

Precision or Peril: Evaluating Code Quality from Quantized Large Language Models

Eric L. Melin[†], Adam J. Torek[†], Nasir U. Eisty, Casey Kennington
Department of Computer Science, Boise State University, Idaho, USA.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): nasireisty@boisestate.edu;
Contributing authors: ericmelin@u.boisestate.edu;
adamtorek@u.boisestate.edu; caseykennington@boisestate.edu;
[†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

Context: When scaled to hundreds of billions of parameters, Large Language Models (LLMs) such as GPT-4 and LLaMA-405b have demonstrated unprecedented capabilities in tasks such as code generation, code completion, and writing test cases. However, scaling up model sizes results in exponentially higher computational cost and energy consumption, leaving a large carbon footprint and making these models difficult to use by academic researchers and small businesses who do not have resources to support hardware or cloud services. Quantization has emerged as a way to mitigate the memory overhead of LLMs, allowing them to run on smaller hardware for lower prices. Quantization, however, may have detrimental effects on a model's output and its effects on LLM generated code quality remains understudied and requires constant evaluation as LLMs are improved. **Objective:** This study aims to evaluate the current code generation capabilities of smaller LLMs using various metrics, exploring the impact of quantization on code quality, and identifying prevalent quality issues in the generated code. **Method:** We conducted a comprehensive evaluation of four smaller open-source LLMs across two benchmarks and code similarity scores. The impact of 8-bit and 4-bit quantization was analyzed, and a static analysis tool was utilized to scrutinize the generated code's quality. **Results:** Our findings show that while the tested LLMs exhibit potential, these smaller LLMs produce code with sub-par performance on established benchmarks. The effects of quantization on code quality are inconsistent, and the generated code frequently exhibits recurring quality and maintainability issues. **Conclusions:** This study underscores the necessity for careful scrutiny and validation of LLM-generated code before its adoption in software projects. While smaller LLMs can generate code, their output requires careful monitoring and validation by practitioners before integration into software projects.

Keywords: Large Language Models, Code Quality, Static Analysis, Code Metrics, Quantization

1 Introduction

The field of software engineering has been greatly impacted by recent advancements in artificial intelligence and machine learning. Large language models (LLMs) have shown great potential in the field of software engineering. LLMs like GPT-3, GPT-4, and ChatGPT are capable of a wide variety of tasks, including code completion, code analysis, writing test cases, and writing documentation, among other use cases. This new technology can potentially automate and improve many software engineering and coding-related tasks [1]. LLMs, however, are a new technology and suffer from drawbacks that need to be taken into consideration.

LLMs have been known to produce incomplete code that cannot compile, code that contain runtime or logical errors, has many inefficiencies, is overly complex or too simple, and code that contains serious bugs and security vulnerabilities [2]. The sheer size of LLMs can be a problem as well. Most LLMs have billions of parameters that demand a huge amount of memory to function properly. This makes them difficult and costly to run, often requiring expensive and power-hungry processors to meet their memory demands, which makes LLMs challenging or even infeasible to run for many smaller organizations.

To address both issues with LLM code quality and model size, industry and academia have created solutions for both of these problems: automatic evaluation metrics, benchmarks, and quantization. There are many ways of evaluating LLM code generation capabilities and code quality. These include benchmarks like HumanEval [3], MBPP [4], and SWE-Bench [5], code similarity metrics like CodeBLEU [6], and software testing and quality tools. These include static and dynamic analysis tools like SonarQube [7] that can identify code quality issues through code smells -warning signs in code that indicate potential issues that could lead to deeper problems over time-, unit testing, integration testing, vulnerability scanners, linters, etc. These various approaches, along with benchmarks, allow industry and academia to quantitatively measure the effectiveness of LLMs at generating code and allow for standardized comparison of different LLMs and LLM-based technologies for generating code.

The memory size of LLMs can also be managed with quantization [8, 9]. Quantization is a compression method that shrinks the size of LLM parameters significantly, allowing them to have a much smaller memory footprint. However, the use of quantization comes with negative impacts on output quality. This phenomenon is known as “quality loss” by experts in the field of LLM optimizations [9].

While both evaluation metrics and tools, as well as quantization, are commonly used by academia and industry, **the impact of quantization on LLM code quality and the dynamics between evaluation metrics and systems for LLM code quality have not been explored.** While many papers have been published demonstrating the effectiveness of HumanEval and MBPP in measuring LLM-generated code quality, the implications of such benchmark results have yet to be thoroughly explored in published research.

Understanding the implications of varying scores on evaluation metrics such as HumanEval or MBPP for factors like code efficiency and code smells is crucial in assessing the quality of LLM-generated code. Additionally, exploring the significance of a low similarity score in CodeBLEU on benchmarks like HumanEval and MBPP can provide valuable insights into the performance of these evaluation tools. Moreover, the detection of code smells raises questions about its correlation with metrics like HumanEval or CodeBLEU. Investigating these inquiries can furnish both industry and academia with a deeper comprehension of

how one measure of LLM code quality relates to others. Furthermore, examining the effects of quantization on LLM code quality can elucidate the extent to which code quality deteriorates with quantization, empowering LLM practitioners to make informed decisions regarding the application and implications of quantization techniques.

Our paper contributes to all these questions by comparing different LLMs and LLM quantization strengths through three different metrics: benchmarks, code similarity scores, and static analysis tools. We specifically evaluate four open source LLMs on HumanEval Plus and MBPP Plus for the benchmarks, CodeBLEU for the similarity score, and SonarQube as the static analysis tool. We also evaluate all 4 LLMs using 8-bit and 4-bit quantization using the same evaluation criteria as before. We directly compare the results between all four LLMs and their quantization results to gain a picture of how these benchmarks, code similarity scores, and static analysis tools corroborate their results, as well as how quantization affects LLM generated code quality across all of these metrics.

The key contributions and main findings of this study can be summarized as follows:

- *How well do different LLMs perform on different metrics?*
 - *Benchmarks*
 - *Code Similarity Scores*
 - *Static Analysis*
- *What effect does quantization have on the quality of generated code?*
- *What kinds of quality issues does LLM generated code have?*
- *The GitHub repository¹ publicly available.*

2 Background

Recently, there’s been an influx of evaluations of the quality of code generated from LLMs. Speiss et al. [10] studied calibrating LLMs to provide specific code snippets on different tasks using confidence scores. Their work used confidence scores as an estimate for code correctness by having multiple code-capable LLMs generate code for a variety of datasets and tasks, using confidence scores along with other metrics to show that LLMs are not well calibrated in their current state for generating code and that their confidence scores are a useful metric for measuring code correctness.

Siddiq and Santos [11] tested a methodology called SALLMS to evaluate possible security vulnerabilities in LLM generated code. This methodology is both a metric that checks for potential vulnerabilities and a tuning framework based on this metric for making LLMs better at detecting and generating secure code.

Jin et al. [12] created InferFix, a system for repairing LLM generated code through an adversarial back-and-forth process. They used a testing platform to run LLM generated code and used another model to read the output and prompt the LLM to fix any detected issues. Both models are used in an iterative back-and-forth process, resulting in a system that can automatically repair LLM-generated code and improve code quality.

