

# Generative Explanations for Program Synthesizers

AMIRMOHAMMAD NAZARI, University of Southern California, USA

SOUTI CHATTOPADHYAY, University of Southern California, USA

SWABHA SWAYAMDIPTA, University of Southern California, USA

MUKUND RAGHOTHAMAN, University of Southern California, USA

Despite great advances in program synthesis techniques, they remain algorithmic black boxes. Although they guarantee that when synthesis is successful, the implementation satisfies the specification, they provide no additional information regarding how the implementation works or the manner in which the specification is realized. One possibility to answer these questions is to use large language models (LLMs) to construct human-readable explanations. Unfortunately, experiments reveal that LLMs frequently produce nonsensical or misleading explanations when applied to the unidiomatic code produced by program synthesizers.

In this paper, we develop an approach to reliably augment the implementation with explanatory names. We recover fine-grained input-output data from the synthesis algorithm to enhance the prompt supplied to the LLM, and use a combination of a program verifier and a second language model to validate the proposed explanations before presenting them to the user. Together, these techniques massively improve the accuracy of the proposed names, from 24% to 79% respectively. Through a pair of small user studies, we find that users significantly prefer the explanations produced by our technique (76% of responses indicating the appropriateness of the presenting names) to the baseline (with only 2% of responses approving of the suggestions), and that the proposed names measurably help users in understanding the synthesized implementation.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The last fifteen years have seen an explosion of work in program synthesis [Alur et al. 2018; Gulwani et al. 2017]. Program synthesizers have been applied in diverse fields, including in producing assembly code [Phothilimthana et al. 2014; Schkufza et al. 2013], in the synthesis of network policies [McClurg et al. 2017], in data wrangling and end-user programming [Gulwani 2011; Le and Gulwani 2014; Singh 2016], and in program repair [Antoni et al. 2016; Nguyen et al. 2013; Singh et al. 2013], among others. The algorithms underlying these synthesizers build on various ideas, including enumerative [Alur et al. 2017; Udupa et al. 2013] and constraint-driven search [Feng et al. 2018], version space algebras [Lau et al. 2000], type-guided enumeration [Guo et al. 2019; Osera and Zdanczewicz 2015], and prioritized search [Lee et al. 2018], and have been shown to synthesize fairly non-trivial pieces of code.

However, there has been comparatively less attention given to the problem of helping users to *understand* this synthesized code. Although there is research on requesting additional guidance from the user during the synthesis process, this has primarily been oriented either towards accelerating the synthesis process itself [Ji et al. 2020], or in reducing the number of examples needed to identify the target program [Laich et al. 2020]. Notably, these approaches do not directly help the user in understanding how the program works, and consequently, whether it accurately realizes their intent. [Nazari et al. 2023] have recently described a technique to characterize the desired behavior of individual subexpressions in a synthesized program: although these *subspecifications* have been shown to help users in understanding code, they primarily take the form of logical formulas, rather than textual comments that can be understood by less experienced programmers.

Although most synthesizers guarantee that the emitted code conforms to the specification, inductive synthesis (i.e., from input-output examples) works from fundamentally incomplete specifications, so there are typically multiple programs which are consistent with the provided

examples [An et al. 2019; Yuan et al. 2023]. Worse still, experience has shown that writing correct and representative specifications is difficult, and is subject both to user error and noise [Handa and Rinard 2020; Kupferman and Vardi 2003]. It is our contention that the difficulty of writing specifications, combined with the difficulty of understanding how the implementation works, reduces users’ confidence in using automatically synthesized code in practical applications.

One approach to produce such human-readable explanations of code is to leverage recent breakthroughs in large language models (including models from OpenAI such as GPT-4 [OpenAI 2023] and LLaMA [Touvron et al. 2023]) and LLMs specialized for processing code (including Codex [Chen et al. 2021] and Copilot [Cop 2021]).

In this paper, we describe such a system. We begin with a specification-implementation pair produced by an appropriate program synthesizer. We focus on implementations produced by DreamCoder [Ellis et al. 2021a], a recent state-of-the-art program synthesis tool, and consider the problem of augmenting the implementation with explanatory names for its subroutines. This problem of automatically generating meaningful names for program elements, including for functions and identifiers has been extensively studied in software engineering research: prominent recent examples include Code2Vec [Alon et al. 2019], JSNice [Raychev et al. 2015], and [Allamanis et al. 2015]. Better chosen names have been shown to improve the readability, maintainability, and debugging of code [Jiang et al. 2019].

The main challenge with these approaches is that implementations produced by program synthesizers are unidiomatic, leading to poor quality names being suggested by the language model / backend tool. While researchers have investigated ideas such as scratchpads [Nye et al. 2021] and chain-of-thought reasoning [Wei et al. 2022] to improve the accuracy of language models, it is not immediately clear how one can use these techniques to sequentially justify the appropriateness of names for program elements.

The first part of our system is a technique to augment the prompt supplied to the LLM with additional information about the specification-implementation pair. Inspired by the framework of [Nazari et al. 2023], we analyze the implementation, and recover subspecifications that describe the local behavior of individual subroutines, thereby helping the language model to suggest more appropriate function names.

Our second technical insight is that when the name suggested by the LLM is appropriate, then it provides a good proxy to reason about the broader behavior of the implementation. For example, consider the following piece of Python code which returns the last element of a non-empty list  $l$ :

```
def last(l):
    return l[g(l) - 1]
def g(l):
    return reduce(lambda x, y: x + 1, l, 0)
```

Observe that the function  $g$  actually computes the length of the list provided as input, so it is appropriate to name the function “length”. This also suggests that any other function which also computes the length of the list—regardless of its internal mechanics—can equivalently play the role of  $g$  in the original implementation. For example, the following function  $g'$  can be safely substituted for  $g$ :

```
def g'(l):
    return 0 if l == [] else 1 + g'(l[1:])
```

This observation motivates us to use a second LLM that resynthesizes code from the proposed function name and type signature. We substitute this resynthesized subroutine into the surrounding implementation, and check whether the alternative implementation satisfies the global spec. The

success of this check is an effective indicator that the name is appropriate for the subroutine in question.

In our experiments, across a set of 144 implementations produced by DreamCoder and when compared to names written by a human expert, these two techniques raise the accuracy of the baseline LLM from 24% to 60% and 82% respectively.

On the other hand, an important drawback of self-censoring mechanisms such as this is that they drastically reduce the response rate of the system—i.e., the fraction of prompts to which it produces a response—from 97% to 42%. We mitigate this by exploiting the stochastic nature of the responses returned by the language model and provide it with multiple opportunities to arrive at internally consistent name suggestions. Together with other optimizations, our experiments indicate that the overall system, which we call NOMNOM, produces a response to 76% of the presented prompts, with an overall accuracy of 79%.

Finally, we conduct two studies (with 18 student programmers each) to identify user preferences among the names chosen by different algorithms, and to determine the impact of appropriately chosen names on user comprehension. We find broad agreement between user preferences and the accuracy numbers from our larger scale experiment, and that our framework boosts our measure of program comprehension from 18% to 76% respectively.

*Contributions.* In summary, we make the following contributions in this paper:

- (1) We introduce an approach to improve the transparency of program synthesizers by providing explanatory names to the subroutines of the implementation.
- (2) We develop a framework to improve the reliability of names produced by large language models (LLMs): The framework supplements the prompt supplied to the LLM with additional information from the synthesizer, and validates its output using a second LLM which resynthesizes code from the proposed names.
- (3) When applied to code produced by DreamCoder [Ellis et al. 2021a], a recent state-of-the-art program synthesizer, and when compared to names written by a human expert, we find that our framework significantly improves on the accuracy of baseline approaches.
- (4) We conduct a user study with student programmers to determine the effectiveness of our approach, and confirm that the proposed names help users to understand the synthesized implementation, and that they prefer names produced by our framework to those produced by baseline techniques.

## 2 OVERVIEW AND MOTIVATING EXAMPLE

Consider a user who wants a program that sorts a list of numbers. They may describe their intent using input-output examples such as the following:

$$f([9, 2, 7, 1]) = [1, 2, 7, 9]. \quad (1)$$

They may then realize this intent using any of a number of inductive program synthesizers [Feser et al. 2015; Miltner et al. 2022; Osera and Zdancewic 2015; Polikarpova et al. 2016].

In this paper, for the sake of concreteness, we focus on programs synthesized using DreamCoder [Ellis et al. 2021a]. Synthesis using DreamCoder runs in two phases: in the first (offline) phase, the system uses a corpus of synthesis tasks to construct a library of reusable components (i.e., functions) which it then uses to more rapidly discharge the provided specification in the subsequent (online) synthesis phase.

