

---

# Synthetic Programming Elicitation and Repair for Text-to-Code in Very Low-Resource Programming Languages

---

Federico Mora<sup>1</sup> Justin Wong<sup>1</sup> Haley Lepe<sup>2</sup> Sahil Bhatia<sup>1</sup> Karim Elmaaroufi<sup>1</sup>  
George Varghese<sup>3</sup> Joseph E. González<sup>1</sup> Elizabeth Polgreen<sup>4</sup> Sanjit A. Seshia<sup>1</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>UC Berkeley <sup>2</sup>MiraCosta Community College <sup>3</sup>UCLA <sup>4</sup>University of Edinburgh  
{fmora, justin.wong, sahilbhatia, k.e, jegonzal, ssesia}@berkeley.edu  
halepe@stanford.edu, varghese@cs.ucla.edu, elizabeth.polgreen@ed.ac.uk

## Abstract

Recent advances in large language models (LLMs) for code applications have demonstrated remarkable zero-shot fluency and instruction following on challenging code related tasks ranging from test case generation to self-repair. Unsurprisingly, however, models struggle to compose syntactically valid programs in programming languages unrepresented in pre-training, referred to as very low-resource Programming Languages (VLPLs). VLPLs appear in crucial settings, including domain-specific languages for internal tools and tool-chains for legacy languages. Inspired by an HCI technique called natural program elicitation, we propose designing an intermediate language that LLMs “naturally” know how to use and which can be automatically compiled to a target VLPL. When LLMs generate code that lies outside of this intermediate language, we use compiler techniques to repair the code into programs in the intermediate language. Overall, we introduce *synthetic programming elicitation and compilation* (SPEAC), an approach that enables LLMs to generate syntactically valid code even for VLPLs. We empirically evaluate the performance of SPEAC in a case study and find that, compared to existing retrieval and fine-tuning baselines, SPEAC produces syntactically correct programs significantly more frequently without sacrificing semantic correctness.

## 1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated an exceptional ability to generate code from natural language prompts for popular programming languages, like Python and Java [11]. Unfortunately, these same language models struggle to generate code for low-resource programming languages, like many domain-specific languages (e.g., CUDA [32]). These challenges are even more pronounced for very low-resource programming languages (VLPLs) (e.g., UCLID5 [27]). Existing work has attempted to remedy this issue through prompting, constrained decoding, and fine-tuning strategies. Unfortunately, these approaches fail to capture the intricacies of real VLPLs and so success remains limited. To see why, consider the following three exemplars.

First, [33] include context-free grammars in text-to-code prompts to guide LLMs toward syntactically correct answers. This approach works well for simple languages but cannot capture most non-trivial programming languages, which are context-sensitive. Second, [1] use static analysis techniques to reject tokens that lead to syntactically incorrect output programs. This technique can go beyond context-free languages but assumes a linear programming process. Unfortunately, it is well known that the root cause of a programming error need not surface as it is written [26], necessitating backtracking and a nonlinear programming process. Third, [8] translate training data from high resource languages

to low resource languages and then use this new data to fine-tune models. This approach is restricted to languages where the LLM is able to translate to the language reliably but unable to generate code from natural language. Further, this approach makes the overly restrictive assumption that the target low-resource language is general purpose: i.e., we cannot translate arbitrary Java programs to CUDA.

In this paper, we propose a text-to-code approach that is fundamentally different (and complementary) to prompting, decoding, and fine-tuning strategies. The first key idea behind our approach comes from natural programming elicitation, a kind of study that helps programming language designers understand how programmers “naturally” approach problems from a given programming domain [23, 9]. Programming language designers use the results of these studies to create languages that are aligned with the expectations of users, leading to less programming friction and more effective developers. We borrow this idea for the setting where LLMs are the “users” of programming languages. Akin to uncovering what human users find “natural” for a given domain, we uncover what LLMs find “natural.” Specifically, our first insight is to embrace LLM’s tendencies and design an intermediate language that aligns with these LLM expectations.

The second key idea behind our approach is that program analysis techniques that are overly aggressive for human users may be suitable for LLM “users.” For example, in UCLID5, all variables have to be declared and statically typed: an assignment like `x = 0;` would require a corresponding declaration like `var x: integer;`. But, if an LLM generates code that had an assignment without a corresponding declaration, instead of crashing, one could automatically “repair” the program and output the result.

We use these two ideas to define a new text-to-code approach called *synthetic programming elicitation and compilation* (SPEAC). Specifically, for a target VLPL  $T$ , we use synthetic programming elicitation to select an intermediate language  $P$  (the “parent” language) and define a subset of the language  $C$  (the “child” language). The language  $P$  should be one that LLMs are good at generating (e.g. Python); the language  $C$  should be easy to compile to the target VLPL  $T$ . Our approach takes  $P$ ,  $C$ , and a compiler from  $C$  to  $T$ , and produces a text-to-code pipeline for the VLPL  $T$ . This pipeline uses deductive techniques to automatically repair programs generated by LLMs that are in  $P$  but not in  $C$ . When these deductive techniques are unable to fully repair a program, we insert a “hole” and ask an LLM to finish the repair, repeating as necessary.

We demonstrate the effectiveness of this idea in a case study that uses Python as the parent language  $P$ , UCLID5 [27] as the target language  $T$  and a subset of Python as the child language  $C$ . UCLID5 is a language used for formal modeling and verification of state transition systems which has code examples numbering in the hundreds rather than thousands or millions. Furthermore, UCLID5 programs rely heavily on the notion of a transition system, which is not frequently found in other programming languages. As such, state-of-the-art LLMs are unable to generate any useful UCLID5 code out-of-the-box (see §5.1).

