

Raiders of the Lost Dependency: Fixing Dependency Conflicts in Python using LLMs

ANTONY BARTLETT, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

CYNTHIA C. S. LIEM, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

ANNIBALE PANICHELLA, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

Fixing Python dependency issues is a tedious and error-prone task for developers, who must manually identify and resolve environment dependencies and version constraints of third-party modules and Python interpreters.

Researchers have attempted to automate this process by relying on large knowledge graphs and database lookup tables. However, these traditional approaches face limitations due to the variety of dependency error types, large sets of possible module versions, and conflicts among transitive dependencies. This study explores the potential of using large language models (LLMs) to automatically fix dependency issues in Python programs. We introduce PLLM (pronounced “plum”), a novel technique that employs retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) to help an LLM infer Python versions and required modules for a given Python file. PLLM builds a testing environment that iteratively (1) prompts the LLM for module combinations, (2) tests the suggested changes, and (3) provides feedback (error messages) to the LLM to refine the fix. This feedback cycle leverages Natural Language Processing (NLP) to intelligently parse and interpret build error messages. We benchmark PLLM on the Gistable HG2.9K dataset, a collection of challenging single-file Python gists. We compare PLLM against two state-of-the-art automatic dependency inference approaches, namely PyEGo and ReadPyE w.r.t. the ability to resolve dependency issues. Our results indicate that PLLM can fix more dependency issues than the two baselines, with +218 (+15.97%) more fixes over ReadPyE and +281 (+21.58%) over PyEGo. Our deeper analyses suggest that PLLM is particularly beneficial for projects with many dependencies and for specific third-party numerical and machine-learning modules. Our findings demonstrate the potential of LLM-based approaches to iteratively resolve Python dependency issues.

CCS Concepts: • **Software and its engineering** → **Empirical software validation; Software verification and validation.**

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Python, dependency conflicts, large language models, retrieval-augmented generation

ACM Reference Format:

Antony Bartlett, Cynthia C. S. Liem, and Annibale Panichella. 2025. Raiders of the Lost Dependency: Fixing Dependency Conflicts in Python using LLMs. 1, 1 (January 2025), 20 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 Introduction

Python was first introduced in 1991 and has since grown into one of the most widely used programming languages in the world [4]. Part of its popularity is due to the ease with which developers can create and reuse modules or dependencies, i.e., Python code that can be imported and reused in

Authors' Contact Information: Antony Bartlett, a.j.bartlett@tudelft.nl, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands; Cynthia C. S. Liem, c.c.s.liem@tudelft.nl, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands; Annibale Panichella, a.panichella@tudelft.nl, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM XXXX-XXXX/2025/1-ART

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

various projects. As Python’s ecosystem expanded, so did the complexity of managing these dependencies, with an increasing number of available modules and versions, leading to the development of tools to streamline dependency management.

A first step toward supporting developers in this process was made around 2000 with the introduction of `distutils`[18], `setuptools`[1] in 2004, and `PIP`[2] in 2008, which is still the major package manager in use today. For example, ‘PIP’ uses the Python Package Index (PyPI) ¹ to locate and download specified dependencies, including specific versions and any transitive dependencies (*i.e.*, a dependency imported by a direct dependency or another transitive dependency). However, even small version discrepancies (1.1 vs. 1.2, for example) can cause serious compatibility problems [7]. Thus, accurate dependence versioning is essential for project longevity.

Despite the widespread use of these tools, many Python projects remain difficult to run out-of-the-box without manual dependency configuration [10, 24]. Developers frequently use by default the latest version for convenience, leading to dependency conflicts—an issue compounded in fields like machine learning, where projects often involve complex dependencies across software and hardware [12]. The need for tools that allow developers to reliably run public Python code has only grown, especially as code from AI assistants often introduces security or reliability risks [16].

Researchers have attempted to automate dependency resolution through large database lookup tables and knowledge graphs to model relationships among versions and dependencies. Horton and Parnin [10] introduced a uniform dataset for validating Python dependency fixes. Building upon this, they later proposed the `Dockerizeme` [11] tool, which implemented a knowledge graph to model version relationships between dependencies and ensure correct installation of versions and sub-dependencies. This approach was further enhanced by wrapping the code in a `Dockerfile` to ease the validation and execution of the Python code under test. Subsequent works have followed the trend of using knowledge graph databases to map dependency relationships and various mechanisms for populating and updating the database. Notable works include `PyEGo` by Ye *et al.* [25] and `ReadPyE` by Cheng *et al.* [5], which have shown to outperform previously proposed solutions.

Although effective, knowledge-graph-based techniques face important limitations. Managing complex transitive dependencies still remains an open challenge, particularly in large projects with numerous third-party modules that create intricate dependency conflict chains. Furthermore, highly specialized and hardware-specific dependencies, common in fields like machine learning—where libraries such as `PyTorch` require specific `CUDA` or `GPU driver` versions—are especially difficult to resolve using knowledge graphs due to the static nature of the latter. Finally, knowledge graphs frequently use Regular Expression (`regex`)-based error log parsing to find conflicts. However, this method can be brittle and require frequent updates to remain effective as error formats evolve.

In this work, we investigate the potential of using Large Language Models (LLMs) to resolve Python dependency conflicts. LLMs have shown promising results in both text-related [20] and code-related tasks (e.g., code completion [9, 14] and code summarization [3]). Intuitively, Python dependency errors involve both natural language elements (e.g., error messages and types) and code-specific information (e.g., module names, versions, and required transitive dependencies). Thus, we conjecture that the reasoning capabilities of LLMs can be highly beneficial in addressing complex dependency conflicts. To test this, we introduce `PLLM` (pronounced “plum”), a novel method that uses LLMs to dynamically resolve dependency issues.

`PLLM` employs a Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) pipeline to infer Python versions and modules whilst iteratively searching for working module versions. Our RAG pipeline utilizes pre-trained Large Language Models (LLMs) to infer dependencies from a given Python file. We then pull specific version information from `PyPI` and feed the module information to the LLM for

¹<https://pypi.org/>

processing at run time. PLLM then retrieves version information from PyPI and provides this data to the LLM at run time, avoiding the need for pre-built relational databases and instead generating relationships by strategically iterating over possible versions. Using a feedback loop, PLLM allows the LLM to refine its output based on build errors, iteratively improving results and reducing the risk of hallucination [17] by grounding recommendations in actual error feedback.

To assess the effectiveness of PLLM, we benchmark it on the HG2.9K dataset by Horton and Parnin [10], a curated collection of challenging single-file Python gists. We ran PLLM ten times on each Python gist to ensure consistent results across executions, accounting for the stochastic nature of LLM responses [17]. We compare PLLM against two state-of-the-art knowledge graph-based approaches, PyEGo and ReadPyE. We chose these for our baselines because they have both compared themselves with other existing methods in their work, to which they define themselves as state-of-the-art approaches.

