance of Code Extraction and AST Conversion

We employ EXTRACTRATE to assess the efficiency of code extraction from LLM outputs and PARSEATE to evaluate the conversion of extracted code into ASTs. Table VI presents the EXTRACTRATE and PARSEATE across various LLM models, with the lowest match rate exceeding 98%, underscoring APILOT’s proficiency in accurately extracting code by guiding the LLMs to generate code in predefined format. The inability of some models, excluding GPT-3.5, to achieve a 100% EXTRACTRATE stems from suboptimal format control. For instance, models such as LLAMA3, LLAMA2, and CODELLAMA occasionally omit backticks in the predefined format, leading to extraction failures. Additionally, GRANITE, MIXTRAL, and DEEPSEEK sometimes produce natural language statements, such as ‘Here is the Python solution:’, instead of adhering strictly to the predefined code format.

Table VI also reveals a high PARSEATE, indicating the LLMs’ ability to generate syntactically and logically coherent code. However, instances where extracted code fails to be correctly parsed into an AST typically involve errors such as undefined variable names within the generated code.

	GPT-3.5	MIXTRAL	LLAMA3	CODELLAMA	GRANITE	DEEPSEEK	LLAMA2
<b>ExtractRate</b>	100%	99.98%	99.39%	99.98%	98.56%	99.94%	99.89%
<b>ParseRate</b>	99%	96.79%	98%	99.32%	95.53%	99.77%	97.86%

TABLE VI: ExtractRate of APILOT and ParseRate by LLMs.

#### E. Usability & Functionality of the recommendation code

**Usability.** To evaluate the usability of code recommended by LLMs, we employed the EXECRATE metric under two distinct scenarios: the use of package versions close to the training dataset’s cutoff date, referred to as the *old version*, and the use of the most recent package versions, termed the *latest version*. Figure 5 shows that APILOT enhances the usability of LLM-recommended code, with improvements of 23.96% for the old version and 31.12% for the latest version. For instance, as shown in Figure 6, the outdated API `nx.to_numpy_matrix()`—deprecated in version 2.6 on July, 2021 and removed in version 3.0 on January 17, 2023—fails to compile in the latest version. In contrast, APILOT’s recommendation employs alternative APIs that deliver equivalent outputs, thereby increasing the usability of the generated code.

**Functionality.** We assessed the functionality of the recommended code using the ICE-SCORE metric. Figure 5 shows that a modest decline in functionality was observed across several models, averaging a 6.84% decrease. We identified the following reasons for the reduced ICE-SCORE of code generated with APILOT. First, as depicted in Figure 6, the code recommended




Fig. 5: Evaluation of Code Usability and Functionality Recommended by LLMs v.s LLMs Enhanced with APILOT

by APILOT achieves the same level of correctness as that recommended by vanilla LLMs but introduces increased code complexity, thus reducing the ICE-SCORE. Secondly, the increased prompt complexity and expanding list of banned APIs can influence the performance of LLMs, thereby reducing the ICE-SCORE. When the prompt is complex, some LLMs may struggle to understand the extended context, leading them to generate trivial or empty solutions. The percentage of such cases for each model is as follows: 4.3% for GPT-3.5, 4.5% for CODELLAMA, 4.8% for LLAMA2, 2.9% for both LLAMA3 and GRANITE, 3.1% for DEEPSEEK, and a notably higher 22.3% for MIXTRAL, underscoring its particular susceptibility to increased prompt complexity.

```

1 Prompt:
2 # Return the graph adjacency matrix as a NumPy matrix
3
4 import networkx as nx
5
6 G = nx.Graph()
7 G.add_nodes_from([1, 2, 3])
8 G.add_edges_from([(1, 2), (2, 3)])
9
10 Recommendation of vanilla LLM:
11 adj_matrix = nx.to_numpy_matrix(G)
12 print(adj_matrix)
13 # Solutions contains the outdated API: to_numpy_matrix()
14
15 Recommendation of LLM with APILOT:
16 adj_matrix = nx.to_numpy_array(G)
17 np_matrix = np.matrix(adj_matrix)
18 print(np_matrix)

```

Fig. 6: Example of alternative solution by APILOT.

