Hailong Jiang¹ Jianfeng Zhu¹ Yao Wan² Bo Fang³ Hongyu Zhang⁴ Ruoming Jin¹ Qiang Guan¹

Abstract

Intermediate Representations (IRs) are essential in compiler design and program analysis, yet their comprehension by Large Language Models (LLMs) remains underexplored. This paper presents a pioneering empirical study to investigate the capabilities of LLMs, including GPT-4, GPT-3, Gemma 2, LLaMA 3.1, and Code Llama, in understanding IRs. We analyze their performance across four tasks: Control Flow Graph (CFG) reconstruction, decompilation, code summarization, and execution reasoning. Our results indicate that while LLMs demonstrate competence in parsing IR syntax and recognizing highlevel structures, they struggle with control flow reasoning, execution semantics, and loop handling. Specifically, they often misinterpret branching instructions, omit critical IR operations, and rely on heuristic-based reasoning, leading to errors in CFG reconstruction, IR decompilation, and execution reasoning. The study underscores the necessity for IR-specific enhancements in LLMs, recommending fine-tuning on structured IR datasets and integration of explicit control flow models to augment their comprehension and handling of IR-related tasks.1

1. Introduction

Intermediate Representations (IRs) play a pivotal role in compiler design by segmenting the compilation process into front-end, middle-end, and back-end phases (Reissmann et al., 2020; Webb et al., 2021; Sbîrlea et al., 2015). They support efficient transformations, optimizations, and analyses that are decoupled from specific programming languages, making them adaptable to diverse architectures (Chow, 2013).

Beyond compilation, IRs are essential for various code intelligence tasks, including *vulnerability detection* (Zhu et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2024a), *code comprehension and generation* (Yuan et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2024b), *clone detection* (Paul et al., 2024), and *binary-to-source matching* (Mao et al., 2023; Collyer et al., 2023). Unlike high-level programming languages, IRs follow an instruction-like format, encoding low-level details such as control flow dependencies, instruction transformations, and memory manipulations. These characteristics introduce unique challenges in *structural analysis, syntactic processing, semantic understanding*, and *execution reasoning*, making IR comprehension fundamentally different from natural language or source code modeling.

Current IR processing methods, such as NCC (Venkata-Keerthy et al., 2020), embed IR instructions as linear text representations using models like Word2Vec (Church, 2017), while BERT-style pretraining (Devlin, 2018; Venkata-Keerthy et al., 2020; Niu et al., 2024) has improved contextual modeling for code. However, these methods lack awareness of control flow structures and execution semantics, limiting their generalization to IR-specific tasks such as *Control Flow Graph* (CFG) reconstruction, bug detection, and execution reasoning. Since IR execution relies on lowlevel operations beyond syntax, models that fail to capture control flow relationships struggle with execution-aware IR tasks. Given these limitations, *can large language models (LLMs) bridge this gap and reason about IRs effectively?*

To effectively leverage LLMs for IR-related tasks, we must first address the following question: *Do LLMs understand IRs, and to what extent can they reason about them?* The answer to this question will determine whether general-purpose LLMs suffice for IR processing or if dedicated IR-trained models are necessary.

To systematically evaluate LLMs' comprehension of IRs, we examine their performance across three dimensions:

Structural Understanding: Can LLMs reconstruct Control Flow Graphs (CFGs) from IRs accurately?

¹Department of Computer Science, Kent State University, Kent, USA ²School of Computer Science and Technology, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China ³Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, USA ⁴School of Big Data and Software Engineering, Chongqing University, Chongqing, China. Correspondence to: Hailong Jiang <hjiang13@kent.edu>, Qiang Guan <qguan@kent.edu>.

¹All the experimental data, source code, used in this paper are available at: https://anonymous.4open.science/r/LLMs-in-IR-558F/.

Can Large Language Models Understand Intermediate Representations?



Figure 1. Overview of the study design.

- Syntactic and Semantic Comprehension: Can LLMs recover high-level representations by decompiling IRs and summarizing their functionality?
- Execution Reasoning: Can LLMs simulate program execution based on IRs and infer correct outputs?

Our study examines five state-of-the-art LLMs—GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023), GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020), LLaMA 3.1 (Touvron et al., 2023), Gemma 2 (Team et al., 2024), and Code Llama (Rozière et al., 2024)—on a benchmark dataset derived from HumanEval (Zheng et al., 2023), consisting of 164 C++ programs and their corresponding IRs.

Take-Away Findings Our evaluation reveals several takeaway findings that may inspire further research.

- LLMs recognize syntax but struggle with control flow (Tasks 1-4): LLMs can parse IR syntax, identifying variables, arithmetic operations, and memory operators. However, they struggle with control flow instructions (e.g., br, jmp), leading to errors in CFG reconstruction.
- *Limited Semantic Understanding (Tasks 2–4)*: While LLMs process individual syntax elements, they often fail to capture deeper execution semantics. Two major challenges are:
 - Random Skipping: LLMs sometimes omit critical IR instructions, leading to incomplete decompilation or flawed execution reasoning.
 - Granularity Issues: While LLMs recognize high-level function structures, they struggle with instruction-level details, often relying on pattern-based inference rather than precise reasoning.
- Loop handling remains a fundamental challenge (Tasks 1 and 4): LLMs fail to reconstruct loop structures in CFGs and frequently misinterpret iteration behaviors and termination conditions during execution reasoning.

While LLMs exhibit some capability in IR-related tasks, their limitations suggest clear areas for improvement. Specifically, 1) Enhancing control flow comprehension could improve CFG reconstruction accuracy; 2) Refining semantic reasoning across multiple granularities may enable better instruction-level analysis; 3) Strengthening loop handling mechanisms could reduce errors in iteration reasoning. These findings highlight the need for IR-specific adaptations to make LLMs more effective in program analysis.

Our main contributions are as follows:

- To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to explore LLMs' ability to understand and reason about IRs, covering structure, syntax, semantics, and execution.
- Comprehensive empirical evaluation. We evaluate stateof-the-art LLMs across multiple IR-processing tasks, introducing experiments, evaluation metrics, and analysis.
- Insights for improving IR comprehension. Our findings suggest key areas for improvement, including control flow awareness, execution reasoning, and fine-grained semantic understanding, paving the way for future IRspecific model adaptations.

2. Preliminaries

LLVM and IRs LLVM is a widely adopted compiler framework that optimizes source code through Intermediate Representations (LLVM IRs) (Lattner & Adve, 2004). LLVM IRs are *low-level*, *typed*, and *structured*, offering a universal representation compatible with numerous highlevel languages. LLVM enables control flow graph (CFG) analysis and supports the integration of custom compiler passes for additional transformations. The key components of LLVM IRs include:

- *Modules*: Groups of functions representing a complete IR-based program unit.
- *Functions*: Collections of basic blocks, each representing an independent unit for analysis or optimization.
- Basic Blocks: Sequences of instructions without internal

branches, forming the building blocks of control flow.

• *Instructions*: Defined by an opcode, type, and operands governed by a static type system.

Control Flow Graphs (CFGs) A CFG models all possible execution paths in a program. Nodes represent basic blocks, while directed edges capture potential control flow transitions. CFGs underpin many software engineering tasks, including vulnerability detection (Zhou et al., 2019; Anju et al., 2010), code optimization (McConnell, 1993), and program analysis (Fechete et al., 2008).

3. Study Design

We systematically evaluate whether LLMs can effectively handle IRs without explicit IR-specific training. As shown in Fig. 1, we investigate their ability to capture *structural*, *syntactic*, and *semantic* properties of IRs through four tasks:

- Task 1: CFG Reconstruction measures an LLM's ability to infer structural relationships in IRs by accurately reconstructing CFGs.
- Task 2: IR Decompilation evaluates syntactic comprehension by recovering high-level source code from IR.
- Task 3: Code summarization assesses semantic understanding by generating high-level descriptions of IR functions, including purpose, inputs, and outputs.
- ▷ Task 4: Execution Reasoning tests whether LLMs can infer program behavior by reasoning about control flow, variable state changes, and assertion outcomes.