Our study is guided by three research questions:

RQ1: *To what extent can current LLMs infer working dependencies from a given Python file?*

RQ2: *How effective is PLLM compared to the state-of-the-art knowledge-based approaches?*

RQ3: *In what context does PLLM perform better compared to the state-of-the-art knowledge based approaches?*

Our results show that PLLM resolves significantly more dependency issues than the two baselines, with 218 additional fixes over ReadPyE (+15.97%) and 281 over PyEGo (+21.58%). According to our more thorough investigation, PLLM works especially well for projects with intricate dependency structures, including those with a large number of module dependencies or specialized libraries in machine learning (e.g., tensorflow), math (e.g., scipy), and hardware-specific libraries (e.g., tensorflow-gpu). We also examined the overlap and orthogonality w.r.t. the conflicts resolved by the three approaches. While we observe a large intersection among the issues addressed by all three approaches, each approach also resolves unique sets of dependency conflicts. Notably, PLLM shows the largest set of uniquely resolved conflicts; however, the baselines also demonstrate strengths in certain cases, suggesting that combining these methods could further enhance Python dependency resolution—a promising direction for future work.

2 Background and Related Work

Python dependency fixing has seen significant research in recent years, driven by the complexity of Python projects and the importance of ensuring that open-source code remains runnable. This section discusses related work by organizing it around two key aspects: *existing approaches* and *datasets*. We also define our baseline methods and elaborate on the dataset we will use in this study.

Existing approaches to Python dependency resolution have generally relied on either graph-based dependency mapping or regex-based parsing to address dependency conflicts.

2.1 Dependency Conflicts Resolutions for Python

Knowledge graphs have been widely used to encode relationships among Python modules and dependencies, making them a popular choice for dependency resolution. Horton and Parnin[11] developed Dockerizeme, a tool that uses a knowledge graph to map package dependencies and versions. Dockerizeme’s graph, built using data from Libraries.io² and Neo4J, includes packages, versions, and required resources, allowing it to infer dependencies based on known relationships. By analyzing both static and dynamic aspects of Python projects, Dockerizeme can resolve transitive dependencies in some cases, providing a structured approach to dependency conflict resolution.

²<https://libraries.io>

PyEGo [25] also uses a Neo4J-based knowledge graph, which includes around 256,000 nodes and 1.9 million relationships, to enhance dependency inference. PyEGo goes beyond Dockerizeme by incorporating information from package documentation, including recent releases, to improve dependency inference accuracy. PyEGo outperforms Dockerizeme on several metrics but requires frequent updates to remain current, which adds maintenance overhead.

Cheng et al. [5] introduced ReadPyE, another knowledge-based tool that combines naming similarity measures with optimization algorithms to match unknown modules with candidate packages. ReadPyE iteratively validates dependency choices, adjusting module selections based on validation logs. Although this method improves matching accuracy, it requires regular updates to maintain the graph's relevance, a common limitation among knowledge-graph-based tools.

In contrast to graph-based methods, PyDFix [15] uses regex-based log analysis to resolve dependencies. PyDFix parses error messages from Python build logs to identify missing modules, extracting relevant dependency information with regex patterns. By iteratively applying dependency patches, PyDFix provides a lightweight alternative to knowledge graphs. However, regex-based methods can be brittle, as patterns must be frequently updated to accommodate changes in error formats, making this approach less adaptable for diverse or novel dependency errors.

Limitations. The aforementioned techniques have offered insightful information about dependency management. Despite their effectiveness, graph-based methods can be resource-intensive due to their need for large pre-built knowledge bases and frequent updates. Regex-based approaches are more lightweight but may lack robustness in handling diverse or complex error types.

In contrast, our approach PLLM, diverges from these methods by leveraging Large Language Models (LLMs) within a Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) pipeline to dynamically infer dependencies at run time. Rather than building extensive pre-built knowledge bases or relying on regex patterns, PLLM performs partial, real-time inference by querying current dependency information directly from PyPI and prompting the LLM. This dynamic approach eliminates the need for ongoing database updates and provides greater flexibility in resolving both common and novel dependency conflicts. By iteratively refining the generated fixes based on build error feedback, PLLM addresses potential issues related to using LLMs, like code hallucination.

2.2 Datasets of Python Dependency Conflicts

Effectively evaluating dependency-fixing methods requires reliable datasets with ground truth for testing and validating inference methods. Several important datasets have been developed for this purpose. The Gistable dataset by Horton and Parnin (2018)[10] is one of the most widely used datasets for evaluating dependency-fixing tools. This dataset, collected from GitHub's Gist platform, contains over 10,000 Python gists—snippets of code that vary in complexity. Horton and Parnin analyzed these gists and found that only 24.4% of them could run without modification, while 52% failed due to missing imports, highlighting the impact of dependency conflicts on code usability. The Gistable dataset³ includes a challenging subset of 2,891 "hard" gists that fail due to missing imports and remain unrunnable without fixes. This subset has become the gold standard for evaluating dependency-fixing approaches.

In addition to Gistable, some works have used other datasets for validation. PyDFix[15], for example, evaluates using BugSwarm[21] and BugsInPy [22], both of which incorporate a variety of dependency conflicts from actual Python projects. These datasets offer a broader evaluation context, allowing researchers to compare results across different dependency issues.

In this paper, we will use Gistable as our main validation dataset since it focuses on the difficult subset of "hard" gists.

³<https://github.com/gistable/gistable>

3 Our Approach




Fig. 1. Overview of PLLM, which encompasses five main stages: (A) extracting the import from the input Python file, (B) prompting the model to infer the modules and Python versions, and (C) generating candidate dependency fixes using PyPI, (D) validating the candidate fixes using Docker run, (E) providing feedback to LLM in case unsuccessful fixes.

Our approach uses a Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) pipeline incorporating an open-source Large Language Model (LLM) to iteratively build and search for a working set of Python dependencies. Figure 1 provides a high-level overview of our approach.

Given a Python file as input, PLLM first extract the import statements from the file (Fig 1, A). We use a simple regular expression (regex) to brute-force search for import statements within the file. Then, our approach prompts the LLM to infer the required Python modules and versions based on the extracted imports (Fig 1, B) for the input file. Notice that the LLM is also asked to provide a version of the Python language compatible with these modules. The LLM’s inferences are combined with information from PyPI to generate a set of candidate dependency fixes (Fig 1, C) and eventually identify additional dependencies that are missing and that should be added to the candidate fix. PLLM then validates these fixes by building and running a Docker container (Fig 1, D).

After each build, PLLM performs a simple check of the Docker build log for potential error messages. If a build error message is detected, this indicates that the candidate dependency fix was not successful and requires further refinements. Therefore, PLLM provides feedback to the LLM based on the build results (Fig 1, E). The feedback consists of interacting with the LLM using follow-up prompts (Fig 1, E) that contain the error message generated by the Docker build plus the unsuccessful fix used in the current loop. This process continues iteratively until a working set of dependencies is found (Fig 1, D, exit to the loop) or until a specified loop limit is met.