We adapt the specification in Equation 1 from Figure 1B of [Ellis et al. 2021a]. In response, it produces a lambda term which may be transliterated into the Python code of Figure 1. Notice that the program uses non-trivial language features such as higher-order functions and that its

```

def g2(x2):
    def g21(x21):
        def g22(x22):
            return x21 < x22
        return len(list(filter(g22, x2))) == 0
    return list(filter(g21, x2))[0]

def g1(x1):
    def g11(x11):
        def g12(x12):
            def g13(x13):
                return x12 > x13
            return x11 > len(list(filter(g13, x1)))
        return g2(list(filter(g12, x1)))
    return g11

def f(x1):
    def f1(x11):
        return g1(x1)(x11 + 1)
    return list(map(f1, range(len(x1))))

```

Fig. 1. Program produced by DreamCoder that sorts a list of numbers. The top-level function is  $f$ . Equation 1 is an excerpt of the specification supplied to the synthesizer. This program has been transliterated into Python from the original lambda-expression which may be found in the supplementary material.

subroutines have uninformative sequentially-generated names (such as  $g_1, g_2, \dots$ ). It is therefore difficult to understand how the program works, or even confirm that it always sorts the provided list of numbers.

We also remark that the top-level auxiliary functions,  $g_1$  and  $g_2$ , correspond to reusable components discovered by DreamCoder from the training data. The synthesizer has therefore concluded that they are useful across a range of tasks, and it appears plausible that they perform some high-level conceptually salient operations over lists. Several recent program synthesizers, including Babble [Cao et al. 2023] and Enumo [Pal et al. 2023], similarly attempt to learn libraries of reusable components / rewrite rules.

Upon reflecting on this program, one may conclude that invoking the function  $g_1(1)(n)$  produces the  $n$ -th smallest element of the list  $l$ , and that the function  $g_2$  returns the largest element of the list  $x_2$  that it accepts as input. In fact, in the original example of [Ellis et al. 2021a], the authors manually add expository comments describing the behavior of these intermediate functions. In this section, we provide an overview of our system NOMNOM: it accepts as input a specification-implementation pair  $(\varphi, f)$  such that  $f$  satisfies  $\varphi$ , and uses an LLM to algorithmically produce names for each subroutine  $g$  that appears in  $f$ .

## 2.1 The Baseline LLM

As a baseline, one may request a large language model, such as one from the GPT family, to provide a name for each function  $g$  in question. Each prompt includes the body and type of the function  $g : T$  being named, and (recursively) any auxiliary functions in the call graph rooted at  $g$ . We provide the baseline prompt templates in the supplementary material.

However, when using GPT-3.5, it consistently fails to produce appropriate names for any of the functions in Figure 1. As an example, it suggests the name “largestSmallestIndices” for the top-level function  $f$ , and “findNearestNumber” and “getFirstItemMinThanArgumentValue” for the functions  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  respectively.

This is somewhat unsurprising, because the program in Figure 1 is unidiomatic Python code. In fact, if one were to replace the function bodies for  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  with the more conventional:

```
def g1(l):
    def g11(n):
        return sorted(l)[n]
    return g11
```

and

```
def g2(l):
    return max(l)
```

respectively, then the system produces accurate names for each function: `get_sorted_values` for the top-level function  $f$ , and `get_nth_sorted_element` and `calculateMax` for  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  respectively.

The poor performance of baseline name suggestion techniques is not limited to LLMs: as we will see in Section 4, even Code2Vec [Alon et al. 2019], a state-of-the-art graph embedding-based name generation tool, produces poor quality names when applied to such unidiomatic code.

As we observe in our user study in Section 5, nonsensical and misleading names massively inhibit program comprehension, and diminish the user’s confidence in future predictions from the system. In this context, the central challenges that we address in this paper are: (a) How do we provide additional information to the language model in order to guide it towards better-chosen names? And (b) can we validate the names produced by the system before presenting them to the user? We will describe our solution to these challenges in the rest of this section.

## 2.2 Prompt Expansion Using Subspecifications

Recall that our computational problem is to produce a name for each subroutine  $g$  that appears in the implementation  $f$ . The first part of our solution involves providing additional information to the language model about the role of  $g$  in the operation of  $f$ .

For example, one might conceptually extend the function  $g_2$  with instructions to log its execution:

```
def g2(x2):
    ...
    ans = list(filter(g21, x2))[0]
    print(f'g2({x2}) = {ans}') # <-- Instrumentation
    return ans
```

Note that the original specification is presented in the form of input-output examples, so one can mechanically evaluate them to confirm that the implementation satisfies the spec. Upon testing the implementation with the logging code enabled, one finds that:

$$g_2([1]) = 1, \tag{2}$$

$$g_2([2, 1]) = 2, \tag{3}$$

$$g_2([2, 7, 1]) = 7, \text{ and} \tag{4}$$

$$g_2([9, 2, 7, 1]) = 9. \tag{5}$$

These observations immediately suggest that the function  $g_2$  is computing the largest element of the list that it takes as input. While this does not provide conclusive proof, careful reading of the

The implementation satisfies the specification. Choose a meaningful name for the function “`g2(x: List[int]) -> int`”:

Specification:

$$\begin{aligned} g2([1]) &= 1, \\ g2([2, 1]) &= 2, \\ g2([2, 7, 1]) &= 7, \text{ and} \\ g2([9, 2, 7, 1]) &= 9. \end{aligned}$$

Implementation:

```
def g2(x2):
    def g21(x21):
        def g22(x22):
            return x21 < x22
        return len(list(filter(g22, x2))) == 0
    return list(filter(g21, x2))[0]
```

Fig. 2. Example prompt for name generation when extended with local input-output subspecifications.

code confirms this hypothesis. In addition, one may conclude that *any* function  $g2'$  which satisfies Equations 2–5, regardless of whether or not it is otherwise semantically equivalent to  $g2$ , can be substituted into the original implementation of Figure 1 without affecting the fact that  $f$  satisfies the global specification, Equation 1.

This motivates us to extend the prompt supplied to the LLM with local input-output behavior of the function  $g$  being named. For example, for the function  $g2$ , we use the extended prompt shown in Figure 2.

With new information of this kind, the LLM is able to choose a more appropriate name for  $g2$ : `findLargestElement`. It also manages to recover the intent of the top-level function,  $f$ , for which it suggests the name `sortList`. In our experiments in Section 4, when applied to the list processing benchmarks solved by DreamCoder, providing logs of input-output behavior measurably improves the accuracy of names suggested by the LLM from 24% to 60% respectively.

*Note 2.1.* The behavior of the function  $g2$ , as described by Equations 2–5, is closely related to the concept of subspecifications recently introduced by [Nazari et al. 2023]. The major difference is that while subspecifications are necessary and sufficient conditions that characterize alternative implementations, monitoring input-output behavior merely provides sufficient conditions: there might conceivably be alternative implementations  $g2'$  that violate Equations 2–5 but which would nevertheless result in the global specification, Equation 1 being satisfied. Regardless, we will adopt their terminology, and refer to these logs of input-output behavior as the subspecifications of individual subroutines.

The primary technical difficulty in formalizing and obtaining these subspecs is the presence of higher-order functions. For example, naively instrumenting the function  $g1$  would produce outputs of the form:

$$g1([9, 2, 7, 1]) = \langle \text{function } g11 \text{ at } 0x\dots \rangle.$$

This output arises from the difficulty in serializing closures and higher-order functions. Our solution in Section 3.1 will involve a new specially designed interpreter to recover subspecifications for higher-order functions, yielding the result:

$$g1([9, 2, 7, 1])(1) = 1, \tag{6}$$

$$g1([9, 2, 7, 1])(2) = 2, \tag{7}$$

$$g1([9, 2, 7, 1])(3) = 7, \text{ and} \tag{8}$$

$$g1([9, 2, 7, 1])(4) = 9, \tag{9}$$

which immediately suggests that evaluating the function  $g1(1)(n)$  produces the  $n$ -th smallest element of the list 1.

Unfortunately, even with this new information, in the run we consulted while writing this paper, the language model still suggested incorrect names for  $g1$  (the suggested name is “genNextGreaterValue”) and the other subroutines in the implementation. Note however that responses from language models are inherently stochastic, so a subsequent run might not exactly reproduce these observations. In fact, our final implementation in NOMNOM makes productive use of this non-determinism.

