

---

# BUG IN THE CODE STACK: CAN LLMs FIND BUGS IN LARGE PYTHON CODE STACKS?

---

**Hokyung (Andy) Lee**  
Computer Science  
University of Waterloo  
a362lee@uwaterloo.ca

**Sumanyu Sharma**  
Hamming.ai  
sumanyu@hamming.ai

**Bing Hu**  
Computer Science  
University of Waterloo  
b25hu@uwaterloo.ca

## ABSTRACT

Recent research in Needle-in-a-Haystack (NIAH) benchmarks has explored the capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs) in retrieving contextual information from large text documents. However, as LLMs become increasingly integrated into software development processes, it is crucial to evaluate their performance in code-based environments. As LLMs are further developed for program synthesis, we need to ensure that LLMs can understand syntax and write syntactically correct code. As a step in ensuring LLMs understand syntax, LLMs can be evaluated in their ability to find and detect syntax bugs. Our benchmark, Bug In The Code Stack (BICS), is designed to assess the ability of LLMs to identify simple syntax bugs within large source code. Our findings reveal three key insights: (1) code-based environments pose significantly more challenge compared to text-based environments for retrieval tasks, (2) there is a substantial performance disparity among different models, and (3) there is a notable correlation between longer context lengths and performance degradation, though the extent of this degradation varies between models.

**Keywords** LLMs, Bug Detection, Benchmark

## 1 Introduction

Recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) have significantly increased their use in various real-world applications, including information retrieval and coding assistance [1]. Notably, the dramatic expansion of context window sizes in models like GPT-4 [2], Claude 3 [3], and Gemini-1.5 [4] has broadened the potential applications of these models. To evaluate the retrieval capabilities of these LLMs within large context windows, a series of benchmarks known as Needle-in-a-Haystack (NIAH) [5] has been developed.

The NIAH benchmarks [5] typically involve prompting an LLM to retrieve contextual information based on a clue (e.g., needle) hidden within a large document (e.g., background). These benchmarks have been effective in evaluating LLMs' ability to retrieve information from large text data such as in text-summarization, and legal and medical domains [6, 7, 8]. NIAH represents important use-cases finding precedent case law in the legal domain [7] and information retrieval from lengthy electronic health records in the medical domain [8]. Verifying the "faithfulness" of long-text-summarization has also been shown as an important NIAH task for the FABLES dataset [6].

Generating code and programs following provided specifications or requirements is a long-standing challenge in computer science called program synthesis [9]. LLMs have shown promise as tools for program synthesis with endeavours such as CODEGEN[10], CODEX[11] powering Github Copilot [1], and ChatGPT [2]. Equally as important is research evaluating code correctness and hallucinations when using LLMs as tools for program synthesis [12, 13]. Looking forward, LLMs can be powerful tools for information retrieval on large code-bases, such as in helping people with understanding code [14, 15]. However, there is a gap in research focusing on LLMs' retrieval capabilities, particularly with the common problem of finding coding bugs, within large source code found in software development.

To address this research gap, we introduce Bug In The Code Stack (BICS), a benchmark specifically designed to assess LLMs' capabilities in identifying bugs within large source code. In BICS, we automatically assemble Python source code from smaller code blocks to create the "background" and insert a syntactic bug within the source code as the

"needle". With the assembled source code, we task the LLMs with identifying the line number and type of bug to evaluate the LLMs' debugging capabilities.

BICS benchmark makes several contributions to the NIAH research area:

- **Domain:** To our knowledge, BICS is the first benchmark aimed at evaluating LLMs' debugging capabilities in long-context source code.
- **Difficulty:** Our results demonstrate that BICS presents a significantly greater challenge to LLMs compared to existing NIAH benchmarks.
- **Relevancy:** BICS has been tested on all major models, providing a clear understanding of each model's capabilities and informing best practices for their use as coding assistants in the industry.

## 2 Related Work

Previous studies have explored the capabilities of LLMs in various domains through several benchmarks designed to evaluate their capabilities at large context windows. For instance, RepoQA [15] benchmarks LLMs on long-context code understanding by evaluating their performance in retrieving specific functions from large codebases based on natural language descriptions. GILT is another tool to help developers understand their code and is an LLM information support tool directly built in the IDE [14]. This work highlights the potential of LLMs in code search tasks, emphasizing the importance of understanding both the natural language descriptions and the code itself.

