Yiling He<sup>†</sup>, Hongyu She<sup>‡</sup>, Xingzhi Qian<sup>†</sup>, Xinran Zheng<sup>†</sup>,

Zhuo Chen<sup>‡</sup>, Zhan Qin<sup>‡</sup>, Lorenzo Cavallaro<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup>University College London

<sup>‡</sup>Zhejiang University

 $\{yiling-he, xingzhi.qian.23, xinran.zheng.23, l.cavallaro\} @ucl.ac.uk$ 

{hongyushe,hypothesiser.hypo,qinzhan}@zju.edu.cn

# Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated strong capabilities in various code intelligence tasks. However, their effectiveness for Android malware analysis remains underexplored. Decompiled Android code poses unique challenges for analysis, primarily due to its large volume of functions and the frequent absence of meaningful function names. This paper presents CAMA, a benchmarking framework designed to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of Code LLMs in Android malware analysis tasks. CAMA specifies structured model outputs (comprising function summaries, refined function names, and maliciousness scores) to support key malware analysis tasks, including malicious function identification and malware purpose summarization. Built on these, it integrates three domain-specific evaluation metrics-consistency, fidelity, and semantic relevance-enabling rigorous stability and effectiveness assessment and cross-model comparison. We construct a benchmark dataset consisting of 118 Android malware samples, encompassing over 7.5 million distinct functions, and use Сама to evaluate 4 popular open-source models. Our experiments provide insights into how Code LLMs interpret decompiled code and quantify the sensitivity to function renaming, highlighting both the potential and current limitations of Code LLMs in malware analysis tasks.

# 1 Introduction

Recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs), driven by transformer-based architectures and self-supervised learning on massive corpora [9, 36, 37], have significantly improved natural language processing (NLP) tasks. Extending these successes to the programming domain, Code LLMs (i.e., specialized LLMs trained on large-scale code repositories) have emerged to effectively capture code syntax and patterns. Models such as CodeLlama [38] and Star-Coder [23] have demonstrated strong performance across software engineering tasks including code generation, code summarization, and code repair [11, 12, 25, 43].

Despite these promising developments, applying Code LLMs to Android malware analysis remains challenging. First, the inherent complexity of decompiled Android code—including obfuscated

LLMSC '25, Co-located with ISSTA'25, June 25–28, 2025, Trondheim, Norway

function names, missing type information, and incomplete control structures [31, 40]—significantly hinders the effectiveness of current models in code summarization. Such decompiled code diverges substantially from the clean and structured source code used in pre-training Code LLMs [52]. Second, accurate semantic interpretation remains difficult due to the high-level abstraction and diverse malicious behaviors present in Android malware [45]. Lastly, the scarcity of reliable ground-truth labels at the function level complicates rigorous model evaluation [16, 18, 39]. These challenges underscore the need for a structured evaluation framework that systematically assesses and compares Code LLM performance in real-world malware analysis scenarios.

To systematically evaluate the performance of Code LLMs in Android malware analysis, we define a structured output format comprising three key elements: *function summaries, refined function names*, and *maliciousness scores*. While function summaries are commonly generated by Code LLMs to describe the purpose of code snippets [17], refined function names address the lack of meaningful identifiers in decompiled code and aid analysts in quickly understanding a function's intent. Additionally, maliciousness scores explicitly quantify the potential security risks associated with each function, serving as critical indicators for malicious behavior localization [10]. As these structured outputs constitute an interpretable and actionable representation, they offer potential to support both human analysts and automated systems in malware analysis [3, 14].

We consider two key malware analysis tasks to benchmark LLM performance: *malicious function identification* and *malware purpose summarization*. For each task, we propose tailored domain-specific metrics. Specifically, for malicious function identification, we define 1) *Consistency*, measuring the stability of generated function names and maliciousness scores under a self-referential process, and 2) *Fidelity*, quantifying how effectively LLM-generated maliciousness scores distinguish between benign and malicious functions. For malware purpose summarization [35], we introduce 3) *Semantic Relevance*, assessing how well aggregated function-level summaries and refined function names generated by the LLM align with ground-truth malware descriptions.

We implement our evaluation framework as CAMA and demonstrate its applicability through a detailed case study. Specifically, we construct a benchmark dataset consisting of 118 Android malware samples across 6 categories and 13 families, collectively comprising over 7.5 million distinct functions. We select 4 popular open-source Code LLMs (i.e., CodeLlama [38], StarChat [23], CodeT5 [47], and PLBART [1]) and design tailored prompting and tuning strategies to generate the desired structured outputs. This study investigates two

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.

<sup>© 2025</sup> Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM. ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-x/YY/MM

LLMSC '25, Co-located with ISSTA'25, June 25-28, 2025, Trondheim, Norway

key research questions: 1) How well do Code LLMs interpret decompiled Android code in malware analysis? and 2) How does function renaming influence the effectiveness of LLM-based analysis?

For the first question, we analyze the quality of LLM-generated outputs using our structured output format and domain-specific metrics. For the second, we systematically rename functions in the original decompiled code with the LLM-suggested names and measure the subsequent impact on evaluation metrics. Our findings reveal that while Code LLMs can generate informative function summaries, their understanding of maliciousness remains limited, highlighting substantial room for improvement. Among existing Code LLMs, instruction-tuned GPT-style models significantly outperform Seq2Seq models across different metrics; function renaming further enhances fidelity and consistency but may reduce semantic clarity, indicating a trade-off that warrants careful consideration.

Contributions. This work makes the following key contributions:

- We propose a benchmarking framework for evaluating Code LLMs for Android malware analysis, incorporating structured outputs and downstream malware analysis tasks. We further define three domain-specific metrics—consistency, fidelity, and semantic relevance—to rigorously assess the stability and effectiveness of LLM-generated outputs.
- We construct a benchmark dataset of 118 representative Android malware samples and a total of 7,542,799 distinct functions to demonstrate our framework's utility. Our empirical analysis provides critical insights into Code LLMs' capabilities in interpreting decompiled code and quantifies the impact of function renaming on malware analysis outcomes.