Different approaches have worked on measuring the effectiveness of LLMs in different tasks or finding the best LLMs to use in tools like IDEs. Bc Petr Kantek [13] did a thorough

¹<https://github.com/Adam-Torek/ExploringLLMCodeQuality>

evaluation of many different code-capable LLMs on various tasks using many different kinds of metrics and tools. Kantek’s evaluation found that GitHub Copilot was the best performing LLM across those tasks and metrics. Pan et al. [14] measured the performance of LLMs in the task of programming language translation or translating a program from one programming language to another. They found that while some LLMs could translate small programs for specific tasks, all LLMs tested failed to correctly translate open source software projects from one language to another. Even the best model tested, GPT-4, could not create executable code when translating open source software between languages.

Other studies have focused on creating benchmarks for evaluating LLM-generated code efficiency, security, or robustness. Du et al. [15] created Mercury, a new metric for evaluating the efficiency of LLM generated code, as well as its correctness. This metric is collected on many different programming tasks the LLM performs, with the results being an aggregate of each programming task’s score of both efficiency and correctness. They found through their methodology that LLMs can generate functionally correct code but do not generate optimized code solutions. Bhatt et al. [16] created a benchmark called CyberSecEval, which evaluates an LLM’s ability to generate secure code, as well as their ability to generate malicious code that could be used in cyberattacks. After creating and experimenting with a proof of concept, they found that some of the LLMs they tested had tendencies to generate insecure code. Zhong and Wang [17] evaluated the robustness of LLM-generated API calls using a dataset they assembled and found that LLMs sometimes lack robustness in generated code that may contain issues that cause program crashes or memory leaks.

There are also studies that evaluate or gain insight into LLM-generated code from a developer’s perspective, as well as the effect code-capable LLMs have on their development workflow. Vaithilingam et al. [18] researched the use of GitHub Copilot in software developer workflows through a user study and found that while Copilot did save time searching for solutions or advice online, some developers had frustrating experiences using GitHub Copilot’s interface to generate, edit, and debug code that it generated. Nguyen et al. [19] studied the dynamics between code-capable LLMs and novice programmers starting their CS education. Their study found that new programmers have difficulty writing prompts or verifying generated code, even with problems at their skill level.

Spiess et al. [20] noticed that calibration has so far been studied in mostly non-generative (e.g., classification) settings and has yet to be researched in generative settings. The results from their study were that they developed a framework for evaluating the calibration of code-generating models. In their work, they compared three models for their experiments: CODEX, GPT-3.5-Turbo-Instruct, and CodeGen2. They found that GPT-3.5-Turbo-Instruct worked well for both function synthesis (HumanEval and MBPP) and line-level code completion (DyPyBench), whilst Codex generally performed well on program repair (SStubs and Defects4J). In their work, they additionally found that there is a clear trend that rescaling does improve calibration. With rescaling, there is a possible 10-20% improvement over baseline rates and good calibration.

To evaluate the effectiveness of LLMs in code generation, researchers employ a variety of benchmarks designed to assess the models’ ability to generate syntactically correct, functional, and human-readable code. Among the most widely recognized of these are HumanEval

Plus, Mostly Basic Python Problems (MBPP) Plus, and CodeBLEU. Each of these benchmarks captures distinct aspects of coding performance, making them valuable tools for a comprehensive evaluation.

HumanEval Plus [21] is an expanded benchmark for evaluating large language models on diverse and realistic programming tasks. It builds on the original HumanEval by incorporating a broader array of coding problems that test models' abilities to generate functional, syntactically correct, and logically coherent code. By focusing on practical problem-solving skills, HumanEval Plus serves as an essential measure of a model's capacity to produce runnable and correct code across varied challenges.

Mostly Basic Python Problems (MBPP) Plus [4] contains hundreds of programming tasks designed to be solvable by entry-level programmers. It allows researchers to measure a model's adaptability and problem-solving skills across mostly basic programming scenarios, offering insights into both functional correctness and versatility in Python programming when provided with easy prompts.

Ren et al. created CodeBLEU [6], a metric for evaluating the accuracy of LLM generated code by comparing them to provided code examples. This metric is based on BLEU, a common evaluation metric used in NLP to measure the accuracy of models like LLMs in text generation tasks.

Together, these benchmarks offer a holistic view of LLM performance in code generation, with HumanEval Plus and MBPP Plus testing practical functionality and CodeBLEU providing insight into code quality. Comparing models across these benchmarks enables a more nuanced understanding of their strengths and limitations, supporting the development of LLMs that are not only accurate but also robust and suitable for real-world software development tasks.

A known problem with LLMs is their sheer size. Most LLMs have billions to tens of billions of parameters, with some of them even having hundreds of billions of parameters [22]. The sheer size of these LLMs becomes a problem, especially with memory requirements. These LLMs often need to run on many different machines because their memory requirements are simply too large to fit on one machine, making them costly and difficult to run for organizations with limited resources and budgets. Quantization has emerged as a way to mitigate the memory overhead of LLMs. Quantization is a technique that works through compression of an LLM's parameters from 16-bit or 32-bit floating point values down into 8-bit floating point values or smaller, often becoming quantized into discrete values in the process [23]. Quantization decreases memory overhead for LLMs, thus allowing them to run on smaller hardware for lower prices, but might also have detrimental effects to a model's output [24].

Previous work on the effects of quantization on LLMs remains a shallowly explored area. Li et al. [24] explored the effect of quantization on various NLP tasks using LLMs. They also explored the effect of quantizing different tensor types and the effect of different quantization methods. In their study, they evaluate the OPT, Bloomz, LLaMA, Falcon, ChatGLM, Mistral, and StableLM model families.

3 Research Questions (RQs)

Our study aims to analyze the current state of smaller LLMs in regard to code generation. We aim to evaluate generated code through various code metrics, explore the effect of quantization on generated code, and use a static analysis tool to identify potential code quality issues.

RQ1: How well does each LLM perform on HumanEval Plus and MBPP Plus, and how do they compare with the CodeBLEU scores of each model?

To answer RQ1, the selected benchmarks—HumanEval Plus, MBPP Plus, and CodeBLEU—provide distinct but complementary insights into each language model’s performance in code generation. While previous works [10–12] have done varying investigations into LLM generated code, constant up-to-date evaluation of the capabilities of these models is necessary to make informed decisions on whether to use them in real work projects. The selected benchmarks collectively evaluate essential dimensions of coding capabilities, including syntactic correctness, functional accuracy, problem-solving adaptability, and code quality. By employing them together, we can assess each LLM’s ability to generate code that meets both practical and quality-oriented criteria. Answering this question provides insights into the efficiency, practicality, and reliability of smaller LLMs in various coding environments.

RQ2: What is the effect of quantization on LLM performance on benchmark scores and CodeBLEU scores?

To answer RQ2, we analyze how quantization impacts LLM performance across benchmark scores from HumanEval Plus, MBPP Plus, and CodeBLEU. Quantization, a technique to reduce model size and improve computational efficiency, can affect model performance by potentially sacrificing precision in computations. Recent works [24–26] explore varying aspects of quantization but do not evaluate the effects it has on generated code quality through benchmarks. By comparing benchmark results before and after quantization, we can quantify the effects of quantization on generated code quality and determine if performance trade-offs occur in the accuracy, functionality, or quality of generated code.

RQ3: What kinds of code quality issues (I.E., code smells, readability issues, maintainability issues) does LLM-generated code have, and what can automatic and manual analysis show about these issues?