### E. Performance Overhead

	GPT-3.5	MIXTRAL	LLAMA3	CODELLAMA	GRANITE	DEEPSEEK	LLAMA2
Relative EXEC TIME	1.75	2.13	1.96	1.99	1.66	2.26	2.07

TABLE VII: Relative EXEC TIME between base mode and model with APILOT.

Table VII illustrates the performance overhead of APILOT by comparing the relative execution times of LLMs with and without APILOT. Specifically, LLMs with APILOT exhibit an EXEC TIME approximately 1.97 times longer than the vanilla

models on average. The following paragraphs discuss the factors in our system that influence performance overhead.

**Efficiency of APILOT on sanitization process.** The metric *SanTime* is utilized to assess the efficiency of the sanitization process including detecting outdated APIs and filtering out outdated APIs. In our analysis, we compare the *SanTime* for APILOT and Purple-Llama even though Purple-Llama does not need to filter out the outdated APIs. Both APILOT and Purple-Llama achieve *SanTime* under 0.5 seconds in our experimental setup, which is considered negligible within the overall *ExecTime*. The findings indicate that APILOT not only mirrors the *SanTime* of Purple-Llama but also significantly surpasses it in accuracy in detecting outdated APIs because Purple-Llama cannot detect any of the outdated APIs shown in §III-B.

**Configuration of the maximum iteration in the augmented recommendation process.** We set the maximum iteration at three in the evaluation. This setting allows the APILOT to recommend responses up to three times for a given prompt, ensuring the absence of outdated APIs. The adjustment of the maximum iteration setting significantly impacts the relative EXEC TIME. Increasing the maximum iteration tends to prolong the EXEC TIME, whereas decreasing it tends to reduce the EXEC TIME. The decision to establish the maximum iteration at three stems from multiple evaluations, aiming to balance the EXEC TIME with the efficacy of reducing outdated API recommendations. It has been observed that if the model continues to produce outdated APIs after three iterations, it likely indicates a limitation in the model’s capability, and further increases in iteration count do not effectively reduce the presence of outdated APIs.

**Inherent capabilities of different models equipping APILOT in managing outdated API recommendations.** GPT-3.5 and GRANITE typically sanitize outdated APIs within two iterations. Conversely, LLAMA3, despite its overall excellence in reducing outdated APIs, often requires up to three iterations. This is attributable to LLAMA3’s tendency during iterative augmented recommendation to introduce new outdated APIs, necessitating additional iterations to produce clean code.

### G. Effect of LLM temperature

The temperature parameter in LLMs significantly influences the randomness of their responses. At lower settings (0-0.5), the model is deterministic and predictable, ensuring reliability but limiting variability. Increasing the temperature (0.5-1) enhances response diversity and creativity, though it may sometimes produce irrelevant or incorrect outputs. Above 1, the model’s preference for improbable words grows, boosting creativity and variety but potentially reducing coherence and accuracy, leading to nonsensical or off-topic content. Figure 7 illustrates the performance of GPT-3.5 when equipped with APILOT, highlighting the system’s efficiency across different temperature settings.

**Increase in temperature correlates with a rise in the reduction rate.** This suggests that higher temperatures boost the model’s creative capabilities, enabling it to recommend functionally similar code without invoking outdated APIs.

**Decline in ParseRate, ExecRate, and ICE-Score when temperature surpasses 1.5.** Our analysis indicates that when




Fig. 7: Evaluation of Affection of the different temperature of GPT-3.5-TURBO

the temperature surpasses 1.5, GPT-3.5 frequently produces code characterized by logical inconsistencies and arbitrary elements, resulting from heightened stochasticity and creativity. These flaws render the code unexecutable in any environment and prevent its conversion into an AST. Additionally, the increased randomness compromises the code’s ability to fulfill predefined functionalities in the prompt.

**Impact of high temperatures on ExecTime.** We observed significant increases in output length when the temperature setting exceeded 1.5, directly leading to elevated EXECUTE. This increase is attributed to enhanced randomness and creativity at higher temperature levels as well. In a specific experiment where the temperature was set at 2, the EXECUTE consistently surpassed 30 seconds per request. The outputs, nearing the maximum allowable length, were predominantly filled with random characters. Due to these adverse impacts, results from the temperature setting of 2 were omitted from our final evaluation.