# 2 Background and Related Work

### 2.1 Code Large Language Models

Code LLM refers to large language models specifically trained on programming-related data to assist with coding tasks. These models are pre-trained on extensive code repositories [5], documentation [20], and other technical resources [33], equipping them with a strong understanding of syntax, semantics, and programming patterns. When fine-tuned with different datasets or optimization techniques, Code LLMs can be tailored to excel in specific tasks, such as code completion, translation, and summarization, across multiple programming languages [7, 21, 46]. These capabilities make them valuable tools for automating and streamlining various aspects of the software development process.

**Code Summary Models.** Code summarization aims to automatically generate concise and meaningful natural-language descriptions of code snippets. Traditional Seq2Seq models, such as CodeT5 [47] and PLBART [1], employ sequence-to-sequence architectures trained on large-scale paired datasets consisting of source code and human-written descriptions. In contrast, instruction-tuned models, such as CodeLlama [38] and StarCoder [23], incorporate additional fine-tuning with structured prompts and task-specific instructions, enabling them to generate more context-aware and adaptive code summaries. In this paper, we select the four models listed in Table 1 as they are widely used, open-source, and explicitly designed for code summarization tasks. Additionally, since all four models have exposure to Java code [17, 22, 28], they are suited for analyzing decompiled Android applications.

Model	Style	Architecture	Java <sup>*</sup>	Inst.†
CodeT5 [47]	T5	Encoder-Decoder	1	X
PLBART [1]	BART	Encoder-Decoder	1	×
CodeLlama [38]	GPT	Decoder-only	1	1
StarChat [23]	GPT	Decoder-only	1	1

\* Whether the model has been trained on datasets that include Java code.
 † Whether the model uses instruction tuning to follow task-specific prompts.

Table 1: Selected Code LLMs for code summarization.

# 2.2 Learning-based Malware Analysis

Traditional machine learning (ML) based approaches primarily focus on coarse-grained malware analysis, such as family classification and benign-malicious identification [4, 29]. However, finegrained analysis is essential for deeper malware understanding, moving beyond simple classification [10]. Recent works explore plugin-based or post-hoc methods, such as explainable AI (XAI) techniques, to extend ML models for interpretable malware analysis. These approaches have been applied to malicious snippet detection [15, 27], function identification [16], and behavioral modeling [14], providing insights into why a model detects malware.

**LLM-powered Analysis.** Recent efforts have explored LLMpowered malware detection, primarily operating within the established pipeline of conventional classifiers and leveraging LLMs in two ways: 1) querying LLMs with original features to generate detection outputs [24], and 2) using LLMs to encode text-based semantic representations that enrich traditional feature spaces [51]. More advanced approaches leverage GPT-40-mini's code summarization capabilities for multi-level malware analysis [44], and improving malware detection via program slicing techniques and multi-tiered code reasoning for factual checking [35]. Despite these advancements, the effectiveness of Code LLMs in fine-grained analysis remains uncharted, largely due to the lack of ground truth. Our work is orthogonal to existing studies, systematically benchmarking open-source Code LLMs in structured malware analysis tasks.

### **3 Our Evaluation Framework**


We propose a benchmarking framework, named CAMA, for systematic evaluation of Code LLMs in Android malware analysis. In this section, we introduce the overview and technical details.

### 3.1 Overview

As illustrated in Figure 1, our benchmarking framework is structured into three main stages: dataset preprocessing, model adaptation of Code LLMs, and downstream malware analysis.

• Dataset Preprocessing. We first build a representative benchmark dataset by collecting Android malware samples across different malware categories and families. The reverse engineering tool Androguard [8] is used to generate decompiled Java functions for each APK. To ensure function diversity and representativeness, we apply a **category-wise de-duplication** based on APK size and the number of extracted methods. Since APKs within the same malware category often exhibit only minor variations, this step helps eliminate near-duplicate samples.

#### LLMSC '25, Co-located with ISSTA'25, June 25-28, 2025, Trondheim, Norway



### Figure 1: Evaluation pipeline of CAMA.

- Model Adaptation of Code LLMs. Next, we carefully design prompting strategies and tuning procedures for the evaluated code LLMs. Our primary goal is to guide these models to produce structured outputs, specifically consisting of 1) suggestions of refined method names, 2) concise and meaningful function summaries, and 3) maliciousness scores indicating potential harmfulness. Such structured outputs facilitate targeted and interpretable malware analysis.
- Downstream Malware Analysis Tasks. We leverage the structured outputs from the LLMs to define two downstream analysis tasks essential for malware characterization: 1) Malicious Function Identification, where we utilize the maliciousness scores as filters to pinpoint malicious functions within Android apps, enabling analysts to efficiently locate suspicious code segments; and 2) Malware Purpose Summarization, where we aggregate function-level summaries into comprehensive prompts, supporting the automatic generation of concise malware descriptions detailing their overall malicious objectives and behavior.

Within this structure, we design three domain-specific metrics to evaluate model effectiveness in generating structured outputs for downstream tasks. We introduce details of the model adaptation in Section 3.2 and the three metrics in Section 3.3.

# 3.2 Prompting and Tuning

To effectively leverage code LLMs for Android malware analysis, we design prompting strategies and tuning mechanisms that guide models to generate the structured outputs. We adopt two complementary approaches: **prompt engineering** for instruction-tuned models and **instruction tuning** for text-to-text models.

3.2.1 Prompt Engineering. Prompt engineering involves designing effective input templates to elicit structured responses from models. Instruction-tuned models such as StarChat and CodeLlama<sup>1</sup> are particularly suitable for this approach, as they are optimized for instruction-following and structured generation tasks [48]. To elicit

consistent outputs that include function descriptions, name suggestions, and maliciousness scores, we design prompts that adhere to several key principles:

- Instruction Blocks: We wrap the main task instruction using special tokens [INST] and [/INST], following each model's best practices for instruction prompting.
- Code Delimiters: Decompiled function code is enclosed between [FUNC] and [/FUNC] tokens to distinguish it from the rest of the prompt and emphasize it as the primary input.
- Role Context: The task is contextualized from the perspective of a cybersecurity expert analyzing decompiled Android functions, encouraging the model to reason with a security mindset.
- Structured Requirements: The instruction clearly specifies that the model should return three structured outputs. The expected response is explicitly described in the prompt (see Output Requirements I–III below).