3.1 LLM Prompting

A novel aspect of our approach involves leveraging an LLM to infer specific information from a Python file or build log in the search for a working set of dependencies.

However, we crafted targeted prompts to elicit accurate information at each step due to the inherent risk of LLMs misinterpreting complex queries or hallucinating responses [23]. Furthermore,

```
Prompt:
"Given a python file:\n{raw_file}\nReturn just a list of Python modules
↳ and python version required to run. Output JSON based on the
↳ schema {format_instructions}"
```

Listing 1. Prompt for inferring information from a given Python file.

```
{ "python_modules": [{"module": "<String>", "version": "<String>"
}], "python_version": "<String>" }
```

Listing 2. JSON Schema: Dependencies and Python version.

```
Prompt:
"Given an ImportError:\n{error_msg}\n Identify the import which is
↳ causing the error.\nFor this type of error, the module is normally
↳ in the text 'from x import y', where x and y are the module to
↳ import and the offending method.\nReturn the name of the module
↳ using the format instructions.\n{format_instructions}"
```

Listing 3. Prompt for obtaining module from the ImportError message.

we specified desired output formats for the LLM to ensure the response was concise and not overly verbose. By using specific instructions and structured outputs, we minimize ambiguity and guide the LLM toward concise, relevant responses.

We developed two types of prompts tailored to the various stages of the search process. The first prompt is used in the initial stage of PLLM (Step B in Figure 1) and aims to request a list of dependencies and the Python version. Listing 1 displays the initial prompt, which provides multiple input items and requires one single return object.

This initial prompt utilizes partial variables, which we supply to the LLM when prompting it for different Python files under analysis. Here, however, ‘raw_file’ represents the Python file, and ‘format_instructions’ contains instructions about the desired output for the LLM response. Listing 2 shows an example of format instructions given to the LLM when requesting inference on the raw Python file. This specific JSON schema ensures that the information returned by the LLM adheres to this format.

Beyond file-based inference, the LLM also analyzes Docker build logs to address common errors during the dependency validation stage. For this purpose, we designed and crafted follow-up prompts that specifically handle the various error messages. Our prompts address in total eight distinct error messages: ‘VersionNotFound’, ‘DependencyConflict’, ‘ImportError’, ‘ModuleNotFound’, ‘AttributeError’, ‘InvalidVersion’, ‘NonZeroCode’ and ‘SyntaxError’. Each error prompt is tailored to extract relevant information specific to that error. Some are specific to the Docker build, such as ‘non-zero code’, while others are encountered when attempting to run the Python file in the Docker container.

For example, given an ImportError, the LLM is directed to identify the missing module, as shown in Listing 3. This type of error message is the most common we have encountered in our experiments. It occurs when one or more dependencies of the Python file are unmet (not installed), leading to the ImportError being thrown along with information about the missing dependency.

```

Prompt:
"Given a comma separated list of 'Module versions' for the '{module}'
  ↳ module, from oldest to newest:\n{module\_versions}\nPerform
  ↳ equally distanced sampling to return a version from the given
  ↳ versions, excluding previously used versions ({previous\_versions
  ↳ }). Return the information with the format {format\_instructions
  ↳ }"

```

Listing 4. Prompt for obtaining a version.

Similarly to Listing 1, this prompt utilizes a number of partial variables to give directed information to the LLM. For example, this prompt provides the ‘error_msg’ containing the specific ImportError and the ‘format_instruction’. This prompt was designed to simply request the name of the missing dependency. Similar but nuanced prompts exist for the other error types, aiming to elicit the offending module using specific phrasing tailored to each error. We employ a simple regular expression (regex) to select the appropriate prompt based on the error message. This targeted approach enhances the accuracy of the LLM’s response.

Through trial and error, we found that requesting all information in a single follow-up prompt caused the LLM to misinterpret complex input, especially when error messages were extensive. Therefore, we adopted a multi-step prompting strategy, breaking down the input into smaller, more manageable prompts.

After the prompt to infer the name of the missing dependency/module, PLLM uses a second follow-up prompt to infer the current version for such an additional module. Listing 4 shows this additional prompt for version inference. The prompt contains a larger set of partial variables as we provide the LLM with specific dependency information for guidance. In Listing 4, ‘module’ represents the dependency obtained from the previous prompt, and ‘module_versions’ is a comma-separated list of available versions sourced from PyPI, for the given dependency. We also provide the LLM with a list of previously attempted versions ‘previous_versions’ to prevent repetition. To promote version diversity, we request equally distanced sampling of the available versions. Finally, the ‘format_instruction’ simply prompts the LLM to return both the dependency name and the newly chosen version.

As discussed earlier, our prompting strategy provides the LLM with curated prompts containing partial variables (*i.e.*, Python file, error message, module versions). One essential partial variable is a list of versions for each dependency. However, not all dependencies require installation or may have inconsistent naming conventions. For example, dependencies such as time, os, and csv are all part of the Python standard library⁴ and do not need to be installed.

We perform two key steps to accurately retrieve dependency information: identifying standard library modules and verifying module existence on PyPI (Step C in Figure 1). First, we check if a dependency is part of the Python standard library, removing it if installation is unnecessary. For modules not in the standard library, we use the PyPI API endpoint⁵ to verify each module’s existence on PyPI. Modules not found in PyPI’s index are excluded from further analysis to prevent errors and ensure only valid dependencies are included.

Finally, we recognize that Python dependency names can differ between import and installation commands, a potential challenge that requires further handling.

⁴<https://docs.python.org/3/tutorial/stdlib.html>

⁵https://pypi.org/pypi/{module_name}/json

```

1 import os
2 import sklearn
3 import tensorflow
4 ...
5
6 $ pip install scikit-learn
7 $ pip install tensorflow

```

Listing 5. scikit-learn import vs install.

Listing 5 illustrates a common discrepancy between module import names and installation package names. For example, while the installed package `scikit-learn` is imported in the Python file as `sklearn`, the package `tensorflow` has the same name for both installation and import. To address such inconsistencies, we developed a JSON lookup file as a quick reference tool. This file cross-references module names, maintaining consistency between import statements and installation packages. For instance, `beautifulsoup4` is installed with that name but imported in Python as `bs4`, so our JSON file maps `bs4` to `beautifulsoup4`, allowing for automatic correction of such discrepancies.

Populating this JSON file required gathering knowledge from various sources, including forum discussions⁶, from which we compiled known examples and organized them alphabetically. Additional discrepancies were identified and added during our testing of PLLM. While comprehensive, we acknowledge that this JSON file does not cover every possible naming mismatch.