Overall, we make the following contributions: 1) We present SPEAC, a novel method for generating syntactically correct code from LLMs in very low resource programming languages; 2) We implement this method for the UCLID5 verification language; and 3) We demonstrate substantial improvement with SPEAC in syntactic correctness, producing parsable code in UCLID5 84.8% of the time compared to 9.1% and 3% by gpt-3.5-turbo fine-tuning or gpt-4-turbo in-context learning, respectively.

## 2 Related Work

**LLMs for Code Generation.** With the rich trove of stack overflow and github data available in public domain, proprietary models like GPT-4 [25] and open-source models such as code-llama [28] and deepseek-coder [16] have transformed code intelligence for developers. GPT-4 especially has achieved impressive success on datasets such as Mostly Basic Python Problems (MBPP) [3] and LiveCodeBench [18], 80% and 40% pass@1 results, respectively. As shown in deepseek-coder, support for less common programming languages (Bash, PHP, etc) improves substantially by inclusion in pretraining as compared to only fine-tuning as done in code-llama [16].

**Training free approaches to low-resource PLs.** In constrained decoding, incremental parsing is used to prevent hallucination by rejecting impossible prefixes without producing the full code [14, 1, 29, 21]. In the context of autoregressive LLMs that naturally produce code left to right, it remains an open problem how to best include the inductive bias of a grammar. Our approach advocates for allowing the

Model a state machine describing a traffic light at a pedestrian crosswalk.	module TrafficLight {	1
This is a time triggered machine that assumes it will react once per second. It starts in the red state and counts 60 seconds with the help of the variable count. It then transitions to green, where it will remain until the pure input pedestrian is present. That input is generated by some other subsystem that detects when a pedestrian is present, and should be modelled as nondeterministic. When pedestrian is present, the machine transitions to yellow if it has been green for at least 60 seconds. ...	var sigG, sigR, sigY: boolean;	2
	var count, state: integer;	3
	var pedestrian: boolean;	4
	init {	5
	sigG = false; sigY = false; sigR = true;	6
	state = 0; count = 0; pedestrian = false; }	7
	procedure step()	8
	modifies sigG; modifies sigY; modifies sigR;	9
	modifies count; modifies state; {	10
	if (state == 0) {	11
	sigG = false; sigY = false; sigR = true;	12
	count = 0;	13
	if (count < 60) { count = (count + 1); }	14
	...	15

(a)

(b)

Figure 1: Task description from [19] (a) and output in UCLID5 (b).

LLM to hallucinate but iteratively repair errors similar to [31, 12, 24]. Orthogonal to our approach, retriever augmented generation has been applied for Dafny, another low-resource language for verification [22]. Additionally, this paper focuses on very low resourced languages (VLPLs) which have far fewer training examples in public domain.

**LLMs for Low-resource PLs.** Recent work has considered augmenting LLMs with support for low-resource programming languages [8, 10, 16]. [10] shows that, on smaller 125M parameter encoder-only models, fine-tuning on adjacent languages improves the monolingual performance coding tasks. However, it remains an open question whether autoregressive language models share this benefit and whether this fine-tuning trend scales to larger (7B to 70B) language models. Synthetic fine-tuning datasets curated and cleaned by LLMs have shown promise for programming tasks [8]. In particular, [8] tackles low-resource programming languages such as Julia and Rust, using an LLM to translate code examples from high-resource languages to the low-resource language. This process is promising for cases where the language model already has a baseline knowledge necessary to translate to the low-resource language which is not the case for VLPLs.

### 3 Overview and Running Example

Given a natural language description of a programming task and a target programming language  $T$ , the text-to-code problem is to generate a correct program  $t \in T$ . Fig. 1 shows a real input-output pair generated by an instance of our approach targeting the UCLID5 programming language. Specifically, Fig. 1a shows a task extracted from [19], and Fig. 1b shows the output corresponding to that task using a prototype implementation of our approach powered by gpt-3.5-turbo-0125. Fig. 1b passes all compiler checks but has a subtle semantic mistake on line 4.

Fig. 2 shows the workflow that generates models based on task descriptions as shown in Fig. 1b. The workflow is parameterized by an LLM,  $L$  (e.g., gpt-3.5-turbo-0125); a target language,  $T$  (e.g., UCLID5); a parent language,  $P$  (e.g., Python); a child language,  $C \subset P$  (e.g., a subset of Python); and a compiler,  $f$ , from  $C$  to  $T$  (e.g., a syntax-directed translation from the subset of Python to UCLID5). Given an input task, we create a prompt  $q$  that asks the LLM  $L$  to generate code,  $p \in C$ , which achieves  $q$ . The second step of the workflow is to repair  $p$ . If there is nothing wrong with  $p$ , or  $p$  can be fixed using formal techniques described in §5.2 and §5.3, then repairing will generate a new, complete program  $p'$  and return  $f(p')$  (i.e., a program in the target language, like Fig. 1b). Frequently, however, repairing will generate a partial program containing “holes” (denoted “???”). For example, Fig. 5b shows the first  $p$  generated for the task in Fig. 1a and Fig. 5a shows the corresponding partial program  $p'$  that was automatically generated using our formal techniques. Programs with holes cannot be compiled to the target language, so the third step of the workflow is ask the LLM to complete the partial program  $p'$ , generating a new  $p$ . We use the template in Fig. 4b to generate the LLM prompt. Fig. 6a shows the output generated by gpt-3.5-turbo-0125 when asked to repair the partial program in Fig. 5a. This program is still incorrect, but, it is now close enough that we can automatically repair it