### Prompt I. Structured Function Summarization

[INST] You are a cybersecurity expert specializing in reverse engineering and malware analysis. Your task is to analyze a decompiled Android function and generate a structured function summary based on the following aspects :

- 1. **Function Summary** : {*summary\_requirement*}
- 2. Suggested Function Name : {name\_requirement}
- 3. Malicious Score(0-10) : {score\_requirement} [/INST]
- [FUNC] {decompiled\_code} [/FUNC]

#### Output Requirement I. Summary

<Provide a brief, high-level description of what this function does. Summarize its purpose, key operations, and intent.>

Output Requirement II. Name

<Suggest a clearer, more descriptive function name that accurately represents its behavior.>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>We use CodeLlama-Instruct and StarChat-Beta, the instruction-tuned variants of CodeLlama and StarCoder, respectively. These models are optimized for instruct-following code summarization, making them better suited for our task.


#### LLMSC '25, Co-located with ISSTA'25, June 25-28, 2025, Trondheim, Norway

 $\checkmark$ 

Expected Summary Output

**Off-topic Summary & Wrong Structure** 

Figure 2: Demonstration of the limited capability of CodeT5<sup>2</sup> in generating a meaningful output when additional requirements are specified.



3.2.2 Instruction Tuning. Since models like CodeT5 and PLBART are pretrained for general-purpose code summarization, they inherently lack the ability to generate function names or maliciousness scores. For instance, as shown in Figure 2, when tasked with generating a function summary alongside a refined function name, CodeT5 would produce off-topic and unstructured responses, failing to generate the expected fields. To bridge this gap, we apply instruction tuning using task-specific data.

- Function Name Prediction: We modify the training data by replacing function names with a placeholder (unk\_function). The model is then fine-tuned to predict the actual function name based on the surrounding code. This adaptation allows CodeT5 and PLBART to suggest meaningful function names instead of generic or incomplete descriptions.
- Maliciousness Score Prediction: Since large-scale ground truth labels for maliciousness scores are unavailable, we introduce a two-step approach. First, we use a tuned model to generate structured summaries and function names. Then, we leverage larger models (e.g., GPT-4 and DeepSeek [13]) to infer maliciousness scores based on the generated summaries and function names.

This hierarchical approach allows us to enhance the structured output capabilities of CodeT5 and PLBART while leveraging more powerful models for tasks that require higher-level reasoning, such as estimating maliciousness scores.

### 3.3 Domain-Specific Metrics

To rigorously assess the performance of code LLMs in Android malware analysis, we define three domain-specific evaluation metrics: **consistency**, **fidelity**, and **semantic relevance**. These metrics quantitatively measure the effectiveness of structured outputs at different levels—individual function analysis, malware classification, and overall application characterization.

**Notations.** Given an Android application  $\mathcal{A}$  composed of a set of decompiled functions  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, f_2, ..., f_n\}$ , our goal is to evaluate the

<sup>2</sup>https://huggingface.co/Salesforce/codet5-base-multi-sum

Yiling He and Hongyu She et al.

structured outputs generated by a target code LLM (denoted as *G*), including function summary S(f), refined function name N(f), and maliciousness score M(f). We formally define the *structured output* for function *f* as  $O(f) = S(f) \oplus N(f) \oplus M(f)$ , which encapsulates all three elements generated by the LLM<sup>3</sup>. For specific evaluation tasks, we define the *function descriptor* as  $D(f) = S(f) \oplus N(f)$ , which serves as the interpretable textual function representation (without including its numerical measure) and is particularly relevant in tasks that focus on function-level understanding and classification.

3.3.1 Consistency-based Metric. The consistency metric measures the internal stability of the LLM's structured outputs by checking whether the model's predictions contradict each other when examined under a self-referential process. We define two forms of consistency, i.e., *maliciousness consistency* and *name consistency*. **Maliciousness Consistency.** This metric evaluates whether the maliciousness scores generated by the LLM from raw decompiled code align with those produced when the model is queried with structured descriptors (*function summaries and suggested names*). Formally, for each function *f*, we obtain:

- a)  $M_{\text{raw}}(f)$ , the original maliciousness score, obtained by directly querying the target model using the decompiled function.
- b)  $M_{\text{des}}(f)$ , the descriptor-based maliciousness score, obtained by prompting the same model with D(f).

### Prompt II. Descriptor-based Maliciousness Score

**Task:** Given a function descriptor, { $score\_requirement$ } **Input:** A function descriptor: { $D_{raw}(f) = S_{raw}(f) \oplus N_{raw}(f)$ } **Output:** A numerical maliciousness score between 0 and 10, where 10 represents highly malicious behavior.

To measure consistency, we first normalize the score vectors over all functions in an application  $(f \in \mathcal{A})$  into valid probability distributions (non-negative and summing to 1), obtaining  $M'_{raw}$  and  $M'_{des}$ . Then we compute the distributional divergence using Jensen-Shannon Divergence (JSD):

$$JSD(M'_{raw}, M'_{des}) = \frac{1}{2} D_{KL}(M_{raw}||M_{avg}) + \frac{1}{2} D_{KL}(M_{des}||M_{avg}),$$
(1)

where  $M_{\text{avg}}$  is the average distribution and  $D_{\text{KL}}(P||Q)$  is the Kullback-Leibler divergence:

$$M_{\rm avg} = \frac{1}{2} (M'_{\rm raw} + M'_{\rm des}), D_{\rm KL}(P||Q) = \sum_{i} P(i) \log \frac{P(i)}{Q(i)}.$$
 (2)

Finally, we normalize the JSD to (0, 1) and define:

$$MCS = 1 - \frac{JSD(M'_{raw}, M'_{des})}{\log 2}.$$
 (3)

A higher maliciousness consistency score (MCS) indicates higher consistency, meaning that the structured outputs retain the function's security-relevant information.