We perform regular validation of our dependencies throughout PLLM execution, typically after prompting the LLM, to ensure that any modules returned are consistent and valid.

3.1.1 Retrieval Augmented Generation. As outlined in the previous subsection, once a dependency is validated, it can be used during prompting. However, to prompt for a specific version of a given dependency, we first need a set of available versions from which to choose.

Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) is a well-established approach to guide LLMs towards more accurate responses by providing context-specific information during prompting, mitigating the risk of hallucinations [23]. As Feldman *et al.* [8], demonstrate in their work, RAG can increase the accuracy of an LLM’s response when implemented correctly. In our experiments, we observed that LLMs frequently hallucinate nonexistent or wildly inaccurate Python module versions during inference, leading to numerous failures.

To address this challenge, we use the Python Package Index (PyPI)⁷. PyPI is the primary repository for Python software with over 550,000 installable modules, and through its Application Programming Interface (API) PLLM can retrieve real-time metadata for specified Python modules. This method allows the dynamic retrieval of module version information at run time without needing a pre-built dependency graph, as some existing methods require.

However, PyPI metadata is extensive, and providing it to an LLM in its raw form could lead to inaccurate responses. For instance, if the target Python version is 3.7, metadata for versions 3.8, 3.9, *etc.*, is irrelevant and may mislead the model. Thus, we designed a focused retrieval strategy that filters metadata to match specific requirements.

Algorithm 1 illustrates our selection process to ensure only specific versions are provided to our model. The initial inputs include ‘python_version(Φ)’, ‘python_version_date_range(Ψ)’ (the

⁶<https://discuss.python.org/t/any-list-of-well-known-distribution-import-name-mismatches/44733>

⁷<https://pypi.org/>

Algorithm 1: PyPI MetaData Filtering

```

1 Input:
2    $\Phi = \text{python\_version}$ 
3    $\Psi = \text{python\_version\_date\_range}$ 
4    $\Omega = \text{module\_metadata}$ 
5 Output:  $\Omega^* \subset \Omega$ 
6    $\Omega^* = \emptyset$ 
7   for  $\text{release} \in \Omega$  do
8     if  $\text{release.date} \in \Psi$  then
9        $\Omega^* \leftarrow \Omega^* \cup \{\text{release}\};$ 
10    elif  $\text{release.version} \equiv \Phi$  then
11       $\Omega^* \leftarrow \Omega^* \cup \{\text{release}\};$ 
12 if  $\Omega^* \equiv \emptyset$  then
13    $\Omega^* \leftarrow \Omega\{\text{latest}\}$ 

```

date range when Φ was the primary Python version, as specified on the official Python website), and $\text{module_metadata}(\Omega)$. For each release in Ω , we check if it meets one of two conditions: (1) the release date falls within Ψ (line 7), or (2) the release is explicitly labeled with Φ (line 9). Releases satisfying either condition are appended to Ω^* . If no suitable candidates are found, the latest release is added to Ω^* . The selected module data is then exported as a text file to the test folder.

The exported file is named according to the Python version and module. For example, version data for the ‘tensorflow’ module on Python 3.7 would be stored in ‘tensorflow_3.7.txt’. Each file contains a simple comma-separated list of versions (e.g., 3.7, 4.6, 5.1, etc.), providing structured data proved effective for our RAG pipeline. Initial tests showed that when irrelevant data, such as release dates, was included, the LLM occasionally misinterpreted the RAG data, returning dates instead of module versions.

3.2 Build Validation Loop

Our approach’s main component, the build validation loop, is made to iteratively search for a working build, up to a specified number of attempts. If a successful build is found before reaching the limit, the program exits with success.

The three phases of the validation loop are (1) creation, (2) building, and (3) running. Initially, we **create** a Dockerfile with the modules and inferred Python version. The Dockerfile is then **built**, and the final image is **run**. The steps involved in creating and running are similar: when an error occurs, the loop is restarted, and another attempt is made after passing the error message to the LLM for inference.

3.2.1 Dockerfile Creation. Once we have generated a set of modules and inferred Python versions, we can proceed to build a Dockerfile for validation. Our methodology is straightforward: we extend from the official Python Docker build corresponding to our inferred version (e.g., Listing 6 uses ‘python:3.6’). We then set the working directory to ‘/app’ to provide a space to run the file under test. Next, we loop through all modules and versions to create specific install lines. These lines also set attributes such as ‘-trusted-host’ and ‘-default-timeout’ to prevent installs from failing for reasons other than those we are testing for. Finally, we copy the Python file to the ‘/app’ directory and set the ‘CMD’ to execute the file at run time.

```

FROM python:3.6
WORKDIR /app
RUN ["pip", "install", "--upgrade", "pip"]
RUN ["pip", "install", "--trusted-host", "pypi.python.org", "--default-
    ↪ timeout=100", "keras==2.0.9"]
RUN ["pip", "install", "--trusted-host", "pypi.python.org", "--default-
    ↪ timeout=100", "tensorflow==2.4.4"]
COPY snippet.py /app
CMD ["python", "/app/snippet.py"]

```

Listing 6. Dockerfile.

3.2.2 Dockerfile Build Validation. With the Dockerfile established, PLLM can proceed to validate its building capabilities. During the build process, our program assigns a unique image name based on the folder name and the specific Python version in use (for instance, ‘test/pipped:678436743_3.6’). This methodology facilitates the concurrent execution of multiple builds.

Next, Docker starts the build of the Dockerfile; it will continue the process and break only when Docker commands cause an error or the build is completed successfully. In the case of an error, PLLM conducts a prompt evaluation of common issues through a straightforward if/else structure to enhance the response provided to the LLM. For example, should a ‘ModuleNotFoundError’ arise, PLLM would execute a prompt akin to Listing 3, wherein we first extract the module name from the error message, followed by a subsequent request as shown in Listing 4 to find the relevant version.

Utilizing the information obtained from the LLM, we can then reconstruct the Dockerfile by incorporating the new module and version pair, subsequently attempting the build process once more. This iterative procedure continues until either a successful build is achieved or the maximum number of iterations is reached.

3.2.3 Docker Image Run Validation. Once the Docker build process finishes without any error, a docker image is created, which can then be run. Each image is coded to carry out the Python script duplicated during the image build time. When an image is run, it produces a container with a unique name, thus ensuring that multiple containers’ executions do not overlap. Analogous to the case of building a container, it either ends in a fault or completes its work. In case of a mistake, a parsing mechanism similar to that used in the build process is employed, and the error message is sent to the LLM for diagnosis. The model’s input is retrieved, and we return to the build stage to recreate the image. This looping continues until the allowed loop count is achieved; if completed successfully, the loop stops and the result is stored.

