

Where Do Large Language Models Fail When Generating Code?

Zhijie Wang*
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB, Canada
zhijie.wang@ualberta.ca

Zijie Zhou*[†]
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, IL, USA
zijiez4@illinois.edu

Da Song*
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB, Canada
dsong4@ualberta.ca

Yuheng Huang
The University of Tokyo
Tokyo, Japan
yuhenghuang42@g.ecc.u-
tokyo.ac.jp

Shengmai Chen
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN, USA
chen3301@purdue.edu

Lei Ma
The University of Tokyo
University of Alberta
ma.lei@acm.org

Tianyi Zhang
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN, USA
tianyi@purdue.edu

ABSTRACT

Large Language Models (LLMs) have shown great potential in code generation. However, current LLMs still cannot reliably generate correct code. Moreover, it is unclear what kinds of code generation errors LLMs can make. To address this, we conducted an empirical study to analyze incorrect code snippets generated by six popular LLMs on the HumanEval dataset. We analyzed these errors alongside two dimensions of error characteristics—*semantic characteristics* and *syntactic characteristics*—to derive a comprehensive code generation error taxonomy for LLMs through open coding and thematic analysis. We then labeled all 558 incorrect code snippets based on this taxonomy. Our results showed that the six LLMs exhibited different distributions of semantic and syntactic characteristics. Furthermore, we analyzed the correlation between different error characteristics and factors such as prompt length, code length, and test-pass rate. Finally, we highlight the challenges that LLMs may encounter when generating code and propose implications for future research on reliable code generation with LLMs.

KEYWORDS

Empirical Study, Code Generation, Large Language Models

1 INTRODUCTION

Automatically generating code from natural language has been a long-term pursuit across multiple research communities. Recent advances in Large Language Models (LLMs) have led to rapid, unprecedented improvements on this task [1, 26, 44, 60, 63]. Despite this great progress, LLMs still cannot reliably generate correct code for many tasks. Currently, there is a lack of deep understanding of the cases where LLMs fail. Specifically, it remains unclear *what types of code generation errors an LLM typically produces* and *whether different LLMs make similar errors*. Answering these questions would help researchers gain insights into the limitations of existing models and identify opportunities for model improvement.

To bridge this knowledge gap, we conducted an in-depth analysis of code generation errors made by LLMs. We focused on six popular LLMs: CodeGen-16B [60], InCoder-1.3B [26], GPT-3.5 [1], GPT-4 [63], SantaCoder [5], and StarCoder [44]. These models produced 558 incorrect code solutions on the 164 tasks from the HumanEval dataset [15]. Four authors performed multiple rounds

of open coding and iterative refinement on these errors to derive a taxonomy of code generation errors made by LLMs. Specifically, we analyzed these errors alongside two dimensions—the *semantic characteristics* and *syntactic characteristics* of these errors:

- **Semantic characteristics** can help identify the high-level root causes of these code generation errors. Representative semantic characteristics include *missing condition*, *wrong (logical) direction*, *incorrect condition*, etc. Analyzing these semantic characteristics across various LLMs can help understand the limitations of current LLMs in interpreting task requirements and generating semantically correct programs.
- **Syntactic characteristics** can help localize where the error occurs in an incorrect code solution. Representative syntactic characteristics include *incorrect code blocks*, *incorrect function arguments*, *incorrect return values*, etc. Understanding these characteristics allows for a better assessment of current LLMs’ abilities to generate different kinds of code constructs. It can also help inform the design of new techniques for localizing and repairing code generation errors made by LLMs.

Our analysis shows that these LLMs tend to make errors with more complex syntactic characteristics, such as *missing code blocks* and *incorrect code blocks*, than smaller issues, such as *incorrect method call target*. We also found that the semantic characteristics behind these errors are likely to be intricate issues such as *wrong (logical) direction* and *missing multiple steps*, which implies a common challenge of interpreting relatively complex task descriptions for LLMs. These errors often require substantial code restructuring and repair rather than simple fixes. Furthermore, we observed different distributions of semantic and syntactic characteristics of code generation errors among the six LLMs, revealing the challenges of handling the diverse set of errors made by different LLMs.

In summary, this paper makes the following contributions:

- We established a taxonomy of both syntactic and semantic characteristics of code generation errors through open coding and thematic analysis.
- We analyzed the similarities and differences in errors made by different code generation models, highlighting the challenges faced by LLMs.
- We discussed the implications and future opportunities for improving LLMs for code generation.

*The first three authors contributed equally to this work.

[†]Work done as a remote research intern at Purdue University

- We developed an interactive data analysis website to help researchers and developers examine and explore code generation errors in different categories. The website is available at <https://llm-code-errors.cs.purdue.edu>.

2 METHODOLOGY

In this section, we first introduce the research questions of this study, followed by the descriptions of the dataset and LLMs used in our study and the procedure of our manual analysis.

2.1 Research Questions

This study investigates the following research questions.