## VIII. DISCUSSION

**Applying APILOT to code in different programming languages.** As a research prototype, APILOT primarily focuses on Python packages. However, it can be adapted for other programming languages with some modifications. The core component of APILOT involves identifying and collecting outdated APIs. APILOT can potentially be extended to other programming languages, if the projects are maintained on GitHub and their ASTs can be generated. We believe these constraints are not difficult to achieve. For instance, Esprima and LLVM can generate the AST for JavaScript and C correspondingly.

**Additional security applications.** The outdated API database can also be used to detect outdated API usage in developer-written code by applying the same techniques used to analyze LLM-generated code. Furthermore, this outdated API database can be integrated into Integrated Development Environments

(IDEs), such as PyCharm and Visual Studio Code. By embedding this functionality within these popular development tools, it becomes feasible to monitor and alert developers about the use of outdated APIs in real-time. This proactive approach guarantees that outdated APIs are not invoked during the coding process, thereby enhancing the security and reliability of the software.

**Limitation of evaluation.** Generating instruction prompts for outdated APIs using function descriptions from their official documentation may increase the recommendation rate of outdated API. However, we use such an approach due to following considerations. Firstly, manually generated prompts can be inaccurate and biased. Because understanding APIs’ functionality usually requires consulting its function description or source code, and developers’ interpretations can vary, leading to imprecise prompts. Second, analysis based on the metrics  $F_{API+}$  reveals that instruction prompts not only trigger the generation of the targeted outdated API but also prompt the generation of other outdated APIs. This observation highlights the widespread issue of outdated API generation as well. Third, our focus on improving security with APILOT means we employ the same instruction prompts for both vanilla LLMs and those enhanced with APILOT. Consequently, our primary concern is the reduction in outdated API generation achieved by APILOT, rather than the overall rate of outdated API generation. Addressing this limitation will leave as future work.

## IX. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we examine the prevalence of outdated API recommendations by large language models (LLMs) and highlight the associated security risks. To mitigate these risks, we introduce APILOT, a version-aware system that guides LLMs to produce secure, version-aware code by leveraging a real-time database of outdated APIs. To implement APILOT, we propose several techniques, including commit differential analysis for accurate collection and detection of outdated APIs, and AST-based program analysis to identify the use of outdated APIs in LLM outputs.