Figure 2: The SPEAC workflow. Users input  $q$ , a task in natural language, and  $C$ , a description of the intermediate language. The LLM takes these inputs and generates  $p$ , a program in  $P$ . We use formal techniques to repair  $p$  and produce  $p'$ , a program in  $C$  that possibly contains holes. If  $p'$  does not contain holes, SPEAC applies  $f$ , a compiler from  $C$  to the target language,  $T$ , and returns the result. Otherwise, SPEAC generates a new prompt,  $q'$ , and repeats by asking the LLM to fill in the holes.

to a complete program without holes. Fig. 6b shows the relevant portion of that complete program. This final, complete program is directly translated to the output in Fig. 1b. §5 elaborates on each of the workflow components.

To understand the subtle mistake in Fig. 1b one needs some understanding of UCLID5 [27, 30]. UCLID5 is a *verification language* used to model hardware and software systems as “state machine” like transition systems and to automatically check if the transition system does indeed satisfy a formal logic specification. UCLID5 transition systems primarily consist of a state space given by a set of variable declarations (e.g., lines 2-4 in Fig. 1b), an initialization block that represents a set of acceptable start states (e.g., lines 5-7 in Fig. 1b), and a transition relation block that defines how the transition system moves from one state to the next state (e.g., lines 8-29 in Fig. 1b). The `var` keyword is used to declare variables that are internal to the transition system in question while the `input` keyword is used to declare readonly variables that are outside the control of the transition system in question. Fig. 1b passes all compiler checks but has a subtle semantic mistake on line 4: `var pedestrian: boolean;` should be `input pedestrian: boolean;` because the presence of a pedestrian should not be controlled by the traffic light transition system. In §6 we mark this case as “mostly correct” because it is correct otherwise.

## 4 Background

In this section we provide the necessary technical background to understand our approach.

### 4.1 Algebraic Data Types and Abstract Syntax Trees

Algebraic data types (ADTs) are a representation of finite trees that is common in functional programming languages. We provide an informal definition of ADTs and point the interested reader to [5] for a more formal treatment.

An ADT consists of a set of constructors (node names), selectors (directed edge names), and testers (predicates). Each constructor has a fixed set of selectors associated with it (nodes with a particular name have a fixed set of outgoing edges). Each selector has an associated type (each edge can only point to a fixed set of node names). Unlike constructors and selectors, testers are not part of the finite trees that ADTs represent. Instead, testers are predicates that are used to ask questions about the finite trees. Specifically, every constructor is associated with exactly one unique tester: that tester returns true on a given tree iff the root of the tree is labeled with the corresponding constructor. Every instance of an ADT (a particular finite tree built from those node and edge names) must be acyclic.

For example, consider an ADT called `Bool` that represents simple Boolean expressions. `Bool` has four constructors: `Not`, `And`, `True`, and `False`. The constructor `Not` is associated with the selector `arg`, which in turn is associated with the type `Bool`; The constructor `And` is associated with the selectors `arg1` and `arg2`, which are both associated with the type `Bool`; and the constructors `True` and `False` are associated with no selectors. An instance of `Bool` is `Not(arg=And(arg1=True, arg2=False))`. This is a finite tree whose root is `Not` and whose two leaves are `True` and `False`.

Abstract syntax trees (ASTs) are instances of ADTs—i.e., ASTs are concrete finite trees—that represent programs. Every programming language has a corresponding ADT that represents a superset of all possible programs in that programming language. Some instances of a language’s ADT will not correspond to valid programs, e.g., if they do not additionally type check.

---

```

# GTCODE 1: imports a class from the hypothetical library
from FormalVerificationLibrary import Module
# GTCODE 2: creates an instance of an imported class
m = Module("myModule")
# GTCODE 3: uses a dunder method (in this case __str__) of an imported class
print(m)

```

---

Figure 3: Hypothetical LLM output with grounded theory codes as comments.

## 4.2 Satisfiability Modulo Theories and Weighted Maximum Satisfiability

Satisfiability Modulo Theories (SMT) [6] is a class of problems generalizing Boolean satisfiability (SAT) to first-order logics with additional background logical theories. We give an informal presentation of satisfiability modulo theories (SMT) that focuses on only the theory of ADTs and covers weighted maximum satisfiability (MAX-SMT). For more details, see [6].