To address RQ3, we aim to examine the code quality issues in LLM-generated code, including code smells, readability concerns, maintainability challenges, and other potential deficiencies that could impact the long-term usability of the code in production environments. Existing literature has explored the quality issues in the biggest LLMs, such as GPT 3.5 Turbo and GPT 4o [27]. Still, it does not explore the quality issues of smaller LLMs catered toward academic researchers and small businesses. Since functional correctness is typically the primary focus of LLMs, and with size they generally become more effective, since these LLMs are much smaller we suspect that their generated code may exhibit a range of quality issues that affect its ease of understanding, modification, and maintenance.

4 Methodology

4.1 Methodology Overview

Figure 1 shows an overview of our methodology and experimental pipeline used to answer our proposed RQs. Below is a brief description of each step:




Fig. 1 Methodology Overview

- Step 1 - Take in Benchmark Prompts: This first step extracts each prompt from both the HumanEval Plus and MBPP benchmarks and prepares them to be given to the LLM. No preprocessing or data cleaning was required before giving the prompt to the LLM.
- Step 2 - Generate 1 Code Solution Per Prompt Using the LLM: This step is the one that generates a code solution for each prompt using the LLM itself. To do this, we first tokenize the prompt using the LLM's tokenizer, feed the prompt to the LLM itself, and decode the output once the generation is complete.
- Step 3 - Store Generated Solutions: This step extracts each generated solution and saves them to JSON files. We saved all the results for a given benchmark for further analysis in steps 4, 5, and 7.
- Step 4 - Run Unit Tests to Get Passing Rates: This step is our first analysis step. Here, we run the unit tests provided with each benchmark on the generated solutions. No preprocessing was done in this step.

- Step 5 - Run CodeBLEU to get Similarity Scores: In this step, we ran CodeBLEU to get the similarity scores between the generated solutions and the human-written solutions provided in both benchmarks. No preprocessing was required.
- Step 6 - Convert solutions to Python Files: Before we run our SonarQube analysis, we convert the solutions into Python files. To do this, we extracted each solution from the JSON files and write them into a separate Python file. This results in a single Python file for each solution that we could then use for SonarQube analysis in step 7.
- Step 7 - Run SonarQube for Code Analysis: Once the generated code is written to Python files, we run SonarQube on all the Python files for a single benchmark. SonarQube analysis results in many different metrics, including code smells, vulnerability issues, maintainability and reliability problems, code efficiency issues, and the estimated time to fix all of these issues.

4.2 Chosen LLMs

We selected four open source LLMs to use for our testing. Due to limited memory constraints, our LLMs had to be able to fit on a single GPU with and without quantization. Our quantization analysis also removed proprietary LLMs from our study, as the quantization state of those LLMs could not be controlled through user settings. This is what limited us to using open source LLMs with less than 10 billion parameters. With these constraints, we selected four different open-source LLMs that were trained and fine-tuned on code-specific tasks using different regimes, architectures, and datasets (explained below for each model). Below, you can find the 4 LLMs analyzed in this study:

1. WizardCoder 3B: WizardCoder is a code-based LLM fine-tuned using an iterative, evolving approach called Evol-Instruct [28]. Evol-Instruct works through adversarial training in which another LLM is used to generate gradually but increasingly difficult and complex coding prompts. The difficulty and complexity of these adversarial prompts was measured using five different metrics. Once WizardCoder achieved satisfactory results on a metric, the difficulty of the prompt was automatically increased by the adversarial LLM. WizardCoder is a fine-tuned version of Llama, an open source LLM released by Facebook/Meta. There are multiple WizardCoder LLMs of different sizes available in 3B, 15B, and 33B parameters. Due to memory constraints, we only used the 3B parameter version.
2. Mistral Instruct 7B: Mistral Instruct is a 7B parameter LLM released by Mistral, a French AI company [29]. Mistral Instruct is a small but effective LLM that leverages new optimization techniques that improve generation performance, time, and reduce compute overhead. It was pretrained from scratch using several large and publicly available datasets before it was fine-tuned for prompting. Mistral Instruct has proven quite effective at many tasks, achieving benchmark performance similar to LLMs twice its size. These optimizations also make it quite capable of generating code despite not being explicitly trained or fine-tuned to do so. We chose to use this LLM in our experiments to see how it would compare to other models.
3. StarCoder 2 7B: StarCoder 2 7B is a code-specific LLM trained using a massive dataset of public repositories scraped from GitHub called The Stack V2 [30]. The Stack was scraped and compiled by the BigCode Project, a partnership between HuggingFace and ServiceNow. The Stack V2 contains more than a trillion tokens in total across a wide

variety of GitHub data, including source code, documentation, notebooks, scripts, pull requests, and issues. StarCoder 2 is an open-source LLM pretrained on the Stack V2. It is meant to serve as a base model to be fine-tuned for other coding tasks, but achieves strong coding performance in its base state. StarCoder 2 comes in 3B, 7B, and 15B parameter versions. We chose the 7B parameter version for our experiments because it was the largest model that could fit on a single GPU, and because it performed better than the 3B version during preliminary testing.

4. LlamaCode 7B: LlamaCode is a code-specific LLM released by FaceBook/Meta. It is a fine-tuned LLM that uses Llama-2 as a base model [31]. Llama-2 and CodeLlama were both trained and released by FaceBook/Meta for academic research. Both CodeLlama and Llama-2 are state of the art LLMs that perform well across both general and code-specific tasks. Code-Llama was fine-tuned on 500 billion tokens of publicly available code data, with a larger context window than Llama-2. Both adaptations give CodeLlama remarkable performance for code generation tasks compared to its foundation model. CodeLlama has 7B, 15B, 34B, and 70B parameter versions available for use. In this study, we use the 7B parameter version due to GPU constraints.

4.3 LLM Code Generation

For LLM code generation, we use two benchmarks as sources for prompts: HumanEval Plus [21] and Mostly Basic Python Problems (MBPP) Plus [4]. Each of these benchmarks contains a standardized set of Python programming problems in the form of prompts that an LLM has to solve. Once the LLM completes all the prompts, they are evaluated through a series of unit tests, and the average passing rate across all of the test cases is returned as the final score for both benchmarks. A human-written solution is included for all test cases as a baseline for comparison. HumanEval Plus has 169 medium-difficulty Python problems with 40-80 test cases per problem. MBPP Plus has roughly 800 easy Python problems that have about 10-30 test cases per problem. The test suites of both HumanEval Plus and MBPP Plus were expanded from HumanEval and MBPP, respectively, through a combination of context-free grammars (CFGs) and LLMs. We used the expanded test cases for our benchmark results. An example of the HumanEval Plus prompt can be seen in Listing 1 and a corresponding generated LLM solution in Listing 2.

```
1 def truncate_number(number: float) -> float:
2     """ Given a positive floating point number, it can be decomposed into an integer
3         part (largest integer smaller than given number) and decimals (leftover part
4         always smaller than 1).
5
6     Return the decimal part of the number.
7     >>> truncate_number(3.5) 0.5 """
```

Listing 1 HumanEval Plus Prompt #2

```
1 def truncate_number(number: float) -> float:
2     """ Given a positive floating point number, it can be decomposed into an integer
3         part (largest integer smaller than given number) and decimals (leftover part
4         always smaller than 1).
5
6     Return the decimal part of the number.
7     >>> truncate_number(3.5) 0.5 """
8     return number % 1
```

Listing 2 Mistral7B Generated Solution

For quantization testing, we used Activation Aware Weight Quantization (AWQ) [8] to quantize our models using 4-bit and 8-bit quantization. This quantization method works by finding the most important parameters in an LLM through activation and quantizing the entire model based on those weights, which results in compressed parameters that preserve much of the LLM’s original performance while still reducing its memory requirements significantly. Another benefit of AWQ quantization is that once the activation testing is complete, the LLM’s parameters can be quantized into 8-bit and 4-bit spaces without further testing. We chose this as our quantization method due to its simple setup and use and because it achieves a good balance between increased LLM generation speed and code quality and decreased memory requirements.