Our evaluations demonstrate that APILOT significantly reduces the incidence of outdated API recommendations while maintaining a minimal impact on performance. Furthermore, APILOT not only bolsters security but also enhances the usability of the code generated by LLMs. Additionally, we introduce a novel metric designed to measure the frequency of outdated API usage in code generated by LLMs. When combined with existing metrics that evaluate logical errors in code, this new metric offers a comprehensive framework for assessing the security of code generated by LLMs.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Amazon Web Services, “Amazon codewhisperer,” Amazon Web Services, 2023, available online: <https://aws.amazon.com/codewhisperer/> (accessed on June 10, 2024).
- [2] O. Asare, M. Nagappan, and N. Asokan, “A user-centered security evaluation of copilot,” *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*, vol. null, p. null, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/4b0faf4968f9b927d6dce946226feb69a82a6766>
- [3] —, “Is github’s copilot as bad as humans at introducing vulnerabilities in code?” *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 28, no. 6, p. 129, 2023.
- [4] M. Bhatt, S. Chennabasappa, C. Nikolaidis, S. Wan, I. Evtimov, D. Gabi, D. Song, F. Ahmad, C. Aschermann, L. Fontana *et al.*, “Purple llama cyberseval: A secure coding benchmark for language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04724*, 2023.
- [5] E. Bommarito and M. J. B. II, “An empirical analysis of the python package index (pypi),” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1907.11073, 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.11073>
- [6] M. Chen, J. Tworek, H. Jun, Q. Yuan, H. P. d. O. Pinto, J. Kaplan, H. Edwards, Y. Burda, N. Joseph, G. Brockman *et al.*, “Evaluating large language models trained on code,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- [7] Clarifai, “Llama-3-8b-instruct,” <https://clarifai.com/meta/Llama-3/models/Llama-3-8B-Instruct>, accessed: 2024-07-08.
- [8] L. contributors, “Discussion on sourcerank 2.0 in libraries.io github repository,” GitHub issue, 2024, issue #1916. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/librariesio/libraries.io/issues/1916>
- [9] A. M. Dakhel, V. Majdinasab, A. Nikanjam, F. Khomh, M. Desmarais, and Z. Jiang, “Github copilot ai pair programmer: Asset or liability?” *J. Syst. Softw.*, vol. 203, p. 111734, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/d6954c43aa1ca197319c45d3988bc8fccc3de976>
- [10] E. Derr, S. Bugiel, S. Fahl, Y. Acar, and M. Backes, “Keep me updated: An empirical study of third-party library updatability on android,” in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2017, pp. 2187–2200.
- [11] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, “Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [12] H. Face, “Codellama-34b-hf,” <https://huggingface.co/codellama/CodeLlama-34b-hf>, accessed: 2024-07-08.
- [13] —, “Llama 2 - 7b,” <https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-2-7b#:~:text=Training%20Data&text=Neither%20the%20pretraining%20nor%20the,recent%2C%20up%20to%20July%202023,> accessed: 2024-07-08.
- [14] I. FIRST.org, “Common vulnerability scoring system version 3.1: Specification document,” <https://www.first.org/cvss/specification-document>, 2019, accessed: 2024-07-05.
- [15] GitHub, “Github,” <https://github.com>, 2024, accessed on: June 10, 2024.
- [16] GitHub, Inc., “Github copilot,” <https://github.com/features/copilot>, 2022.
- [17] J. He and M. T. Vechev, “Large language models for code: Security hardening and adversarial testing,” *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, vol. null, p. null, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/63e2740dc581b4186b4e277a9955e8048c414521>
- [18] M. A. Islam, R. Hasan, and N. U. Eisty, “Documentation practices in agile software development: A systematic literature review,” in *2023 IEEE/ACIS 21st International Conference on Software Engineering Research, Management and Applications (SERA)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 266–273.