Let  $\Gamma$  be a set of ADTs and let  $V$  be a set of typed variables (pairs of names and types). For simplicity we assume that variable types are exactly elements of  $\Gamma$ . In reality, variables can also have function types (e.g.,  $V \doteq \{(z, \text{Bool}), (f, \text{Bool} \mapsto \text{Bool})\}$  would be fine). An *atomic formula* is an equation or the application of a single tester over  $V$  (e.g.,  $z = \text{True}$  and  $\text{is\_And}(z)$  are both atomic formulas). A *theory literal* is an atomic formula or its negation. A *clause* is a set of theory literals. A *conjunctive normal form (CNF) formula*, or *formula* for short, is a set of clauses. For example, if  $\Gamma \doteq \{\text{Bool}\}$  and  $V \doteq \{(z, \text{Bool})\}$ , then  $\{z = \text{True}\}, \{\text{is\_And}(z)\}$  is a formula. An *interpretation* is a mapping from variables to elements of their corresponding type. For example,  $I(x) \doteq \text{True}$  if  $x = z$  and  $I(x) \doteq \text{False}$  otherwise, is an interpretation. Interpretations are extended to atomic formulas in the natural way (plug-in the values for the variables and evaluate using the standard semantics of Boolean logic, equality, and testers). When an atomic formula  $\phi$  evaluates to true under an interpretation  $I$ , we say that  $I$  *satisfies*  $\phi$  and write  $I \models \phi$ . We extend the notion of satisfiability to literals, clauses, and formulas in the natural way and reuse the same notation: a clause is satisfied if any of its elements is satisfied; a formula is satisfied if all of its elements are satisfied. The satisfiability modulo theories problem is to determine if, for a given formula  $\phi$ , there exists an interpretation  $I$  such that  $I \models \phi$ . When such an  $I$  exists we say that  $\phi$  is *satisfiable* (**sat**). When no such  $I$  exists, we say that  $\phi$  is *unsatisfiable* (**unsat**). For example,  $\{z = \text{True}\}, \{\text{is\_And}(z)\}$  is **unsat**.

The maximum satisfiability problem is, for a given (CNF) formula  $\phi$ , to determine the largest subset of  $\phi$  that is **sat** (solvers aim to satisfy as many clauses as possible). The weighted maximum satisfiability problem (MAX-SMT) is a variation with two differences. First, some clauses can be “hard”—meaning they must be satisfied. Second, every “soft” clause (any clause that is not “hard”) has an associated weight. The problem is then to determine subset of  $\phi$  that maximizes the sum of weights while being **sat** and containing all “hard” clauses.

## 5 Approach

In this section we describe the SPEAC approach. We begin with how to select  $P$  and  $C$ , and then we describe the two formal techniques at the heart of our automated repair.

### 5.1 Synthetic Programming Elicitation

In this section, we present a three step recipe for conducting LLM programming studies—studies where LLMs are the subject. The results of these studies can be used to select  $P$  and  $C$ . We call this process synthetic programming elicitation since it is inspired heavily by natural programming elicitation [23].

**First Step: Setup.** First prepare LLM subjects, select a target language, and collect or construct a set of programming tasks. In our case, our target language is UCLID5, our LLM subjects are gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09 and gpt-3.5-turbo-0125, and our programming tasks are a set of regression tests written by UCLID5 developers with corresponding natural language descriptions (see §6).

1	Write [PARENT LANGUAGE] code to complete the following task.	Fix the following [PARENT LANGUAGE] code by replacing every occurrence of ‘?’ with the correct code.
2		
3	> [TASK GOES HERE]	
4		[CODE WITH HOLES GOES HERE]
5	Reply with your code inside one unique code block	
6		Make sure that your code completes the following task.
7	[DESCRIBE CHILD LANGUAGE]	
8		
9	I can definitely do that! Here is the code:	
10	““	[LINES 3–10 OF (a)]

(a) Template for prompt  $q$  in Fig. 2(b) Template for prompt  $q'$  in Fig. 2

Figure 4: SPEAC prompt templates for first generation (a) and hole filling (b).

The second part of the study setup is to create multiple kinds of specialized prompts. The first will ask for the output to be in the target language directly. Subsequent prompts will ask for the output to use an imaginary API in a popular host language, like Python or Java. For example, for UCLID5, we generated prompts that look like the following.

1. “Write a UCLID5 model for a system that counts the number of times the temperature exceeds a threshold [ . . . ]”
2. “ FormalVerificationLibrary is a Python library for generating verification models [ . . . ]. Use the FormalVerificationLibrary to model a system that counts the number of times the temperature exceeds a threshold [ . . . ]”

**Second Step: Execute.** Now we execute every LLM subject on every prompt and collect the outputs. Each query should be executed independently.

**Third Step: Analyze and Design.** Finally, we analyze the collected LLM outputs and select  $P$  and  $C$  based on the analysis. To do this analysis, we follow a lightweight version of grounded theory [15].

The first step of our grounded theory analysis is to “code” the outputs generated by the LLMs. In grounded theory parlance, “code” is akin to labelling parts of the generated outputs. For example, Fig. 3 shows a hypothetical LLM output for our running example along with grounded theory codes as comments. The second step is to group codes into concepts. Concepts are slightly more abstract than codes. For example, a concept that may emerge from Fig. 3 is the group of codes 1, 2, and 3. The corresponding concept could be “using a class from the hypothetical library.” In the third step, we group concepts into categories. For example, we may group concepts related to the object oriented programming paradigm as one category. Finally, we select a  $P$  and  $C$  that are consistent with the final categories we observed across multiple prompts.

In our study, we found that, when asked to write UCLID5 code without any special prompting or training, no LLM was able to produce code that parses (660 attempts: 10 samples per LLM per benchmark, 33 benchmarks, two LLMs). Worse still, the code generated by LLMs was inconsistent, with each LLM giving different outputs that resemble different programming languages at different times. When asked to write Python code that used a non-existent formal verification API, however, the LLM outputs were more consistent. Therefore, we selected Python as our parent language,  $P$ .

Specifically, the Python code was more consistent because LLM outputs fell into three broad categories, which we call “from-scratch,” “procedural,” and “object-oriented,” respectively. Programs in the “from-scratch” category used existing APIs (e.g., the Z3 solver API [13]) to re-implement what UCLID5 does, e.g., to manually model transition systems. This was the smallest significant category. Programs in the “procedural” category imported a class from the hypothetical API, created an instance of it, and then called methods from the class to declare variables, assert specifications and so on. Programs in the “object-oriented” category imported a class from the hypothetical API and extended it, including methods that correspond closely to parts of UCLID5 code.