**Name Consistency.** This metric assesses whether the suggested function name remains stable when the LLM is prompted with its own function summary. For each function f, the LLM generates:

a)  $N_{\text{raw}}(f)$ , the initial function name suggested as part of the structured output O(f).

 $<sup>^3 {\</sup>rm The}\ {\rm operator}\ \oplus\ {\rm denotes}\ {\rm concatenation}\ {\rm and}\ {\rm is}\ {\rm used}\ {\rm consistently}\ {\rm throughout}\ {\rm the}\ {\rm paper.}$ 

b)  $N_{\text{reg}}(f)$ , a new function name generated when the LLM is reprompted with its own function summary S(f).

### Prompt III. Re-generated Function Name

**Task:** Given a function summary, { $name_requirement$ } **Input:** A function summary: { $S_{raw}(f)$ } **Output:** A concise, descriptive function name.

To quantify name consistency, we compute the normalized edit distance between the original and revised function names:

$$NCS = 1 - \frac{EditDistance(N_{raw}, N_{reg})}{max(|N_{raw}|, |N_{reg}|)},$$
(4)

where |n| represents the length of n, and EditDistance is the Levenshtein distance, which counts the minimum number of characterlevel insertions, deletions, or substitutions required to transform  $N_{\text{raw}}$  into  $N_{\text{reg}}$ . The result is normalized to (0, 1) by the length of the longer function name to ensure comparability across different naming conventions.

A higher name consistency score (NCS) indicates greater stability in function name generation, suggesting that the model consistently associates summaries with the same function identity.

*3.3.2 Fidelity-based Metric.* The fidelity metric assesses the degree to which function-level structured outputs contribute to *malicious function identification.* Inspired by explainable AI (XAI) evaluation techniques [49], we define fidelity in terms of the impact of function removals on malware classification performance.

Given a malware classifier *C*, which takes the function descriptor as input and predicts a malware category  $\hat{y}$ , we measure classification confidence before and after removing the *top-k most malicious* function summaries. Formally, let:

$$p_{\text{full}} = C(D(f_1) \oplus D(f_2) \oplus \dots \oplus D(f_n))$$
(5)

be the malware classification probability for an application before removal. After removing the top-k most malicious function features ranked by maliciousness, the new classification probability is:

$$p_{\operatorname{red}(k)} = C\left(\bigoplus_{f \notin \mathcal{F}_k} D(f)\right), \tag{6}$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_k = \{f_i \in \mathcal{F} \mid M(f_i) \text{ is among the top } k\}$  is the set of k most malicious functions. The maliciousness-based fidelity score (MFS) is then computed as the *relative drop in confidence*:

$$MFS_{(k)} = \frac{p_{full}[\hat{y}] - p_{red(k)}[\hat{y}]}{p_{full}[\hat{y}]}.$$
 (7)

A higher fidelity score indicates that structured outputs effectively encode function-level characteristics for malware classification, as the maliciousness-based descriptor removal leads to a significant drop in the classifier's confidence for the predicted class.

3.3.3 Semantic-based Metric. The semantic metric evaluates how function outputs contribute to accurate application-level *malware purpose descriptions*. Adopting approaches from automatic machine translation evaluation [30], we measure the similarity between LLM-generated malware descriptions and reference descriptions.

Given a set of top-v malicious function outputs, where v varies based on the target LLM's context window, we firstly generate

$$A_{\text{LLM}} = G_{app}(O(f_1) \oplus O(f_2) \oplus \dots \oplus O(f_v)), \qquad (8)$$

where  $G_{app}$  is the target code LLM prompted to generate a highlevel malware description. This approach mimics *context slicing*, but leverages LLM outputs (i.e., maliciousness scores) instead of heuristic-based methods such as sensitive API filtering, which can often be incomplete or overlook critical behaviors. Specifically, the prompt for  $G_{app}$  is defined as follows.

# Prompt IV. Application Purpose Description

**Task:** Given the structured function-level analyses, generate a concise and comprehensive description of the overall application's purpose. **Input:** A set of top-*v* malicious functions: { Function Summary S(f), Refined Function Name N(f), Maliciousness Score M(f) } **Output:** An application purpose description summarizing the app's behavior and potential security risks.

We compare  $A_{LLM}$  against the reference malware description  $A_{GT}$  using three widely used text similarity metrics:

a) BLEU [32]: Measures n-gram precision between A<sub>LLM</sub> and A<sub>GT</sub>:

BLEU(
$$A_{\text{LLM}}, A_{\text{GT}}$$
) = exp $\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N} w_n \log p_n\right)$  (9)

where  $p_n$  is n-gram precision and  $w_n$  are weighting factors.

b) METEOR [6]: Extends BLEU by incorporating synonym matching and recall:

$$METEOR(A_{LLM}, A_{GT}) = F_{mean} \cdot (1 - Penalty)$$
(10)

where  $F_{\text{mean}}$  balances precision and recall, and the penalty term accounts for word order discrepancies.

c) ROUGE-L [26]: Measures the longest common subsequence (LCS) overlap between *A*<sub>LLM</sub> and *A*<sub>GT</sub>:

$$\text{ROUGE-L}(A_{\text{LLM}}, A_{\text{GT}}) = \frac{\text{LCS}(A_{\text{LLM}}, A_{\text{GT}})}{|A_{\text{GT}}|}$$
(11)

where LCS denotes the longest matching word sequence.

A higher BLEU, METEOR, or ROUGE-L score indicates stronger alignment between the LLM-generated description and the reference description, validating the semantic relevance of function outputs in capturing malware behavior.