- *RQ1: What specific types of errors manifest in code generation across different LLMs?* This question aims to uncover the common characteristics and distinctions of different types of code generation errors. This can help us identify whether different LLMs exhibit unique or similar characteristics in their code generation errors.
- *RQ2: How much repair effort is needed for the incorrect code generated by LLMs?* This question aims to measure how closely LLMs can mimic correct coding solutions and how many edits are needed to fix the errors. It can help us understand the potential difficulties of locating and repairing the incorrect model-generated code.
- *RQ3: How does the prompt complexity affect an LLM’s code generation?* Prompting is an essential step in code generation with LLMs. This question aims to investigate how prompt complexity affects the correctness of code snippets generated by LLMs. It specifically examines how variations in prompt length might influence the types of errors in the generated code.
- *RQ4: How does code length relate to the types of LLMs’ code generation errors?* Different from RQ5, this question aims to investigate if the generated code length affects the correctness of a code snippet generated by LLMs. We are particularly interested in those lengthy code solutions and their error characteristics.
- *RQ5: Does partially failed code exhibit different characteristics compared with fully failed code?* This question explores the distinctions between code that fails a subset of test cases and code that fails all test cases. It can offer insights into the specific challenges faced in achieving full correctness on test cases.

2.2 Code Generation LLMs

In this study, we focus on six representative code generation LLMs: CodeGen-16B [60], InCoder-1.3B [26], GPT-3.5 [1], GPT-4 [63], SantaCoder [5], and StarCoder [44]. As shown in Table 1, these models cover a wide range of model sizes (1B to 1.7T parameters) and model performance (12.2% to 88.4% in terms of pass@1).

We further introduce each model as follows.

- **CodeGen-16B** [60] is an open-source LLM released by Salesforce. It employs a decoder-only architecture with rotary position embedding. The series of CodeGen models are trained on 217GB of Python code. We utilize the version with 16B parameters.
- **InCoder-1.3B** [26] is another open-source LLM released by Meta AI. InCoder utilizes a new causal masking objective, which allows

Table 1: Code generation LLMs included in this study

Model	Release	Size	Performance		
			Pass@1	Pass@10	Pass@100
CodeGen-16B [60]	Mar. 2022	16B	32.9%	56.0%	81.5%
InCoder-1.3B [26]	Apr. 2022	1.3B	12.2%	15.9%	25.2%
GPT-3.5 [1]	Nov. 2022	175B	73.2%	88.6%	94.0%
GPT-4 [63]	Mar. 2023	1.7T	88.4%	—	—
SantaCoder [5]	Apr. 2023	1.1B	14.6%	29.3%	45.9%
StarCoder [44]	May. 2023	15.5B	34.1%	56.7%	84.2%

filling code blocks as well as standard left-to-right code generation. InCoder is trained on 159GB of open-source repositories with a permissive license from GitHub, GitLab, and StackOverflow. We adopt an InCoder variant with 1.3b parameters.

- **GPT-3.5** [1] was released by OpenAI as the first model deployed for ChatGPT. It has been further refined for conversational tasks through the use of Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback (RLHF). GPT-3.5 is trained with a massive number of crowd-sourced web texts up to September 2021.
- **GPT-4** [63] is a successor to GPT-3.5, developed and released by OpenAI, which is one of the most advanced language models available. Like GPT-3.5, GPT-4 has also undergone RLHF to enhance its conversational capabilities.
- **SantaCoder** [5] is an open-sourced LLM released as a part of the BigCode project. It uses *multi query attention* and was trained with Python, Java, and Javascript subset of The Stack dataset with 1.1b parameters.
- **StarCoder** [44] is another open-sourced LLM released as a part of the BigCode project. Compared with SantaCoder, it was trained on the complete The Stack dataset with 15.5b parameters.

2.3 Data Collection

In this study, we utilize the widely used HumanEval [15] to collect code generation errors made by LLMs. HumanEval includes 164 hand-written Python programming tasks, each accompanied by an average of 7.7 unit tests. These tasks involve language comprehension, reasoning, algorithms, and simple mathematics. For each task, We prompted each LLM with the original prompt from HumanEval and greedy decoding with the temperature set to 0. Then, we executed the test cases to identify incorrect solutions for the generated code solutions. We also performed a round of manual checks to find solutions that pass test cases but are not fully correct, since some tasks may not have sufficient test cases. In the end, we identified a total of 558 incorrect code solutions generated by the six models.

2.4 Manual Analysis Procedure

We followed the well-established open coding process [6, 12, 40, 74] to analyze the characteristics of the 558 incorrect code solutions and develop a taxonomy of code generation errors made by LLMs. **Open coding.** From the 558 incorrect solutions, we first randomly sampled 160 of them as a starting point for analysis. The sample size is statistically significant, with a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error. Two authors independently labeled each incorrect solution and documented the errors in the code and their root causes. For some solutions, it is easy to identify the error and root cause by visually comparing the incorrect solution and the ground truth. Yet many solutions have subtle bugs or follow a different path to solve the task, e.g., using a lambda expression instead of a

for loop to solve a problem. The authors had to copy the incorrect solution and their test cases to an IDE and performed step-by-step debugging to locate the errors.