Similarly, Kuratov et al. [16] introduced BABILong, a benchmark designed to assess LLMs' performance in extracting and processing distributed facts within extensive texts. This benchmark demonstrates the ability of LLMs to handle extremely long input sequences, setting a new standard for evaluating the processing capabilities of LLMs for long contexts. LV-Eval [17] has been developed to standardize the NIAH benchmarks across bilingual datasets and multiple QA tasks. This benchmark consists of 11 datasets in English and Chinese applied to various QA tests, providing comprehensive bilingual measurements of LLMs' retrieval capabilities. RULER [18] differentiates itself from standard NIAH benchmarks by introducing four task categories with thirteen representative tasks. These tasks include multi-hop tracing through variable tracking and aggregation through common/frequent word extraction, offering a broader assessment of LLMs' capabilities.

EvalPlus is a code synthesis evaluation framework to benchmark the functional correctness of LLM-generated code [12]. It uses an LLM- and mutation-based strategy to automatically generate large amounts of test cases to test LLM-generated code compared to ground-truth implementations [12]. Codex introduces HumanEval, an evaluation set that relies on manually constructed test cases to evaluate LLM solutions [11]. Many evaluation benchmarks, similar to EvalPlus and HumanEval, such as CoderEval [19], exist to evaluate the performance of the generated code. As LLMs are prone to generate hallucinations across applications, HALLUCODE is introduced to evaluate the performance of code LLMs in recognizing hallucinations that conflict with the user's requirements, contextual information, or code knowledge [13].

While these benchmarks offer valuable insights into the capabilities of LLMs with large context windows, they fail to address the specific needs of software engineering tasks, such as identifying bugs within large source code. Additionally, existing benchmarks often do not cover all the most popular models (e.g., GPT-4 [2], Claude 3 [3], Gemini-1.5 [4], Command-R [20], Llama3 [21], etc.), making it difficult to evaluate the true capabilities of LLMs for real-world applications.

## 3 Bug In The Code Stack

The Bug In The Code Stack (BICS) benchmark first aims to evaluate the ability of LLMs to find simple syntactical bugs in large code stacks. The intuition is to start with measuring LLMs for simple bugs before moving on to more complex ones. BICS consists of insertions of 7 types of syntax bugs into a code stack. Table 1 lists and provides descriptions for each of the 7 syntactical bugs. Bug In The Code Stack (BICS) benchmark consists of four major steps: Dataset Curation and Source Code Assembly, Bug Insertion, and Bug Retrieval.

### 3.1 Methodology

**Code Curation.** We utilize a simple curation strategy to create the background code (i.e. haystacks) for our BICS benchmark. Our background source code is gathered from the Python Alpaca dataset [22]. The Python Alpaca dataset contains 18k Python code samples covering various software domains (i.e. data structures and algorithms, machine learning, databases, etc.). The Python Alpaca dataset is an unbiased code base from which we can create our haystacks. We remove any Alpaca code samples with existing syntax bugs with a static code analyzer to create a sanitized

#	Syntactic Bug	Description
1	Missing Colon	A colon is removed where previously used to indicate the start of a new block-of-code such as a loop, function or conditional statement.
2	Missing Parenthesis	A parenthesis is removed where previously one was used for the order of operations, order of evaluation, or in a tuple.
3	Missing Quotation	A quotation is removed where previously one was used to enclose a string.
4	Missing Comma	A comma is removed where previously one was used as a separator for items in a list, arguments, etc.
5	Mismatched Quotation	One of the quotations enclosing a string is replaced with a different quotation type, swapping between single quotation and double quotation.
6	Mismatched Bracket	One of the enclosing brackets for list, dictionary, function arguments, etc., is replaced with a different bracket type, swapping between parenthesis, square bracket, and curly bracket.
7	Keywords as Identifier	A variable name is set to a Python identifier name.

Table 1: Each of the 7 simple syntactical bugs.

baseline for our experiments. Alpaca code samples deemed too small or large that fall outside the parameters of our experimentation are also removed. After removing code samples with pre-existing bugs, and ones that are too small or large, we are left with a filtered list of Alpaca code samples which we use to construct our haystack.