# 4 Benchmarking Results

We conduct experiments guided by two key research questions:

- **RQ1:** How well do Code LLMs understand decompiled code for malware analysis tasks?
- **RQ2:** How does function renaming affect their performance (i.e., can models self-repair based on their own suggested names)?

# 4.1 Experimental Setup

**Dataset Selection.** We use the LAMD [35] dataset<sup>4</sup>, which provides Android malware samples with high-quality GPT-4-generated ground-truth application purpose summaries, making it well-suited for evaluating semantic relevance. To reduce redundancy, we perform de-duplication by filtering out near-identical APKs within each malware category, resulting in 118 APKs across 6 categories (Adware, Backdoor, PUA, Riskware, Scareware, Trojan) and 13 families.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>https://zenodo.org/records/14884736

	Consistency		Fidelity			Semantic Relevance		
	MCS	NCS	MFS <sub>(2)</sub>	MFS(5)	MFS <sub>(8)</sub>	BLEU	METEOR	ROUGE-L
CodeT5	N/A	$0.233 \pm 0.04$	$0.332 \pm 0.30$	$0.125\pm0.22$	$0.396 \pm 0.32$	$0.059 \pm 0.04$	$0.083 \pm 0.04$	$0.186 \pm 0.04$
PLBART	N/A	$0.499 \pm 0.05$	$0.033 \pm 0.14$	$0.031 \pm 0.11$	$0.065\pm0.14$	$0.137 \pm 0.03$	$0.185\pm0.05$	$0.228 \pm 0.04$
CodeLlama	$0.381\pm0.03$	$0.628 \pm 0.04$	$0.158 \pm 0.27$	$0.159 \pm 0.27$	$0.113 \pm 0.25$	$0.175\pm0.05$	$0.247 \pm 0.08$	$0.271 \pm 0.06$
StarChat	$0.813 \pm 0.02$	$0.575\pm0.02$	$0.111 \pm 0.20$	$0.254 \pm 0.30$	$0.275 \pm 0.33$	$0.176\pm0.05$	$0.273 \pm 0.09$	$0.272\pm0.06$
CodeLlama+	0.357 <b>16.30%</b>	0.677 ↑7.80%	0.485 ↑207.0%	<b>0.451</b> ↑183.7%	0.440 ↑289.4%	0.171 ↓2.29%	0.219 ↓11.34%	0.270 \0.37%
StarChat+	0.828 ↑1.85%	0.582 11.22%	0.298 ↑168.5%	<b>0.351</b> ↑38.19%	0.726 ↑164.0%	0.172 ↓2.27%	0.246 <mark>↓9.89%</mark>	<b>0.274</b> ↑0.74%

\* Rows 1-4 correspond to RQ1, evaluating the performance of all four models on decompiled code. Results are reported as mean ± standard deviation.

\* Rows 5–6 correspond to RQ2, assessing the impact of function renaming by replacing original names with LLM-suggested ones. CodeT5 and PLBART are excluded due to limited name generation capability—they often replicate names from the input code. Results are reported as mean values with relative improvement ratios.

Table 2: Benchmarking results.

All APKs are decompiled using Androguard, resulting in a total of 7, 542, 799 decompiled functions across the dataset.

Implementation Details. For all selected models in Table 1, we use their official implementations from the Hugging Face Hub <sup>5</sup> to ensure consistency and reproducibility. For models not originally instruction-tuned (i.e., CodeT5 and PLBART), we perform additional tuning on Java functions from their pretraining datasets. Each model is fine-tuned for 3 epochs, which we find sufficient to produce the structured outputs. The maliciousness score prediction of these two models is assisted by a locally deployed DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-70B. In the fidelity evaluation, we use LightGBM [19] as the malware category classifier C, ensuring high reliability with an accuracy above 0.95. To assess the effect of removing suspicious code, we experiment with top-k values of 2, 5, and 8. In the semantic relevance evaluation, to ensure stylistic consistency, we prompt all models to begin their outputs with the phrase: "This application appears to ... ", matching the format used in the ground truth from LAMD. We set top-v based on model context limits: 4K tokens for CodeLlama, 8K for StarChat, and 1K for CodeT5 and PLBART. For BLEU-based evaluation, we use 2-gram precision, which is more appropriate for evaluating short summaries.

Our overall experimental results are summarized in Table 2. In the following sections, we provide a detailed analysis of each research question: RQ1 in Section 4.2 and RQ2 in Section 4.3.

# 4.2 RQ1 - Decompiled Code

This experiment investigates how well Code LLMs interpret decompiled Android code for malware analysis. We evaluate their ability to generate the structured outputs and analyze their effectiveness using the three domain-specific metrics.

For maliciousness consistency, only CodeLlama and StarChat are evaluated, as CodeT5 and PLBART rely on external models for score generation. Among the two, StarChat achieves a notably higher score (over twice that of CodeLlama), suggesting a better understanding of high-level semantics relevant to malicious behavior. For name consistency, CodeLlama performs best, with StarChat following closely. Both models outperform the Seq2Seq baselines, reinforcing the observation that instruction-tuned, GPT-style models exhibit greater stability in structured output generation. Among the Seq2Seq models, PLBART outperforms CodeT5 by approximately 114%, likely due to its larger pretraining corpus and improved alignment between code and natural language.

In downstream evaluations, we observe clear performance differences across models in both fidelity and semantic relevance. Star-Chat consistently outperforms the others, demonstrating a stronger ability to assign meaningful maliciousness scores and produce highlevel malware descriptions—results that align with its superior consistency metrics. This superior performance is likely driven by its larger model size and the StarCoder architecture, which emphasizes multilingual understanding and instruction-following, enhancing its ability to reason across diverse and obfuscated functions. CodeLlama performs competitively, especially excelling in top-2 function removal and producing stylistically aligned summaries, suggesting it effectively captures the most critical functions but is less robust than StarChat when evaluating broader function sets.