### 2.3 Algorithmic Sanity Checks

Our next insight is that when a function is appropriately named, that name can be used to substantially recover the original implementation. For example, recall that GPT-3.5 suggested the name `findLargestElement` for the function  $g2$ . Given this proposed function name and its type, we can request a second language model to reproduce the corresponding function, to which it responds:

```
def findLargestElement(x: List[int]):
    maxValue = 0
    for val in x:
        if maxValue < val:
            maxValue = val
    return maxValue
```

Observe that this resynthesized implementation,  $g2' = \text{findLargestElement}$ , is not semantically equivalent to the original function  $g2$ . In particular, it does not fail on empty inputs and it also assumes that the list does not contain any negative numbers. Despite these differences, observe that  $g2'$  continues to satisfy the same subspecification in Equations 2–5. It can therefore be substituted into the larger implementation of Figure 1 without affecting overall correctness, i.e., Equation 1. This suggests that `findLargestElement` is indeed an appropriate name for the subroutine  $g2$ .

Conversely, recall that with the extended prompt of Section 2.2, the language model suggested the name `GenNextGreaterValue` for  $g1$ . Once again, we might ask the LLM to produce an alternative implementation of a function with this name, and type `List[int] -> Callable[[int], int]`. We provide a listing of its output in the supplementary material. Unsurprisingly, the implementation does not satisfy the subspecification corresponding to  $g1$ , i.e., Equations 6–9.

Although such checks do not guarantee the appropriateness of names, they at least confirm some degree of internal consistency. This gives us a mechanism to detect and filter out inappropriate names. In fact, in the run we consulted while writing this paper, this *algorithmic sanity check* provides support for the proposed names `findLargestElement` and `sortList` for the functions  $g2$  and  $f$  respectively. It also successfully refuted the spurious name suggestions for the remaining functions in the implementation.




Fig. 3. Overall architecture of NOMNOM. We begin with a specification-implementation pair,  $(E, f)$ , and a subroutine  $g$  of interest. The system alternates between querying a first LLM to obtain proposals  $w$  for  $g$  and validating  $w$  by resynthesizing an alternative implementation  $g'$  using a second language model.

Overall, in our experiments in Section 4, this further boosts the accuracy of the name suggestions from 60% to 82% respectively. On the other hand, notice that this technique is essentially a censor that filters out inappropriate names, whose use reduces the *response rate* from 97% to 42% respectively. One of the final optimizations in our system, NOMNOM, is a technique to exploit the non-determinism in LLM outputs and regenerate names upon failure of the sanity check. This manages to recover the drop in response rate from 42% to 72%, albeit with a slight decrease in accuracy from 82% to 79% respectively.

*Note 2.2.* Given the extensive use of LLMs in our approach, the reader might wonder whether: (a) it might be possible to directly use the language model to synthesize code, and completely bypass the use of the underlying program synthesizer, and (b) whether the alternative implementation  $g'$  produced by the language model might somehow be more idiomatic and appropriate for presentation to the user. While this is certainly possible, this approach would sacrifice guarantees inherited from the underlying synthesizer, including that the implementation  $f$  satisfies the provided input-output examples. In addition, many synthesis tasks are formulated in the context of a target DSL, and there is no guarantee that an implementation produced by a language model would follow the syntactic constraints of the target DSL.

We describe the overall architecture of NOMNOM in Figure 3. We devote the next section to discussing its underlying algorithms.

### 3 ALGORITHMIC NAME SYNTHESIS

We devote this section to describing our algorithm and some optimizations. The user starts by providing a set of input-output examples,  $E = \{(i_1, o_1), (i_2, o_2), \dots, (i_n, o_n)\}$ . These examples may be drawn from integers, Boolean values, and lists of values. Upon successful synthesis, DreamCoder returns a program  $f$  which satisfies the specification  $E$ , i.e., for all  $(i, o) \in E$ ,  $f(i) = o$ . We indicate



this by writing  $f \models E$ . The implementations produced by DreamCoder are expressed as lambda-terms, examples of which may be found in the supplementary material. Given this specification-implementation pair, our system proposes meaningful names for each subroutine  $g$  appearing in  $f$ . We present the top-level procedure in Algorithm 1.

---

**Algorithm 1**  $\text{NOMNOM}(E, f, g)$ . Given a set of input-output examples  $E = \{(i_1, o_1), (i_2, o_2), \dots, (i_n, o_n)\}$ , implementation  $f \models E$ , and a subroutine  $g$  of  $f$ , produces a name  $w$  for  $g$ .

---

- (1) Compute the local subspecification for  $g$ ,  $E_g = \{(i_{g1}, o_{g1}), (i_{g2}, o_{g2}), \dots\}$ .
  - (2) Repeat until retries are exhausted:
    - (a) (SS.) Request a name  $w$  for  $g$  by supplying its type  $g : T$  and the subspecification  $E_g$  and by using the prompt template from Figure 7b.
    - (b) Request an alternative implementation  $g' : T$  of a function named  $w$  by using the prompt template from Figure 7c.
    - (c) (SS + F.) Substitute the new implementation  $g'$  into  $f$ . If  $f[g'/g] \models E$ , then return the name  $w$ .
  - (3) Report failure.
- 

We begin by performing a best-effort analysis of the program, and associate each sub-expression  $t$  of the program with a type  $t : T$ . In addition, while presenting these programs to the user and to the language model, we freely alternate between their representations as lambda-terms and as programs expressed in a restricted subset of Python. For example, we present the lambda-term `(lambda (x) (cons (+ x 1) (cons (+ x 2) nil)))` to users as follows, inventing placeholder identifiers as needed:

```
def f(x):
    return [ x + 1, x + 2 ]
```

We now discuss the two principal elements of the algorithm, namely prompt expansion using subspecifications and the subsequent algorithmic sanity checks.

### 3.1 Prompt Expansion Using Subsolutions

As discussed in Section 2.2, obtaining the local input-output examples  $E_g$  for prompt expansion is conceptually simple: one can place instrumentation code at appropriate points inside the function body, and log the inputs and outputs being sent into and produced by the function  $g$  currently being named. The hope is that the local input-output behavior provides clues to the overall purpose of  $g$  that is not apparent from its function body. However, this procedure is tricky because of the presence of higher-order functions. In particular, the function  $g$  might either itself take a function (closure) as input, or produce a closure as output, or possibly even both. We develop a custom interpreter to address these challenges.

First, our interpreter includes a mechanism to print (serialize) closures. Thus, for example, the subspecification of  $g_1$  in the following program:

```
def g1(h):
    return h(3)
def f1(x):
    return g1(lambda y: x + y)
```

given the global input-output example  $f_1(2) = 5$  is given by:

$$g1(\text{lambda } y: 2 + y) = 5.$$

Notice that this constraint is satisfied by the original subroutine  $g1$ , but is also satisfied by other implementations, including by the constant-valued function  $g1' = \text{lambda } y: 5$ . Furthermore, it is safe to use any such new implementation  $g1'$  instead of the previous implementation  $g1$ .

Next, we consider the case when subroutines themselves return closures. Consider, for example, the subroutine  $g2$  in the following program:

```
def g2(x):
    def h(y): return x + y
    return h
def f2(x):
    return g2(x)(3)
```

With the global input-output example  $f_2(2) = 5$ , the subroutine  $g2$  is invoked with the input  $x = 2$ . If we instrument the return value of  $g2$  as before, we would observe that  $g2(2) = \text{lambda } y: 2 + y$ . Notice that, given an alternative implementation  $g2'$ , it is conceptually difficult to compare closures for equality.

We instead use the following procedure. Say we wish to produce the subspec for a function  $g$  which itself produces a closure as output. In this case, given the original argument  $x_1$ , we wrap the closure  $g(x_1)$  in a monitor object  $m_1 = ([x_1], g(x_1))$ . We incorporate successive arguments to  $m_1$ , say  $x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k$ , resulting in the monitor object  $m_k = ([x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k], g(x_1)(x_2)(\dots)(x_k))$ . When the closure finally reduces to a ground value, the monitor  $m = (l, v)$  prints the sequence of function arguments  $l$  and the finally produced ground value  $v$ , which are then included as part of the subspecification  $E_g$ .