Once the benchmarks and quantization method were selected, we had each LLM generate one solution for each programming problem in the benchmarks. We used the starter prompt and had each LLM perform a code completion task based on that prompt. Once all the solutions were generated for both HumanEval Plus and MBPP Plus, we saved the results for each benchmark. We repeated this process for all four open source LLMs with 4-bit and 8-bit quantization, as well as no quantization. This resulted in 8 generation runs across all LLMs and quantization settings and 24 solution files in total. These solution files became the basis for all of our evaluations and analysis after our code generation was complete. Everything except for the LLM and quantization state remained the same during our procedure. All of our LLMs were run on the same hardware, software, environment and generation settings to minimize the potential for confounding variables in our experiments.

4.4 Benchmark and CodeBLEU Scoring

Once the solution files from our generation step were complete, we then evaluated all the LLMs and their quantization results using the unit tests provided in the HumanEval Plus and MBPP Plus benchmarks. For both benchmarks, we used the pass@1 score, which runs all the unit tests on a single generated solution and reports the test passing rate per solution. We recorded the test passing rate for the expanded test cases in our evaluation into a single solution file for analysis and comparison to other metrics. Our benchmark results were used as a baseline to compare our other evaluation metrics and were utilized to investigate the impact of AWQ on the LLM’s weights. We ran our benchmarks on all 4 LLMs on all 3 quantization settings, resulting in 12 benchmark scores for HumanEval Plus and 12 benchmark scores for MBPP Plus.

We used CodeBLEU as our similarity metric for comparing LLM-generated and human written code. Both HumanEval Plus and MBPP Plus have correctly implemented human solutions for all the programming problems in both benchmarks. Since CodeBLEU is a dataset-level benchmark that uses data flow and syntax tree evaluations across an entire code-base as part of its comparison process, we ran it on all the generated and human written solutions at once rather than one solution at a time. To do our similarity scoring, we simply ran CodeBLEU on each of the problem sets for both benchmarks between the LLM generated code and human-written code. We repeated this process for all four LLMs and all 3 quantization settings, resulting in 12 similarity scores for HumanEval Plus and 12 similarity scores for MBPP Plus.

4.5 SonarQube Analysis

We used SonarQube as our static analysis tool for our experimentation. SonarQube is a static analysis framework produced by SonarSource, a code analysis company that provides different code analysis and issue detection tools. SonarQube can run many different kinds of analyses, including code smells, security vulnerabilities, linting, maintainability issues, readability issues, code inefficiencies, and the estimated time to fix all of these issues. We selected SonarQube as our static analysis tool because of its ease of use and the variety of metrics we could use in our analysis. We used the Community Edition of SonarQube for our analysis since the code base of our generated solutions is not large, and we did not need any of the additional features that the paid editions of SonarQube provide.

Since the generation of the LLM code had been stored in individual solution files for each unquantized LLM dataset pair, we had a total of 8 different solution files containing a total of 2,252 JSON objects containing both the dataset question ID and the generated LLM solution. Given all these objects, we then needed to parse through each object to create a python file from each in order to run SonarQube analysis on the generated code. To do this, we created and used a Python script that parsed each line and translated the corresponding python code as an individual python files. Once that was complete, we then fed each batch of Python files from each benchmark into SonarQube for analysis.

4.6 Experimental Setup

We used a single desktop computer to perform our LLM code generation. The desktop included a single Nvidia RTX 3090 GPU with 24 gigabytes of VRAM and a 16-core 32-thread AMD Ryzen CPU with 64 gigabytes of RAM. We used Ubuntu 22.04 as the operating system and Python version 3.11. We used HuggingFace to download the trained weights for all our LLMs and quantized versions, PyTorch 2 as our deep learning library, and CUDA 12.1 as our GPU driver. We used AWQ to quantize WizardCoder 3B since there was no quantized version available on HuggingFace. Our evaluations were done using the HumanEvalplus and codeBLEU Python libraries and SonarQube Community Edition version 10.5.

5 Results

This section presents the key findings of our study, addressing the research questions and providing a detailed analysis of the benchmark performance, code similarity, and static analysis. We analyze the effects of quantization on the code quality generated by smaller LLMs, focusing on their utility and limitations in real-world software engineering applications.

5.1 RQ1: How well does each LLM perform on HumanEval Plus and MBPP Plus, and how do they compare with the CodeBLEU scores of each model?

Table 1’s unquantized row summarizes the benchmark performance of the four tested LLMs across two prominent coding tasks: HumanEval Plus and MBPP Plus. Both benchmarks are widely accepted as rigorous tests for evaluating an LLM’s ability to generate correct, functional code from natural language descriptions. However, our analysis reveals that all the tested models performed poorly on these benchmarks.

Mistral Instruct 7B was the best performer of all the tested LLMs on HumanEval Plus, passing 25.00% of test cases. Compared to the four other LLMs, it passed 21.95% more test cases than the next best LLM suggesting that compared to the other LLMs, Mistral excels at solving more complex, real-world programming tasks represented in HumanEval. Surprisingly, on the other hand, Mistral Instruct 7B passed 0.00% of test cases from MBPP’s test cases, possibly suggesting that Mistral is optimized for more complex programming tasks rather than simpler, more contained tasks.

WizardCoder 3B appeared to be the next best unquantized LLM evaluated, exhibiting a low HumanEval Plus pass rate of 2.44% but the best MBPP pass rate at 16.04%. This suggested that WizardCoder 3B was optimized for simpler programming tasks.

CodeLlama 7B and starcoder2 7B in their unquantized state both performed terribly on both HumanEval Plus and MBPP. Like Mistral, CodeLLama also exhibited a 0.00% pass rate on MBPP while passing 3.05% of test cases from HumanEval Plus. Starcoder2 7B passed 0.61% of HumanEval and 1.25% of MBPP.

Table 1 Benchmark Results For Expanded Test Cases

	CodeLlama 7B		Mistral Instruct 7B		WizardCoder 3B		starcoder2 7B	
	humaneval	mbpp	humaneval	mbpp	humaneval	mbpp	humaneval	mbpp
4 bit	7.93%	15.04%	18.29%	42.36%	0.00%	0.00%	NaN	NaN
8 bit	5.49%	13.53%	18.29%	40.85%	0.00%	0.00%	NaN	NaN
unquantized	3.05%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	2.44%	16.04%	0.61%	1.25%

Overall, all the models did poorly, showing that these smaller LLMs, in general, have a hard time generating correct code that functions properly. This could be due to the limited parameter sizes they have, which may be too small to capture many of the coding patterns present in the datasets they were trained and fine-tuned on.

For CodeBLEU (Table 2), which measures the structural similarity of LLM-generated code to human-written solutions, the results present a different perspective. The unquantized models performed much better in terms of code similarity than unquantized models in actual functionality.

Mistral Instruct 7B achieved the highest CodeBLEU scores, ranging from 0.24 to 0.26 across both benchmarks, indicating that its generated code was relatively close in structure to human-authored code. However, the high CodeBLEU score contrasts sharply with its functional performance, where it often failed to pass basic unit tests.