3.1. Evaluation Tasks

3.1.1. CFG RECONSTRUCTION (TASK 1)

Reconstructing a CFG from IR is critical for various software engineering tasks such as bug detection (Zhang et al., 2023), vulnerability detection (Li et al., 2018), and malware analysis (Anju et al., 2010). Although CFG recovery from binaries has been extensivly studied binaries (Andriesse et al., 2016; Pang et al., 2021; Shoshitaishvili et al., 2016), the application of LLMs to IR_based CFG reconstruction is relatively unexplored.

Approach

We prompt LLMs to generate CFGs directly from IR snippets. Outputs are compared against compiler-generated ground truth using an expert meta-template prompt (detailed in Section 3.3), which provides structured guidance and iterative refinements.

Evaluation Metrics Following (Ma et al.), we classify LLM-generated CFGs based on structural correctness: **Node Construction Accuracy** measures the correctness of identified basic blocks, while **Edge Construction Accuracy** assesses control-flow edges, further categorized into **Full** **CFG Accuracy** (both nodes and edges match the ground truth) and **Partial CFG Accuracy** (nodes are correct, but edges contain errors). Within partial accuracy, **Loop Edge Accuracy** evaluates loops construction (e.g., for, while), and **Conditional Branch Accuracy** verifies branching structures (if-else).

3.1.2. IR DECOMPILATION (TASK 2)

Decompilation—converting IR back to source code—is a fundamental task in reverse engineering, vulnerability assessments, malware detection, and software modernization (Brumley et al., 2013; Jiang et al., 2023; Hu et al., 2024). Unlike CFG reconstruction, decompilation focuses on syntactic comprehension, testing whether LLMs can recover human-readable, high-level representations from IRs.

Approach We prompt LLMs to decompile IR into C++ source and compare the generated output to the original code. Since compiler optimizations (O0–O3) significantly alter IR structure, we evaluate LLMs' ability to handle these transformations.

Evaluation Metrics Following prior work (Tan et al., 2024; Armengol-Estapé et al., 2024; Wong et al., 2023), we evaluate *re-executability* of decompiled code by categorizing outcomes into **Re-execution Error** (compilation failure or crash), **Re-execution Completed** (successful execution), and, within the latter, **Re-execution Mismatch** (at least one assertion fails) and **Re-execution Success** (all assertions pass, ensuring correct functionality).

3.1.3. CODE SUMMARIZATION (TASK 3)

While CFG reconstruction and decompilation emphasize structure and syntax, code summarization assesses semantic understanding. In this task, LLMs are required to generate natural language descriptions of IR functions, capturing their purpose, inputs, and outputs (Sun et al., 2024; Haldar & Hockenmaier, 2024).

Approach We prompt LLMs with IR snippets and request concise, human-readable summaries. To enhance clarity, we employ expert meta-prompts, few-shot examples, and chain-of-thought guidance. The generated summaries are compared to ground truth or human-curated references for evaluation.

Evaluation Metrics

The quality of summary is measured using the following metrics: **BLEU** (Papineni et al., 2002) for token overlap, **ROUGE-L** (Lin, 2004) for sequence alignment based on the longest common subsequence, and **METEOR** (Denkowski & Lavie, 2014) for a comprehensive assessment that combines precision, recall, and synonym matching.

3.1.4. EXECUTION REASONING (TASK 4)

Execution reasoning (ER) evaluates whether LLMs can track variable states and control flow in IR-level "execution" without actually running the program. Unlike specification reasoning (SR) (Min et al., 2023; Deshpande et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2023), which assesses compliance with expected behavior, ER focuses on inferring program behavior from static IR code.

Approach We provide LLMs with IR code snippets and assertion statements, prompting them them to predict which assertions hold "*true*". This requires reasoning over control flow, variable changes, and function interactions.

Evaluation Metrics Execution reasoning is assessed based on assertion correctness: **Pass** (all assertions correct), **Partial Pass** (some assertions correct), and **Failure** (no assertions correct). Additionally, we compute the **Overall Pass Rate**, which quantifies the ratio of correct assertions to the total, reflecting the LLM's ability to reason about IR-level behaviors.

3.2. Datasets

To evaluate LLMs' ability to comprehend IRs, we build on prior work (Zheng et al., 2023; Tan et al., 2024) and use the widely recognized **HumanEval** benchmark. Developed by OpenAI, HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021) is designed to assess multilingual code generation and consists of 164 carefully handcrafted programming challenges. Each challenge contains a function signature, a natural language description, a function body, and an average of 7.7 assertion statements per challenge. In our experiments, these 164 C++ programs serve as the source code for generating IRs to be analyzed.

3.3. Prompt Design

Effective prompt design is crucial for optimizing LLM performance (Liu et al., 2022). Traditional single-turn prompts, which combine role instructions and task descriptions into a single input, often lack clarity and fail to provide structured guidance. Recent studies (Liu et al., 2023; Park et al., 2023) show that LLMs perform more effectively when treated as *expert agents* with detailed, domain-specific instructions.

To improve response accuracy, we adopt an Expert Meta-Template Prompt:

Frompt

You are an expert in [relevant field]. Input Data: [IR snippet or relevant context] Task: [Description of tasks] Output Format: [Structured format expectations]

This template ensures that LLMs receive explicit role definitions, domain knowledge, task specifications, and output formatting requirements, enabling more precise responses.

Table 1. LLM performance in CFG construction.

I I Me	Task	Node	Full	Partial Accu.			
	Comp.	Acc.	Accu.	Loop	Condition		
GPT-4	164	50	39	9	2		
GPT-3	133	18	14	3	1		
Gemma 2	98	18	16	2	0		
LLaMA 3.1	76	17	15	2	0		
Code Llama	67	0	0	0	0		

For each experiment (Tasks 1–4), we iteratively refine prompts using strategies such as few-shot learning and chainof-thought (CoT) prompting (Wei et al., 2022), evaluating multiple versions to maximize accuracy and relevance.

4. Experimental Results and Analysis

We evaluate the performance of LLMs across four core IR-related tasks: CFG construction, decompilation, code summarization, and execution reasoning, assessing their effectiveness without fine-tuning. This section presents quantitative results and key observations. We categorized tasks based on their completion status: **Task Completed**, where the model successfully produced an output, and **Task Failed**, where it encountered a hang or crash, primarily due to the IR length exceeding the LLM's context window.

4.1. CFG Reconstruction (Task 1)

Table 1 presents the number of applications successfully processed by each LLM in Task 1, highlighting significant challenges in CFG reconstruction. GPT-4 is the only model to complete all 164 applications, whereas GPT-3 and Gemma 2 complete 133 and 98, respectively. LLaMA 3.1 and Code Llama perform the worst, with only 76 and 67 completed applications. These differences likely stem from token limitations, suggesting the need for expanded context windows or token-efficient IR representations.

In terms of accuracy, GPT-4 outperforms all other models, achieving full CFG accuracy in 39 applications, while GPT-3, Gemma 2, and LLaMA 3.1 achieve only 14, 16, and 15, respectively. Code Llama fails to produce a single fully accurate CFG, despite being code-focused, highlighting its struggles with control flow reconstruction. These results underscore a clear gap in LLMs' ability to comprehend and construct CFGs, emphasizing the need for stronger structural reasoning in IR processing.

Finding 1: LLMs struggle with accurately identifying basic blocks and constructing control flow edges.

Despite their ability to process IRs, LLMs face significant challenges in basic block recognition and loop structure reconstruction, both essential for CFG construction. As shown in Table 1, node construction errors remain high across all



Figure 2. Density metrics comparing Complete CFG Accuracy vs. Node Construction Error.

models, with GPT-4 at 114 errors, GPT-3 and Gemma 2 exceeding 100 errors, and LLaMA 3.1 and Code Llama at 60 and 40 errors, respectively. These errors stem from misinterpreted instruction boundaries, leading to incorrect basic block formation and disrupted CFGs.

LLMs also struggle with control flow edge construction, particularly in loops and conditional branches. Even GPT-4 reconstructs only 9 out of 125 loop edges and 2 conditional branches, while other models perform worse, often failing to recognize branching behavior. Code Llama's complete failure to produce an accurate CFG underscores LLMs' limited structural reasoning. These findings highlight the need for improved control flow reasoning, particularly in instruction grouping, edge formation, and loop handling, to enhance CFG reconstruction.

Finding 2: LLMs' performance varies by CFG density, guiding model selection.