**Haystack (Code) Assembly.** We construct our haystack by stacking code samples from our filtered list of Alpaca code samples up to a desired token length. Desired lengths can be one of 500, 1k, 2k, 4k, 8k, or 16k tokens. Each sample in a stack is randomly selected from the filtered list of Alpaca code samples. As code samples that are too large or small are removed from our filtered list, each randomly selected Alpaca code sample is more consistent in size and uniformity is ensured comparing between haystacks. As pre-existing syntax bugs are removed from our filtered list, our haystacks are less noisy and we can accurately evaluate the ability of LLMs to detect simple bugs. The token length for our haystacks ranges between 500 to 16k tokens in each experiment.

**Needle (Syntax Bug) Insertion.** Once the Python source code haystack is assembled, a syntactic bug is inserted at 5 target depths ranging from 0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100% of the haystack. The benchmark employs seven different types of syntactic bugs, each capable of causing a runtime error. Table 1 lists and provides descriptions for each of the 7 syntactical bugs. Each syntactic bug has an equal chance of being selected for each experiment.

**Retrieving the (Bug) Needle.** After the bug is inserted into the Python source code, the LLMs are tasked with identifying the line number and type of bug within the code. The prompt template includes two-shot examples [23] of short source code samples and a list of possible bug types to guide the LLMs. An example of a two-shot example pair is in listing Listing 1. The retrieval is considered a success if the LLM correctly finds both the line number and type of the inserted syntax bug. This task evaluates the LLMs ability to understand code syntax as well as underscoring the importance of accurate retrieval in real-life software engineering scenarios.

### 3.2 Experimental Setup

Table 2 lists the 11 selected LLMs that are tested against the BICS benchmark. Given there are 6 options for haystack (code) token lengths (500, 1k, 2k, 4k, 8k, and 16k), and 5 options for needle (bug) depth (0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100%), each LLM is tested against the BICS benchmark with 30 combinations. Every combination is repeated 5 times so that each LLM is tested against the BICS benchmark for 150 iterations. As Llama3 [21] has a maximum context window of up to 8k tokens, the 16k token length experiments are omitted.

We utilized the LiteLLM [24] package for inference. To ensure consistency across model experiments, no modifications were made to the base prompt template to avoid skewing the experiment based on model-specific prompt optimizations. The only exceptions were Codestral [25] where we used Regex to filter out irrelevant trailing output common in Mistral models.

## Bug In The Code Stack: Can LLMs Find Bugs In Large Python Code Stacks?

```
1 I will give you a codebase with a syntactic bug hidden at some line. You need
  to answer the line at which the syntactic error occurs and the type of the
  syntactic error.
2
3 <example>
4 1 | def fahrenheit_to_celsius(fahrenheit):
5 2 |     return (fahrenheit - 32) * 5.0/9.0
6 3 |
7 4 | def is_prime(num:
8 5 |     if num <= 1:
9 6 |         return False
10 7 |     for i in range(2, int(num**0.5) + 1):
11 8 |         if num % i == 0:
12 9 |             return False
13 10|     return True
14 Answer: 4, missing_parenthesis
15 </example>
16
17 <example>
18 1| import random
19 2| import string
20 3|
21 4| def generate_password(length=8):
22 5|     characters = string.ascii_letters + string.digits
23 6|     password = ''.join(random.choice(characters) for i in range(length))
24 7|     return password
25 Answer: 6, mismatched_quotation
26 </example>
27
28 <context>...</context>
29 <bug_types>...</bug_types>
30
31 Always return your answer in the following format: <line_number>, <bug_type>
32 Do not write anything else after that.
33
```

Listing 1: Prompt template with two-shot examples for bug identification task.

#	Model Name	Publisher	Latest Release	Year Released	License
1	GPT-4o	OpenAI	2024	2024	Proprietary
2	GPT-4-Turbo	OpenAI	2024	2023	Proprietary
3	Claude-3.5 Sonnet	Anthropic	2024	2024	Proprietary
4	Claude-3 Opus	Anthropic	2024	2024	Proprietary
5	Gemini-1.5-Pro	Google	2024	2024	Proprietary
6	Gemini-1.5-Flash	Google	2024	2024	Proprietary
7	GPT-3.5-Turbo	OpenAI	2024	2022	Proprietary
8	Codestral	Mistral	2024	2024	Proprietary
9	Llama3-70b	Meta	2024	2024	Llama 3 Community
10	Command-r+	Cohere	2024	2024	CC-BY-NC-4.0
11	Gemini-1.0-Pro	Google	2024	2024	Proprietary

Table 2: Each of the 11 LLMs that are tested against BICS.