CodeLlama 7B also achieved respectable CodeBLEU scores between 0.24 and 0.25, showing consistency in its ability to replicate the style and structure of human code while WizardCoder 3B and starCoder 2 exhibited much lower CodeBLEU scores, particularly on HumanEval scoring .18 and .19 respectively.

The divergence between CodeBLEU scores and benchmark passing rates suggests that these LLMs may prioritize syntactic correctness over functional accuracy. In essence, the models generate code that "looks" correct but often fails to perform as intended [32]. This aligns with the idea that smaller LLMs struggle to fully capture the functional aspects of complex coding problems, even when they are able to replicate superficial coding patterns.

Table 2 CodeBLEU Scores comparing Generated VS Baseline Similarity

	CodeLlama 7B		Mistral 7B Instruct		WizardCoder 3B		starcoder2 7b	
	humaneval	mbpp	humaneval	mbpp	humaneval	mbpp	humaneval	mbpp
4 bit	0.242619	0.238994	0.245361	0.212472	0.023056	0.251026	NaN	NaN
8 bit	0.243333	0.244497	0.251942	0.214113	0.023056	0.251026	NaN	NaN
unquantized	0.252537	0.244789	0.263305	0.244989	0.184853	0.236126	0.190918	0.259609

This finding reinforces the need for better functional benchmarks and testing during the LLM training phase, as relying solely on code similarity metrics like CodeBLEU may provide a misleading assessment of an LLM’s practical utility in coding tasks.

RQ1 Findings: The results reveal that smaller LLMs, while capable of generating syntactically similar code, struggle to produce functional code, especially under more complex coding tasks. This underscores the limitations of smaller models and highlights the need for robust functional testing in real-world applications. High CodeBLEU scores do not guarantee practical usability, suggesting that functional correctness must be prioritized in future evaluations of LLM-generated code.

5.2 RQ2: What is the effect of quantization on LLM performance on benchmark scores and CodeBLEU scores?

Quantization, a technique used to reduce model size and computational demands by lowering the precision of a model’s weights, is a key focus of this study. Table 1 and Table 2 4-bit and 8-bit rows show how differences in quantization affect both the functional performance (as measured by benchmarks) and the structural similarity (as measured by CodeBLEU) of the generated code.

Mistral Instruct 7B and CodeLlama 7B demonstrated fascinating results when quantized. Both models performed better in some quantized states than in their unquantized forms for MBPP, suggesting that quantization can actually improve performance for simple programming tasks. For instance, both models, when unquantized, exhibited a 0.00% pass rate on MBPP, but when using 4-bit quantization they both exhibited their best performance with Mistral at 42.36% and CodeLlama at 15.04%. Furthermore, when comparing 4-bit quantization to 8-bit quantization, this hypothesis is further supported. For both models, the 4-bit quantization performed better than the 8-bit quantization for MBPP showing that for tasks requiring less precision, the smaller memory footprint may enable more efficient processing, offsetting any loss in quality due to reduced precision.

On the other hand, WizardCoder 3B and StarCoder2 7B suffered considerably from quantization, with WizardCoder’s passing rate dropping to 0.00% across all tests once quantized. The fact that StarCoder2 was unable to complete any tests in its quantized form suggests that the model architecture is highly sensitive to precision loss, making it unsuitable for environments where reduced memory usage is critical.

The CodeBLEU scores tell a slightly different story. While quantization had a minimal impact on the CodeLlama and Mistral models, reducing their CodeBLEU scores by only

0.01-0.03 points, it had a severe impact on WizardCoder 3B, whose CodeBLEU score on HumanEval dropped by 0.16 points. This sharp decline indicates that for WizardCoder, quantization affects not only functional correctness but also the structural integrity of the generated code.

The inconsistent effects of quantization reveal an important insight: the architecture of the model plays a critical role in determining how well it can tolerate reduced precision. Models like CodeLlama and Mistral, which rely on optimizations designed for smaller hardware, appear to handle quantization more gracefully, while models like WizardCoder and StarCoder are far more sensitive. This suggests that quantization methods should be carefully matched to model architectures to avoid catastrophic losses in performance.

Furthermore, the fact that 4-bit quantization led to worse CodeBLEU results than 8-bit in some cases (e.g., Mistral Instruct 7B & CodeLlama 7B) indicates that the relationship between precision and performance may be linear when it comes to code similarity.

RQ2 Findings: Quantization is a powerful tool for reducing the memory footprint of LLMs, but its impact on code quality and code similarity varies significantly across models. While some models, like Mistral Instruct 7B and CodeLlama 7B benefit from quantization, others, such as WizardCoder 3B, are highly susceptible to performance degradation. Practitioners need to carefully evaluate the trade-offs between efficiency and quality when using quantized models, especially for tasks that require high precision.

5.3 RQ3: What kinds of code quality issues (i.e., code smells, readability issues, maintainability issues, etc.) does unquantized LLM-generated code have, and what can automatic and manual analysis show about these issues?

To evaluate the quality of LLM-generated code, we conducted a static analysis using SonarQube. As seen in Table 3, the SonarQube analysis covered a total of 2,252 Python files, revealing 489 detected issues from the LLM generated code. SonarQube’s projection suggests that addressing all identified issues would require approximately 175 hours of development effort.

Table 3 SonarQube Analysis Results

Metric	Value
Generated Python Solutions	2,252
Issues Detected	489
Estimated Remediation Cost	175 hrs

Figure 2 shows the breakdown of 489 issues in terms of clean code attributes. SonarQube [7] defines clean code as code that has the following attributes: consistency, intentionality, adaptability, and responsibility. Consistency refers to the code being written in a uniform and conventional way. All the code should look similar and follow a regular pattern, even with multiple contributors at different times. *Consistent code is formatted, conventional, and*

identifiable. Intentionality refers to code that is precise and purposeful. Every instruction makes sense, is adequately formed, and clearly communicates its behavior. *Intentional code is clear, logical, complete, and efficient*. Adaptability means that code is structured to be easy to evolve and develop with confidence. It makes extending or repurposing its parts easy and promotes localized changes without undesirable side-effects. *Adaptable code is focused, distinct, modular, and tested*. Responsibility considers that the code takes into account its ethical obligations on data, as well as societal norms. *Responsible code is lawful, trustworthy, and respectful*.

Fig. 2 Clean Code Attributes Issues




Figure 2 shows a total of 489 issues from the 2,252 python solutions, 327 are related to intentionality, 134 consistency, 28 adaptability, and 0 responsibility. These results suggest that roughly 21.7% of the time, when asking these LLMs for code, you can expect the code to have some sort of issue. From the breakdown of these issues from a clean code perspective, intentionality is the most common issue, showing that the most common issue with the code is related to the generated code not being clear, logical, complete, or efficient. The following were consistency issues, where the code was found to have not been formatted, conventional, or identifiable. A breakdown of all the 489 issues can be found in 4.

In Figure 3 shows the breakdown of the 489 issues, but this time in terms of software quality. SonarQube [7] breaks code issues into one of three categories being: Security, Reliability, and Maintainability. Security refers to the number of vulnerability issues found in the code. Reliability refers to the total number of bug issues found. Maintainability refers to the total amount of code smell issues.