Although LLMs generally struggle with CFG reconstruction, their success or failure varies by graph density. Upon further analysis, we observe that the applications in these groups are distinguished by their graph density metrics, suggesting that CFG density influences which model can successfully or unsuccessfully construct them.

Graph Density Graph density measures the proportion of present edges to the maximum possible edges in a graph. For directed graphs, it is calculated as:

$$Density = \frac{Number of Edges}{n \times (n-1)}$$
(1)

where n is the number of nodes.

Fig. 2 compares Complete CFG Accuracy (blue bars) and Node Construction Error (orange bars) across LLMs. The x-axis represents the combinations of LLMs with identical results for the same set of applications (e.g., "GPT-4 only" refers to applications where only GPT-4 succeeded, while "GPT-4 \times Gemma 2" refers to applications where GPT-4 and Gemma 2 produced identical results). The y-

Table 2. The number of applications in each category for different LLMs in decompilation tasks, including task completion, reexecution, and success across optimization levels (O0–O3).

LLMs	Task Completed			Task Completed Re-execution Completed			Re-e	executi	on Suc	cess		
Opts	-00	-01	-02	-03	-00	-01	-02	-03	-00	-01	-02	-O3
GPT-4	161	164	164	164	34	34	38	32	15	12	10	14
GPT-3	95	145	144	133	2	7	7	4	2	4	4	0
Gemma 2	72	100	100	98	0	12	16	9	0	7	6	6
LLaMA 3.1	72	97	96	77	0	24	26	23	0	15	15	14
Code Llama	65	88	83	120	14	16	21	19	4	6	6	4

axis represents CFG density, with error bars illustrate the density range for each category. The distinct density patterns between correctly constructed CFGs and those with node construction errors highlight the role of CFG density in LLM performance.

This suggests that analyzing density can guide model selection for CFG tasks, increasing the likelihood of correctly reconstructing a complete CFG by choosing models suited for specific density characteristics. For example:

Denser CFGs (0.11): GPT-4 or Gemma 2 are recommended, as both successfully completed the tasks at this density, while LLaMA 3.1 often fails.

Denser CFGs (0.02) LLaMA 3.1 is the better option, as it handled these tasks successfully, while GPT-4 and Gemma 2 struggle.

4.2. IR Decompilation (Task 2)

This task evaluates LLMs' ability to decompile IR into C++ by comparing generated code with the original source. We assess re-executability (Tan et al., 2024; Armengol-Estapé et al., 2024; Wong et al., 2023), ensuring correctness via assertion-based checks. Key metrics include task completion, re-execution success, and failure rates.

Table 2 shows that most failures occur at O0, where GPT-4 has the fewest failures (3), while Code Llama struggles (99 failures). This is due to O0 generating the longest IRs, exceeding the context windows of many models.

It is interesting to see that re-execution success is highest at O1 and O2, despite similar IR lengths at O1–O3. This is likely because O1 and O2 retain structured control flow, while O3 applies aggressive optimizations (e.g., loop unrolling, instruction reordering) that obscure execution logic, reducing LLM accuracy. Overall, O1 and O2 provide the best balance between optimization and interpretability, leading to more reliable decompilation outcomes.

Finding 3: LLMs occasionally skip parts of the IR, deviating from traditional decompilers.

In several tasks, LLMs omit portions of the IR during decompilation, such as entire if statements within loops, leading to incomplete or simplified outputs. This suggests that LLMs do not strictly follow traditional decompilation methods but instead reconstruct code by recognizing patterns and inferring missing details. Due to their limited ability to process fine-grained IR semantics, LLMs often guess loop behavior, resulting in missing control flow elements. A similar issue is observed in the other two tasks: Code Summarization (Section 4.3) and Execution Reasoning task (Section 4.4), where LLMs struggle to fully capture execution semantics, further reinforcing the need for more structured IR comprehension. Figure 3 (Appendix D.1) shows a re-execution mismatch from GPT-4.

Overall, these omissions confirm that LLMs do not always follow a strict decompilation pipeline. Instead, they generate code that is *syntactically valid* but may simplify or skip certain IR instructions, reflecting a more heuristic approach to IR reconstruction.

4.3. Code Summarization (Task 3)

To assess LLMs' ability to capture the broader semantics of IRs, we prompt them to generate natural language descriptions of code snippets derived from IRs. This task evaluates how well LLMs understand and articulate the purpose, functionality, inputs, and outputs of the code. The generated summaries are compared against predefined golden summaries using similarity metrics such as BLEU and ROUGE. Higher similarity scores indicate a stronger grasp of IR semantics, reflecting the LLMs' ability to infer and convey meaningful program behavior.

Table 3 shows the summarization performance of LLMs across BLEU, ROUGE-L, and METEOR metrics. GPT-4 outperforms the others in task completion, successfully completing all 164 tasks, while GPT-3, Gemma 2, LLaMA 3.1, and Code Llama fail 31, 76, 83, and 41 tasks, respectively. High-quality summaries (scores above 0.8) are rare, with each model achieving just one BLEU score above 0.8. However, GPT-4 leads in ROUGE-L with 9 high-quality summaries, followed by LLaMA 3.1 (5), Gemma 2 (4), and GPT-3 and Code Llama (1 each). GPT-4 also excels in ME-TEOR with 21 high-quality summaries, while LLaMA 3.1, Gemma 2, GPT-3, and Code Llama have 11, 7, and 1 each, respectively. These results highlight GPT-4's advantage in capturing and summarizing code semantics. In terms of average scores, LLaMA 3.1 leads in BLEU (0.39), followed by GPT-4 and Gemma 2 (both 0.35). LLaMA 3.1 also leads in ROUGE-L (0.61), followed by GPT-4 (0.56), Gemma 2 (0.52), GPT-3 (0.47), and Code Llama (0.43). In METEOR, LLaMA 3.1 scores the highest (0.67), followed by GPT-4 and Gemma 2 (0.63 each). GPT-3 and Code Llama trail with 0.56 and 0.55, respectively, indicating weaker performance in summarizing code semantics.

Table 3. Performance comparison of LLMs in the code summarization task, including task completion and evaluation scores (BLEU, ROUGE-L, METEOR).

LIMe	Task	High-(Quality (S	core > 0.8)		Avg. Sco	res
LLIVIS	Comp.	BLEU	ROUGE	METEOR	BLEU	ROUGE	METEOR
GPT-4	164	1	9	21	0.35	0.56	0.63
GPT-3	131	1	1	1	0.24	0.47	0.56
Gemma 2	88	1	4	7	0.35	0.52	0.63
LLaMA 3.1	81	1	5	11	0.39	0.61	0.67
Code Llama	123	1	1	1	0.25	0.43	0.55

Table 4. Execution reasoning performance of LLMs across IRs and Source Code (SC). Pass rates are calculated based on the number of completed tasks.

I I Me	Task Comp.		Pass		Partial Pass		Pass Rate	
	IRs	SC	IRs	SC	IRs	SC	IRs	SC
GPT-4	164	164	59	118	102	44	0.36	0.72
GPT-3	164	164	7	26	113	135	0.04	0.158
Gemma 2	164	164	32	100	132	63	0.195	0.610
LLaMA 3.1	164	164	31	119	114	35	0.189	0.73
Code Llama	163	164	44	131	119	33	0.270	0.80

Finding 4: LLMs can capture function signatures and input-output relationships but fail to retain full semantic details.

Our results show that LLMs accurately identify the number of functions, inputs, and outputs, as well as extract basic function structures, input types, and arithmetic operations. However, their summaries often omit critical semantic details, such as iteration logic and conditional dependencies. This suggests that LLMs generate descriptions based on high-level patterns rather than truly reconstructing the underlying semantics. A detailed case study is provided in Appendix D.2.

4.4. Execution Reasoning (Task 4)

We prompt LLMs to simulate execution using assertion statements from the HumanEval benchmark, generating detailed execution logs to assess whether they correctly follow inputdriven control flow and produce expected outputs. To further investigate their reasoning abilities, we extend this task to a counterfactual study, comparing execution behavior on IRs and their corresponding source code (C++). Execution reasoning requires models to track variable evolution, manage control flow transitions, and handle memory operations, testing their ability to infer program behavior accurately.