- [19] G. Izacard and E. Grave, “Leveraging passage retrieval with generative models for open domain question answering,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.01282*, 2020.
- [20] K. Jesse, T. Ahmed, P. T. Devanbu, and E. Morgan, “Large language models and simple, stupid bugs,” in *2023 IEEE/ACM 20th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 563–575.
- [21] V. Karpukhin, B. Oğuz, S. Min, P. Lewis, L. Wu, S. Edunov, D. Chen, and W.-t. Yih, “Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04906*, 2020.
- [22] R. Khoury, A. R. Avila, J. Brunelle, and B. M. Camara, “How secure is code generated by chatgpt?” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 2445–2451.
- [23] S. Lee, R. Wu, S.-C. Cheung, and S. Kang, “Automatic detection and update suggestion for outdated api names in documentation,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 653–675, 2019.
- [24] P. Lewis, E. Perez, A. Piktus, F. Petroni, V. Karpukhin, N. Goyal, H. Küttler, M. Lewis, W.-t. Yih, T. Rocktäschel *et al.*, “Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 9459–9474, 2020.
- [25] J. Li, A. Sangalay, C. Cheng, Y. Tian, and J. Yang, “Fine tuning large language model for secure code generation,” in *Proceedings of the 2024 IEEE/ACM First International Conference on AI Foundation Models and Software Engineering*, 2024, pp. 86–90.
- [26] Libraries.io, “Search results on libraries.io,” <https://libraries.io/search?order=desc&platforms=PyPI&sort=rank>, 2024, accessed: 2024-06-10.
- [27] Z. Liu, Y. Tang, X. Luo, Y. Zhou, and L. F. Zhang, “No need to lift a finger anymore? assessing the quality of code generation by chatgpt,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2024.
- [28] T. McDonnell, B. Ray, and M. Kim, “An empirical study of api stability and adoption in the android ecosystem,” in *2013 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 70–79.
- [29] MITRE Corporation, *Common Weakness Enumeration*, MITRE, Bedford, MA, 2024, available online: <https://cwe.mitre.org/> (accessed on June 10, 2024).
- [30] S. Mostafa, R. Rodriguez, and X. Wang, “Experience paper: a study on behavioral backward incompatibilities of java software libraries,” in *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGSOFT international symposium on software testing and analysis*, 2017, pp. 215–225.
- [31] E. Nijkamp, B. Pang, H. Hayashi, L. Tu, H. Wang, Y. Zhou, S. Savarese, and C. Xiong, “Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13474*, 2022.
- [32] OpenAI, “Openai codex,” <https://openai.com/blog/openai-codex>, 2021.
- [33] —, “Gpt-4 turbo and gpt-4 documentation,” 2024, accessed: 2024-06-03. [Online]. Available: <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4-turbo-and-gpt-4>
- [34] H. Pearce, B. Ahmad, B. Tan, B. Dolan-Gavitt, and R. Karri, “An empirical cybersecurity evaluation of github copilot’s code contributions,” *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2108.09293, p. null, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/3f97c2067cde9377e50b3160bbd7982c94abd88a>
- [35] —, “Asleep at the keyboard? assessing the security of github copilot’s code contributions,” in *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 754–768.
- [36] N. Perry, M. Srivastava, D. Kumar, and D. Boneh, “Do users write more insecure code with ai assistants?” *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, vol. null, p. null, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/ce3f027b68dad014a58aa35f52380932c8d0b209>
- [37] Python Packaging Authority, “pip-audit: Audits Python environments and dependency trees for known vulnerabilities,” <https://github.com/pypa/pip-audit>, 2024, accessed: 2024-06-25.
- [38] Python Software Foundation, “warnings — non-fatal alerts,” <https://docs.python.org/3/library/warnings.html>, 2024, accessed: 2024-06-26.