In the example above, recall that the global specification was  $f_2(2) = 5$ . Querying the subspecification for  $g2$  initially results in the monitor object  $m_1 = ([2], \text{lambda } y: 2 + y)$ . Further evaluation using this monitor object produces the final subspec  $g2(2)(3) = 5$ . We can show that:

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $E$  be a set of input-output examples, and  $f \models E$  be a conformant implementation. Let  $g$  be a subroutine in  $f$ , with local input-output subspecification  $E_g$ . Pick a function  $g'$  such that  $g' \models E_g$ . Then  $f[g'/g] \models E$ .*

### 3.2 Algorithmic Sanity Checks

The names proposed by the LLM in response to the query in Step 2a are sometimes directly embedded in the original source code, or are presented with some other decorative text, such as “Name: *«name»*”. We have devised a set of simple extractor routines and regular expressions that detect these patterns and appropriately extract the proposed name. We hope to simplify this process by using structured prompting techniques in future versions of the system [Beurer-Kellner et al. 2023].

We then forward the proposed name  $w$  and the type  $T$  of the subroutine  $g$  being named to a second language model using the prompt template from Figure 7c. We interpret the response from the LLM as an alternative implementation  $g'$  of the original subroutine  $g$ . This step might fail either because the response from the LLM is not a syntactically well-formed program, or if it fails to have the desired type  $T$ , or if substituting it into the surrounding implementation compromises the overall correctness specification,  $f[g'/g] \not\models E$ . In any of these cases, we reject the name  $w$  being proposed in response to the naming query in Step 2a. Note that we only generate names for top-level subroutines, so we do not have to consider the possibility of variable capture. This assumption greatly simplifies our implementation.

Finally, if  $f[g'/g] \models E$ , then we certify the name  $w$  as having passed the sanity check.

### 3.3 Optimizations

Finally, our implementation in NOMNOM includes two optimizations which increase the overall response rate of the system without losing accuracy.

*Retries.* It turns out that the algorithmic sanity checks of Section 3.2 are very effective in discovering inconsistencies between functions and their proposed names. Filtering names using this heuristic therefore massively improves the accuracy of the naming algorithm. Unfortunately, this accuracy improvement is accompanied by a corresponding drop in the number of queries successfully answered, as we will see in Section 4. The non-deterministic responses generated by language models provide an easy approach to mitigate this drop. When a proposed name fails the sanity check, we repeatedly retry (with a limit of 20 attempts) until the check succeeds, leading to the outermost loop in Algorithm 1.

*Bottom-up name generation.* Finally, there are certain functions which prove to be difficult to name even after multiple independent queries. One example is the following function  $f$ :

```
def f(x1):
    return a2(x1)(5)
def a2(x2):
    def a21(x21):
        def a22(x22):
            return x22 > 0
        return a22(countOccurrences(x2)(x21))
    return a21
```

Observe first that calling the function  $a2(1)(n)$  tests the output of `countOccurrences` to determine whether the value  $n$  occurs in the list 1. It therefore follows that calling the top-level function  $f(l)$  checks whether the provided list contains an occurrence of the number 5.

The last optimization in NOMNOM facilitates this reasoning process by iteratively finding names for higher-level functions only after all lower-level functions, i.e., those reachable from it in the call graph have been successfully named.<sup>1</sup> In our experiments, this turns out to cause a slight increase in the response rate of the system, including for the function  $f$  above. This optimization has a flavor similar to emerging techniques for prompting language models such as scratchpads and chain-of-thought reasoning [Nye et al. 2021; Wei et al. 2022].

## 4 EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

Our implementation of NOMNOM uses `text-davinci-003` as our backend language model. We use the default language model settings for name generation, and only change `max_tokens` to 1,000 for the reverse code generation pass. Our evaluation focuses on the following research questions:

**RQ1.** How effective is our system in producing well-chosen names for subroutines?

**RQ2.** How frequently does the system produce suggestions for subroutine names?

**RQ3.** How many queries does the system require in order to propose these names?

*Benchmarks.* Our evaluation dataset started with 155 specifications involving list processing programs which were synthesized by DreamCoder.<sup>2</sup> Each of these specifications was associated

<sup>1</sup>Note that the concepts learned by DreamCoder naturally have a hierarchical structure in the form of a DAG.

<sup>2</sup>File named `jobs/list_hard_test_ellis_2019-02-15T11.43.28` from the DreamCoder artifact [Ellis et al. 2021b].




Fig. 4. Effectiveness of the algorithmic variants. SS indicates prompt expansion with local input-output subspecifications, SS + F indicates the subsequent algorithmic sanity check, (SS + F) ↻ indicates the version which repeatedly retries upon failure, and NOMNOM indicates our final system with bottom-up name generation. The bars represent the median of five independent executions.

with a name, indicating the user’s intent, and a varying number of implementations (from 1 to 16). Upon manually inspecting these implementations, we discovered that 3 of them did not satisfy the stated user intent, and 8 implementations which we were unable to explain. We eliminated these programs, and chose the largest remaining implementation for each specification, which left us with a dataset consisting of 144 specification-implementation pairs and which consisted of a total of 344 subroutines. We manually provided reference names for each of these subroutines. The appropriateness of these names was subsequently validated by a visiting student researcher who was not among the authors of this paper.

*Baselines.* In addition to the baseline LLM and our algorithmic variants, we also evaluated the performance of Code2Vec [Alon et al. 2019]. Because Code2Vec works with Java code, we translated each of the benchmark programs into Java by hand. We will include these implementations in our artifact.

#### 4.1 RQ1: Effectiveness of Explanations

In order to measure the effectiveness of NOMNOM in producing evocative function names, we ran five variants of our algorithm across the subroutines in our evaluation dataset. We then compared the algorithmically produced function names to our reference names and computed the Jaro similarity between the two [Cohen et al. 2003; Jaro 1989]. We declared the proposed name to be appropriate if this similarity measure exceeded 0.7. Finally, in order to estimate the variability of the overall procedure, we ran each algorithm five times for each subroutine. We present our observations in Figure 4.

Notice the consistent improvement in accuracy as we incorporate algorithmic improvements from a baseline score of 24% to the final value of 79%. One example of a successfully named function is the following:

```
def a2(x2):
  def a21(x21):
    def a22(x22):
```

```

    return x2[x22]
    return list(map(a22, range(x21)))
return a21

```

Evaluating the function  $a2(1)(n)$  returns the first  $n$  elements of the list  $l$ . Only the last two algorithms consistently suggest names such as `getFirstNItems`, `selectFirstElements`, etc., while  $SS$  and  $SS + F$  occasionally produce appropriate names. On the other hand, without any additional information, the baseline LLM suggests the misleading name, `transformList`.

Also, observe that `Code2Vec` generates poor quality names: this is because our benchmarks make heavy use of higher-order functions, resulting in unidiomatic Java code. In many cases, in the absence of an alternative, the system simply regurgitates the original placeholder function name, `f1`, `f2`, etc.

One concern with our evaluation methodology might involve the validity of the reference names. Of the 40 proposed function names polled in our user study, we only observed 3 names which we thought were appropriate (with sufficiently high Jaro similarity to the reference), but for which the average score of the users was “Neutral” or less. Conversely, we did observe situations where we marked a proposed name as inappropriate, even though users subsequently thought otherwise. One example is the following function `c2`:

```

def c2(x3):
    def c31(x31):
        def c32(x32):
            return x32==x31
        return len(list(filter(c32, x3)))
    return c31

```

Evaluating the function  $c2(1)(k)$  counts the number of occurrences of  $k$  in  $l$ . Our reference name was `countOccurrencesOfK`, while  $(SS + F) \odot$  suggested the name `countElementsMatchingValue`, which we rejected based on an insufficient Jaro similarity to the reference name.

## 4.2 RQ2: Response Rate of Tools

Although the algorithmic sanity check,  $SS + F$ , significantly improves the accuracy of the overall algorithm, one concern is that suppressing responses from the LLM might lead to the overall system answering a smaller number of queries. We therefore measured the response rate of the system, and we include this data in Figure 4.

First, observe that providing additional information to the language model, i.e., going from the baseline algorithm to one with prompt expansion,  $SS$ , modestly increases the overall response rate from 82% to 97% respectively. The real benefit of prompt expansion comes from the massive increase in the number of queries correctly answered,  $Acc \times RR$ , from 20% to 58%.

Next, we observe that the greater accuracy of  $SS + F$  is accompanied by a corresponding drop in response rate from 97% to 42% respectively. Indeed, it is not possible for a filtering pass to increase the total number of queries which are correctly answered, so that the product,  $Acc \times RR$ , actually experiences a drop upon its application. We also provide the confusion matrix from one run of  $SS + F$  in Table 1. The overall F1 score of the filter turns out to be 0.68, so better filter designs is an important direction of future work.

Lastly, the figure also confirms the need for the final two algorithmic variants,  $(SS + F) \odot$  and `NOMNOM`: By giving the system multiple opportunities to produce an internally consistent response, they somewhat restore the response rate and provide modest increases in the product measure from 34% to 57% and 59% respectively.