3.3 Parallel Execution

A distinctive feature of our approach is its capacity to effortlessly build and run against any major Python version (2.x or 3.x) and its subsequent variants. We provide our approach with a Python version range at run time. This value determines the number of parallel executions to perform; for example, a value of 2 dictates that we wish to execute against two adjacent Python versions. This will ensure that two versions on either side of the version inferred by the LLM will be executed. For instance, if the LLM predicts that the code should run on Python 3.5, we would also execute against Python 2.7, 3.4, 3.6, and 3.7. These variants are executed in parallel, performing all the same build-run steps outlined in Section 3.2. Doing so allows us to identify multiple viable Python versions for the code snippet under validation. Note that we ensure Python 2.7 is always executed by appending this to the first element of the Python versions list. Unlike our related work 2, we do not switch versions based on errors, but instead attempt to find fixes for multiple Python versions.

4 Study Design

The goal of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of PLLM in resolving Python dependency conflicts for real-world programs. To this aim, we formulated the following *research questions*:

RQ1: *To what extent can current LLMs infer working dependencies from a given Python file?*

RQ2: *How effective is PLLM compared to the state-of-the-art knowledge-based approaches?*

RQ3: *In what context does PLLM perform better compared to the state-of-the-art knowledge based approaches?*

RQ1 aims to provide insights into the current capabilities of PLLM in inferring working dependencies for real-world Python programs. **RQ2** and **RQ3** are designed to evaluate the effectiveness of PLLM compared to state-of-the-art knowledge-based approaches. By comparing PLLM to these approaches, we can determine the contexts in which PLLM performs better and identify areas for improvement.

4.1 LLM Model Selection

We utilized a number of specific LLM tools to implement our strategy. To ensure openness and reproducibility in our approach, we opted for Ollama⁸, an open-source tool for deploying models on local systems, rather than proprietary tools such as ChatGPT. The model chosen for our final experiment was Gemma2 [19], dated (24-06-2024). This particular quantized model boasts 9B parameters and has been reduced to a 4-bit value (Q4_0), allowing it to run on memory-constrained systems while maintaining high usability.

4.2 Dataset

We validated our approach using the HG2.9K dataset, which has become the standard benchmark for evaluating Python import fixing tools [5, 25]. This dataset, originally created as part of the Dockerizeme paper by Horton and Parmin, 2019 [11], consists of 2,891 Python Gist snippets, where snippets are executable Python files that people have shared via the Gist platform.

The original Gist dataset [10], contains just over 10,000 Gists, and was created due to a growing observation that the majority of Gists shared to the platform were no longer runnable without some form of human intervention. This is due to the imports used in Python and the gradual variation of versions. When installing a Python module, it will always pull the latest version unless a specific version is specified. If the module version has drifted significantly, the underlying code will no longer be executable.

The (HG2.9K) dataset we utilized is a curated set of 'hard' Gists, that still returned an `ImportError` after applying the Gistable's Naive approach. This dataset provides a challenging and realistic representation of dependency drift issues in Python.

4.3 Implementation and Parameter settings

We have implemented our approach using Python 3.11, Langchain and Langchain-community 0.2.1, and Ollama 0.2.0. Langchain and Langchain-community⁹ ¹⁰ provide the building blocks for creating LLM-based tools. Combined with the Ollama module¹¹, which enables interaction with a running Ollama instance, these libraries form the core components of our implementation.

All approaches were executed inside a Docker container on an AMD EPYC 7713 64-core Processor running at 2.6 GHz, with 256 available CPUs. The LLM was run through a Dockerized Ollama 0.3.12

⁸<https://ollama.com>

⁹<https://www.langchain.com/langchain>

¹⁰<https://pypi.org/project/langchain-community/>

¹¹<https://pypi.org/project/ollama/>

instance on an Nvidia A40 GPU, utilizing only 8 GB of the available 48 GB GDDR6 memory. The Dockerfile for our implementation has pinned Python module versions to ensure replication.

4.3.1 Parameters setting. Our implementation takes various parameters to assist in optimizing our test runs. The pertinent parameters for our evaluation are, ‘-model = gemma2’, ‘-temp = 0.7’, ‘-loop = 10’ and , ‘-range = 1’. Here, the model allows us to specify which model to run against, which is gemma2. This can be any model we have downloaded locally with Ollama. The temp (set to 0.7) allows us to control how an LLM responds to our questions. A higher value, with a maximum of 1, will see a model being more ‘creative’ with its response. We did not want the LLM to take too many risks with the response, but we did want some mild creativity.

However, it is still unclear what the ‘default’ temp of a model should be. In the GPT-4 technical report [20], we observe the temperature value is arbitrarily chosen to be 0.6. In the Ollama documentation¹², we see they now define the ‘default’ as 0.8, but the older value of 0.7 is still visible. Our choice of 0.7 is primarily motivated by it being the ‘default’ when we initially developed PLLM.

As mentioned in Section 3.2, our approach iteratively loops in search for a working set of dependencies. During the creation of our approach, it was found setting the loop value to 10 resulted in the best cost to wait ratio. A value lower than this would not give the LLM long enough to search, whereas a higher value would lead to longer execution times for failing scenarios.

Lastly, we define the number of parallel executions as discussed in the parallel execution section 3.3. The range parameter allows us to validate multiple Python versions at the same time and for this specific evaluation we chose 1. By choosing 1, we ensure that 3 Python versions will be tested for each Gist in the HG2.9K dataset.

4.3.2 Baseline settings. We ran both baselines with the recommended settings in their projects’ README. Both baselines required building a Dockerfile to host and run their experiment, with each requiring the creation of a Neo4J database. PyEGo included a database backup in their repository and ReadPyE gave this as a separate artifact. ReadPyE as noted in their paper [5], have two database versions. For this experiment, we chose Knowledge Graph 0 (KG0), designed to fix only Python module implementations. This was chosen to keep our approaches close in their implementation, given that our approach focuses solely on module inference. It is worth noting that PyEGo fixes Python modules and operating system-level dependencies as part of their approach.

4.4 Evaluation Criteria

To answer **RQ1** and **RQ2**, we execute PLLM along with both our baselines, PyEGo and ReadPyE against the HG2.9K dataset. Following the evaluation criteria set out by Horton and Parnin in their Dockerizeme work [11], we measure the success of each approach based on the number of successfully generated runnable environments (i.e., successful dependency fixes). As discussed in Section 3.1, a success is any runnable Python snippet that does not encounter specific error messages (ImportError, ModuleNotFoundError, AttributeError and SyntaxError).