- [39] A. Radford, K. Narasimhan, T. Salimans, I. Sutskever *et al.*, “Improving language understanding by generative pre-training,” 2018.
- [40] B. Roziere, J. Gehring, F. Gloeckle, S. Sootla, I. Gat, X. E. Tan, Y. Adi, J. Liu, T. Remez, J. Rapin *et al.*, “Code llama: Open foundation models for code,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*, 2023.
- [41] G. Sandoval, H. Pearce, T. Nys, R. Karri, S. Garg, and B. Dolan-Gavitt, “Lost at c: A user study on the security implications of large language model code assistants,” in *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*, 2023, pp. 2205–2222.
- [42] A. A. Sawant, R. Robbes, and A. Bacchelli, “To react, or not to react: Patterns of reaction to api deprecation,” *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 24, pp. 3824–3870, 2019.
- [43] M. L. Siddiq and J. C. S. Santos, “Generate and pray: Using salms to evaluate the security of llm generated code,” *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2311.00889, p. null, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/900a6dbaf028cda9a962944fff1f138106a23bc0>
- [44] C. Tony, M. Mutas, N. E. D. Ferreyra, and R. Scandariato, “Llmseceval: A dataset of natural language prompts for security evaluations,” in *2023 IEEE/ACM 20th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 588–592.
- [45] P. Vaithilingam, T. Zhang, and E. L. Glassman, “Expectation vs. experience: Evaluating the usability of code generation tools powered by large language models,” *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems Extended Abstracts*, vol. null, p. null, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/4054fc9e8776dc0324cfc215462d606eb75916c0>
- [46] Vertex Cybersecurity, “TLS 1.2 End of Life - Vertex Cybersecurity,” 2024, accessed on 2024-06-25. [Online]. Available: <https://www.vertexcybersecurity.com.au/tls1-2-end-of-life/#:~:text=TLS%201.2%20being%20published%20in,still%20supports%20for%20compatibility%20reasons.>
- [47] S. Wang, X. Wang, K. Sun, S. Jajodia, H. Wang, and Q. Li, “Graphspd: Graph-based security patch detection with enriched code semantics,” in *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 2409–2426.
- [48] Wikipedia contributors, “Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia,” 2024, [Online; accessed 10-June-2024]. [Online]. Available: <https://www.wikipedia.org/>
- [49] F. F. Xu, U. Alon, G. Neubig, and V. J. Hellendoorn, “A systematic evaluation of large language models of code,” *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on Machine Programming*, vol. null, p. null, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/b32a6f6ef7dd775e0f876b4713cecebc56e651e>
- [50] B. Yetiştirilen, I. Özsoy, M. Ayerdem, and E. Tüzün, “Evaluating the code quality of ai-assisted code generation tools: An empirical study on github copilot, amazon codewhisperer, and chatgpt,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10778*, 2023.
- [51] B. Yetiştirilen, I. Ozsoy, and E. Tuzun, “Assessing the quality of github copilot’s code generation,” in *Proceedings of the 18th international conference on predictive models and data analytics in software engineering*, 2022, pp. 62–71.
- [52] A. Zerouali, T. Mens, J. Gonzalez-Barahona, A. Decan, E. Constantinou, and G. Robbes, “A formal framework for measuring technical lag in component repositories—and its application to npm,” *Journal of Software: Evolution and Process*, vol. 31, no. 8, p. e2157, 2019.
- [53] L. Zhong and Z. Wang, “Can llm replace stack overflow? a study on robustness and reliability of large language model code generation,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 38, no. 19, 2024, pp. 21 841–21 849.
- [54] T. Y. Zhuo, “Ice-score: Instructing large language models to evaluate code,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2024*, 2024, pp. 2232–2242.
- [55] A. Ziegler, E. Kalliamvakou, X. A. Li, A. Rice, D. Rifkin, S. Simister, G. Sittampalam, and E. Aftandilian, “Productivity assessment of neural code completion,” in *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on Machine Programming*, 2022, pp. 21–29.

```

1 from importlib.metadata import version
2 from distutils.version import StrictVersion
3
4 package_name = "" # Package in the Generated Code
5 module = __import__(package_name)
6 package_version = version(package_name)
7
8 v1 = StrictVersion(str(package_version))
9 v2 = [] # List of versions which are affected by the CVE
10
11 if v1 in v2:
12     """
13     Insert a code snippet that is free from patched
14     vulnerable APIs.
15     If no such code snippet is available, display a warning
16     message indicating
17     that the generated API xxx is vulnerable in your current
18     package version.
19     """
20     generated_code = ""
21 else:
22     """
23     Insert a code snippet generated from the LLMs which may
24     contain patched vulnerable APIs.
25     However, this code snippet will not cause security
26     problem since the user's package version
27     is not in the affected version list.
28     """
29     generated_code = ""
30
31 print(generated_code)