# Bug In The Code Stack: Can LLMs Find Bugs In Large Python Code Stacks?




Figure 1: BICS results for all 11 selected models: (1) GPT-4o, (2) GPT-4-Turbo, (3) Claude-3.5 Sonnet, (4) Claude-3 Opus, (5) Gemini 1.5 Pro, (6) Gemini 1.5 Flash, (7) GPT-3.5 Turbo, (8) Codestral, (9) Llama3 70B, (10) Command-r+, and (11) Gemini 1.0 Pro.

## 4 Results

Figure 1 contains the BICS benchmark for all 11 models for all 30 context length and needle length combinations, where the accuracy for each combination is averaged over 5 test iterations. Table 3 contains the performance at each context length for the 11 selected models. Accuracy results in Table 3 for each context length are generated by averaging results across needle depths for each context length. The average accuracy for all context lengths is reported alongside the standard deviation in Table 3. Additionally, the average accuracy of each of the 11 models for all bug types is shown in Table 4.

#	Models	Ctx Size	500	1k	2k	4k	8k	16k	Avg.±(std)
1	gpt-4o	128k	82	<b>91</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>81.2±(5.5)</b>
2	gpt-4-turbo	128k	<b>86</b>	82	78	74	70	66	76.1±(6.7)
3	claude-3.5-sonnet	200k	84	84	<b>79</b>	72	61	46	70.9±(13.9)
4	claude-3-opus	200k	84	73	67	50	23	18	52.5±(24.8)
5	gemini-1.5-pro	1000k	62	60	50	47	43	46	51.3±(7.0)
6	gemini-1.5-flash	1000k	58	58	61	43	27	23	45.1±(15.2)
7	gpt-3.5-turbo	16k	54	43	43	29	13	6	31.3±(17.4)
8	codestral	32k	62	38	35	29	18	5	31.1±(17.7)
9	llama3-70b	8k	60	54	33	17	13	-	35.4*±(19.1)
10	command-r+	128k	42	45	29	27	8	1	25.2±(16.1)
11	gemini-1.0-pro	32k	37	29	10	3	3	2	13.9±(13.8)

Table 3: Retrieval accuracy (%) of 11 LLMs averaged over needle depth for each context length. The primary value in the "Avg." column represents the average accuracy across all context lengths. The standard deviation values are recorded in parenthesis in the "Avg." column. \*Note that the average for Llama3-70b excludes the 16k context length combinations.

## 5 Discussions

**Disparity between Major Models.** The most notable observation is the performance disparity between major models. GPT-4o and GPT-4-Turbo exhibit the best performance among all the models. Claude 3 Opus, Gemini-1.5-Pro, and Gemini-1.5-Flash follow closely as the next best performers. Subsequently, GPT-3.5-Turbo, Codestral, Llama3-70B, and Command-R+ demonstrate similar performance levels. Lastly, Gemini-1.0-Pro shows lacklustre performance.

Comparing the standard deviation between model performances, we can see GPT-4o and GPT-4-Turbo has a high degree of performance while maintaining a low standard deviation. This shows that GPT-4 models are highly robust given this benchmark across all context lengths and needle depths. Higher variance indicates greater sensitivity to needle placement, suggesting that the model is less robust. It is important to note that extremely low accuracy will result in low variance; thus, variance is more relevant when comparing models with similar performance levels.

Models	MC	MP	MQo	MCo	MQ	MB	KID	Avg.
gpt-4o	93	<b>93</b>	18	<b>90</b>	91	<b>96</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>81.2</b>
gpt-4-turbo	94	92	<b>59</b>	78	69	73	65	76.1
claude-3.5-sonnet	<b>96</b>	76	5	74	<b>92</b>	65	76	70.9
claude-3-opus	76	76	53	59	28	23	46	52.5
gemini-1.5-pro	64	48	18	72	74	27	50	51.3
gemini-1.5-flash	81	73	32	58	14	11	41	45.1
gpt-3.5-turbo	35	65	18	44	24	21	5	31.3
codestral	45	41	36	50	20	5	16	31.1
llama-3-70b	47	52	26	28	37	23	33	35.4
command-r+	30	20	5	17	6	0	17	25.2
gemini-1.0-pro	17	0	6	30	17	20	5	13.9
average	65	61	26	54	43	32	42	43

Table 4: Retrieval accuracy (%) of each 7 syntactic bug types for each 11 LLMs. Each column name stands for the following: (MC) Missing Colon, (MP) Missing Parenthesis, (MQo) Missing Quotation, (MCo) Missing Comma, (MQ) Mismatched Quotation, (MB) Mismatched Bracket, (KID) Keywords as Identifier. The "Avg." column represents the average accuracy across all bug types within every context length.