Table 1. Confusion matrix from one run of SS+F. We compare the names produced by the LLM to our reference names, and declare a match when the Jaro similarity exceeds 0.7.

Reference	Filter Approves	Filter Rejects
Match	116 / 344	82 / 344
Mismatch	25 / 344	121 / 344

Table 2. Number of LLM queries needed by the algorithmic variants to name each subroutine. We report the median over five independent runs.

Algorithm	Num Queries
Baseline	1
SS	1
SS + F	2
(SS + F) $\odot$	4
NOMNOM	4

### 4.3 RQ3: Number of LLM Queries Used

Finally, we measured the number of LLM queries needed by the different algorithmic variants to name each function. We list these statistics in Table 2. Both the baseline approach and the variant with prompt expansion, SS, require just one LLM query to produce their response, while the version with algorithmic sanity checks enabled, SS + F, needs two queries: the first to produce a name suggestion and the second to reverse-synthesize the subroutine body. On the other hand, the last two variants, with retries enabled, need to make additional queries when the first query either fails to elicit a response or receives a response which fails validation. Note that we report the median number of queries in Table 2 as the average is skewed by subroutines for which we hit the limit of 20 retries and eventually fail to produce a name.

While we did not explicitly track the time needed to name each subroutine or the cumulative cost of LLM queries, the statistics in Table 2 provide some guidance. Note that the time needed to name each subroutine is dominated by the response time from the OpenAI servers, and depends on numerous other factors such as load on the LLM implementation. In our experience, the most resource-intensive algorithms, (SS + F)  $\odot$  and NOMNOM, produce responses within 5–10 seconds for each subroutine.

## 5 USER STUDY

To determine whether names help users in understanding the outputs of program synthesis tools, we conducted two user studies to answer the following questions:

**RQ4.** Do names help users in inferring the top-level purpose of each subroutine?

**RQ5.** Do names help users in understanding subroutines and the relationships between them?

**RQ6.** How do user preferences vary among the names produced by different algorithmic variants?

*Participant selection.* After IRB approval, we recruited 36 students who were familiar with Python from the engineering schools (Computer Science, Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and Materials Science departments) of 7 prominent American and Canadian universities. These participants had different levels of experience in programming and were a mix of undergraduate, Masters’, and Ph.D. students. We posit that the variation in experience is representative of users




Fig. 5. Time needed and accuracy of participant responses when explaining how implementations worked (Study 1). The missing bars for the baseline correspond to questions that no participant was able to successfully answer.

of program synthesis tools. We randomly divided the 36 participants into two groups with 18 participants for each user study.

## 5.1 Tasks and Study Structure

Before each user study, we had a short screening quiz asking participants to write a Python program that computes the sum of the elements in a list. Disregarding minor syntactic errors, all participants passed the screening quiz. We then showed participants a short video describing the tasks they needed to complete, and a brief introduction to aspects of the Python language that would be heavily used, including higher-order functions and some syntactic quirks. After the study was complete, we had a short discussion with each participant. During the discussion, participants gave their feedback about which aspects of the study they found easy or difficult, and their experience while answering questions. The study materials may be found in Appendices B and C.

*Study 1: Explanations.* We chose four programs from the larger dataset of 88 implementations produced by DreamCoder so that there was no mutual overlap in the subroutines used. In the first study, we asked participants to examine these programs and explain how they worked. We first asked participants to explain what each subroutine did, and then we asked them to walk us through the execution of the program on a specific input. We conducted the study in one of two randomly chosen conditions, with names suggested either by the baseline language model, or our final bottom-up name synthesizer, NOMNOM. We ensured that each participant attempted two tasks with names from the baseline approach, and the remaining two tasks with names from our system. In every case, the names were directly embedded inside the program.

For the first class of questions (i.e., what each subroutine did), we awarded responses with grades of either 0, 0.5, or 1, indicating whether it adequately captured the high-level goal of the function. For the second class of questions (i.e., walking us through an execution), we assessed whether participants accurately described how each function made use of the auxiliary functions that it called. For each such question, we normalized their scores from 0 to 1. We measured the time needed by participants and their average scores. See Figure 5.

*Study 2: Preferences.* The second study consisted of four tasks in which we presented users with a program and asked them to rate their preferences among different suggestions for function names on a five-point Likert scale (“*Inappropriate*”, “*somewhat inappropriate*”, “*neutral*”, “*somewhat*




Fig. 6. Distribution of participant preferences among names suggested by different algorithms (Study 2). The numbers in parentheses indicate the total number of user responses collected for the corresponding naming algorithm.

*appropriate*”, “*appropriate*”). We used the same programs as in the previous study. All participants undertook this study in the same condition, and had access to local subspecifications for each subroutine. We measure the distribution of their responses in Figure 6.

## 5.2 RQ4: Understanding What Functions Do

We first measured the impact of the proposed function names on users’ understanding of the top-level purpose of each function, and the effect of the different naming algorithms on this understanding. From Figure 5b, we observe that names suggested by our tool unambiguously help users in determining the purpose of each function.

Notice that for a majority of questions, all responses from participants looking at names from the baseline LLM were incorrect. We discovered that for the 12 subroutines in question, the baseline algorithm never suggested an appropriate name: four of its suggestions were nonsensical, and eight name suggestions were actually misleading.

By our estimate, all participants critically examined the programs that we showed them. When faced with misleading names, they responded in a few different ways: one subset of participants chose to skip the question, another group of participants sensed a mismatch but chose to trust the stated names anyway, while the last subset disregarded the stated names upon discovering their inappropriateness and attempted to manually recover the function specification. In any case, apart from the program in Task 3, they were uniformly unable to discover the true purpose of the corresponding functions.

In contrast, we judged that all names produced by the final algorithm were appropriate, leading to massively higher accuracies when participants encountered questions in this condition.

## 5.3 RQ5: Understanding How They Work

Our next question involved determining the effect of names on users’ understanding of how functions work. In particular, we asked users to walk us through an execution of the program, and focused on whether they were able to articulate the relationships among the various subroutines, i.e., why and how a particular subroutine called another.



Our measurements are contained in the last question for each task in Figure 5b. Similar to RQ4, we concluded that participants have a much easier time understanding synthesized code when functions are appropriately named. During the post-study debrief, participants reported being surprised by “unnatural” implementations, and complained that the programs realize simple user intentions in complicated ways. In addition, even when they had well-chosen function names, effort was required to confirm their understanding and frame their responses to the questions being asked. When they were unable to definitively understand the code, some participants chose to guess functional relationships based on their names, while others opted to skip the question rather than make tentative predictions.

Anecdotally, we also found a cascading effect in users’ understanding as they went higher up in the call graph towards the top-level functions: i.e., if they were unable to explain how a function  $f_2$  used an auxiliary function  $f_3$  which was called in its body, then they were often also unable to determine the working of a higher-level function  $f_1$  which in turn called  $f_2$ .

#### 5.4 RQ6: Distribution of User Preferences

In our final research question, we attempted to determine how user preferences varied among names produced by different naming algorithms. See Figure 6. From the figure, it is clear that the progressive algorithmic improvements that we discussed in this paper result in names that are well-liked by users. If we assign numerical values to these user preferences on a 0 (“Inappropriate”)–1 (“Appropriate”) scale, then the average score of names produced by the baseline LLM is 0.11, while the average score of names produced by NOMNOM is 0.89. Furthermore, the response rates show a similar trend as discussed in Section 4, with SS + F producing the fewest number of suggestions.

Anecdotally, participants who undertook this study (Study 2) found it easier to indicate their preferences, as compared to participants who had to provide more detailed accounts of how the implementations worked (Study 1). Recall that we included the local input-output subspecifications as part of this study: most participants made their judgments by simply checking for compatibility between the proposed names and the subspecs.

## 6 LIMITATIONS

We now discuss some limitations of our approach and the evaluation methodology employed in this paper.

The first concern is whether function names are sufficient to help programmers understand the synthesized implementation. How programmers choose identifier names [Feitelson et al. 2022; Swidan et al. 2017], and their effect on program comprehension [Deissenboeck and Pizka 2006] has been the subject of extensive research. Despite some research indicating otherwise [Beniamini et al. 2017], there is broad agreement that good variable names are important [Avidan and Feitelson 2017]. This is consistent with our observations in Section 5, where programmers are able to better understand code with appropriately chosen function names.