Among the Seq2Seq models, PLBART shows better performance in semantic relevance, benefiting from its BART-based architecture which favors fluent and coherent natural language generation. However, PLBART notably underperforms CodeT5 in fidelity, while both models' maliciousness scores are generated externally by the same larger models. This difference arises because CodeT5's summaries, though less fluent, contain more descriptions that better highlight critical code features, allowing the external scoring model to produce more discriminative maliciousness scores. Nevertheless, both Seq2Seq models exhibit limited stylistic control. For instance, even when explicitly prompted to begin with *"This application appears to…*", they frequently prepend generic phrases like *"This function…*", revealing limited control over stylistic constraints.

These findings highlight a fundamental **tradeoff between linguistic fluency and semantic precision** in LLM-generated outputs: for Seq2Seq models, while PLBART can produce readable summaries, they may not align well with underlying malicious behaviors; conversely, CodeT5 may better capture function-level semantics but lack expressive output formatting. Ultimately, our results reinforce the **superiority of instruction-tuned GPT-style models (especially StarChat)** for generating both accurate and interpretable outputs in fine-grained malware analysis tasks.

# 4.3 RQ2 - Function Naming

This experiment investigates whether replacing original decompiled function names with LLM-suggested names affects model

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>https://huggingface.co/{meta-llama/CodeLlama-7b-Instruct-hf,

HuggingFaceH4/starchat-beta, Salesforce/codet5-base-multi-sum, uclanlp/plbart-base}




Figure 3: Maliciousness score distributions before and after function renaming. For both models, refined function names lead to more scores concentrated in the middle range.

performance. The goal is to understand whether LLMs can improve their own reasoning and potentially providing more meaningful input for subsequent predictions.

We compare each model's outputs before and after replacing function names, modifying only those names that differ from the originals, while keeping all other code aspects unchanged. CodeT5 and PLBART are excluded from RQ2 due to their limited function name refinement capability. These models often fail to produce meaningful or distinct name suggestions. For instance, 61.75% of PLBART's generated names are exact copies of the names found in the decompiled code. Even among the remaining cases, many suggestions are only trivially modified (e.g., renaming set\_b to set\_a), which lacks usefulness in evaluating the impact of renaming.

Results show that replacing original function names with LLMsuggested names notably benefits fidelity, with both CodeLlama+ and StarChat+ showing substantial improvements. This suggests that improved naming significantly helps the models better prioritize and identify critical malicious functions. Consistency also improves moderately, indicating enhanced stability in model predictions when meaningful names are used. However, semantic relevance slightly decreases after renaming, likely because renaming leads to a convergence of maliciousness scores around the midrange (Figure 3), reducing the distinctiveness of highly ranked functions when aggregated into malware descriptions.

Overall, these findings indicate that LLM-based function renaming effectively **enhances function-wise consistency and fidelity metrics**, but may **require careful handling to avoid diluting high-level semantic clarity**. To mitigate this issue, future improvements could focus on calibrating the scores to better reflect model confidence and explicitly encoding more robust knowledge about malware semantics. Such enhancements may enable the models to maintain semantic clarity while benefiting from the improved consistency and fidelity introduced by meaningful function names.

# 5 Discussion

While CAMA enables structured evaluation of Code LLMs in malware analysis, it also exposes a *fundamental challenge*: the scarcity of reliable ground truth at the function and behavior levels. Our function-level evaluation relies on counterfactual fidelity-based methods, while APK-level summarization adopts techniques from LLM-driven malware detection [35], which leverage program slicing and prompt large models like GPT-4. Though practical, these surrogate approaches can introduce noise and bias [42], which underscores the pressing need for high-quality, fine-grained ground truth malware datasets to advance trustworthy evaluation.

CAMA opens the door to *broader research directions*. For example, it can support studies on malware concept drift [34], enabling evaluation of whether Code LLM-based analyses generalize to evolving threats and unseen malware families. Beyond Code LLMs and Android malware, the framework is adaptable to assess a wide range of approaches, as long as they target core sub-tasks including function summarization, naming, and maliciousness estimation. Beyond benchmarking, CAMA also supports *practical applications*: it can guide the selection, pretraining, or fine-tuning of Code LLMs specifically for malware tasks [2, 41, 50]. Its structured outputs, particularly maliciousness scores, can be used to prioritize suspicious functions, improving the precision of traditional malware classifiers [4, 15].

### 6 Conclusion

This paper introduces CAMA, a benchmarking framework for systematically evaluating the effectiveness of open-source Code LLMs in Android malware analysis. We define a structured output format aligned with two key analysis tasks: malicious function identification and malware purpose summarization. To address the lack of fine-grained ground truth, we propose three domain-specific evaluation metrics, enabling rigorous assessment of LLM-generated outputs. Our benchmarking results reveal both the potential and current limitations of Code LLMs, emphasizing the necessity of structured evaluation frameworks to ensure stability and interpretability in real-world malware analysis. CAMA provides a foundation for future work to select and adapt Code LLMs for malware analysis, improving their effectiveness in downstream tasks such as family classification and behavioral explanation.

#### References

- Wasi Ahmad, Saikat Chakraborty, Baishakhi Ray, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2021. Unified Pre-training for Program Understanding and Generation. In Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies. 2655–2668.
- [2] Ali Al-Kaswan, Toufique Ahmed, Maliheh Izadi, Anand Ashok Sawant, Premkumar Devanbu, and Arie van Deursen. 2023. Extending source code pre-trained language models to summarise decompiled binaries. In 2023 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER). IEEE, 260–271.
- [3] Simone Aonzo, Yufei Han, Alessandro Mantovani, and Davide Balzarotti. 2023. Humans vs. Machines in Malware Classification. In 32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23).
- [4] Daniel Arp, Michael Spreitzenbarth, Malte Hubner, Hugo Gascon, Konrad Rieck, and CERT Siemens. 2014. Drebin: Effective and explainable detection of android malware in your pocket. In Proceedings of the Network and Distributed Systems Security Symposium (NDSS), Vol. 14. 23–26.
- [5] Ramakrishna Bairi, Atharv Sonwane, Aditya Kanade, Arun Iyer, Suresh Parthasarathy, Sriram Rajamani, B Ashok, and Shashank Shet. 2024. Codeplan: Repository-level coding using llms and planning. *Proceedings of the ACM on Software Engineering* 1, FSE (2024), 675–698.
- [6] Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. METEOR: An automatic metric for MT evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In Proceedings of the acl workshop on intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation measures for machine translation and/or summarization. 65–72.
- [7] Xinyun Chen, Maxwell Lin, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. 2024. Teaching large language models to self-debug. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [8] Anthony Desnos. [n.d.]. Androguard. https://github.com/androguard/ androguard 2020.
- [9] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In

Yiling He and Hongyu She et al.