```

Fig. 8: Generated code pattern for handling patched vulnerable APIs.

CVE ID	Package	API	Bug Type	CVSS Score
CVE-2012-2374	tornado	set_header	CRLF injection	5
CVE-2013-0294	pyrad	Packet.CreateAuthenticator	Cryptographic Weakness	5.9
CVE-2013-0342	pyrad	Packet.CreateID	Insufficiently Random Values	4.3
CVE-2013-4251	scipy	scipy.weave.inline	Insecure Temporary File Creation	7.8
CVE-2014-0012	Jinja2	FileSystemBytecodeCache	Insecure Temporary File Creation	4.4
CVE-2014-1402	Jinja2	FileSystemBytecodeCache	Insecure Temporary File Creation	4.4
CVE-2015-0260	rhodocode	get_repo	Information Disclosure	4
CVE-2015-1613	rhodocode	update_repo	Information Disclosure	4
CVE-2015-7316	plone	URLTool.isURLInPortal	Cross-site scripting	6.1
CVE-2016-10149	pysaml2	parse_soap_enveloped_saml	XML External Entity	7.5
CVE-2017-12852	numpy	pad	Denial of Service	7.5
CVE-2017-18342	pyyaml	yaml.load	Arbitrary Code Execution	9.8
CVE-2018-25091	urllib3	PoolManager	Information Disclosure	6.1
CVE-2019-20477	pyyaml	yaml.load_all	Arbitrary Code Execution	9.8
CVE-2019-6446	numpy	load	Arbitrary Code Execution	9.8
CVE-2020-13092	numpy	load	Arbitrary Code Execution	9.8
CVE-2020-13901	pandas	read_pickle	Buffer Overflow	9.8
CVE-2020-15190	tensorflow	tf.raw_ops.Switch	Null Pointer Dereference	5.3
CVE-2020-15191	tensorflow	dlpack.to_dlpack	Null Pointer Dereference	5.3
CVE-2020-15192	tensorflow	dlpack.to_dlpack	Memory Leak	4.3
CVE-2020-15203	tensorflow	as_string	Format String Vulnerability	7.5
CVE-2020-15204	tensorflow	raw_ops.GetSessionHandle	Null Pointer Dereference	5.3
CVE-2020-15205	tensorflow	raw_ops.StringNGrams	Heap Overflow	9.8
CVE-2020-15265	tensorflow	tf.quantization.quantize_and_dequantize	Out-of-Bounds Read/Write	7.5
CVE-2020-15266	tensorflow	tf.image.crop_and_resize	Undefined Behavior	7.5
CVE-2020-5215	tensorflow	tf.constant	Denial of Service	7.5
CVE-2021-29516	tensorflow	raw_ops.RaggedTensorToVariant	Null Pointer Dereference	5.5
CVE-2021-29519	tensorflow	raw_ops.SparseCross	Type Confusion	5.5
CVE-2021-29524	tensorflow	raw_ops.Conv2DBackpropFilter	Division by Zero	5.5
CVE-2021-29525	tensorflow	raw_ops.Conv2DBackpropInput	Division by Zero	7.8
CVE-2021-29526	tensorflow	raw_ops.Conv2D	Division by Zero	5.5
CVE-2021-29527	tensorflow	raw_ops.QuantizedConv2D	Division by Zero	5.5
CVE-2021-29528	tensorflow	raw_ops.QuantizedMul	Division by Zero	5.5
CVE-2021-29529	tensorflow	raw_ops.QuantizedResizeBilinear	Heap overflow	7.8
CVE-2021-29533	tensorflow	raw_ops.DrawBoundingBoxes	Denial of Service	5.5
CVE-2021-29541	tensorflow	raw_ops.StringNGrams	Null Pointer Dereference	5.5
CVE-2021-29542	tensorflow	raw_ops.StringNGrams	Heap overflow	5.5
CVE-2021-29543	tensorflow	raw_ops.CTCGreedyDecoder	Denial of Service	5.5
CVE-2021-29544	tensorflow	raw_ops.QuantizeAndDequantizeV4Grad	Denial of Service	5.5
CVE-2021-29546	tensorflow	raw_ops.QuantizedBiasAdd	Division by Zero	7.8
CVE-2021-29547	tensorflow	raw_ops.QuantizedBatchNormWithGlobalNormalization	Denial of Service	5.5
CVE-2021-29548	tensorflow	raw_ops.QuantizedBatchNormWithGlobalNormalization	Division by Zero	5.5
CVE-2021-29549	tensorflow	raw_ops.QuantizedBatchNormWithGlobalNormalization	Division by Zero	5.5
CVE-2021-29550	tensorflow	raw_ops.FractionalAvgPool	Denial of Service	5.5
CVE-2021-29558	tensorflow	raw_ops.SparseSplit	Heap overflow	7.8
CVE-2021-29559	tensorflow	raw_ops.UnicodeEncode	Out-of-Bounds Read/Write	7.1
CVE-2021-29560	tensorflow	raw_ops.RaggedTensorToTensor	Heap overflow	7.1
CVE-2021-29562	tensorflow	raw_ops.IRFFT	Denial of Service	5.5
CVE-2021-29563	tensorflow	raw_ops.RFFT	Denial of Service	5.5
CVE-2021-29564	tensorflow	raw_ops.EditDistance	Null Pointer Dereference	5.5