After analyzing the outputs, we concluded that it would be easiest to translate Python programs from the “object-oriented” category to UCLID5. Therefore we defined a subset of Python that matches the “object-oriented” category and used that as our child language,  $C$ . Essentially,  $C$  is an abstract

<pre> 1 class TrafficLight(Module): 2     def types(self): 3         self.state_t = BitVector(2) 4     def locals(self): 5         self.state = BitVector(2) 6         self.count = BitVector(6) 7         self.pedestrian = Boolean() 8         self.sigG = Boolean() 9         self.sigY = Boolean() 10        self.sigR = Boolean() 11    def inputs(self): 12        self.pedestrian = Boolean() 13    def outputs(self): 14        self.sigG = Boolean() 15        self.sigY = Boolean() 16        self.sigR = Boolean() 17    def init(self): 18        self.state = BitVector(2) 19        self.count = BitVector(6) 20        self.pedestrian = Boolean() 21        self.sigG = Boolean() 22        self.sigY = Boolean() 23        self.sigR = Boolean() </pre>	<pre> 24 def next(self): 25     if self.state == 0: 26         self.sigG = False 27         self.sigY = False 28         self.sigR = True 29         self.count = 0 30         if self.count &lt; 60: 31             self.count += 1 32         else: 33             self.state = 1 34     ... 35     elif self.state == 3: 36         self.sigG = False 37         self.sigY = False 38         self.sigR = False 39         if self.count &lt; 60: 40             self.count += 1 41         else: 42             self.state = 0 </pre>	<pre> 1 class TrafficLight(Module): 2     def locals(self): 3         self.state = int 4         self.count = int 5         self.pedestrian = bool 6     def outputs(self): 7         self.sigG = bool 8         self.sigY = bool 9         self.sigR = bool 10    def init(self): 11        self.state = ?? 12        self.count = ?? 13        self.pedestrian = ?? 14        self.sigG = ?? 15        self.sigY = ?? 16        self.sigR = ?? 17    def next(self): 18        if self.state == 0: 19            self.sigG = False 20            self.sigY = False 21            self.sigR = True 22            self.count = 0 23            ... </pre>
(a)	(b)	

Figure 5: Response for task in Fig. 1a using gpt-3.5-turbo-0125 (a) and first repair (b).

class that the LLM must implement and extend (shown in Appx. A). Fig. 6b shows a portion of an example of a Python program in  $C$  and Fig. 1b shows its corresponding UCLID5 program.

**(Minimal) Prompting.** Once  $P$  and  $C$  have been selected, we use minimal prompting to interface with LLMs. For example, for UCLID5, we use the prompt template in Fig 4a to create initial programs and the prompt template in Fig. 4b to fill in holes.

## 5.2 Largest Consistent Subtree

Given a program  $p$  in  $P$ , but not in  $C$ , our aim is to remove as little as possible from  $p$  to bring it into the language  $C$ . That is, given the AST for  $p$ , we wish to generate the largest subtree of the AST, possibly containing holes, that is not rejected by the static checks of the language  $C$ . For example, the code in Fig. 5b contains some errors, including mismatches between variable and constant types (UCLID5 does not automatically cast constants and so the line `self.count = 1` is interpreted as assigning the integer literal 1 to the bitvector variable `self.count`, which is a type error).

We find the largest consistent subtree in three steps. First, we use an error tolerant parser to build an AST,  $A$ , for the language  $P$ . Second, beginning at the root of  $A$ , we recursively descend and prune anything that cannot exist in an AST for the language  $C$ , placing holes wherever they are needed. This is an aggressive program slice, similar to [2], which gives a new AST  $A'$ .  $A'$  may or may not pass compiler checks, like type checking, or be semantically correct.

The third step finds the minimal number of AST nodes that need to be replaced with holes such that all static checks of the language  $C$  pass, using the approach of [26]. Specifically, for every static check of the language, for every node of the AST, we generate a set of soft clauses. Let  $S$  be the union of all the generated clauses, and let  $S'$  be the largest subset of clauses that is **sat** (the output of a MAX-SMT solver). Any clause,  $c$ , that appears in  $S$  but does not appear in  $S'$  represents a bug: if we add  $c$  to  $S'$ , then we will get an **unsat** set of clauses. So, for every such  $c$ , we replace the AST node that generated  $c$  with a hole.

For example, in UCLID5, the two statements `var x: bv32;` and `x = 0;` would produce a set of clauses corresponding to the assertions that (a)  $x$  is a bitvector and that (b)  $x$  is an integer (since 0 is an integer). These assertions, together, are **unsat**, so MAX-SMT would return a set of clauses that

<pre> class TrafficLight(Module):   def locals(self):     self.state = 0     self.count = 0     self.pedestrian = False   def outputs(self):     self.sigG = False     self.sigY = False     self.sigR = False   def init(self):     self.state = 0     self.count = 0     self.pedestrian = False     self.sigG = False     self.sigY = False     self.sigR = True ... </pre>	<pre> class TrafficLight(Module):   def locals(self):     self.count = <b>int</b>     self.pedestrian = <b>bool</b>     self.sigG = <b>bool</b>     self.sigR = <b>bool</b>     self.sigY = <b>bool</b>     self.state = <b>int</b>   def init(self):     self.state = 0     self.count = 0     self.pedestrian = False     self.sigG = False     self.sigY = False     self.sigR = True ... </pre>
(a)	(b)

Figure 6: Response for Fig. 5a using gpt-3.5-turbo-0125 (a) and second repair (b).

does not include both (a) and (b). One solution would be to remove the bitvector type, producing the partial, but consistent, two statements `var x: ??;` and `x = 0;`.