Proceedings of the 2019 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies, volume 1 (long and short papers). 4171–4186.

- [10] Evan Downing, Yisroel Mirsky, Kyuhong Park, and Wenke Lee. 2021. DeepReflect: Discovering Malicious Functionality through Binary Reconstruction. In 30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21).
- [11] Chongzhou Fang, Ning Miao, Shaurya Srivastav, Jialin Liu, Ruoyu Zhang, Ruijie Fang, Asmita, Ryan Tsang, Najmeh Nazari, Han Wang, and Houman Homayoun. 2024. Large Language Models for Code Analysis: Do LLMs Really Do Their Job?. In 33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24). USENIX Association, Philadelphia, PA, 829–846.
- [12] Qiuhan Gu. 2023. Llm-based code generation method for golang compiler testing. In Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering. 2201–2203.
- [13] Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Yu Wu, YK Li, et al. 2024. DeepSeek-Coder: When the Large Language Model Meets Programming-The Rise of Code Intelligence. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196 (2024).
- [14] Yiling He, Junchi Lei, Zhan Qin, and Kui Ren. 2024. DREAM: Combating Concept Drift with Explanatory Detection and Adaptation in Malware Classification. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04095 (2024).
- [15] Yiling He, Yiping Liu, Lei Wu, Ziqi Yang, Kui Ren, and Zhan Qin. 2023. MsDroid: Identifying Malicious Snippets for Android Malware Detection. *IEEE Transactions* on Dependable and Secure Computing 20, 3 (2023), 2025–2039.
- [16] Yiling He, Jian Lou, Zhan Qin, and Kui Ren. 2023. Finer: Enhancing state-of-theart classifiers with feature attribution to facilitate security analysis. In Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security. 416–430.
- [17] Hamel Husain, Ho-Hsiang Wu, Tiferet Gazit, Miltiadis Allamanis, and Marc Brockschmidt. 2019. Codesearchnet challenge: Evaluating the state of semantic code search. arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.09436 (2019).
- [18] Alex Kantchelian, Michael Carl Tschantz, Sadia Afroz, Brad Miller, Vaishaal Shankar, Rekha Bachwani, Anthony D. Joseph, and J. Doug Tygar. 2015. Better Malware Ground Truth: Techniques for Weighting Anti-Virus Vendor Labels. In Proceedings of the 8th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security, AISec 2015, Denver, Colorado, USA, October 16, 2015. https://doi.org/10.1145/2808769. 2808780
- [19] Guolin Ke, Qi Meng, Thomas Finley, Taifeng Wang, Wei Chen, Weidong Ma, Qiwei Ye, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2017. Lightgbm: A highly efficient gradient boosting decision tree. Advances in neural information processing systems 30 (2017).
- [20] Junaed Younus Khan, Md Tawkat Islam Khondaker, Gias Uddin, and Anindya Iqbal. 2021. Automatic detection of five api documentation smells: Practitioners' perspectives. In 2021 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER). IEEE, 318–329.
- [21] Mohammad Abdullah Matin Khan, M Saiful Bari, Xuan Long Do, Weishi Wang, Md Rizwan Parvez, and Shafiq Joty. 2023. xcodeeval: A large scale multilingual multitask benchmark for code understanding, generation, translation and retrieval. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03004 (2023).
- [22] Denis Kocetkov, Raymond Li, LI Jia, Chenghao Mou, Yacine Jernite, Margaret Mitchell, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Sean Hughes, Thomas Wolf, Dzmitry Bahdanau, et al. 2023. The Stack: 3 TB of permissively licensed source code. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2023).
- [23] Raymond Li, Loubna Ben allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Jia LI, Jenny Chim, Qian Liu, Evgenii Zheltonozhskii, Terry Yue Zhuo, Thomas Wang, Olivier Dehaene, Joel Lamy-Poirier, Joao Monteiro, Nicolas Gontier, Ming-Ho Yee, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, Jian Zhu, Ben Lipkin, Muhtasham Oblokulov, Zhiruo Wang, Rudra Murthy, Jason T Stillerman, Siva Sankalp Patel, Dmitry Abulkhanov, Marco Zocca, Manan Dey, Zhihan Zhang, Urvashi Bhattacharyya, Wenhao Yu, Sasha Luccioni, Paulo Villegas, Fedor Zhdanov, Tony Lee, Nadav Timor, Jennifer Ding, Claire S Schlesinger, Hailey Schoelkopf, Jan Ebert, Tri Dao, Mayank Mishra, Alex Gu, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, Danish Contractor, Siva Reddy, Daniel Fried, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Yacine Jernite, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Sean Hughes, Thomas Wolf, Arjun Guha, Leandro Von Werra, and Harm de Vries. 2023. StarCoder: may the source be with you! *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2023).
- [24] Yao Li, Sen Fang, Tao Zhang, and Haipeng Cai. 2024. Enhancing Android Malware Detection: The Influence of ChatGPT on Decision-centric Task. arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04352 (2024).
- [25] Zongjie Li, Chaozheng Wang, Zhibo Liu, Haoxuan Wang, Dong Chen, Shuai Wang, and Cuiyun Gao. 2023. Cctest: Testing and repairing code completion systems. In 2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE). IEEE, 1238–1250.
- [26] Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In Text summarization branches out. 74–81.
- [27] Zhijie Liu, Liang Feng Zhang, and Yutian Tang. 2023. Enhancing malware detection for android apps: Detecting fine-granularity malicious components. In 2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering

(ASE). IEEE, 1212-1224.