CVE-2021-29565	tensorflow	raw_ops.SparseFillEmptyRows	Null Pointer Dereference	5.5
CVE-2021-29572	tensorflow	raw_ops.SdcaOptimizer	Undefined Behavior	5.5
CVE-2021-29575	tensorflow	raw_ops.ReverseSequence	Denial of Service	5.5
CVE-2021-29578	tensorflow	raw_ops.FractionalAvgPoolGrad	Heap overflow	7.8
CVE-2021-29579	tensorflow	raw_ops.MaxPoolGrad	Heap overflow	7.8
CVE-2021-29580	tensorflow	raw_ops.FractionalMaxPoolGrad	Undefined Behavior	5.5
CVE-2021-29582	tensorflow	raw_ops.Dequantize	Out-of-Bounds Read/Write	7.1
CVE-2021-29608	tensorflow	raw_ops.RaggedTensorToTensor	Undefined Behavior	7.8
CVE-2021-29610	tensorflow	raw_ops.QuantizeAndDequantizeV2	Heap Underflow	7.8
CVE-2021-29613	tensorflow	raw_ops.CTCLoss	Out-of-Bounds Read/Write	7.1
CVE-2021-29614	tensorflow	io.decode_raw	Out-of-Bounds Read/Write	7.8
CVE-2021-29617	tensorflow	strings.substr	Denial of Service	5.5
CVE-2021-29618	tensorflow	tf.transpose	Crash	5.5
CVE-2021-29619	tensorflow	raw_ops.SparseCountSparseOutput	Crash	5.5
CVE-2021-37636	tensorflow	raw_ops.SparseDenseCwiseDiv	Division by Zero	5.5
CVE-2021-37637	tensorflow	raw_ops.CompressElement	Null Pointer Dereference	7.7
CVE-2021-37638	tensorflow	raw_ops.RaggedTensorToTensor	Null Pointer Dereference	7.8
CVE-2021-37640	tensorflow	raw_ops.SparseReshape	Division by Zero	5.5
CVE-2021-37641	tensorflow	raw_ops.RaggedGather	Out-of-Bounds Read/Write	7.3
CVE-2021-37642	tensorflow	raw_ops.ResourceScatterDiv	Division by Zero	5.5
CVE-2021-37645	tensorflow	raw_ops.QuantizeAndDequantizeV4Grad	Integer Overflow	5.5
CVE-2021-37646	tensorflow	raw_ops.StringNGrams	Integer Overflow	5.5
CVE-2021-37647	tensorflow	raw_ops.SparseTensorSliceDataset	Null Pointer Dereference	7.7
CVE-2021-37649	tensorflow	raw_ops.UncompressElement	Null Pointer Dereference	7.7
CVE-2021-37651	tensorflow	raw_ops.FractionalAvgPoolGrad	Out-of-Bounds Read/Write	7.8
CVE-2021-37653	tensorflow	raw_ops.ResourceGather	Division by Zero	5.5
CVE-2021-37654	tensorflow	raw_ops.ResourceGather	Out-of-Bounds Read/Write	7.3
CVE-2021-37655	tensorflow	raw_ops.ResourceScatterUpdate	Out-of-Bounds Read/Write	7.3
CVE-2021-37656	tensorflow	raw_ops.RaggedTensorToSparse	Null Pointer Dereference	7.8
CVE-2021-37666	tensorflow	raw_ops.RaggedTensorToVariant	Undefined Behavior	7.8
CVE-2021-37667	tensorflow	raw_ops.UnicodeEncode	Undefined Behavior	7.8
CVE-2021-37668	tensorflow	raw_ops.UnravelIndex	Denial of Service	5.5
CVE-2021-37670	tensorflow	raw_ops.UpperBound	Out-of-Bounds Read/Write	5.5
CVE-2021-37674	tensorflow	raw_ops.MaxPoolGrad	Denial of Service	5.5
CVE-2021-37676	tensorflow	raw_ops.SparseFillEmptyRows	Undefined Behavior	5.5
CVE-2021-37677	tensorflow	raw_ops.Dequantize	Denial of Service	5.5
CVE-2021-37679	tensorflow	tf.map_fn	Data Corruption	7.8
CVE-2021-3842	nlTK	BrillTaggerTrainer.train	Inefficient Regular Expression Complexity	7.5
CVE-2021-40324	cobbler	TFTPGen.generate_script	Arbitrary File Write	7.5
CVE-2021-41195	tensorflow	tf.math.segment_sum	Overflow	5.5
CVE-2021-41198	tensorflow	tf.file	Overflow	5.5
CVE-2021-41199	tensorflow	tf.image.resize	Overflow	5.5
CVE-2021-41200	tensorflow	tf.summary.create_file_writer	Overflow	5.5
CVE-2021-41202	tensorflow	tf.range	Overflow	5.5
CVE-2021-41495	numpy	sort	Null Pointer Dereference	5.3
CVE-2021-43854	nlTK	PunktSentenceTokenizer	Regular Expression Denial of Service	7.5
CVE-2022-22815	Pillow	PIL.ImagePath.Path	Undefined Behavior	6.5
CVE-2022-22816	Pillow	PIL.ImagePath.Path	Buffer OverRead	6.5
CVE-2022-22817	Pillow	ImageMath.eval	Arbitrary Code Execution	9.8
CVE-2022-24766	mitmproxy	validate_headers	Security Bypass	9.8

TABLE VIII: All patched vulnerable APIs with corresponding CVE number, Bug Type and CVSS Score