We might indeed have asked the language model to produce explanations in the form of longer free-form comments: Note that our thesis in Section 3.2 is that well-chosen function names can be used to recover semantically equivalent implementations, and can thereby be subject to experimental falsification. The experimental validation of free-form comments, whether produced by a language model or a human programmer, is an important challenge for future work.

Another concern involves the brittleness of LLM outputs in response to minor changes in the provided prompt. While this cannot be completely mitigated, we hope that the full text of prompts provided in the supplementary material will at least partially address issues with reproducibility.

One might also object to human-written reference names being used for evaluation in Section 4. To mitigate this concern, we had our reference names cross-verified by another student programmer who is not among the authors of this paper.

A final concern involves potential biases in our choice of participants for the user study in Section 5. Are these participants representative of *actual* users of program synthesis tools? While we attempted to mitigate this concern by drawing broadly from graduate and undergraduate students across engineering schools of various prominent American and Canadian universities, conducting a larger study with working programmers is an important direction of future work.

## 7 RELATED WORK

*Comprehension of Synthesized Programs.* While program synthesizers are meant to meet realize logical correctness specifications, their output is rarely easy to understand. Synthesized programs are often obscure and complicated, with no explanation on how the implementation works or meets the user intent. This obscurity partly stems from the use of procedurally generated identifier names ( $v_1$ ,  $v_2$ ,  $f_1$ ,  $f_2$ , etc.) in synthesized code.

Human programmers use different practices to make code comprehensible, such as by writing detailed comments [Woodfield et al. 1981], using meaningful names and identifiers [Schankin et al. 2018], or maintaining documentation of their rationale. Of these approaches, the use of meaningful names has been found to make a significant contribution to improve the comprehensibility [Avidan and Feitelson 2017]. This is intuitive, as 70% of source code consists of identifiers [Deissenboeck and Pizka 2006]. Thus, the lack of meaningful names in synthesized code inhibits understanding. Although the automatic generation of meaningful function and variable names is a well-studied problem in software engineering: see [Jiang et al. 2019] for a survey, and Code2Vec [Alon et al. 2019] and JSNice [Raychev et al. 2015] for prominent examples. Still, the unintuitive nature of automatically generated programs makes it challenging to apply existing techniques.

Research studies have looked into techniques to implement comprehensible code [Storey 2005]. Researchers have also discussed using various techniques to help improve comprehension like program debugging [Caballero et al. 2017; Zeller 1999], program slicing [Ko and Myers 2004; Weiser 1981], automatic summarization [Zhu and Pan 2019], and user-guided program synthesis [Zhang et al. 2021]. However, none of these techniques have been used to generate names for synthesized programs. [Nazari et al. 2023] introduced subspecifications to allow programmers to reason about individual parts of synthesized implementations. Our paper builds on this idea and develops a technique to annotate implementations from program synthesizers with meaningful identifier names.

*Large Language Models in Program Synthesis.* Large language models (LLMs) have been shown to be surprisingly capable of generating code from natural language specifications of programmer intent [Chen et al. 2021]. Such LLMs also have the potential to improve the explainability of code by augmenting it with natural language explanations. However, these large language models do not understand program semantics, and offer no guarantees about quality and accuracy of the suggested code or explanations.

To provide guarantees with LLMs, researchers have suggested using LLMs as a complementary approach to formal methods which can guarantee accuracy and adherence to specifications. For example, Jigsaw [Jain et al. 2022] is a program synthesis tool that augments LLMs with post-processing steps based on program analysis and synthesis techniques, NLX [Rahmani et al. 2021] marries pre-trained natural language models and component-based program synthesis for multi-modal program inference. In this paper, we follow this approach of combining program synthesis

and LLMs to augment synthesized programs with explanatory names that help users understand the intent of the code.

*Prompting.* The effective use of LLMs depends on carefully chosen prompts: Researchers have investigated various prompting techniques like LLM programming [Beurer-Kellner et al. 2023] which is a combination of text prompting and scripting, chain-of-thought prompting [Wei et al. 2022] which uses a series of intermediate reasoning steps to perform complex reasoning, and probabilistic inference paradigm [Ozturkler et al. 2023] which probabilistically reasons over sets of objects using LLMs. While researchers have investigated these approaches to improve the accuracy of language models, it is not evident how to use these techniques to justify the appropriateness of names for program elements.

In this paper, we discuss two novel prompting approaches to improve the accuracy of explanatory names generated by LLMs for synthesized programs. First, we expand the prompt using subspecifications by recovering input-output data from the synthesis algorithm. Second, we conduct sanity check of the algorithm by using another language model to validate the proposed explanations.

## 8 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we showed how to use a large language model (LLM) to annotate automatically synthesized code with meaningful names. Our procedure principally relies on a combination of two relatively simple techniques: *first*, by including additional information about the implementation as part of the prompt, and *next*, by validating the proposed names with an algorithmic sanity check. Both experiments and a user study show the effectiveness of our technique in producing well-chosen function names. Our research contributes to the emerging body of work on combining language models with formal reasoning techniques. In future, we hope to extend these ideas to automatically produce free-form comments, and also potentially techniques that confirm the validity of comments, identifiers and other natural language artifacts in code.

## REFERENCES

2021. GitHub Copilot. <https://copilot.github.com/>.
- Miltiadis Allamanis, Earl Barr, Christian Bird, and Charles Sutton. 2015. Suggesting Accurate Method and Class Names. In *Proceedings of the 2015 10th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE 2015)*. ACM, 38–49. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2786805.2786849>
- Uri Alon, Meital Zilberstein, Omer Levy, and Eran Yahav. 2019. Code2vec: Learning Distributed Representations of Code. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 3, POPL, Article 40 (jan 2019), 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290353>
- Rajeev Alur, Arjun Radhakrishna, and Abhishek Udupa. 2017. Scaling Enumerative Program Synthesis via Divide and Conquer. In *23rd International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems (TACAS) (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 10205)*. 319–336.
- Rajeev Alur, Rishabh Singh, Dana Fisman, and Armando Solar-Lezama. 2018. Search-Based Program Synthesis. *Commun. ACM* 61, 12 (nov 2018), 84–93. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3208071>
- Shengwei An, Rishabh Singh, Sasa Misailovic, and Roopsha Samanta. 2019. Augmented Example-Based Synthesis Using Relational Perturbation Properties. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 4, POPL, Article 56 (Dec. 2019), 24 pages.
- Loris Antoni, Roopsha Samanta, and Rishabh Singh. 2016. Qclose: Program Repair with Quantitative Objectives. In *27th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV)*.
- Eran Avidan and Dror G. Feitelson. 2017. Effects of Variable Names on Comprehension: An Empirical Study. In *2017 IEEE/ACM 25th International Conference on Program Comprehension (ICPC)*. 55–65. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICPC.2017.27>
- Gal Beniamini, Sarah Gingichashvili, Alon Klein Orbach, and Dror G. Feitelson. 2017. Meaningful Identifier Names: The Case of Single-Letter Variables. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Program Comprehension (Buenos Aires, Argentina) (ICPC '17)*. IEEE Press, 45–54. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICPC.2017.18>
- Luca Beurer-Kellner, Marc Fischer, and Martin Vechev. 2023. Prompting Is Programming: A Query Language for Large Language Models. 7, PLDI, Article 186 (2023), 24 pages.