For each approach, we also recorded the time taken to infer a working environment, as we were particularly interested in understanding the efficiency of each method in resolving dependency conflicts. Accurate timing information provides insight into the practical usability of these approaches, especially for scenarios where dependency resolution speed may be crucial. Some adjustments were required to obtain timings for our baselines. For ReadPyE, more extensive modifications were necessary to achieve precise timing measurements. First, we recorded the inference time, which includes the stage where a Dockerfile was created with the inferred Python modules. Next, we validated the Dockerfiles, as no logging was initially provided to confirm whether a Dockerfile was

¹²[urlhttps://github.com/ollama/ollama/blob/main/docs/modelfile.md](https://github.com/ollama/ollama/blob/main/docs/modelfile.md)




Fig. 2. Cumulative chart displaying the number of fixes found by PLLM across multiple runs.

executable. Each Dockerfile was built and run at this stage, analyzing the output and logging the time required for completion. We then combined these timings to determine which Dockerfiles were successfully executed. For PyEGo, we could infer considerable information from their output logs, which contained various data points, such as the start and stop times for each snippet inference and whether the inference was successful.

To account for the stochastic nature of LLMs, we executed PLLM 10 times, aggregating the data to understand the full extent of fixes. However, as both of our baselines utilize a static knowledge graph, these approaches only required a single run.

To answer **RQ3**, we conducted a permutation test [6], a non-parametric alternative to the ANOVA test, that does not require the data to be normally distributed. This test allowed us to determine whether there is a significant difference in the number of successful fixes produced by PLLM, PyEGo, and ReadPyE. We also assessed the impact of various project co-factors on these outcomes. The permutation test provided insights into the statistical significance of differences in successful fixes among the approaches without relying on the normality assumptions of ANOVA. To further investigate specific patterns, we analyzed the frequency of successful fixes for particular types of modules (e.g., PyTorch) and for projects with varying numbers of dependencies. We examined the success frequencies across Python files with similar dependencies and different dependency counts. Additionally, we analyzed the intersection and unique sets of projects successfully fixed by PLLM, PyEGo, and ReadPyE, identifying both shared and unique successes for each approach.

The complete replication package, including the datasets, the source code, and results, is available on Figshare: <https://figshare.com/s/0b6df87b17b4bba0e528>.

5 Empirical Evaluation

In this section, we discuss the results of the experiment with regard to our research questions.

Method	# Fixed	# Unfixed	Fix Time (IQR)
PLLM	1583	1308	151.461 (221.30)
ReadPyE	1365	1526	62.77 (40.57)
PyEgo	1302	1589	4.025 (7.56)

Table 1. Number successful and unsuccessful fixes produced by PLLM, PyEgo and ReadPyE. We also report the average time (in seconds) needed to generate the successful fixes alongside the interquartile range (IQR).




Fig. 3. Intersections and difference sets for the projects successfully fixed by PLLM, PyEgo, and ReadPyE.

5.1 Results for RQ1

RQ1 seeks to understand how much an LLM can infer working dependencies from a given Python file. To start, we observe Figure 2, which provides insight into how PLLM performs across multiple runs. As stated in Section 4.3.1, PLLM was executed a total of 10 times to account for the inherent randomness in LLM outputs. The plot in Figure 2 is cumulative, where a fix is considered successful if it was achieved in at least one of the first $N=\{1, \dots, 10\}$ runs. This approach allows us to assess the LLM’s overall effectiveness at inferring working dependencies, as each additional run uncovers more potential fixes. Importantly, the LLM does not learn from prior runs or sessions; each inference is based solely on the information provided at run time in its dedicated session.

The effectiveness of PLLM is further visible when we examine the single test run shown to the left of Figure 2. Here, we see that the number of fixes achieved is just under 1440. Combined with Table 1, this shows that a single run of PLLM generates more fixes than both baseline methods (see the next subsection).

5.2 Results for RQ2

Table 1 reports the number of successful and unsuccessful fixes produced by PLLM, PyEgo, and ReadPyE. The table also includes the average time (in seconds) required to generate successful fixes, along with the interquartile range (IQR). As observed, PLLM outperforms both baselines in terms of the number of successful fixes, achieving a total of 1583 successful fixes. This is significantly higher than the 1365 and 1302 successful fixes produced by ReadPyE and PyEgo, respectively.

The average time taken to generate successful fixes is higher for PLLM compared to the baselines, with an average time of 151.46 seconds, compared to 62.77 seconds for ReadPyE and 4.025 seconds for PyEgo. The higher IQR for PLLM indicates a broader range of fix times, largely due to the iterative nature of our approach, which continues searching until a successful set of dependencies is found. We argue that this additional time is justified by the higher success rate achieved by PLLM, and an average time of two minutes remains reasonable for achieving a successful fix with Dockerfile generation and execution.

To further analyze the effectiveness of our approach, we examined cases where PLLM succeeded while both baselines failed. Figure 4 displays the overlap of successful fixes across all three approaches. When combined with Figure 3, these results illustrate the unique effectiveness of PLLM.




Fig. 4. Alluvial plot illustrating the relationship between Python files successfully fixed by PLLM and the baselines. The plot highlights Python files uniquely fixed by PLLM, those fixed by the baselines but not by PLLM, and files jointly fixed by PLLM and one or both baselines.

Specifically, all three approaches were successful on 53% of all snippets, while PLLM uniquely succeeded on 13% (237 snippets) that neither baseline could fix.

Figure 3 provides a clear overview of the total successes across all three approaches. There is a distinct overlap of 981 Gists, representing cases where all three approaches were successful. The combined success across all approaches reaches 1858 Gists. Considering these 1858 as the total potentially fixable Gists within our validation system, PLLM successfully fixed 85% of the fixable Gists in the dataset. This finding strongly supports the effectiveness of our approach in reliably inferring working dependencies from a Python file and highlights the potential of hybrid approaches, which are part of our future agenda.

5.3 Results for RQ3

To understand where our approach PLLM outperforms the baselines (PyEGo, ReadPyE), we conducted a series of permutation tests. The results of the one-way permutation test indicate that the chosen approach (PLLM, PyEGo, or ReadPyE) has a significant impact on the ability to fix the Python dependencies (p -value < 0.01), confirming the statistically significant superiority of our approach. The two-way permutation test further indicates that there is a significant interaction between the approach (PLLM, PyEGo, or ReadPyE) and the number of Python modules in the dependency file in determining the success of the generated fixes (p -value < 0.01). Here, the number of modules is a proxy to measure the complexity of the fix as, we argue, projects with a larger number of dependencies might be more tricky to fix than projects with only two dependencies. Table 4 displays a ranked list of dependency instances in successful evaluations, highlighting that our approach handles common dependencies more effectively than existing methods.

Table 2. Percentage of successful fixes produced by PLLM and PyEGo for projects with a different number of dependencies. The best values are highlighted in gray color. The best values are highlighted in gray color.

# Project Dependencies	PLLM	PyEGo	ReadPyE
0-2	0.5478	0.4846	0.5046
3-4	0.5500	0.4162	0.4517
5-6	0.5410	0.2551	0.2806
7+	0.5333	0.3555	0.2222

Table 3. Selection of snippets to understand the intersection of passing and failing examples. Grey cells indicate a successful fix.