Table 4 summarizes execution simulation results across LLMs for both IRs and source code. All models successfully complete the execution tasks, except for Code Llama, which fails in only one IR-based case. Unlike failures in other tasks caused by token limitations, this suggests that code reasoning processes IR incrementally, interpreting execution step by step rather than consuming the entire IR at once. This distinction highlights a different way LLMs interact with IRs in execution reasoning compared to structural and syntactic tasks.

Pass rates in Table 4 indicate a significant performance gap between source code and IRs, with LLMs performing better on high-level source code. GPT-4 leads in IR execution, achieving 59 successful cases, while Code Llama demonstrates the highest pass rate on source code with 131 passes. Notably, Code Llama's strong performance on source code suggests that code-specific training enhances LLMs' understanding of programming languages. This implies that if we aim to improve LLMs' comprehension of IR, IR-specific training may be necessary to bridge the gap between sourcelevel and IR-level reasoning.

In this task, we also observe that LLMs struggle with complex control flows, leading to inconsistencies between IR and source code execution, which is consistent to Finding 2. While LLMs correctly predict execution results for simple control flows, assertion failures increase with more iterations or interdependencies. For instance, in "CPP_93," an encoding function to replaces all vowels is tested with:

assert (encode("TEST") == "tgst") (Pass)
assert (encode("I DoNt KnOw WhAt tO
WrItE") == "k dQnT kNqW wHcT Tq wRkTg")
(Fail)

The failure stems from the LLM skipping intermediate transformation steps, causing an incomplete encoding process.

Finding 5: LLMs approximate execution in large semantic steps rather than strictly following control flow.

Instead of interpreting IRs instruction by instruction, LLMs generate abstracted execution steps based on their understanding of function semantics. The reasoning logs reveal that LLMs typically break execution into 5-7 steps, including: function comprehension, input analysis, loading elements, performing operations, logical evaluation, assertion comparison, and final conclusions (detailed example in Section D.3). In each step, they attempt to summarize the semantic meaning of different parts rather than executing them in a sequential, instruction-level manner.

As discussed in Section 4.3, LLMs already struggle with semantic understanding, and their execution reasoning further reflects this limitation. The reasoning log provides deeper insights into how LLMs approximate rather than simulate execution, often relying on pattern recognition rather than faithfully following control dependencies.

Granularity Issues: While LLMs recognize high-level algorithms (e.g., sorting), they fail to apply rules consis-

tently—e.g., identifying a sorting algorithm but not realizing it only sorts odd numbers. LLMs sometimes omit execution steps, leading to assertion failures.

For example, in "CPP_149", which is

Function Description:

A function that accepts a vector of strings as a parameter deletes the strings that have odd lengths from it, and returns the resulting vector in sorted order.

However, the LLM skipped an "odd number removal" step, altering execution behavior. Here is a reasoning log snippet:

Step 3: Analyzing the LLVM IR code: - The LLVM IR code is complex and involves multiple operations, including comparisons, memory allocations, and calls to other functions. - Key parts of the code involve loading strings from the vector, comparing them, and potentially invoking sorting or filtering operations.

This suggests that LLMs need a more structured approach to execution reasoning, focusing on fine-grained step tracking instead of high-level approximations. Overcoming this limitation may involve fine-tuning on execution traces, using explicit reasoning prompts, or incorporating reinforcementbased feedback to improve control flow reasoning.

Finding 6: LLMs exhibit lower confidence in IR execution compared to source code, leading them to rely on pattern-based inference rather than explicit reasoning.

Unlike source code, IRs lack explicit variable names and high-level semantics, making execution reasoning more ambiguous. When LLMs encounter uncertainties in IR execution, instead of acknowledging gaps in understanding, they often default to heuristic strategies, such as inferring behavior from function names or patterns in assertions. This guesswork approach frequently results in incorrect outputs, as LLMs prioritize familiar structures over accurate execution semantics. We have observed 35 cases out of 164 in GPT-4 that guess based function names or result patterns. There is one case detailed in Appendix D.3.2.

The lack of explicit uncertainty handling highlights a fundamental limitation in their IR comprehension, further reinforcing the need for IR-specific training to improve execution reasoning. LLMs compensate by:

• Guessing semantics based on function names rather than

pure execution logic. For example, in "CPP_120", LLM might assume that a function named maximum sorts a vector and selects the largest k elements based solely on its name. While a naive LLM can recognize syntax patterns, it fails at step-by-step execution reasoning, which is necessary for accurately understanding the function's intent.

• Leaning on assertion results to infer missing information rather than deducing behavior strictly from IR operations. In "CPP_109", where the function move_one_ball determines whether a vector can be sorted through any number of right shifts, the model should simulate the IR operations to validate correctness. However, instead of reasoning through the shifting process, LLMs make conclusions "pass" based on the expected behavior of the function.

Summary Our evaluation reveals significant challenges in LLMs' capacity to handle IRs, particularly in control flow reasoning, execution semantics, and loop analysis. One key issue is token limitations, which become more severe for IRs than for natural language or source code, as IRs contain longer sequences with more tokens per function. This exacerbates the difficulty of processing structural dependencies and capturing execution semantics.

Even within the constraints of token length, LLMs struggle with tasks requiring control flow graph reconstruction, execution behavior inference, and iteration analysis. While they can effectively identify syntactic patterns and highlevel structures, their performance drops significantly when deeper reasoning is required. Among the evaluated models, GPT-4 consistently outperforms the others, aligning with its demonstrated proficiency in source code comprehension, as explored in (Ma et al., 2023).

Addressing these limitations requires targeted improvements in three areas:

- Control Flow Comprehension: LLMs frequently misinterpret branching and loop structures, leading to inaccuracies in CFG reconstruction. Enhancing their ability to track execution paths could improve structural reasoning.
- Granular Semantic Understanding: These models rely heavily on heuristics when reasoning about IRs, often skipping fine-grained execution details. Future study should focus on refining instruction-level comprehension.
- *Loop Reasoning*: The inability to accurately predict loop behavior and termination conditions remains a significant challenge. A deeper understanding of iterative constructs is necessary to enhance execution reasoning capabilities.

These findings suggest that improving control flow awareness, refining multi-level semantic analysis, and strengthening loop handling mechanisms could significantly enhance LLMs' effectiveness in IR-related tasks.

5. Related Work

LLMs for High-level Programming Languages Recent advancements in LLMs for NLP have extended to code understanding, enabling models to comprehend high-level languages like Python, C++, and Java. Models such as GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020), GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023), LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023), and Claude 3 (Anthropic, 2024) excel at tasks like code generation, translating natural language into executable code. Specialized models, including Star-Coder (Li et al., 2023), Code Llama (Rozière et al., 2024), and Code Gemma (Team, 2024), enhance these capabilities, tackling more complex coding tasks and driving advances in software engineering applications (Zhao et al., 2023).

IR Representation Learning IR representation learning integrates structural and flow-based features, such as token sequences (Peng et al., 2021), control flow graphs (CFGs)(VenkataKeerthy et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2020), and control-data flow graphs (CDFGs)(Ben-Nun et al., 2018; Brauckmann et al., 2020; Cummins et al., 2021). In terms of model architectures, graph neural networks (GNNs) have been widely used to encode the structures of CFGs and CDFGs via message-passing techniques (Brauckmann et al., 2020; Cummins et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2020). Other approaches include skip-gram embeddings, such as inst2vec (Ben-Nun et al., 2018), and relation-based embeddings, like TransE (Bordes et al., 2013), which are trained on CDFGs and CFGs to produce instruction-level embeddings. However, these models lack task-agnostic pre-trained embeddings, limiting their ability to capture essential contextual information for downstream tasks. Approaches like IR2Vec (VenkataKeerthy et al., 2020) address this limitation by introducing hierarchical vector representations that enhance the semantic understanding of IRs. Meta's LLM Compiler (Cummins et al., 2024) aligns with these efforts, offering pre-trained models for code optimization tasks. While previous work has explored IR representation for code optimization, no study has systematically examined how LLMs understand IR syntax, CFGs, execution behavior, and semantics. This study provides the first empirical evaluation of LLMs' IR comprehension across these dimensions.