We can bias the solver to include one or the other by adjusting the weights on the corresponding clauses. In practice, we assign clauses weights that are proportional to the depth of the corresponding node in the AST. This ensures that edits are closer to the leafs of the AST but it breaks syntactic minimality guarantees. In the case where weights are uniform and every node corresponds to exactly one clause, the MAX-SMT approach will make the minimal edit to the AST.

### 5.3 Model-Based Repair

Once we have a satisfiable set of clauses, we can generate a corresponding satisfying model and use the model to repair the partial program. This is where our work most differs from [26]. For example, the partial program `var x: ??;` from above would correspond to the set of clauses `is_Integer(??)`. This clause would be satisfied by setting `??` to `integer` and so we can repair the partial program to be `var x: integer;`.

Fig. 6 shows one buggy AST (Fig.6a) and the corresponding fix (Fig. 6b). For example, the variable `count` is declared as an integer in the repaired program because it is used as an integer in the buggy program. For repairs that cannot be automatically resolved by the MAX-SMT model, we use the LLM to generate code to replace the AST holes, as shown in Fig. 2.

## 6 Evaluation

We implement a prototype of SPEAC for UCLID5, called Eudoxus, as a Python project that uses `tree-sitter` to parse and search Python programs and Z3 [13, 7] for all MAX-SMT queries<sup>1</sup>. All MAX-SMT queries are solved locally on a 2.3 GHz Quad-Core Intel Core i7 with 32 GB of RAM. All LLM calls are made through the OpenAI Python API.

**Benchmarks.** We use three sets of UCLID5 benchmarks. The first set is a curated set of 33 regression tests with handwritten natural language descriptions. These tests are designed to cover a broad range of UCLID5 features and were used for the synthetic programming elicitation study in § 5.1.

The second set is a set of 317 regression tests without descriptions taken directly from the UCLID5 GitHub repository. These tests were used for fine-tuning our baseline model described below. This set is representative of the quantity and quality of data that a user may have available for a VLPL.

<sup>1</sup>Available at: <https://github.com/FedericoAureliano/eudoxus>



	Parse Rate	Semantic Score				
		1	2	3	4	5
Eudoxus (GPT-4-turbo)	24/33	1/24	1/24	3/24	8/24	11/24
Eudoxus (GPT-3.5-turbo)	28/33	3/28	6/28	5/28	5/28	9/28
Fine-tuned GPT-3.5-turbo	2/33	0	2/2	0	0	0
One-shot with COT (GPT-4-turbo)	1/33	0	0	0	1/1	0
One-shot with COT (GPT-3.5-turbo)	0	-	-	-	-	-
One-shot (GPT-4-turbo)	0	-	-	-	-	-
One-shot (GPT-3.5-turbo)	0	-	-	-	-	-

Table 1: Eudoxus compared to fine-tuning in-context learning baselines. We report the semantic score over all correctly parsed models, where 1 is semantically completely wrong and 5 is semantically fully correct. Eudoxus is limited to 5 LLM calls per benchmark, and 4 benchmarks hit this limit. “-” indicates that this entry is not applicable for this approach.

For the purposes of fine-tuning, we use self-instruct to first ask the model to summarize the UCLID5 regression tests in natural language and then provide a natural language description using self-instruct.

The third and final set is a set of 33 exercises and examples taken from three textbooks: [4, 20, 17]. These benchmarks cover formal modelling of concurrent systems, linear-time properties, model checking and systems with discrete dynamics. In cases where the same system is used for multiple examples, we extract the system description into a singular benchmark. We used this final set for an end-to-end evaluation.

## 6.1 Baselines

We compare against two LLM baselines: one-shot and fine-tuning.

**One-shot.** We ask the LLM to first create an outline describing each component of the UCLID5 model before lowering to code. In context, we provide an example taken from the repository that verifies a two-safety property. We demonstrate the outline process with this in-context example.

**Fine-tuning.** As with many VLPL, there are very limited number of NL to UCLID5 examples in the public domain, and certainly not enough for fine-tuning. We do, however, have access to 317 regression tests from the open-source code base. We fine-tune gpt-3.5-turbo-0125 for 284 steps with learning-rate multiplier 0.16.

## 6.2 Results

We run two variations of Eudoxus (one using gpt-3.5-turbo-0125, one using gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09) and five variations of the baselines on all 33 textbook benchmarks. We report the fraction of outputs that pass all compiler checks (“parse,” for short) and semantic correctness over all eight approaches in Table 1. Semantic correctness is manually assessed using a combination of manual reasoning and hand-written specifications for all programs that compile. Correctness is rated on a scale from 1 – 5, where 1 is entirely wrong, and 4 indicates that the model is correct with only a few minor errors (e.g., the example output described in §3 and Fig. 5). Intuitively, any score of  $\geq 4$  indicates that we believe the output would be useful to text-to-code users.

Eudoxus outperforms all baselines in terms of compiler checks (see “Parse Rate” in Tab 1), passing all compiler checks on 78% of benchmarks. There are four benchmarks on which Eudoxus hits the LLM call limit and fails to produce a result, and three benchmarks with small syntax errors due to bugs in our Eudoxus implementation (e.g., failing to extract code snippets from LLM outputs or printing UCLID5 code incorrectly). In contrast, we find that gpt-3.5-turbo-0125 and gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09 are unable to produce any UCLID5 models that parse using the one-shot approach. However, gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09 with chain-of-thought reasoning is able to produce one model that parses. The best baseline is the fine-tuned gpt-3.5-turbo-0125, but it is only able to produce two programs that parse.