Figure 3 shows that from the LLM generated Python code, SonarQube reports 0 security issues, 58 reliability issues, and 431 maintainability issues. These SonarQube metrics suggest that when the LLM generates code with an issue, roughly 88% of the time it is related to the

maintainability of the code, found in the form of a code smell. These results show that when generating a solution using the tested LLMs, there is roughly a 19.1% chance of it containing a code smell. A breakdown of all the 489 issues can be found in Table 4.

In terms of the Software Quality issues, a breakdown of where the reliability issue came from can be found in Table 5 and maintainability issues in Table 6. Both tables show that while no LLM is perfect, some performed much better than others when it came to generating code with reliability issues and maintainability issues. Table 5 shows that Mistral Instruct and StarCoder 2 performed much better than CodeLlama and WizardCoder when it came to reliability issues. These results, however, didn't mirror the maintainability issue results found in Table 6. Here, Mistral Instruct strongly outperforms the 3 other LLMs. Surprisingly, StartCoder 2 performed much worse than the other LLMs, generating nearly 13x more issues than the best and over 3x than the next worst.

Table 4 SonarQube Fix Recommendations

Rule	CodeLlama 7B		Mistral 7B Instruct		WizardCoder 3B		starcoder2 7B		Total
	humaneval	mbpp	humaneval	mbpp	humaneval	mbpp	humaneval	mbpp	
Unused local variables should be removed.	1	1	0	0	3	0	6	160	171
Function name should comply with a naming convention.	0	8	1	8	8	27	2	13	67
isinstance() should preferred to direct type comparisons.	0	1	0	0	0	0	48	0	49
Sections of code should not be commented out.	6	0	0	0	25	0	14	0	45
Floating point numbers should not be tested for equality.	0	26	0	2	0	0	0	0	28
Related "if/ else if" conditions should not have the same condition.	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	23
Unused function parameters should be removed.	2	2	0	1	3	1	2	4	15
The "print" statement should not be used.	0	10	2	0	1	0	0	1	14
Cognitive complexity of functions should not be too high.	0	8	1	1	0	2	0	1	13
String literals should not be duplicated.	0	7	1	0	0	3	0	2	13
Builtins should not be overshadowed by local variables.	1	0	1	2	0	2	3	3	12
Functions and methods should not be empty.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
Mergeable "if" statements should be combined.	4	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	9
Local variable and function parameters names should comply with a naming convention.	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	4
The number and name of arguments passed to a function should match its parameters.	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4
Tracks uses of "TODO" tags.	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Non-empty statements should change control flow or have at least one side-effect.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
Two branches in a conditional structure should not have exactly the same implementation.	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Expressions creating dictionaries should not have duplicate keys.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Jump statements should not be redundant.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Fig. 3 Software Quality Issues




Table 5 LLM Reliability Code Issues

LLM	humaneval dataset	mbpp dataset
CodeLlama 7B	0 Issues	26 Issues
Mistral 7B Instruct	0 Issues	2 Issues
WizardCoder 3B	4 Issues	23 Issues
starcoder2 7b	2 Issues	1 Issues

Table 6 LLM Maintainability Code Issues

LLM	humaneval dataset	mbpp dataset
CodeLlama 7B	18 Issues	39 Issues
Mistral 7B Instruct	7 Issues	14 Issues
WizardCoder 3B	45 Issues	37 Issues
starcoder2 7b	76 Issues	195 Issues

Manual analysis of the generated code, however, reveals a slightly different story. Upon examining the unquantized LLMs, several recurring issues became apparent. One of the most prevalent problems was the omission of required import statements. For instance, the best-performing model, Mistral Instruct 7B, frequently failed to include import statements for methods it referenced from external libraries. This oversight was a consistent issue across many generated outputs, which resulted in non-functional code that would fail upon execution.

Another major issue observed was the repetition of generated code, a problem that appeared across all the LLMs. For example, CodeLlama 7B, when given prompt 18 from HumanEval Plus, initially produced a correct solution. However, it continued generating additional, unnecessary methods (i.e.

`how_many_times_no_overlap()`, `how_many_times_no_overlap_2()`, `how_many_times_no_overlap_3()`, `how_many_times_no_overlap_4()`, often duplicating functionality until the maximum token length was reached. This pattern of generating redundant code, rather than stopping once a correct solution was reached, was a common problem noted across multiple models during manual inspection. This not only inflated the size of the generated code but also made it more difficult to read and maintain.

These results underscore the importance of post-processing when using smaller LLMs for code generation. While the models are capable of generating code that functions in some cases, the presence of numerous code smells and maintainability issues highlights the risks of integrating such code into production environments. Developers will need to invest considerable effort in refactoring LLM-generated code to ensure long-term maintainability and scalability. Additionally, these findings suggest that LLMs, even when they generate correct code, may not adhere to best practices in software engineering, leading to higher technical debt over time.

RQ3 Findings: The static analysis reveals significant challenges in quality of smaller LLM-generated code. The tested LLMs generate a solution with some kind of quality issue roughly 21.7% of the time. From manually analyzing the code, we found that the LLM's would frequently repeat code, use non-imported methods, and the code would frequently contain issues related to intentionality or maintainability. Developers should be cautious when relying on smaller LLMs for large-scale software development, and consider employing additional tools to clean and optimize the generated code before use.

6 Discussion

The results of this study highlight both the promise and limitations of using smaller LLMs in code generation tasks. While LLMs like GPT-4 have been demonstrated to perform well at scale, our findings suggest that smaller models struggle to maintain high performance across multiple evaluation criteria.

One key takeaway from this study is the variability in how well different unquantized LLMs perform across benchmarks. For example, Mistral Instruct 7B consistently outperformed the other models on the HumanEval Plus benchmark, passing 25% of the test cases. However, its performance on simpler coding tasks in the MBPP Plus benchmark was remarkably poor, achieving a 0% pass rate. This disparity suggests that Mistral may be better suited to handling more complex tasks, but struggles with simpler ones, potentially due to overfitting on more intricate patterns in the training data.

In contrast, WizardCoder 3B showed much better performance on MBPP Plus, passing 16.04% of test cases, but performed poorly on HumanEval Plus, with only a 2.44% pass rate. This suggests that WizardCoder is better optimized for simpler problems, though its overall performance across both benchmarks was relatively low compared to more robust models like Mistral. The performance gaps observed between these models highlight the specialization of smaller LLMs and their varying capabilities depending on the nature of the tasks they are applied to.

Quantization, which was applied to both 4-bit and 8-bit precision, also had mixed effects on model performance. While quantization is an attractive solution for reducing the memory and computational requirements of large models, the results showed that its impact is not uniform across different models. For instance, quantizing Mistral Instruct 7B and CodeLlama 7B improved their performance on MBPP Plus, where Mistral’s pass rate jumped to 42.36% with 4-bit quantization. This suggests that certain tasks—particularly those that are simpler or less computationally intensive—might benefit from the reduced precision without significantly sacrificing code quality.

However, WizardCoder 3B and StarCoder2 7B saw drastic reductions in performance following quantization, with WizardCoder failing to pass any tests after quantization. These results indicate that some models are highly sensitive to reduced precision, making them less suitable for quantized environments where performance sacrifices would be unacceptable. Therefore, quantization techniques must be applied selectively, and model architecture plays a crucial role in determining how well a model can tolerate reduced precision.