6. Conclusion and Future Work

This study evaluates LLMs' ability to comprehend various aspects of IRs, focusing on structural analysis, syntax, semantics, and execution reasoning. Our findings reveal that while LLMs effectively recognize static IR features and basic control flow structures, they struggle with more complex constructs such as loop reasoning and execution simulation. Specifically, LLMs often fail to reconstruct precise control dependencies, omit key instructions during decompilation, and approximate execution in broad semantic steps rather than following instruction-level behavior. Despite these limitations, LLMs exhibit strong performance in source-code-level tasks, highlighting the effectiveness of code-specific pretraining. This suggests that enhancing LLMs with IR-specific training, incorporating control-flowsensitive modeling, and refining token-efficient IR representations could significantly improve their accuracy in handling IR-based tasks.

Future work should explore techniques for better control flow awareness, multi-granularity semantic understanding, and robust loop handling mechanisms. Additionally, finetuning LLMs on IR-annotated datasets or integrating graphbased neural representations may further enhance their capacity for structural and execution reasoning, bridging the gap between source code comprehension and IR analysis.

Impact Statement

This work explores the capabilities of LLMs in understanding IRs, contributing to advancements in code understanding, optimization, and automated reasoning. While this research primarily aims to enhance machine learning for software analysis, potential societal impacts include both improvements in software reliability and risks related to automated program manipulation. We encourage further exploration of ethical safeguards in applying LLMs to securitycritical software tasks.

Despite these insights, several limitations should be considered. First, our study relies on a limited set of LLMs and focuses primarily on HumanEval-derived IRs, which may not fully represent the diversity of real-world IR structures. Additionally, while we employ expert meta-prompts, we do not explore the full spectrum of advanced prompting techniques, which could impact model performance. Furthermore, we highlight critical challenges in IR comprehension but do not propose solutions, such as IR-specific fine-tuning or dataset augmentation, which could improve LLM capabilities. Future research should expand evaluations to broader datasets, incorporate newer LLMs, and investigate targeted fine-tuning strategies to enhance LLMs' understanding of IRs in both static and dynamic contexts.

References

- Andriesse, D., Chen, X., Van Der Veen, V., Slowinska, A., and Bos, H. An {In-Depth} analysis of disassembly on {Full-Scale} x86/x64 binaries. In 25th USENIX security symposium (USENIX security 16), pp. 583–600, 2016.
- Anju, S., Harmya, P., Jagadeesh, N., and Darsana, R. Malware detection using assembly code and control flow graph optimization. In *Proceedings of the 1st Amrita ACM-W Celebration on Women in Computing in India*, pp. 1–4. 2010.

- Anthropic. Claude 3 model, 2024. Available at https: //www.anthropic.com/product.
- Armengol-Estapé, J., Woodruff, J., Cummins, C., and O'Boyle, M. F. Slade: A portable small language model decompiler for optimized assembly. In 2024 IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO), pp. 67–80. IEEE, 2024.
- Ben-Nun, T., Jakobovits, A. S., and Hoefler, T. Neural code comprehension: A learnable representation of code semantics. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Bordes, A., Usunier, N., Garcia-Duran, A., Weston, J., and Yakhnenko, O. Translating embeddings for modeling multi-relational data. *Advances in neural information* processing systems, 26, 2013.
- Brauckmann, A., Goens, A., Ertel, S., and Castrillon, J. Compiler-based graph representations for deep learning models of code. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Compiler Construction*, pp. 201– 211, 2020.
- 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., and Amodei, D. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020.
- Brumley, D., Lee, J., Schwartz, E. J., and Woo, M. Native x86 decompilation using {Semantics-Preserving} structural analysis and iterative {Control-Flow} structuring. In 22nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 13), pp. 353–368, 2013.
- 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.
- Chow, F. Intermediate representation: The increasing significance of intermediate representations in compilers. *Queue*, 11(10):30–37, 2013.
- Church, K. W. Word2vec. *Natural Language Engineering*, 23(1):155–162, 2017.
- Collyer, J., Watson, T., and Phillips, I. Faser: Binary code similarity search through the use of intermediate representations. arXiv.org, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arxiv.2310.03605.

- Cummins, C., Fisches, Z. V., Ben-Nun, T., Hoefler, T., O'Boyle, M. F., and Leather, H. Programl: A graphbased program representation for data flow analysis and compiler optimizations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 2244–2253. PMLR, 2021.
- Cummins, C., Seeker, V., Grubisic, D., Roziere, B., Gehring, J., Synnaeve, G., and Leather, H. Meta large language model compiler: Foundation models of compiler optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.02524, 2024.
- Denkowski, M. and Lavie, A. Meteor universal: Language specific translation evaluation for any target language. In *Proceedings of the ninth workshop on statistical machine translation*, pp. 376–380, 2014.
- Deshpande, R., Chen, J., and Lee, I. Rect: A recursive transformer architecture for generalizable mathematical reasoning. In *NeSy*, pp. 165–175, 2021.
- Devlin, J. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., and Toutanova, K. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805, 2018.
- Fechete, R., Kienesberger, G., and Blieberger, J. A framework for cfg-based static program analysis of ada programs. In *Reliable Software Technologies–Ada-Europe* 2008: 13th Ada-Europe International Conference on Reliable Software Technologies, Venice, Italy, June 16-20, 2008. Proceedings 13, pp. 130–143. Springer, 2008.
- Feng, Z., Guo, D., Tang, D., Duan, N., Feng, X., Gong, M., Shou, L., Qin, B., Liu, T., Jiang, D., et al. Codebert: A pre-trained model for programming and natural languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08155*, 2020.
- Guo, D., Ren, S., Lu, S., Feng, Z., Tang, D., Liu, S., Zhou, L., Duan, N., Svyatkovskiy, A., Fu, S., et al. Graphcodebert: Pre-training code representations with data flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.08366*, 2020.
- Guo, D., Lu, S., Duan, N., Wang, Y., Zhou, M., and Yin, J. Unixcoder: Unified cross-modal pre-training for code representation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.03850, 2022.
- Guo, D., Zhu, Q., Yang, D., Xie, Z., Dong, K., Zhang, W., Chen, G., Bi, X., Wu, Y., Li, Y., et al. Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming-the rise of code intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196*, 2024.
- Haldar, R. and Hockenmaier, J. Analyzing the performance of large language models on code summarization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.08018, 2024.

- Han, X., Zhang, Z., Ding, N., Gu, Y., Liu, X., Huo, Y., Qiu, J., Yao, Y., Zhang, A., Zhang, L., et al. Pre-trained models: Past, present and future. *AI Open*, 2:225–250, 2021.
- Hu, P., Liang, R., and Chen, K. Degpt: Optimizing decompiler output with llm. In Proceedings 2024 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (2024). https://api. semanticscholar. org/CorpusID, volume 267622140, 2024.
- Jiang, H., Zhu, J., Fang, B., Barker, K., Chen, C., Jin, R., and Guan, Q. Happa: A modular platform for hpc application resilience analysis with llms embedded. In 2024 43rd International Symposium on Reliable Distributed Systems (SRDS), pp. 40–51. IEEE, 2024a.
- Jiang, H., Zhu, J., Fang, B., Chen, C., and Guan, Q. Investigating resilience of loops in hpc programs: A semantic approach with llms. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual IEEE High Performance Extreme Computing Virtual Conference (HPEC)*. IEEE, September 2024b.
- Jiang, N., Wang, C., Liu, K., Xu, X., Tan, L., and Zhang, X. Nova ⁺: Generative language models for binaries. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13721, 2023.
- Lattner, C. and Adve, V. LLVM: a compilation framework for lifelong program analysis & transformation. In *CGO*, CGO '04, 2004.
- Li, R., Allal, L. B., Zi, Y., Muennighoff, N., Kocetkov, D., Mou, C., Marone, M., Akiki, C., Li, J., Chim, J., et al. Starcoder: may the source be with you! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06161*, 2023.
- Li, Z., Zou, D., Xu, S., Ou, X., Jin, H., Wang, S., Deng, Z., and Zhong, Y. Vuldeepecker: A deep learningbased system for vulnerability detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.01681*, 2018.
- Lin, C.-Y. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pp. 74–81, 2004.
- Liu, P., Yuan, W., Fu, J., Jiang, Z., Hayashi, H., and Neubig, G. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *ACM Computing Surveys*, September 2022. URL https: //arxiv.org/abs/2107.13586.
- Liu, P., Yuan, W., Fu, J., Jiang, Z., Hayashi, H., and Neubig, G. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. ACM Computing Surveys, 55(9):1–35, 2023.