- Rafael Caballero, Adrián Riesco, and Josep Silva. 2017. A Survey of Algorithmic Debugging. *Comput. Surveys* 50 (08 2017), 1–35.
- David Cao, Rose Kunkel, Chandrakana Nandi, Max Willsey, Zachary Tatlock, and Nadia Polikarpova. 2023. Babble: Learning Better Abstractions with E-Graphs and Anti-Unification. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 7, POPL, Article 14 (2023), 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3571207>
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. arXiv:2107.03374 [cs.LG]
- William Cohen, Pradeep Ravikumar, and Stephen Fienberg. 2003. A comparison of string metrics for matching names and records. In *Kdd workshop on data cleaning and object consolidation*, Vol. 3. 73–78.
- Nicolaas Govert de Bruijn. 1972. Lambda calculus notation with nameless dummies, a tool for automatic formula manipulation, with application to the Church-Rosser theorem. *Indagationes Mathematicae* 75, 5 (1972), 381–392.
- Florian Deissenboeck and Markus Pizka. 2006. Concise and consistent naming. *Software Quality Journal* 14 (2006), 261–282.
- Kevin Ellis, Catherine Wong, Maxwell Nye, Mathias Sablé-Meyer, Lucas Morales, Luke Hewitt, Luc Cary, Armando Solar-Lezama, and Joshua Tenenbaum. 2021a. DreamCoder: Bootstrapping Inductive Program Synthesis with Wake-Sleep Library Learning. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI 2021)*. ACM, 835–850.
- Kevin Ellis, Catherine Wong, Maxwell Nye, Mathias Sablé-Meyer, Lucas Morales, Luke Hewitt, Luc Cary, Armando Solar-Lezama, and Joshua Tenenbaum. 2021b. *DreamCoder Software and Data*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3410302>
- Dror G. Feitelson, Ayelet Mizrahi, Nofar Noy, Aviad Ben Shabat, Or Eliyahu, and Roy Sheffer. 2022. How Developers Choose Names. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 48, 2 (2022), 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2020.2976920>
- Yu Feng, Ruben Martins, Osbert Bastani, and Isil Dillig. 2018. Program Synthesis Using Conflict-Driven Learning. In *Proceedings of the 39th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI 2018)*. ACM, 420–435.
- John K. Feser, Swarat Chaudhuri, and Isil Dillig. 2015. Synthesizing Data Structure Transformations from Input-Output Examples. In *Proceedings of the 36th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (Portland, OR, USA) (PLDI '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 229–239. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2737924.2737977>
- Sumit Gulwani. 2011. Automating String Processing in Spreadsheets Using Input-Output Examples. In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*. ACM, 317–330.
- Sumit Gulwani, Alex Polozov, and Rishabh Singh. 2017. *Program Synthesis*. Vol. 4. NOW, 1–119 pages. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/program-synthesis/>
- Zheng Guo, Michael James, David Justo, Jiaxiao Zhou, Ziteng Wang, Ranjit Jhala, and Nadia Polikarpova. 2019. Program Synthesis by Type-Guided Abstraction Refinement. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 4, POPL, Article 12 (Dec. 2019), 28 pages.
- Shivam Handa and Martin Rinard. 2020. Inductive Program Synthesis over Noisy Data. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE 2020)*. ACM, 87–98.
- Naman Jain, Skanda Vaidyanath, Arun Iyer, Nagarajan Natarajan, Suresh Parthasarathy, Sriram Rajamani, and Rahul Sharma. 2022. Jigsaw: Large Language Models Meet Program Synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. ACM, 1219–1231.
- Matthew A. Jaro. 1989. Advances in Record-Linkage Methodology as Applied to Matching the 1985 Census of Tampa, Florida. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 84, 406 (1989), 414–420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1989.10478785> arXiv:<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/01621459.1989.10478785>
- Ruyi Ji, Yican Sun, Yingfei Xiong, and Zhenjiang Hu. 2020. Guiding Dynamic Programming via Structural Probability for Accelerating Programming by Example. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 4, OOPSLA, Article 224 (Nov. 2020), 29 pages.
- Lin Jiang, Hui Liu, and He Jiang. 2019. Machine Learning Based Recommendation of Method Names: How Far are We. In *34th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. 602–614. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2019.00062>

- Amy Ko and Brad Myers. 2004. Designing the Whyline: A Debugging Interface for Asking Questions About Program Behavior. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI)*. ACM, 151–158.
- Orna Kupferman and Moshe Vardi. 2003. Vacuity Detection in Temporal Model Checking. *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer* 4, 2 (Feb. 2003), 224–233.
- Larissa Laich, Pavol Bielik, and Martin Vechev. 2020. Guiding Program Synthesis by Learning to Generate Examples. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=BJl07ySKvS>
- Tessa Lau, Pedro Domingos, and Daniel Weld. 2000. Version Space Algebra and Its Application to Programming by Demonstration. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 527–534.
- Vu Le and Sumit Gulwani. 2014. FlashExtract: A Framework for Data Extraction by Examples. In *Proceedings of the 35th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI)*. ACM, 542–553.
- Woosuk Lee, Kihong Heo, Rajeev Alur, and Mayur Naik. 2018. Accelerating Search-Based Program Synthesis Using Learned Probabilistic Models. In *Proceedings of the 39th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI 2018)*. ACM, 436–449.
- Jedidiah McClurg, Hossein Hojjat, and Pavol Cerný. 2017. Synchronization Synthesis for Network Programs. In *Computer Aided Verification*. Springer, 301–321.
- Anders Miltner, Adrian Trejo Nuñez, Ana Brendel, Swarat Chaudhuri, and Isil Dillig. 2022. Bottom-up Synthesis of Recursive Functional Programs Using Angelic Execution. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 6, POPL, Article 21 (jan 2022), 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3498682>
- Amirmohammad Nazari, Yifei Huang, Roopsha Samanta, Arjun Radhakrishna, and Mukund Raghathan. 2023. Explainable Program Synthesis by Localizing Specifications. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 7, OOPSLA2, Article 298 (oct 2023), 25 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3622874>
- Hoang Duong Thien Nguyen, Dawei Qi, Abhik Roychoudhury, and Satish Chandra. 2013. SemFix: Program Repair via Semantic Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2013 International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE Press, 772–781.
- Maxwell Nye, Anders Johan Andreassen, Guy Gur-Ari, Henryk Michalewski, Jacob Austin, David Bieber, David Dohan, Aitor Lewkowycz, Maarten Bosma, David Luan, Charles Sutton, and Augustus Odena. 2021. Show Your Work: Scratchpads for Intermediate Computation with Language Models. arXiv:2112.00114 [cs.LG]
- OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. arXiv:2303.08774 [cs.CL]
- Peter-Michael Osera and Steve Zdancewicz. 2015. Type-and-Example-Directed Program Synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 36th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI)*. ACM, 619–630.
- Batu Ozturkler, Nikolay Malkin, Zhen Wang, and Nebojsa Jojic. 2023. ThinkSum: Probabilistic reasoning over sets using large language models. arXiv:2210.01293 [cs.CL]
- Anjali Pal, Brett Saiki, Ryab Tjoa, Cynthia Richey, Amy Zhu, Oliver Flatt, Max Willsey, Zachary Tatlock, and Chandrakana Nandi. 2023. Equality Saturation Theory Exploration à La Carte. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 7, OOPSLA2, Article 258 (2023), 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3622834>
- Phitchaya Mangpo Phothilimthana, Tikhon Jelvis, Rohin Shah, Nishant Totla, Sarah Chasins, and Rastislav Bodik. 2014. Chlorophyll: Synthesis-Aided Compiler for Low-Power Spatial Architectures. In *Proceedings of the 35th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI)*. ACM, 396–407.
- Nadia Polikarpova, Ivan Kuraj, and Armando Solar-Lezama. 2016. Program Synthesis from Polymorphic Refinement Types. In *Proceedings of the 37th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (Santa Barbara, CA, USA) (PLDI '16)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 522–538. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2908080.2908093>
- Kia Rahmani, Mohammad Raza, Sumit Gulwani, Vu Le, Daniel Morris, Arjun Radhakrishna, Gustavo Soares, and Ashish Tiwari. 2021. Multi-Modal Program Inference: A Marriage of Pre-Trained Language Models and Component-Based Synthesis. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 5, OOPSLA, Article 158 (oct 2021), 29 pages.
- Veselin Raychev, Martin Vechev, and Andreas Krause. 2015. Predicting Program Properties from "Big Code". In *Proceedings of the 42nd Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL '15)*. ACM, 111–124.
- Andrea Schankin, Annika Berger, Daniel V. Holt, Johannes C. Hofmeister, Till Riedel, and Michael Beigl. 2018. Descriptive Compound Identifier Names Improve Source Code Comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 26th Conference on Program Comprehension (Gothenburg, Sweden) (ICPC '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3196321.3196332>
- Eric Schkufza, Rahul Sharma, and Alex Aiken. 2013. Stochastic Superoptimization. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS)*. ACM, 305–316.
- Mike Shulman. 2021. You Could Have Invented de Bruijn Indices. [https://golem.ph.utexas.edu/category/2021/08/you\\_could\\_have\\_invented\\_de\\_bru.html](https://golem.ph.utexas.edu/category/2021/08/you_could_have_invented_de_bru.html).
- Rishabh Singh. 2016. BlinkFill: Semi-Supervised Programming by Example for Syntactic String Transformations. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 9, 10 (June 2016), 816–827.