A deeper look at the code quality produced by these models using SonarQube further reveals significant challenges. Over 80% of the issues identified in the generated code were related to maintainability, including problems such as code smells, inconsistent naming conventions, and unnecessarily complex code structures. These issues are not merely cosmetic; they have practical implications for software development, where maintainability is critical for long-term project success. The fact that many of these smaller LLMs produce unmaintainable code suggests that, even when they can generate functionally correct solutions, integrating their output into real-world software projects would require substantial refactoring.

The results of this study also shed light on an important challenge in the current evaluation methods for LLMs in code generation. While benchmarks like HumanEval Plus and MBPP Plus provide a useful snapshot of model performance, they do not fully capture the long-term sustainability of the generated code, particularly in terms of maintainability, readability, and scalability. The high number of code smells detected in the generated output indicates that smaller LLMs tend to prioritize solving problems over producing clean, modular, and efficient code. This suggests a need for more comprehensive evaluation frameworks that go beyond basic functionality and consider the holistic quality of the code generated by these models.

Moving forward, the findings suggest that developers and organizations seeking to adopt smaller LLMs for code generation need to be mindful of the trade-offs between performance and efficiency. Smaller models, while easier to deploy due to their reduced memory requirements, may produce code that is either non-functional or difficult to maintain. Moreover, while quantization can significantly improve the feasibility of using LLMs in resource-constrained environments, its application needs to be carefully matched with model architecture to avoid drastic performance losses.

Finally, this study underscores the need for further research into post-processing tools that can refine and clean up LLM-generated code. Given the high prevalence of maintainability issues in the code produced by smaller LLMs, there is a strong case for developing automated tools that can improve the overall quality of the generated output, making it more suitable for real-world use.

7 Threats to Validity

In this section, we address potential threats to the validity of our findings.

7.1 Internal Validity

Internal validity refers to the degree to which our results can be attributed to the factors we investigated rather than external influences. One potential threat to internal validity in this study is the configuration and implementation of the quantization techniques. While we employed Activation Aware Weight Quantization (AWQ), a proven method for reducing memory overhead, small implementation details or misconfigurations could have skewed the performance results for specific LLMs. Moreover, all LLMs were tested on the same hardware, which could introduce biases if certain models are better optimized for the hardware used in our experiments.

Another internal threat is the randomness inherent in the LLM generation process. Since LLMs often generate different outputs for the same input prompt, results could vary between runs. We mitigated this by running each LLM with consistent settings, but additional variability in output could still influence performance, especially on benchmarks where slight differences in code can significantly impact passing rates.

7.2 External Validity

External validity concerns the generalizability of our findings. One limitation is that our study focuses on smaller open-source LLMs, such as Mistral Instruct 7B, WizardCoder 3B, and CodeLlama 7B. Our results may not be applicable to larger, proprietary models like GPT-4, or to models trained on different datasets or with different fine-tuning regimes. As such, the conclusions drawn from the performance of these smaller models may not scale to larger models or those used in more diverse applications.

Furthermore, we used only two specific benchmarks, HumanEval Plus and MBPP Plus, both of which focus on Python programming problems. While these benchmarks are widely used in evaluating code generation models, they do not encompass the full diversity of real-world software development tasks or other programming languages. As a result, our findings may not generalize to other domains or programming languages that have different complexities or requirements.

7.3 Construct Validity

Construct validity refers to how well the measurements used in our study reflect the phenomena we are trying to study. A threat to construct validity arises from the metrics we used to evaluate LLM performance. Specifically, we relied on pass rates from benchmark unit tests and CodeBLEU for code similarity. While these are standard evaluation metrics, they do not capture the full scope of code quality, particularly in terms of maintainability, readability, or scalability, which are crucial for real-world software development. Additionally, CodeBLEU measures only syntactic similarity, which may not align with functional correctness or code efficiency.

Another threat to construct validity is the use of SonarQube as our primary tool for assessing code maintainability. While SonarQube provides valuable insights into code smells,

maintainability, and other quality factors, it may not detect all potential issues. Its focus on static analysis may overlook runtime issues or the nuances of code that is syntactically correct but functionally flawed.

7.4 Conclusion Validity

Conclusion validity refers to the degree to which the conclusions we draw are reasonable and statistically sound. A potential threat here is the limited number of LLMs and configurations tested. While we included four models and three quantization settings (unquantized, 8-bit, and 4-bit), the relatively small sample size may limit the robustness of our conclusions. Moreover, we did not test the models across multiple hardware configurations, meaning our findings regarding model performance under quantization may vary on different hardware or GPU architectures.

Additionally, our analysis was based on a single solution per prompt, which may not reflect the true performance of the models. In practice, LLMs could be used with techniques such as sampling multiple solutions or incorporating feedback to improve generated code. Thus, the actual potential of these models in real-world scenarios might be higher than our single-solution approach suggests.

8 Conclusion

This study highlights the dual promise and limitations of smaller LLMs in code generation. While capable of generating code that mimics human-written structures, these models frequently fail to meet functional requirements. Additionally, the introduction of quantization, while beneficial for reducing memory usage, can exacerbate the gap between syntactic accuracy and functional performance in certain models.

The high incidence of maintainability issues uncovered through static analysis reinforces the need for caution when integrating LLM-generated code into real-world applications. Code generated by these models often requires significant refactoring to meet industry standards, especially for long-term use.

Future work should focus on improving the functional accuracy of LLM-generated code, enhancing training datasets, and refining quantization techniques to minimize performance losses. There is also a need for developing tools that can automatically refine the generated code to improve maintainability. In summary, while smaller LLMs hold potential for code generation, their practical application requires careful consideration and ongoing refinement.

9 Data Availability

The code and data for this study are available at -

<https://github.com/Adam-Torek/ExploringLLMCodeQuality>

10 Funding

There is no funding involved in this study.

References

- [1] Fan, A., Gokkaya, B., Harman, M., Lyubarskiy, M., Sengupta, S., Yoo, S., Zhang, J.M.: Large language models for software engineering: Survey and open problems (arXiv:2310.03533) (2023). arXiv:2310.03533 [cs]
- [2] Siddiq, M.L., Santos, J.C.: Generate and pray: Using sallms to evaluate the security of llm generated code. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00889 (2023)
- [3] Liu, J., Xia, C.S., Wang, Y., Zhang, L.: Is your code generated by chatgpt really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **36** (2024)
- [4] Austin, J., Odena, A., Nye, M., Bosma, M., Michalewski, H., Dohan, D., Jiang, E., Cai, C., Terry, M., Le, Q., Sutton, C.: Program synthesis with large language models (arXiv:2108.07732) (2021). arXiv:2108.07732 [cs]
- [5] Jimenez, C.E., Yang, J., Wettig, A., Yao, S., Pei, K., Press, O., Narasimhan, K.: Swen-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? (arXiv:2310.06770) (2024). arXiv:2310.06770 [cs]
- [6] Ren, S., Guo, D., Lu, S., Zhou, L., Liu, S., Tang, D., Sundaresan, N., Zhou, M., Blanco, A., Ma, S.: CodeBLEU: a Method for Automatic Evaluation of Code Synthesis (2020)
- [7] SonarSource: SonarQube Documentation. <https://docs.sonarsource.com/sonarqube/latest/user-guide/clean-code/definition/>
- [8] Lin, J., Tang, J., Tang, H., Yang, S., Dang, X., Gan, C., Han, S.: Awq: Activation-aware weight quantization for llm compression and acceleration (arXiv:2306.00978) (2023). arXiv:2306.00978 [cs]
- [9] Frantar, E., Ashkboos, S., Hoefler, T., Alistarh, D.: Gptq: Accurate post-training quantization for generative pre-trained transformers (arXiv:2210.17323) (2023). arXiv:2210.17323 [cs]
- [10] Spiess, C., Gros, D., Pai, K.S., Pradel, M., Rabin, M.R.I., Alipour, A., Jha, S., Devanbu, P., Ahmed, T.: Calibration and correctness of language models for code (arXiv:2402.02047) (2024). arXiv:2402.02047 [cs]
- [11] Siddiq, M.L., Santos, J.C.S.: Generate and pray: Using sallms to evaluate the security of llm generated code (arXiv:2311.00889) (2023). arXiv:2311.00889 [cs]
- [12] Jin, M., Shahriar, S., Tufano, M., Shi, X., Lu, S., Sundaresan, N., Svyatkovskiy, A.: Inferfix: End-to-end program repair with llms (arXiv:2303.07263) (2023). arXiv:2303.07263 [cs]
- [13] Kantek, B.P.: Ai-driven software development source code quality (2023)