- Ma, W., Liu, S., Zhao, M., Xie, X., Wang, W., Hu, Q., Zhang, J., and Liu, Y. Unveiling code pre-trained models: Investigating syntax and semantics capacities. ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology.
- Ma, W., Liu, S., Lin, Z., Wang, W., Hu, Q., Liu, Y., Zhang, C., Nie, L., Li, L., and Liu, Y. Lms: Understanding code syntax and semantics for code analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12138*, 2023.
- Mao, J., Tang, Z., and Rao, W. Cross-language binarysource code matching based on rust and intermediate representation, 2023.
- McConnell, C. D. Tree-based code optimization. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1993.
- Mikolov, T. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*, 2013.
- Min, M. J., Ding, Y., Buratti, L., Pujar, S., Kaiser, G., Jana, S., and Ray, B. Beyond accuracy: Evaluating selfconsistency of code large language models with identitychain. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14053, 2023.
- Niu, C., Li, C., Ng, V., Lo, D., and Luo, B. Fair: Flow type-aware pre-training of compiler intermediate representations. In *Proceedings of the 46th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering*, pp. 1–12, 2024.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023. URL https://
 openai.com/research/gpt-4.
- Pang, C., Yu, R., Chen, Y., Koskinen, E., Portokalidis, G., Mao, B., and Xu, J. Sok: All you ever wanted to know about x86/x64 binary disassembly but were afraid to ask. In 2021 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP), pp. 833–851. IEEE, 2021.
- Papineni, K., Roukos, S., Ward, T., and Zhu, W.-J. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 311–318, 2002.
- Park, J. S., O'Brien, J., Cai, C. J., Morris, M. R., Liang, P., and Bernstein, M. S. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th annual acm symposium on user interface software and technology*, pp. 1–22, 2023.
- Paul, I., Luo, J., Glavas, G., and Gurevych, I. Ircoder: Intermediate representations make language models robust multilingual code generators. *arXiv.org*, 2024. doi: 10.48550/arxiv.2403.03894.

- Peng, D., Zheng, S., Li, Y., Ke, G., He, D., and Liu, T.-Y. How could neural networks understand programs? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 8476–8486. PMLR, 2021.
- Pennington, J., Socher, R., and Manning, C. D. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings* of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP), pp. 1532–1543, 2014.
- Qiu, X., Sun, T., Xu, Y., Shao, Y., Dai, N., and Huang, X. Pre-trained models for natural language processing: A survey. *Science China technological sciences*, 63(10): 1872–1897, 2020.
- Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., Sutskever, I., et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.
- Reissmann, N., Meyer, J. C., Bahmann, H., and Själander, M. Rvsdg: An intermediate representation for optimizing compilers. ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems (TECS), 19(6):1–28, 2020.
- 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., and Synnaeve, G. Code Ilama: Open foundation models for code, 2024. URL https:// arxiv.org/abs/2308.12950.
- Sbîrlea, A., Shirako, J., Pouchet, L.-N., and Sarkar, V. Polyhedral optimizations for a data-flow graph language. In *International Workshop on Languages and Compilers for Parallel Computing*, pp. 57–72. Springer, 2015.
- Shoshitaishvili, Y., Wang, R., Salls, C., Stephens, N., Polino, M., Dutcher, A., Grosen, J., Feng, S., Hauser, C., Kruegel, C., et al. Sok:(state of) the art of war: Offensive techniques in binary analysis. In 2016 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP), pp. 138–157. IEEE, 2016.
- Sun, W., Miao, Y., Li, Y., Zhang, H., Fang, C., Liu, Y., Deng, G., Liu, Y., and Chen, Z. Source code summarization in the era of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07959*, 2024.
- Tan, H., Luo, Q., Li, J., and Zhang, Y. Llm4decompile: Decompiling binary code with large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05286, 2024.
- Team, C. Codegemma: Open code models based on gemma. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11409, 2024.

- Team, G., Riviere, M., Pathak, S., Sessa, P. G., Hardin, C., Bhupatiraju, S., Hussenot, L., Mesnard, T., Shahriari, B., Ramé, A., et al. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size. arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00118, 2024.
- Touvron, H., Lavril, T., Izacard, G., Martinet, X., Lachaux, M.-A., Lacroix, T., Roziere, B., Goyal, N., Hambro, E., Azhar, F., Rodriguez, A., Joulin, A., Grave, E., Lample, G., and Jegou, H. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971, 2023.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł., and Polosukhin, I. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information* processing systems, 30, 2017.
- VenkataKeerthy, S., Aggarwal, R., Jain, S., Desarkar, M. S., Upadrasta, R., and Srikant, Y. Ir2vec: Llvm ir based scalable program embeddings. ACM Transactions on Architecture and Code Optimization (TACO), 17(4):1–27, 2020.
- Wang, Y., Wang, W., Joty, S., and Hoi, S. C. Codet5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00859*, 2021.
- Webb, B. J., Utting, M., and Hayes, I. J. A formal semantics of the graalvm intermediate representation. In *International Symposium on Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis*, pp. 111–126. Springer, 2021.
- Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q. V., Zhou, D., et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- Wong, W. K., Wang, H., Li, Z., Liu, Z., Wang, S., Tang, Q., Nie, S., and Wu, S. Refining decompiled c code with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06530*, 2023.
- Wu, Z., Qiu, L., Ross, A., Akyürek, E., Chen, B., Wang, B., Kim, N., Andreas, J., and Kim, Y. Reasoning or reciting? exploring the capabilities and limitations of language models through counterfactual tasks. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2307.02477, 2023.
- Yu, Z., Zheng, W., Wang, J., Tang, Q., Nie, S., and Wu, S. Codecmr: Cross-modal retrieval for function-level binary source code matching. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:3872–3883, 2020.

- Yuan, D., Fang, S., Zhang, T., Xu, Z., and Luo, X. Java code clone detection by exploiting semantic and syntax information from intermediate code-based graph. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability*, 2023. doi: 10.1109/TR.2022. 3176922.
- Zhang, J., Wang, X., Zhang, H., Sun, H., Liu, X., Hu, C., and Liu, Y. Detecting condition-related bugs with control flow graph neural network. In *Proceedings of the 32nd* ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis, pp. 1370–1382, 2023.
- Zhao, W. X., Zhou, K., Li, J., Tang, T., Wang, X., Hou, Y., Min, Y., Zhang, B., Zhang, J., Dong, Z., et al. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*, 2023.
- Zheng, Q., Xia, X., Zou, X., Dong, Y., Wang, S., Xue, Y., Wang, Z., Shen, L., Wang, A., Li, Y., Su, T., Yang, Z., and Tang, J. Codegeex: A pre-trained model for code generation with multilingual benchmarking on humaneval-x. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pp. 5673–5684, 2023.
- Zhou, M., Chen, J., Liu, Y., Ackah-Arthur, H., Chen, S., Zhang, Q., and Zeng, Z. A method for software vulnerability detection based on improved control flow graph. *Wuhan University Journal of Natural Sciences*, 24(2): 149–160, 2019.
- Zhu, C., Wei, R., Chen, L., Wu, T., Du, G., and Shi, G. Vulnerability localization based on intermediate code representation and feature fusion. *The Computer Journal*, 2024. doi: 10.1093/comjnl/bxae041.

A. Comprehensive Related Work

LLMs for High-level Programming Languages The advancements in pre-trained LLMs for NLP have extended into code understanding, enabling models to comprehend high-level programming languages such as Python, C++, and Java. Models like GPT (Brown et al., 2020), GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023), LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023), and Claude 3 (Anthropic, 2024) have demonstrated strong capabilities in tasks such as code generation, where they translate natural language descriptions into executable source code. Specialized models, including StarCoder (Li et al., 2023), Code Llama (Rozière et al., 2024), DeepSeek-Coder (Guo et al., 2024), and Code Gemma (Team, 2024), further refine these capabilities, addressing complex coding tasks and advancing software engineering applications (Zhao et al., 2023).

Pre-trained LLMs have revolutionized NLP by learning versatile language representations from large-scale corpora, which can then be fine-tuned for specific downstream tasks (Qiu et al., 2020). Early models like Word2Vec (Mikolov, 2013) and GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014) captured basic word semantics but lacked deeper contextual understanding (Han et al., 2021). The advent of deep transformer-based models like GPT (Radford et al., 2019) and BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) introduced context-aware modeling, enhancing language comprehension (Vaswani et al., 2017).