**Disparity between Retrieving Different Syntactical Bugs.** There is a noticeable difference in performance between different syntactical bugs. Generally speaking, the missing colon and missing parenthesis bugs were best retrieved compared to other bugs. The missing quotation and missing bracket bugs were very challenging to retrieve for most models.

**Closed-Source Models vs. Open-Source Models.** With the exception of Gemini-1.0-Pro, all closed-source models demonstrate superior performance compared to open-source models, highlighting a gap in the development of current open-source models relative to their closed-source counterparts.

**Correlation between Context Length and Performance Degradation.** Generally, retrieval accuracy decreases as context length increases exponentially. However, some models are less affected by this increase in context length. For instance, GPT-4o’s performance only drops by 8% from 500 tokens to 16K tokens, and Gemini-1.5-Pro experiences a modest 16% drop. In contrast, more susceptible models like Claude 3 Opus exhibit a dramatic 66% decline in performance between 500 tokens and 16K tokens.

**Correlation between Needle Depth and Performance Degradation.** LLMs generally perform better when the syntax bug is placed at the code stack’s top or bottom. There is a dip in performance for many models when the syntax bug is placed closer to the center of the code stack. Depending on the design of the LLM in question, syntax bugs nearer to the code stack’s top or bottom may be easier to detect.




Figure 2: Comparing retrieval accuracy of GPT-3.5-Turbo on BICS versus BABILong benchmark

**Comparison with BABILong Benchmark.** Figure 2 compares the retrieval accuracy of GPT-3.5-Turbo on BICS with its performance on the BABILong benchmark [16]. Notably, the same model exhibits 5-10 times lower accuracy on BICS, highlighting the increased difficulty of code-based benchmarks compared to text-based benchmarks for NIAH tests.

## 6 Conclusion and Future Work

We present Bug In The Code Stack (BICS), a benchmark designed to evaluate LLMs' capabilities in identifying bugs within large source code. By evaluating 11 major LLMs on the benchmark, we identified performance disparities between the models and observed the impact of increased context length on each model. Additionally, we established that code-based benchmarks pose significantly greater challenges compared to text-based benchmarks for NIAH tests, underscoring the need for further development to enhance model performance.

Our goal is to assist software developers in selecting the best models for developing their applications and to identify limitations in current models to guide further advancements. To this end, we plan to expand the benchmark to include runtime errors and warnings as the needle, as well as incorporate multilingual backgrounds for programming languages such as C++ and Rust. Specifically, we aim to address bugs related to pointers, memory management, and ownership & borrowing in C++ and Rust, areas where, to our knowledge, a comprehensive LLM benchmark does not yet exist.

## Resource

All datasets and evaluation codes are released at: <https://github.com/HammingHQ/bug-in-the-code-stack>