- [28] Shuai Lu, Daya Guo, Shuo Ren, Junjie Huang, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Ambrosio Blanco, Colin Clement, Dawn Drain, Daxin Jiang, Duyu Tang, et al. 2021. CodeXGLUE : A Machine Learning Benchmark Dataset for Code Understanding and Generation. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 1).*
- [29] E Mariconti, L Onwuzurike, P Andriotis, E De Cristofaro, G Ross, and G Stringhini. 2017. MamaDroid: Detecting Android Malware by Building Markov Chains of Behavioral Models. In Proceedings of the Network and Distributed Systems Security Symposium (NDSS).
- [30] Nitika Mathur, Timothy Baldwin, and Trevor Cohn. 2020. Tangled up in BLEU: Reevaluating the Evaluation of Automatic Machine Translation Evaluation Metrics. In Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. 4984–4997.
- [31] Xiaozhu Meng and Barton P Miller. 2016. Binary code is not easy. In Proceedings of the 25th International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis. 24–35.
- [32] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. 311–318.
- [33] Hammond Pearce, Benjamin Tan, Baleegh Ahmad, Ramesh Karri, and Brendan Dolan-Gavitt. 2023. Examining zero-shot vulnerability repair with large language models. In 2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP). IEEE, 2339–2356.
- [34] Feargus Pendlebury, Fabio Pierazzi, Roberto Jordaney, Johannes Kinder, and Lorenzo Cavallaro. 2019. {TESSERACT}: Eliminating experimental bias in malware classification across space and time. In 28th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 19). 729–746.
- [35] Xingzhi Qian, Xinran Zheng, Yiling He, Shuo Yang, and Lorenzo Cavallaro. 2025. LAMD: Context-driven Android Malware Detection and Classification with LLMs. arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13055 (2025).
- [36] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training.
- [37] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research* 21, 140 (2020), 1–67.
- [38] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Romain Sauvestre, Tal Remez, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950 (2023).
- [39] Aleieldin Salem. 2021. Towards Accurate Labeling of Android Apps for Reliable Malware Detection. In Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM Conference on Data and Application Security and Privacy (CODASPY '21). https://doi.org/10.1145/3422337. 3447849
- [40] Xiuwei Shang, Shaoyin Cheng, Guoqiang Chen, Yanming Zhang, Li Hu, Xiao Yu, Gangyang Li, Weiming Zhang, and Nenghai Yu. 2024. How Far Have We Gone in Binary Code Understanding Using Large Language Models. In 2024 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME). IEEE, 1–12.
- [41] Shuo Shao, Yiming Li, Hongwei Yao, Yiling He, Zhan Qin, and Kui Ren. 2025. Explanation as a Watermark: Towards Harmless and Multi-bit Model Ownership Verification via Watermarking Feature Attribution. In Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS).
- [42] Xinyu She, Yue Liu, Yanjie Zhao, Yiling He, Li Li, Chakkrit Tantithamthavorn, Zhan Qin, and Haoyu Wang. 2023. Pitfalls in language models for code intelligence: A taxonomy and survey. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17903 (2023).
- [43] Runchu Tian, Yining Ye, Yujia Qin, Xin Cong, Yankai Lin, Yinxu Pan, Yesai Wu, Hui Haotian, Liu Weichuan, Zhiyuan Liu, et al. 2024. DebugBench: Evaluating Debugging Capability of Large Language Models. In Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024. 4173–4198.
- [44] Brandon J Walton, Mst Eshita Khatun, James M Ghawaly, and Aisha Ali-Gombe. 2025. Exploring Large Language Models for Semantic Analysis and Categorization of Android Malware. arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.04848 (2025).
- [45] Liu Wang, Haoyu Wang, Ren He, Ran Tao, Guozhu Meng, Xiapu Luo, and Xuanzhe Liu. 2022. MalRadar: Demystifying Android malware in the new era. Proceedings of the ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems 6, 2 (2022), 1–27.
- [46] Shiqi Wang, Zheng Li, Haifeng Qian, Chenghao Yang, Zijian Wang, Mingyue Shang, Varun Kumar, Samson Tan, Baishakhi Ray, Parminder Bhatia, et al. 2023. ReCode: Robustness Evaluation of Code Generation Models. In *The 61st Annual Meeting Of The Association For Computational Linguistics.*
- [47] Yue Wang, Weishi Wang, Shafiq Joty, and Steven CH Hoi. 2021. CodeT5: Identifieraware Unified Pre-trained Encoder-Decoder Models for Code Understanding and Generation. In Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. 8696–8708.
- [48] Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2022. Finetuned Language Models are Zero-Shot Learners. In International Conference on Learning Representations.
- [49] Fan Yang, Mengnan Du, and Xia Hu. 2019. Evaluating explanation without ground truth in interpretable machine learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.06831

LLMSC '25, Co-located with ISSTA'25, June 25-28, 2025, Trondheim, Norway

(2019).

- [2019]
   [50] Yuchen Yang, Hongwei Yao, Bingrun Yang, Yiling He, Yiming Li, Tianwei Zhang, Zhan Qin, and Kui Ren. 2024. Tapi: Towards target-specific and adversarial prompt injection against code llms. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.09164 (2024).
- [51] Wenxiang Zhao, Juntao Wu, and Zhaoyi Meng. 2025. Apppoet: Large language model based android malware detection via multi-view prompt engineering.

Expert Systems with Applications 262 (2025), 125546.

[52] Qinkai Zheng, Xiao Xia, Xu Zou, Yuxiao Dong, Shan Wang, Yufei Xue, Lei Shen, Zihan Wang, Andi Wang, Yang Li, et al. 2023. Codegees: 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*. 5673–5684.