- [14] Pan, R., Ibrahimzada, A.R., Krishna, R., Sankar, D., Wassi, L.P., Merler, M., Sobolev, B., Pavuluri, R., Sinha, S., Jabbarvand, R.: Lost in translation: A study of bugs introduced by large language models while translating code (2024) <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597503.3639226> . arXiv:2308.03109 [cs]
- [15] Du, M., Luu, A.T., Ji, B., Ng, S.-K.: Mercury: An efficiency benchmark for llm code synthesis (arXiv:2402.07844) (2024) <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.07844> . arXiv:2402.07844 [cs]
- [16] Bhatt, M., Chennabasappa, S., Nikolaidis, C., Wan, S., Evtimov, I., Gabi, D., Song, D., Ahmad, F., Aschermann, C., Fontana, L., Frolov, S., Giri, R.P., Kapil, D., Kozyrakis, Y., LeBlanc, D., Milazzo, J., Straumann, A., Synnaeve, G., Vontimitta, V., Whitman, S., Saxe, J.: Purple llama cyberseceval: A secure coding benchmark for language models (arXiv:2312.04724) (2023) <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2312.04724> . arXiv:2312.04724 [cs]
- [17] Zhong, L., Wang, Z.: Can chatgpt replace stackoverflow? a study on robustness and reliability of large language model code generation (arXiv:2308.10335) (2024) <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.10335> . arXiv:2308.10335 [cs]
- [18] Vaithilingam, P., Zhang, T., Glassman, E.L.: Expectation vs. experience: Evaluating the usability of code generation tools powered by large language models. In: Extended Abstracts of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. CHI EA '22. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491101.3519665> . <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491101.3519665>
- [19] Nguyen, S., Babe, H.M., Zi, Y., Guha, A., Anderson, C.J., Feldman, M.Q.: How beginning programmers and code llms (mis)read each other (arXiv:2401.15232) (2024) <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.15232> . arXiv:2401.15232 [cs]
- [20] Spiess, C., Gros, D., Pai, K.S., Pradel, M., Rabin, M.R.I., Jha, S., Devanbu, P., Ahmed, T.: Quality and trust in llm-generated code. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02047 (2024)
- [21] Chen, M., Tworek, J., Jun, H., Yuan, Q., Pinto, H.P.D.O., Kaplan, J., Edwards, H., Burda, Y., Joseph, N., Brockman, G., et al.: Evaluating large language models trained on code. arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374 (2021)
- [22] Brown, T.B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D.M., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., Amodei, D.: Language models are few-shot learners (arXiv:2005.14165) (2020). arXiv:2005.14165 [cs]
- [23] Zhu, X., Li, J., Liu, Y., Ma, C., Wang, W.: A survey on model compression for large language models (arXiv:2308.07633) (2023). arXiv:2308.07633 [cs]

- [24] Li, S., Ning, X., Wang, L., Liu, T., Shi, X., Yan, S., Dai, G., Yang, H., Wang, Y.: Evaluating quantized large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18158 (2024)
- [25] Lin, J., Tang, J., Tang, H., Yang, S., Chen, W.-M., Wang, W.-C., Xiao, G., Dang, X., Gan, C., Han, S.: Awq: Activation-aware weight quantization for on-device llm compression and acceleration. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems* **6**, 87–100 (2024)
- [26] Egashira, K., Vero, M., Staab, R., He, J., Vechev, M.: Exploiting llm quantization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.18137 (2024)
- [27] Simões, I.R.d.S., Venson, E.: Evaluating source code quality with large languagem models: a comparative study. arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.07082 (2024)
- [28] Luo, Z., Xu, C., Zhao, P., Sun, Q., Geng, X., Hu, W., Tao, C., Ma, J., Lin, Q., Jiang, D.: Wizardcoder: Empowering code large language models with evol-instruct (arXiv:2306.08568) (2023). arXiv:2306.08568 [cs]
- [29] Jiang, A.Q., Sablayrolles, A., Mensch, A., Bamford, C., Chaplot, D.S., Casas, D.d.l., Bressand, F., Lengyel, G., Lample, G., Saulnier, L., Lavaud, L.R., Lachaux, M.-A., Stock, P., Scao, T.L., Lavril, T., Wang, T., Lacroix, T., Sayed, W.E.: Mistral 7b (arXiv:2310.06825) (2023). arXiv:2310.06825 [cs]
- [30] Lozhkov, A., Li, R., Allal, L.B., Cassano, F., Lamy-Poirier, J., Tazi, N., Tang, A., Pykhtar, D., Liu, J., Wei, Y., Liu, T., Tian, M., Kocetkov, D., Zucker, A., Belkada, Y., Wang, Z., Liu, Q., Abulkhanov, D., Paul, I., Li, Z., Li, W.-D., Risdal, M., Li, J., Zhu, J., Zhuo, T.Y., Zheltonozhskii, E., Dade, N.O.O., Yu, W., Krauß, L., Jain, N., Su, Y., He, X., Dey, M., Abati, E., Chai, Y., Muennighoff, N., Tang, X., Oblokulov, M., Akiki, C., Marone, M., Mou, C., Mishra, M., Gu, A., Hui, B., Dao, T., Zebaze, A., Dehaene, O., Patry, N., Xu, C., McAuley, J., Hu, H., Scholak, T., Paquet, S., Robinson, J., Anderson, C.J., Chapados, N., Patwary, M., Tajbakhsh, N., Jernite, Y., Ferrandis, C.M., Zhang, L., Hughes, S., Wolf, T., Guha, A., Werra, L., Vries, H.: Starcoder 2 and the stack v2: The next generation (arXiv:2402.19173) (2024). arXiv:2402.19173 [cs]
- [31] Rozière, B., Gehring, J., Gloeckle, F., Sootla, S., Gat, I., Tan, X.E., Adi, Y., Liu, J., Sauvestre, R., Remez, T., Rapin, J., Kozhevnikov, A., Evtimov, I., Bitton, J., Bhatt, M., Ferrer, C.C., Grattafiori, A., Xiong, W., Défossez, A., Copet, J., Azhar, F., Touvron, H., Martin, L., Usunier, N., Scialom, T., Synnaeve, G.: Code llama: Open foundation models for code (arXiv:2308.12950) (2024). arXiv:2308.12950 [cs]
- [32] Bender, E.M., Koller, A.: Climbing towards NLU: On meaning, form, and understanding in the age of data. In: *Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 5185–5198 (2020)