For semantic correctness, we observe that 33/52 programs that pass compiler checks produced by Eudoxus are mostly or completely semantically correct. On the other hand, only 1/3 valid programs produced by the baselines achieves a correctness score greater than two.

## 7 Conclusion

We have presented a synthetic program elicitation and compilation method (SPEAC) that supports natural language to code generation for very low resource programming languages (VLPLs). The two key ideas behind SPEAC are (1) to design an interface that is “natural” for LLM “users” and (2) to use deductive techniques, which could be deemed too aggressive for human users, to automatically repair LLM outputs when possible. We implemented a prototype of SPEAC called Eudoxus that targets the UCLID5 VLPL and evaluated it on a set of 33 benchmarks from textbooks in the same domain as UCLID5. Eudoxus performs significantly better than standard LLM baselines on syntactic correctness (from at best 2/33 to at worst 24/33) and semantic correctness (from at best 1/33 to at worst 14/33).

We believe that SPEAC can achieve similar results on other VLPLs, but further case studies are needed to evaluate that claim. In this paper, we demonstrate that our combination of synthetic programming elicitation and deductive repair can significantly improve text-to-code performance for one VLPL.

## References

- [1] Lakshya Agrawal, Aditya Kanade, Navin Goyal, Shuvendu K Lahiri, and Sriram Rajamani. Monitor-guided decoding of code LMs with static analysis of repository context. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=qPUBKxKvXq>.
- [2] Murad Akhundov, Federico Mora, Nick Feng, Vincent Hui, and Marsha Chechik. Verification by gambling on program slices. In *Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis: 19th International Symposium, ATVA 2021, Gold Coast, QLD, Australia, October 18–22, 2021, Proceedings 19*, pages 266–282. Springer, 2021.
- [3] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*, 2021.
- [4] Christel Baier and Joost-Pieter Katoen. *Principles of model checking*. MIT Press, 2008.
- [5] Clark Barrett, Aaron Stump, Cesare Tinelli, et al. The smt-lib standard: Version 2.0. In *Proceedings of the 8th international workshop on satisfiability modulo theories (Edinburgh, UK)*, volume 13, page 14, 2010.
- [6] Clark Barrett, Roberto Sebastiani, Sanjit A. Seshia, and Cesare Tinelli. Satisfiability modulo theories. In Armin Biere, Marijn Heule, Hans van Maaren, and Toby Walsh, editors, *Handbook of Satisfiability*, chapter 33, pages 1267–1329. IOS Press, second edition, 2021.
- [7] Nikolaj Bjørner, Anh-Dung Phan, and Lars Fleckenstein. *vz*-an optimizing smt solver. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems: 21st International Conference, TACAS 2015, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2015, London, UK, April 11–18, 2015, Proceedings 21*, pages 194–199. Springer, 2015.
- [8] Federico Cassano, John Gouwar, Francesca Lucchetti, Claire Schlesinger, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Michael Greenberg, Abhinav Jangda, and Arjun Guha. Knowledge transfer from high-resource to low-resource programming languages for code llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09895*, 2023.
- [9] Sarah E. Chasins, Elena L. Glassman, and Joshua Sunshine. Pl and hci: better together. *Commun. ACM*, 64(8):98–106, jul 2021. ISSN 0001-0782. doi: 10.1145/3469279. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3469279>.
- [10] Fuxiang Chen, Fatemeh H Fard, David Lo, and Timofey Bryksin. On the transferability of pre-trained language models for low-resource programming languages. In *Proceedings of the 30th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Program Comprehension*, pages 401–412, 2022.

- [11] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- [12] Xinyun Chen, Maxwell Lin, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. Teaching large language models to self-debug. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05128*, 2023.
- [13] Leonardo De Moura and Nikolaj Bjørner. Z3: An efficient smt solver. In *International conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, pages 337–340. Springer, 2008.
- [14] Saibo Geng, Martin Josifoski, Maxime Peyrard, and Robert West. Grammar-constrained decoding for structured NLP tasks without finetuning. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10932–10952, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.674. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.674>.
- [15] Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss. *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Routledge, 2017.
- [16] Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Y Wu, YK Li, et al. Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming—the rise of code intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196*, 2024.
- [17] Michael Huth and Mark Dermot Ryan. *Logic in computer science - modelling and reasoning about systems (2. ed.)*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [18] Naman Jain, King Han, Alex Gu, Wen-Ding Li, Fanjia Yan, Tianjun Zhang, Sida Wang, Armando Solar-Lezama, Koushik Sen, and Ion Stoica. Livecodebench: Holistic and contamination free evaluation of large language models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07974*, 2024.
- [19] Edward A. Lee and Sanjit A. Seshia. An introductory textbook on cyber-physical systems. In *WESE*, page 1. ACM, 2010.
- [20] Edward A. Lee and Sanjit A. Seshia. *Introduction to Embedded Systems: A Cyber-Physical Systems Approach*. MIT Press, second edition edition, 2016. URL <http://leeseshia.org>.
- [21] Daniel Melcer, Nathan Fulton, Sanjay Krishna Gouda, and Haifeng Qian. Constrained decoding for code language models via efficient left and right quotienting of context-sensitive grammars. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17988*, 2024.
- [22] Md Rakib Hossain Misu, Cristina V Lopes, Iris Ma, and James Noble. Towards ai-assisted synthesis of verified dafny methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00247*, 2024.
- [23] Brad A. Myers, John F. Pane, and Amy J. Ko. Natural programming languages and environments. *Commun. ACM*, 47(9):47–52, sep 2004. ISSN 0001-0782. doi: 10.1145/1015864.1015888. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1015864.1015888>.
- [24] Theo X Olausson, Jeevana Priya Inala, Chenglong Wang, Jianfeng Gao, and Armando Solar-Lezama. Is self-repair a silver bullet for code generation? In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [25] OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve

Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiro, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeer Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayarvigiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024.