## References

- [1] GitHub. Github copilot, 2021. Official Blog.
- [2] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024.
- [3] Anthropic. Introducing the next generation of claude anthropic, 2024. Official Blog.
- [4] Google Team Gemini. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context, 2024.
- [5] Greg Kamradt. Needle in a haystack - pressure testing llms, 2023. GitHub Repository.
- [6] Yekyung Kim, Yapei Chang, Marzena Karpinska, Aparna Garimella, Varun Manjunatha, Kyle Lo, Tanya Goyal, and Mohit Iyyer. Fables: Evaluating faithfulness and content selection in book-length summarization, 2024.
- [7] Ahmed Izzidien, Holli Sargeant, and Felix Steffek. Llm vs. lawyers: Identifying a subset of summary judgments in a large uk case law dataset, 2024.
- [8] Khaled Saab, Tao Tu, Wei-Hung Weng, Ryutaro Tanno, David Stutz, Ellery Wulczyn, Fan Zhang, Tim Strother, Chunjong Park, Elahe Vedadi, Juanma Zambrano Chaves, Szu-Yeu Hu, Mike Schaekermann, Aishwarya Kamath, Yong Cheng, David G. T. Barrett, Cathy Cheung, Basil Mustafa, Anil Palepu, Daniel McDuff, Le Hou, Tomer Golany, Luyang Liu, Jean baptiste Alayrac, Neil Houlsby, Nenad Tomasev, Jan Freyberg, Charles Lau, Jonas Kemp, Jeremy Lai, Shekoofeh Azizi, Kimberly Kanada, SiWai Man, Kavita Kulkarni, Ruoxi Sun, Siamak Shakeri, Luheng He, Ben Caine, Albert Webson, Natasha Latysheva, Melvin Johnson, Philip Mansfield, Jian Lu, Ehud Rivlin, Jesper Anderson, Bradley Green, Renee Wong, Jonathan Krause, Jonathon Shlens, Ewa Dominowska, S. M. Ali Eslami, Katherine Chou, Claire Cui, Oriol Vinyals, Koray Kavukcuoglu, James Manyika, Jeff Dean, Demis Hassabis, Yossi Matias, Dale Webster, Joelle Barral, Greg Corrado, Christopher Semturs, S. Sara Mahdavi, Juraj Gottweis, Alan Karthikesalingam, and Vivek Natarajan. Capabilities of gemini models in medicine, 2024.
- [9] Sumit Gulwani, Oleksandr Polozov, Rishabh Singh, et al. Program synthesis. *Foundations and Trends® in Programming Languages*, 4(1-2):1–119, 2017.
- [10] Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Huan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis, 2023.
- [11] 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. Evaluating large language models trained on code, 2021.
- [12] Jiawei Liu, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuyao Wang, and Lingming Zhang. Is your code generated by chatgpt really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation, 2023.

- [13] Fang Liu, Yang Liu, Lin Shi, Houkun Huang, Ruifeng Wang, Zhen Yang, Li Zhang, Zhongqi Li, and Yuchi Ma. Exploring and evaluating hallucinations in llm-powered code generation, 2024.
- [14] Daye Nam, Andrew Macvean, Vincent Hellendoorn, Bogdan Vasilescu, and Brad Myers. Using an llm to help with code understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE '24*, New York, NY, USA, 2024. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [15] Jiawei Liu, Jia Le Tian, Vijay Daita, Yuxiang Wei, Yifeng Ding, Yuhan Katherine Wang, Jun Yang, and Lingming Zhang. Repoqa: Evaluating long context code understanding, 2024.
- [16] Yuri Kuratov, Aydar Bulatov, Petr Anokhin, Dmitry Sorokin, Artyom Sorokin, and Mikhail Burtsev. In search of needles in a 11m haystack: Recurrent memory finds what llms miss, 2024.
- [17] Tao Yuan, Xuefei Ning, Dong Zhou, Zhijie Yang, Shiyao Li, Minghui Zhuang, Zheyue Tan, Zhuyu Yao, Dahua Lin, Boxun Li, Guohao Dai, Shengen Yan, and Yu Wang. Lv-eval: A balanced long-context benchmark with 5 length levels up to 256k, 2024.
- [18] Cheng-Ping Hsieh, Simeng Sun, Samuel Krirman, Shantanu Acharya, Dima Rekesh, Fei Jia, Yang Zhang, and Boris Ginsburg. Ruler: What’s the real context size of your long-context language models?, 2024.
- [19] Yakun Zhang, Wenjie Zhang, Dezhi Ran, Qihao Zhu, Chengfeng Dou, Dan Hao, Tao Xie, and Lu Zhang. Learning-based widget matching for migrating gui test cases. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE '24*. ACM, February 2024.
- [20] Cohere. Command r: Retrieval-augmented generation at production scale, 2024. Official Blog.
- [21] Meta. Introducing meta llama 3: The most capable openly available llm to date, 2024. Official Blog.
- [22] Tarun Bisht. python-code-instructions-18k-alpaca, 2023. HuggingFace Dataset.
- [23] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners, 2020.
- [24] BerriAI. Litellm, 2023. GitHub Repository.
- [25] Mistral. A model fluent in 80+ programming languages, 2024. Official Blog.