Snippet ID	PLLM	PyEGo	ReadPyE
019fd5c706e0bc94879f	rx;twisted	rx;twisted	twisted;urx
477a9dcd198439ef2def	urllib2;readability	readability-lxml	readability-lxml
3153844	graphite	NA	graphiti
4e5035242b8e4b07ff3a	pymongo;pip;bson	pymongo	pymongo
c2dfe5772ba3cd16c1be17ba42b7db66	keras;tensorflow	keras	keras;tensorflow-gpu
7030355	mpd	python-mpd2	python-mpd2

To better understand the interaction between these two factors (the number of modules and the fixing approach), Table 2 reports the average success rate (percentage of successful fixes) of the three approaches on projects with a different number of dependencies. As we can observe, PLLM consistently generates more successful fixes than the two baselines independently on the number of project dependencies. However, we observe different patterns for the three approaches: (1) the success rate for PLLM remains relatively consistent despite an increase in the number of dependencies (from 53% up to 55%). This suggests that LLMs can be particularly useful when handling a broad range of projects; (2) the success rate for PyEGo and ReadPyE instead decreases from around 50% to 32% for PyEGo and less than 25% for ReadPyE. This indicates that traditional knowledge-graph methods struggle as the number of dependencies increases, making them a less viable solution for more complex projects.

Table 3 displays examples of snippets in which the various approaches passed and failed. We intersect here to have examples where PLLM was either better or worse than both baselines (e.g., PLLM passed, PyEGo, ReadPyE failed, etc.). By doing so, we can dig deeper into the results of these specific data points to understand why the LLM succeeds or fails.

As a first example, we analyze snippet ‘019fd5c706e0bc94879f’ from a module standpoint, in which we can observe that PLLM and PyEGo both installed the modules rx and twisted. However, ReadPyE settled on the module urx, which is likely some form of alternative dependency discovered during the building of their relational database. When investigating the logs for these, we found that urx gave an ImportError, resulting in ReadPyE failing. PyEGo however had the same dependencies as PLLM, but had chosen different versions. The rx version from PyEGo also resulted in an ImportError. Interestingly, the version of twisted selected by both baselines was the same. PLLM required a small number of iterations to land on a version of rx that worked well with the initially chosen version of twisted, resulting in a successful fix.

The next snippet ‘477a9dcd198439ef2def’ is an example of where PLLM was unsuccessful. By observing the dependency chosen by both baselines, we identify that readability is likely

Table 4. Percentage of successful fixes for the top-15 most frequent Python modules in our dataset for PLLM, PyEGo, and ReadPyE.

Module Name	# Projects	PLLM	PyEGo	ReadPyE
numpy	572	69.06	57.17	53.50
django	382	86.65	65.18	79.84
scipy	296	79.39	58.78	62.50
requests	168	66.67	50.60	52.38
pillow	166	76.51	69.88	71.08
matplotlib	162	64.81	62.96	54.94
tensorflow	140	83.57	51.43	62.14
scikit-learn	136	76.47	55.88	66.91
tensorflow-gpu	135	82.96	52.59	68.15
opencv-python	85	64.71	49.41	24.71
pandas	73	68.49	63.01	57.53
cython	69	55.07	33.33	39.13
image	69	23.19	18.84	18.84
pyyaml	69	66.67	66.67	71.01
theano	67	68.66	26.87	37.31
keras	63	77.78	14.29	42.86

no longer available or has been replaced with `readability-lxml`. We can also observe the same scenario with `'7030355'` and the `mpd`, now `python-mpd2` dependency. These examples could be added to our JSON file mentioned in Section 3.1. We also note a failure for PLLM with snippet `'4e5035242b8e4b07ff3a'`. This is a little more interesting as the LLM has `pymongo` listed as a dependency. However, unlike the other approaches, it has also attempted to install `pip` and `bson`, which have likely attributed to the failure in this instance.

Next, we examine snippets `'3153844'` and `'c2dfe5772ba3cd16c1be17ba42b7db66'` in which PLLM was the only successful approach. Here, we witness another example of ReadPyE attempting a dependency with an alternative name. In this instance, the original dependency `graphite` was successfully installed by PLLM, and no dependency was even attempted by PyEGo. The final snippet `'c2dfe5772ba3cd16c1be17ba42b7db66'` has overlap between the baselines, but ultimately, the lack of `tensorflow` in PyEGo and the incorrect `tensorflow` dependency for ReadPyE led to unsuccessful conflict resolutions for both approaches.

Given this data, we can observe that PLLM performs well across an iterative search for versions but ultimately can fall short if the naming of a dependency varies from the install.

6 Threats to validity

Construct validity. A key aspect of our approach (PLLM) is allowing the LLM to dynamically infer Python versions from code snippets and validate these along with adjacent Python versions. This flexible strategy addresses limitations in prior work [5], which rely on static Python versions during testing, potentially limiting both the adaptability and real-world relevance of the results. The only exception in our approach is Python 2.7, which is consistently validated due to its unique, legacy-specific versioning requirements.

Our method ensures that, once execution begins, the Python version remains unchanged, even if a `SyntaxError` occurs—an indicator of an incompatible Python version. Unlike approaches that dynamically switch versions mid-execution, our approach simulates real-world constraints more

accurately. This design choice enhances construct validity by reducing the reliance on manual interventions, such as regex patterns, common in previous approaches.

By allowing LLMs more freedom to infer versions and handle code as it would in practical use, our approach aims to capture the true essence of an LLM's inference capabilities and adaptability. Our autonomous framework ensures that our results reflect how an LLM theoretically operates when inferring dependencies, reinforcing the construct validity and credibility of our findings.

Internal validity. This work leverages Large Language Models (LLMs) to infer Python versions and dependencies, facilitating the execution of public code snippets. For evaluation, we used a single LLM, Gemma2 [19], which showed strong performance in preliminary tests compared to other open-source LLMs. However, using a different LLM could yield varying inference results. For example, an alternative model like ChatGPT might find fixes that Gemma2 does not due to differences in training data and model architecture.

To address the stochastic nature of LLM outputs, we followed existing guidelines [17] on assessing LLMs and executed PLLM multiple times, aggregating the results to ensure a more comprehensive assessment of its effectiveness. The model size also impacts internal validity; we selected the 9-billion-parameter version of Gemma2, compatible with both our local machine and the validation servers. However, different results may emerge when using models of different sizes.

External validity. Our approach was validated exclusively on the classic HG2.9K dataset, chosen as it has been widely used to evaluate prior approaches, including our baselines, and includes challenging dependency conflicts. While both baselines were validated on this dataset as well, ReadPyE has also been tested on additional datasets. Due to current tool limitations, we focused on this single dataset, which requires the validation of only one file at a time. Expanding our tool to handle more complex, multi-file datasets is a potential area for future work, which would improve the generalizability of our results.