- [26] Zvonimir Pavlinovic, Tim King, and Thomas Wies. Finding minimum type error sources. *SIGPLAN Not.*, 49(10):525–542, oct 2014. ISSN 0362-1340. doi: 10.1145/2714064.2660230. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2714064.2660230>.
- [27] Elizabeth Polgreen, Kevin Cheang, Pranav Gaddamadugu, Adwait Godbole, Kevin Laeuffer, Shaokai Lin, Yatin A. Manerkar, Federico Mora, and Sanjit A. Seshia. UCLID5: multi-modal formal modeling, verification, and synthesis. In *CAV (1)*, volume 13371 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 538–551. Springer, 2022.
- [28] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*, 2023.
- [29] Torsten Scholak, Nathan Schucher, and Dzmitry Bahdanau. Picard: Parsing incrementally for constrained auto-regressive decoding from language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.05093*, 2021.
- [30] Sanjit A. Seshia and Pramod Subramanyan. UCLID5: integrating modeling, verification, synthesis and learning. In *MEMOCODE*, pages 1–10. IEEE, 2018.
- [31] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.

- [32] Artur Tarassow. The potential of llms for coding with low-resource and domain-specific programming languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13018*, 2023.
- [33] Bailin Wang, Zi Wang, Xuezhi Wang, Yuan Cao, Rif A Saurous, and Yoon Kim. Grammar prompting for domain-specific language generation with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.

## A Child Language C for UCLID5

---

**class** Module:

*"""An abstract class to represent a UCLID5 module."""*

**def** types(self):

*"""(Optional) Defines the type declarations.*

*For example, the following implementation defines a 8-bit type called T:*

*"""*

*def* types(self):

*self.T = BitVector(8)*

*"""*

*"""*

**pass**

**def** locals(self):

*"""(Optional) Defines the local variables and their types.*

*For example, the following implementation defines an 8-bit variable x*

*and an integer variable y:*

*"""*

*def* locals(self):

*self.x = BitVector(8)*

*self.y = Integer()*

*"""*

*"""*

**pass**

**def** inputs(self):

*"""(Optional) Defines the input variables and their types.*

*For example, the following implementation defines an input variable x,*

*which is an array of 8-bit bitvectors indexed by 2-bit bitvectors:*

*"""*

*def* inputs(self):

*self.x = Array(BitVector(2), BitVector(8))*

*"""*

*"""*

**pass**

**def** outputs(self):

*"""(Optional) Defines the output variables and their types.*

*For example, the following implementation defines an output variable y,*

*which is a real number:*

*"""*

*def* outputs(self):

*self.y = Real()*

*"""*

*"""*

**pass**

**def** shared\_vars(self):

*"""(Optional) Defines the shared variables and their types.*

*For example, the following implementation defines a shared variable z,*

*which is an array of booleans indexed by integers:*

*"""*

*def* shared\_vars(self):

*self.z = Array(Integer(), Boolean())*

*"""*

*"""*

**pass**

**def** instances(self):

*"""(Optional) Defines the instances of other modules and relates their*

*input, output, and shared variables to local variables. Every instance*

*variable must be related to a local variable. For example, let M be*

another module with inputs  $x$  and  $y$ , and output  $z$ . The following implementation defines an instance of  $M$  called  $m$ , and connects  $M$ 's input variable  $x$  to the local variable  $self.a$ ,  $M$ 's input variable  $y$  to the local variable  $self.b$ , and  $M$ 's output variable  $z$  to the local variable  $self.c$ :

```
...  
def instances(self):  
    self.m = M(x=self.a, y=self.b, z=self.c)  
...  
"""  
pass
```

**def** `init(self)`:  
"""(Optional) Defines how variables are initialized.  
For example, the following implementation initializes  $x$  to 0 if  $y$  is greater than or equal to 20:  
...  
"""

```
def init(self):  
    if self.y >= 20:  
        self.x = 0  
...  
"""  
pass
```

**def** `next(self)`:  
"""(Optional) Defines the transition relation.  
For example, the following implementation increments  $x$  or decrements  $y$  depending on  $z$ :  
...  
"""

```
def next(self):  
    if self.z:  
        self.x = self.x + 1  
    else:  
        self.y = self.y - 1  
...  
"""  
pass
```

**def** `specification(self)`:  
"""(Optional) Defines the specification in terms of invariant properties.

Returns:  
bool: True if the specification is satisfied, False otherwise.

For example, the following implementation defines two invariants:  
...  
"""

```
def specification(self):  
    return self.x < 10 and self.y > 0  
...  
"""  
pass
```

**def** `proof(self)`:  
"""(Optional) Defines the control block.  
For example, the following implementation uses 1-induction to prove that the specification always holds:  
...  
"""

```
def proof(self):  
    induction(1)  
...  
"""  
pass
```

---