These LLMs have been adapted to the programming domain, leading to specialized models such as CodeBERT (Feng et al., 2020), GraphCodeBERT (Guo et al., 2020), UnixCoder (Guo et al., 2022), and CodeT5 (Wang et al., 2021). These models integrate Transformer architectures to encode code semantics effectively. Enhancements such as data flow integration in GraphCodeBERT (Guo et al., 2020), multi-modal learning in UnixCoder (Guo et al., 2022), and encoder-decoder frameworks in CodeT5 (Wang et al., 2021) enable improved code comprehension and generation.

IR Representation Learning IR representation learning incorporates structural and flow-based features such as token sequences (Peng et al., 2021), control flow graphs (CFGs) (VenkataKeerthy et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2020), and control-data flow graphs (CDFGs) (Ben-Nun et al., 2018; Brauckmann et al., 2020; Cummins et al., 2021).

For model architectures, graph neural networks (GNNs) have been widely employed to encode CFG and CDFG structures through message-passing techniques (Brauckmann et al., 2020; Cummins et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2020). Other strategies include skip-gram embeddings, such as inst2vec (Ben-Nun et al., 2018), and relation-based embeddings, such as TransE (Bordes et al., 2013), trained on CDFGs and CFGs to generate instruction-level embeddings. However, these models lack task-agnostic pre-trained embeddings, preventing them from capturing contextual information crucial for downstream tasks.

Approaches like IR2Vec (VenkataKeerthy et al., 2020) mitigate this issue by introducing hierarchical vector representations to improve semantic comprehension of IRs. Recent work, such as FAIR (Flow-aware Pre-trained Model) (Niu et al., 2024), further refines IR representations using Graph Transformers to reduce over-smoothing issues while incorporating pre-training tasks that explicitly capture IR token semantics and flow-type information. FAIR has achieved state-of-the-art performance across multiple code-related tasks, highlighting the increasing importance of pre-trained IR models.

Meta's LLM Compiler (Cummins et al., 2024) aligns with these efforts, offering pre-trained models for code optimization tasks. While prior work has explored IR representation learning for code optimization and analysis, no studies have systematically examined how LLMs comprehend IR syntax, CFG structures, execution behavior, and semantic relationships. Our study addresses this gap by providing the first empirical evaluation of LLMs' IR comprehension across these dimensions.

B. Prompts

B.1. Prompt for Structural Understanding: Inferring Control Flow from IRs (Task 1)

Prompt

You are a control flow graph analyzer for Intermediate Representations (IRs). I will provide you with LLVM Intermediate representation (IRs), a low-level, platform-independent representation of a program. Here is the IR code input: **[IR]** Your task is to generate the control flow graph from the IR. The output format should be a DOT file, including nodes and edges. You do not need to list the content of each basic block; show each node's title. Here is the IR code example to follow: **[IR Example]** The output of the control flow graph should exactly match the following format: **[CFG Example]**

B.2. Prompt for Syntactic Comprehension: Decompiling IRs to High-Level Code (Task 2)

Prom	n
	24

You are an expert in high-performance computation. I will provide you with LLVM IRs (Intermediate Representations), which is a low-level, platform-independent representation of a program.

Here is the IR code input: **[IR]**

Your task is to decompile this IR code into a pure C or C++ source code format that can be run directly.

Do not add any extra comments, explanations, or characters, and do not use any markdown formatting like "" or ""cpp.

B.3. Prompt for Semantic Comprehension: Generating Natural Language Descriptions from IRs (Task 3)

The final prompt used in the code summarization task is as follows:

Prompt

I will give you an IR code. Here is the IR code input: [IR]

I would like you to summarize the code according to the following specifications: 1. **Output Format**: - There are [n] functions in the code: - function[I (I in n)] takes [m] inputs: input1, input2, ..., inputm. - Function[I (I in n)] is [doing semantical function] on input1, input2, ..., inputm, and outputs [output].

2. **Type and Variable Name Mapping Rules**: - '% "class.std::vector"*' should be summarized as 'vector; float; numbers'. - Other IR-specific types should be mapped to their equivalent C++ types, following this pattern where possible.

3. **Strict Adherence to Formatting**: - The summary should strictly match the format provided below. - No additional comments, explanations, or deviations from the format should be added. - Do not use any markdown formatting such as "' or "'cpp.

Here is the IR code example to follow: **[IR Example]**

The output should exactly match the following format: [Output Example]

Important Instructions: - The summary must not include any additional comments, explanations, or formatting. - Ensure that variable names and types are directly transcribed as described in the example. - No markdown formatting (e.g., no "' or "'cpp) should be used. **Do not deviate from the specified format under any circumstances.**

B.4. Prompt for Execution Reasoning: Inferring Program Behavior (Task 4)

Prompt

I need your help to analyze whether a given assertion passes or fails based on the provided LLVM IR code for a function.

LLVM IR Code: **[IR]** Assertion Statement: **[Assertion]**

Please write down your thinking process, and list the pass/fail result of each assertion at the end. NOTE: Make sure the format the pass/fail result of each assertion at the end follow the example: **[Output Example]**

C. HumanEval Setups

Building on prior work (Zheng et al., 2023; Tan et al., 2024), we utilize widely recognized benchmarks, specifically HumanEval and its extended test case version, to evaluate the ability of five state-of-the-art LLMs to comprehend semantics and compare them against various golden baselines. HumanEval, introduced by OpenAI, is a benchmark designed to assess the multilingual capabilities of code-generative models. It comprises 164 carefully handwritten programming challenges, each featuring a function signature, a natural language (NL) description, a function body, and a set of unit tests, with an average of 7.7 assertion statements per challenge (Chen et al., 2021). In our experiments, these 164 C++ programs serve as the source code for IR analysis.

The compilation experiments were conducted on a Dell Workstation equipped with 32 Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPUs E5-2620 v4 @ 2.10GHz, running on an x86-64 architecture with a 64-bit system. For these experiments, we used Clang adapted for LLVM 13 on Ubuntu 18.04. The C++ source code were compiled into IRs (.bc files) using the following command:

clang++ -O{Opt-level} -emit-llvm {benchmark}.cpp -S -o {benchmark}.bc

We use LLVM's built-in passes to generate golden CFGs with the *-dot-cfg* option to ensure accurate and consistent representations of the code structure. The golden code summarization is meticulously performed to ensure that the generated graphs and code representations faithfully reflect the original source code's semantics. This process is critical for precise evaluations in subsequent tasks, such as static analysis, code summary analysis, and dynamic analysis. By employing these methodologies, we ensure that the golden datasets are of the highest fidelity, providing a solid foundation for assessing the granular understanding and representation of IRs by LLMs.



Figure 3. An example of Re-execution Mismatch from GPT-4

D. Cases of Findings

D.1. Example of decompilation

Figure 3 shows a re-execution mismatch from GPT-4. The original code searches for a value in the key object and increments out when not found. In contrast, the decompiled version checks only for matching characters in two strings, incrementing count instead. This discrepancy likely arises because GPT-4 loses context during loop reconstruction, leading to partial logic and a different outcome during re-execution.

D.2. Example of summarization

2

3

Figure 4 illustrates the LLVM Intermediate Representation (IR) of the truncate_number function, which extracts the decimal part of a floating-point number.

Table 5 presents the summarization of the Example IR generated by various LLMs, showing how each model interprets the function's behavior.

```
LLVM IR Source Code
    ; ModuleID = '../../Human_xBenchmarks_164/CPP_2/CPP_2.cpp'
    source_filename = "../../Human_xBenchmarks_164/CPP_2/CPP_2.cpp"
    target datalayout = "e-m:e-p270:32:32-p271:32:32-p272:64:64-i64:64-f80:128-n8
        :16:32:64-S128"
    target triple = "x86_64-unknown-linux-gnu"
    ; Function Attrs: mustprogress nofree norecurse nosync nounwind readnone
        uwtable willreturn
    define dso_local float @_Z15truncate_numberf(float %0) local_unnamed_addr #0 {
      %2 = fptosi float %0 to i32
      %3 = sitofp i32 %2 to float
      %4 = fsub float %0, %3
      ret float %4
    }
    attributes #0 = { mustprogress nofree norecurse nosync nounwind readnone
                       uwtable willreturn "frame-pointer"="none"
"min-legal-vector-width"="0" "no-trapping-math"="true"
                       "stack-protector-buffer-size"="8" "target-cpu"="x86-64"
                       "target-features"="+cx8,+fxsr,+mmx,+sse,+sse2,+x87"
                       "tune-cpu"="generic" }
    !llvm.module.flags = !{!0, !1}
    !llvm.ident = !{!2}
    !0 = !{i32 1, !"wchar_size", i32 4}
    !1 = !{i32 7, !"uwtable", i32 1}
    !2 = !{!"clang_version_13.0.0_(https://github.com/llvm/llvm-project.git_
        d7b669b3a30345cfcdb2fde2af6f48aa4b94845d) "}
```

Figure 4. An example of IR

Can Large Language Models Understand Intermediate Representations?