Conclusion validity. The HG2.9K dataset includes some code snippets that are unresolvable due to module deprecation. Additionally, our approach was validated only on x86 Docker Linux machines. This limitation restricts our ability to validate snippets in HG2.9K designed for other platforms, such as macOS or ARM-based systems. Hence, we were unable to validate if a Dockerfile generated by one of our baselines would execute correctly on these platforms.

As a result, PyEGo includes operating system-level dependencies by default. ReadPyE also provides this capability through a specific database dump. However, to keep the approaches consistent with PLLM, we configured ReadPyE to only fix Python-level dependencies by using its default database.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

This work introduces PLLM, a novel tool that leverages the power of Large Language Models (LLMs) for dependency conflict resolution in Python programs. Departing from traditional knowledge-graph-based methods (PyEGo and ReadPyE), our approach utilizes an LLM to infer imports and versions directly from a given Python file and subsequent build logs, eliminating the need for complex databases, such as those found in our baselines.

Through our evaluation of the HG2.9K dataset, PLLM demonstrably outperformed the existing state-of-the-art methods, successfully fixing a larger number of Python Gists. Notably, PLLM retained effectiveness even as the number of imports in a Gist increased, a significant advantage over the baselines, which saw a decline in effectiveness.

PLLM achieved a statistically better ability to fix conflict resolutions than the baselines, complemented by qualitative analysis of the various strengths and weaknesses. Thus, our work displays the use of LLMs for dependency resolution, opening the door to a new generation of more efficient and adaptable solutions. However, more work should be done to understand how effective these models can be and their potential limitations.

Future work should first explore the resolution of system-level dependencies alongside Python dependencies. Additionally, there is also scope to better construct the data we give to the LLM. We plan to investigate alternative RAG methods, such as GraphRAG [13] recently introduced by Microsoft. While PLLM outperformed the baselines, the latter still resolved a non-negligible set of conflicts that PLLM missed. Thus, exploring hybrid approaches that combine these strengths is part of our future work.

References

- [1] 2024. Building and Distributing Packages with Setuptools. <https://setuptools.pypa.io/en/latest/setuptools.html>
- [2] 2024. Python Software Foundation - The pip tool. <https://pypi.org/project/pip/https://pypi.org/project/pip/>
- [3] Toufique Ahmed and Premkumar Devanbu. 2022. Few-shot training LLMs for project-specific code-summarization. In *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. 1–5.
- [4] Stephen Cass. 2024. The Top Programming Languages 2024. *IEEE Spectrum* (22 08 2024). <https://spectrum.ieee.org/top-programming-languages-2024>
- [5] Wei Cheng, Wei Hu, and Xiaoxing Ma. 2024. Revisiting Knowledge-Based Inference of Python Runtime Environments: A Realistic and Adaptive Approach. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 50, 2 (2024), 258–279. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2023.3346474>
- [6] Michael J Crawley. 2014. *Statistics: an introduction using R*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [7] Jens Dietrich, David Pearce, Jacob Stringer, Amjed Tahir, and Kelly Blincoe. 2019. Dependency versioning in the wild. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 16th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. IEEE, 349–359.
- [8] Philip Feldman Foulds, R James, and Shimei Pan. 2024. RAGged Edges: The Double-Edged Sword of Retrieval-Augmented Chatbots. arXiv:2403.01193 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.01193>
- [9] Daya Guo, Canwen Xu, Nan Duan, Jian Yin, and Julian McAuley. 2023. Longcoder: A long-range pre-trained language model for code completion. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 12098–12107.
- [10] Eric Horton and Chris Parnin. 2018. Gistable: Evaluating the Executability of Python Code Snippets on GitHub. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME)*. 217–227. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSME.2018.00031>
- [11] Eric Horton and Chris Parnin. 2019. DockerizeMe: Automatic Inference of Environment Dependencies for Python Code Snippets. arXiv:1905.11127 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.11127>
- [12] Kaifeng Huang, Bihuan Chen, Susheng Wu, Junming Cao, Lei Ma, and Xin Peng. 2023. Demystifying Dependency Bugs in Deep Learning Stack. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE 2023)*. 450–462. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3611643.3616325>
- [13] Jonathan Larson and Steven Truitt. 2024. GraphRAG: Unlocking LLM discovery on narrative private data. *Microsoft Research Blog* (13 02 2024). <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/blog/graphrag-unlocking-llm-discovery-on-narrative-private-data/>
- [14] Fang Liu, Ge Li, Yunfei Zhao, and Zhi Jin. 2020. Multi-task learning based pre-trained language model for code completion. In *Proceedings of the 35th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. 473–485.
- [15] Suchita Mukherjee, Abigail Almanza, and Cindy Rubio-González. 2021. Fixing dependency errors for Python build reproducibility. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (Virtual, Denmark) (ISSTA 2021)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 439–451. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460319.3464797>
- [16] Neil Perry, Megha Srivastava, Deepak Kumar, and Dan Boneh. 2023. Do Users Write More Insecure Code with AI Assistants?. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS '23)*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3576915.3623157>
- [17] June Sallou, Thomas Durieux, and Annibale Panichella. 2024. Breaking the silence: the threats of using llms in software engineering. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM/IEEE 44th International Conference on Software Engineering: New Ideas and Emerging Results*. 102–106.
- [18] Kurt W Smith. 2015. *Cython: A Guide for Python Programmers*. " O'Reilly Media, Inc".
- [19] Gemma Team et al. 2024. Gemma 2: Improving Open Language Models at a Practical Size. arXiv:2408.00118 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.00118>
- [20] OpenAI Team. 2024. GPT-4 Technical Report. arXiv:2303.08774 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>
- [21] David A Tomassi, Naji Dmeiri, Yichen Wang, Antara Bhowmick, Yen-Chuan Liu, Premkumar T Devanbu, Bogdan Vasilescu, and Cindy Rubio-González. 2019. BugSwarm: Mining and Continuously Growing a Dataset of Reproducible Failures and Fixes. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 339–349. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2019.00048>

- [22] Ratnadira Widayarsi et al. 2020. BugsInPy: a database of existing bugs in Python programs to enable controlled testing and debugging studies. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (Virtual Event, USA) (ESEC/FSE 2020)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1556–1560. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3368089.3417943>
- [23] Ziwei Xu, Sanjay Jain, and Mohan Kankanhalli. 2024. Hallucination is Inevitable: An Innate Limitation of Large Language Models. arXiv:2401.11817 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.11817>
- [24] Di Yang, Aftab Hussain, and Cristina Videira Lopes. 2016. From query to usable code: an analysis of stack overflow code snippets. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (ICSE '16)*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2901739.2901767>
- [25] Hongjie. Ye et al. 2022. Knowledge-based environment dependency inference for python programs. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania) (ICSE '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1245–1256. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3510003.3510127>