- Rishabh Singh, Sumit Gulwani, and Armando Solar-Lezama. 2013. Automated Feedback Generation for Introductory Programming Assignments. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI)*. ACM, 15–26.
- M.-A. Storey. 2005. Theories, methods and tools in program comprehension: past, present and future. In *13th International Workshop on Program Comprehension (IWPC'05)*. 181–191. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WPC.2005.38>
- Alaaeddin Swidan, Alexander Serebrenik, and Felienne Hermans. 2017. How do Scratch Programmers Name Variables and Procedures?. In *17th IEEE International Working Conference on Source Code Analysis and Manipulation, SCAM 2017, Shanghai, China, September 17-18, 2017*. IEEE Computer Society, 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SCAM.2017.12>
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. LLaMA: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models. arXiv:2302.13971 [cs.CL]
- Abhishek Udupa, Arun Raghavan, Jyotirmoy Deshmukh, Sela Mador-Haim, Milo Martin, and Rajeev Alur. 2013. Transit: Specifying Protocols with Concolic Snippets. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI)*. ACM, 287–296.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed H. Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain of Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. CoRR abs/2201.11903 (2022). arXiv:2201.11903
- Mark Weiser. 1981. Program Slicing. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE Press, 439–449.
- S. N. Woodfield, H. E. Dunsmore, and V. Y. Shen. 1981. The Effect of Modularization and Comments on Program Comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Software Engineering (San Diego, California, USA) (ICSE '81)*. IEEE Press, 215–223.
- Yongwei Yuan, Arjun Radhakrishna, and Roopsha Samanta. 2023. Trace-Guided Inductive Synthesis of Recursive Functional Programs. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 7, PLDI, Article 141 (2023), 24 pages.
- Andreas Zeller. 1999. Yesterday, My Program Worked. Today, It Does Not. Why?. In *Proceedings of the 7th European Software Engineering Conference Held Jointly with the 7th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE)*. Springer, 253–267.
- Tianyi Zhang, Zhiyang Chen, Yuanli Zhu, Priyan Vaithilingam, Xinyu Wang, and Elena Glassman. 2021. Interpretable Program Synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, 16 pages.
- Yuxiang Zhu and Minxue Pan. 2019. Automatic Code Summarization: A Systematic Literature Review. arXiv:1909.04352 [cs.SE]




Fig. 7. Prompt templates utilized in the generation of names and code using the LLMs. Figure 7a is utilized to generate names for the baseline, while Figure 7b is employed to generate names for our algorithms. Additionally, Figure 7c is employed to generate programs for our filtering technique.

## A PROMPT TEMPLATES

Figure 7 displays the prompt templates utilized in the generation of names and code using the LLMs.

```
(lambda
  (map (lambda
        #(lambda
            (lambda
              #(lambda
                (car (filter $0 (lambda
                        (empty? (filter $1 (lambda
                                  (gt? $0 $1)))))))
                (filter $1 (lambda
                          (gt? $1 (length (filter $2 (lambda
                                                        (gt? $1 $0))))))))))
              $1 (+ 1 $0)))
        (range (length $0)))
```

Fig. 8. Sorting a list of numbers. The corresponding Python program is in Figure 12.

```
(lambda (#(lambda (lambda ((lambda (gt? $0 0))
  (#(lambda (lambda (length (#(lambda (lambda (#(lambda (lambda
    (fold $1 empty
      (lambda (lambda (fold ($2 $1 range) $0
        (lambda (lambda (cons $3 $2)))))))
    $1 (lambda (lambda (if ($2 $1) $3 empty)))))) $1
      (lambda (eq? $0 $1)))))) $0 $1)))
  (+ (+ (+ 1 (+ 1 1)) 1) 1)
  $0)
```

Fig. 9. Checking if a list has 5. The corresponding Python program is in Figure 13.

```
(lambda (cdr (
  #(lambda (lambda (map (lambda (index $0 $2)) (range $0))))
  (map (lambda $0) $0) (+ 1 (+ 1 1))))
```

Fig. 10. Getting second and third elements of a list. The corresponding Python program is in Figure 14.

```
(lambda (fold $0 (#(map (lambda (mod (+ $0 1) (+ 1 (+ 1 1)))) empty)
  (lambda (lambda (#(lambda (lambda (fold $1 (cons $0 empty)
    (lambda (lambda (cons $1 $0)))))) $0 $1))))
```

Fig. 11. Reversing a list. The corresponding Python program is in Figure 15.

## B IMPLEMENTATION LISTINGS

We list the lambda-expressions emitted by DreamCoder in Figures 8–11 and our corresponding transliterated Python programs for all examples and user study tasks in Figures 12–15. Note that the lambda-expressions use de Bruijn indices [de Bruijn 1972; Shulman 2021], thereby eliminating variable names.



```
def a3(x3):
    def a31(x31):
        def a32(x32):
            return x31 < x32
        return len(list(filter(a32, x3)))==0
    return list(filter(a31, x3))[0]

def a2(x2):
    def a21(x21):
        def a22(x22):
            def a23(x23):
                return x22>x23
            return x21>len(list(filter(a23, x2)))
        return a3(list(filter(a22, x2)))
    return a21

def a1(x1):
    def a11(x11):
        return a2(x1)(x11+1)
    return list(map(a11, range(len(x1))))
```

Fig. 12. Sorting a list of numbers.

```

import functools

def a5(x5):
    def a51(x51):
        def a52(x52, x53):
            def a54(x54, x55):
                return [x53]+x52
            return functools.reduce(a54, x51(x53)(range)[::-1], x52)
        return functools.reduce(a52, x5[::-1], [])
    return a51

def a4(x4):
    def a41(x41):
        def a42(x42):
            def a43(x43):
                if x41(x42):
                    return x4
                else:
                    return []
            return a43
        return a5(x4)(a42)
    return a41

def a3(x3):
    def a31(x31):
        def a32(x32):
            return x32==x31
        return len(a4(x3)(a32))
    return a31

def a2(x2):
    def a21(x21):
        def a22(x22):
            return x22>0
        return a22(a3(x2)(x21))
    return a21

def a1(x1):
    return a2(x1)((((1+(1+1))+1)+1)

```

Fig. 13. Checking if a list has 5.

```

def a2(x2):
    def a21(x21):
        def a22(x22):
            return x2[x22]
        return list(map(a22, range(x21)))
    return a21

def a1(x1):
    def a11(x11):
        return x11
    return a2(a11(x1))(1+(1+1))[1:]

```

Fig. 14. Getting second and third elements of a list.

```

import functools

def a3(x3):
    def a31(x31):
        def a32(x32, x33):
            return [x33] + x32
        return functools.reduce(a32, x3[::-1], [x31])
    return a31

def a2(x2):
    return (x2+1)%(1+(1+1))

def a1(x1):
    def a11(x11, x12):
        return a3(x11)(x12)
    return functools.reduce(a11, x1[::-1], list(map(a2, [])))

```

Fig. 15. Reversing a list.

```

def genNextGreaterValue(x):
    def f(i: int):
        greater = []
        for e in x:
            if e > i:
                greater.append(e)
        return min(greater)
    return f

```

Fig. 16. Generated code by LLM for the generated name genNextGreaterValue.

Table 3. The generated names used in two user studies. In the first user study, we only used names generated by the baseline and NomNom. In the second user study, we asked participants to rate the names generated by the baseline, SS, SS + F, (SS + F)  $\odot$ , and NomNom. We omitted the names produced by Code2Vec because they were uniformly uninformative.

Function	Code2Vec	Baseline	SS	SS+F	(SS+F) $\odot$	NomNom
T1.a3	a3	foldFuncComposer				appendListFunc
T1.a2	a2	addModuloThree	getScaledX21Value	modulo_plus_one	modulo_plus_one	addOneModThree
T1.a1	a1		reverseOrderList	reverseList	reverseMapping	reverseList
T2.a3	a3	getLowestUnusedValue	getMaxElement		getMaxElement	getLargestElement
T2.a2	a2	getHighestValueInList	getNthElementInList			getOrderedElement
T2.a1	a1	findMaxElementIndex	findMaxElementIndex		sortList	sortList
T3.a2	a2	transformList			getFirstXElements	getFirstNItems
T3.a1	a1				extractNextTwoElements	getSecondAndThirdElements
T4.a5	a5		filterFives		filterAppendFunc	filterFunc
T4.a4	a4		filterIntListByPredicate	filterListByPredicate	filterList	filterListByPredicate
T4.a3	a3	summationFunc	countOccurrences		countElementsMatchingValue	countOccurrences
T4.a2	a2	filterPositiveNumbers	hasElementsGreaterThanOrEqual5s	containsNumber	containsNum	hasAtLeastOneOccurrence
T4.a1	a1	isOddIntList			checkForFiveInSequences	hasFiveInList

## C USER STUDY TASKS

Figure 3 includes all names generated by all algorithms used in two user studies.