LLMs	Summarizing of Example IR
GPT-4	There is 1 function in the code, function[1] takes 1 input: float number. function[1] is truncating the float number to its integer part and outputs the fractional part as a float.
GPT-3	There is 1 function in the code, function[1] takes 1 input: float number. Function[1] is truncating the decimal part of the input number and outputs the truncated value.
Gemma 2	There is 1 function in the code: function[1] takes 1 input: float number. function[1] is truncating the fractional part of the input number on number, and outputs float.
LLaMA 3.1	There is 1 function in the code, function[1] takes 1 input: float number. function[1] is truncating the decimal part of the input number on number, and outputs the decimal part of the input number.
Code Llama	There is 1 function in the code, function[1] takes 2 inputs: vector; float; numbers, float threshold. function[1] is checking if any two elements in the vector are closer to each other than the given threshold on numbers, and outputs a boolean value indicating if such elements exist.

Table 5. Summarization of Example IR by Different LLMs

D.3. Example of execution reasoning

Fig. 5 presents the source code for execution reasoning. The IR code shown is the same as the one used for summarization in the previous section.

D.3.1. MISUNDERSTANDING ALGORITHM LOGIC (45 CASES)

Example (CPP_69):

assert (search({5, 5, 5, 5, 1}) == 1);

Expected behavior: The function should find the greatest integer with a frequency greater than or equal to its value. **LLM failure:** The model fails to track frequency accumulation and instead returns an incorrect value, misunderstanding how the search function should operate.

	Code from execution reasoning					
1 2 3 4 5	<pre>#include <stdio.h> #include <math.h> float truncate_number(float number) { return number - (int)number; }</math.h></stdio.h></pre>					

Figure 5. An example of source code C++

Can Large Language Models Understand Intermediate Representations?

Assertion Analysis				
assert (trunc	ate_number(3.5) == 0.5); \rightarrow Pass			
Step 1: Understanding the Function	 The function truncate_number takes a floating-point number as input. It uses int () to truncate the decimal part, returning the largest integer smaller than or equal to the input. The function then subtracts this integer value from the original number to obtain the decimal part. 			
Step 2: Analyzing the Input	 The assertion checks if truncate_number (3.5) equals 0.5. Let's evaluate: The integer part of 3.5 is 3 (int (3.5) returns 3). The decimal part is calculated as 3.5 - 3, which equals 0.5. 			
Step 3: Comparing with the Assertion	- The assertion checks if truncate_number(3.5) == 0.5. - Since we calculated that truncate_number(3.5) returns 0.5, the assertion evaluates to true.			
Step 4: Conclusion	 The assertion passes because the expected value (0.5) matches the actual output of the function (0.5). ✓ **Assertion Result: Pass** 			

Table 6. An example of Execution Reasoning Result of the IR Example from GPT-4

D.3.2. PATTERN-BASED GUESSING (35 CASES)

Example (CPP_121) as shown in Fig. 8:

assert (solutions({5, 8, 7, 1}) == 12);

Expected behavior: Sum all odd elements at even positions.

LLM failure: Instead of following the logic step-by-step, the model guesses the sum based on pattern recognition from prior examples rather than executing the correct loop iteration.

D.3.3. CONTROL FLOW ISSUES (28 CASES)

Example (CPP_92):

assert (any_int(2.5, 2, 3) == false);

Expected behavior: The function should correctly handle nested conditionals to determine if any sum of two numbers equals the third.

LLM failure: The model does not properly evaluate the if-else branching and incorrectly processes non-integer values.

D.3.4. OVERRELIANCE ON FUNCTION NAMES (22 CASES)

Example (CPP_105):

```
assert (issame(by_length({2, 1, 1, 4, 5, 8, 2, 3}) ,
{"Eight", "Five", "Four", "Three", "Two", "Two", "One", "One"}));
```

Expected behavior: Sort numbers, reverse the list, and replace them with corresponding word representations. **LLM failure:** Instead of applying the transformation rules, the model simply assumes the function operates based on its name and produces an incorrect output.

D.3.5. STRING PROCESSING ERRORS (18 CASES)

Example (CPP_112):

Assertion Analysis				
assert (truncate_number(3.5) == 0.5); \rightarrow Pass				
Analysis of the Provided C/C++ Code	The function truncate_number takes a floating-point number as input and returns the decimal part.It uses int() to truncate the decimal part, effectively rounding down to the nearest integer.The decimal part is obtained by subtracting the truncated integer from the original number.			
Step-by-Step Breakdown	 The input number is passed to the function. The int (number) expression truncates the decimal part, effectively rounding it down. The truncated integer is subtracted from the original number, leaving only the decimal portion. The decimal part is returned as the result. 			
Analysis of the Assertion Statement	<pre>The assertion statement verifies whether truncate_number(3.5) correctly returns 0.5 The assertion checks if truncate_number(3.5) == 0.5 Let's evaluate: - The integer part of 3.5 is 3 (int (3.5) returns 3) The decimal part is calculated as 3.5 - 3, which equals 0.5.</pre>			
Final Result	 The assertion passes because the expected value (0.5) matches the actual output of the function (0.5). ✓ **Assertion Result: Pass** 			

Table 7. An example of Execution Reasoning Result of the C++ Example from GPT-4

```
assert (issame(reverse_delete("abcde", "ae") , {"bcd", "False"}));
```

Expected behavior: Remove characters and check for palindromicity.

LLM failure: The model fails to correctly apply character deletions and check the reverse consistency, leading to incorrect assertions.

D.4. Conclusion

These findings highlight common failure patterns in LLM-based code interpretation, including logical misinterpretation, heuristic-based assumptions, and issues with numerical computations. Further refinement in model training and debugging processes is recommended.

Reasoning log					
assert (solut	ions(5, 8, 7, 1) == 12); \rightarrow Fail				
Step 1: Function Signature	the function 'solutions' takes a pointer to a ' std :: $vector < int >$ ' as its argument. the vector is expected to contain integers.				
Step 2: loading vector elements	 the function uses 'getelementptr' and 'load' instructions to access the elements of the vector. the vector is accessed in a way that suggests it is iterating over its elements.				
Step 3: Vector Operations	 the function performs several operations on the elements of the vector, including loading elements, performing shifts, and using the 'srem' (signed remainder) operation. the function also uses a vector reduction operation ('@llvm.vector.reduce.add.v4i32') which indicates that it sums up the elements of the vector in groups of four. 				
Step 4: understanding the logic	 the function appears to be summing the elements of the vector, but it also applies some conditions based on the results of the 'srem' operations. the 'srem' operation checks if the elements are odd (i.e., remainder when divided by 2 is 1) and conditionally includes them in the sum. 				
Step 5: input values	 the input vector '5, 8, 7, 1' contains the integers 5, 8, 7, and 1. the odd numbers in this vector are 5, 7, and 1. the even number is 8. 				
Step 6: calculating the expected result	 the sum of all elements is '5 + 8 + 7 + 1 = 21'. however, since the function seems to apply a filter based on the 'srem' operation, we need to check which elements are included in the final sum. the 'srem' operation checks if the remainder is 1, which means only the odd numbers (5, 7, and 1) would be included in the sum. therefore, the sum of the odd numbers is '5 + 7 + 1 = 13'. 				
Step 7: final comparison	 the assertion checks if the result of 'solutions(5, 8, 7, 1)' equals 12. based on our analysis, the function would return 13, not 12. 				

Table 8. An example of Guessing Result based on patterns from GPT-4