The authors documented all error locations and root causes and discussed them with other authors after the initial coding. They refined some code labels in the meeting and came up with an initial codebook. At this stage, we found that code generation errors made by LLMs can be categorized along two dimensions based on their *semantic* and *syntactic* characteristics. Specifically, we identified *seven common semantic characteristics* and *eight common syntactic characteristics* of these errors.

Iterative refinement of the codebook. After obtaining the initial codebook, the two authors invited another two authors to iteratively improve the established codebook. The four authors were first assigned with a batch of 10 code generation errors. Subsequently, they independently labeled these code snippets from both semantic and syntactic perspectives. They were tasked with justifying their codes for every error and writing down the reasons. If a new error occurs that the codebook does not cover, an author needs to write a description of the error.

After the first round of labeling, we computed Fleiss' Kappa [25] to determine the internal consistency among the authors. The initial scores were 0.37 and 0.32 for semantic characteristics and syntactic characteristics, respectively. To figure out where the disagreements were, the four authors met to discuss the differences between the justification of specific coding and exchange opinions about updating the codebook.

The four authors were then assigned a new batch of 10 errors and conducted another round of labeling following the aforementioned process. After the second round of labeling, the Fleiss' Kappa scores were 0.68 and 0.69 for semantic characteristics and syntactic characteristics, respectively, indicating substantial agreement. They further conducted the third round of labeling with a new batch of 10 errors. After the third round of labeling, the Fleiss' Kappa scores were 0.84 and 0.71 for semantic characteristics and syntactic characteristics, respectively, indicating substantial agreement. The final codebook was then established, which includes *13 common semantic characteristics* and *14 common syntactic characteristics*.

Annotating the remaining dataset. The second author further used the final codebook to label the remaining 390 incorrect code snippets. While labeling the remaining code snippets, the author found no new error characteristics. The final coding results were documented as a spreadsheet and provided in the supplementary material. The whole labeling process took about 268 person-hours.

3 RESULTS

In the following subsections, we denote the 164 programming tasks in HumanEval [15] as Task 0–163. Due to the page limit, some of the code examples are omitted or simplified. We refer the readers to our website (<https://llm-code-errors.cs.purdue.edu>) for more details.

3.1 RQ1: What specific types of errors manifest in code generation across different LLMs?

Table 2 and Table 3 presents the finalized taxonomy of code generation errors made by LLMs. The taxonomy categorizes the incorrect code solutions based on their *semantic* and *syntactic* characteristics.

The semantic characteristics highlight the high-level root causes of these code generation errors, while the syntactic characteristics indicate which parts of the code an error occurs in.

3.1.1 Semantic Characteristics. We identified the following 7 types and 13 sub-types of common semantic characteristics in the code generation errors.

- **Condition Error** includes *missing condition* and *incorrect condition*. Missing condition is when necessary conditions are omitted, while incorrect condition is when conditions are incorrectly formulated, leading to errors.
- **Constant Value Error** is an error that occurs when an incorrect constant value is set. An incorrect constant value can occur in function arguments, assignments, or other parts of the code.
- **Reference Error** involves incorrect references to variables or functions, which includes the usage of an incorrect function or variable that does not match the requirement (*wrong method/-variable*) and reference to a variable or method name that has not been defined (*undefined name*).
- **Operation/Calculation Error** indicates the mistakes in mathematical or logical operations.
- **Garbage Code** is defined as unnecessary parts of the code that do not contribute to the intended functionality. It can occur in several forms: a *meaningless code snippet*, where the code, though syntactically correct, is irrelevant to the assigned task; *only comments*, where the code consists exclusively of comments without any executable statements to address the task; or *wrong (logical) direction*, where the code significantly deviates from the intended task logic and expected outcomes.
- **Incomplete Code/Missing Steps** indicates the absence of crucial steps to achieve the task.
- **Memory Error** includes *infinite loop*, which is a loop or recursion that never terminates.

Comparison between LLMs. Fig. 1 shows the distribution of the 13 semantic characteristics for each LLM. On the one hand, we find that several characteristics are frequently shared among all LLMs, such as *incorrect condition* and *wrong (logical) direction*. This implies that all LLMs struggle with certain kinds of task requirements such as handling complex logic conditions, regardless of their model size and capability. For instance, CodeGen-16B generated an incorrect condition in Example 1 (Task 146). In this example, the task requires the program to check if the first and last digits of a number are odd. However, CodeGen-16B generated an incorrect condition to check if the number itself is odd.

```
# [Task 146] Return the number of elements in the array that are
# greater than 10 and both first and last digits are odd.

def specialFilter(s):
    count = 0
    for num in nums:
        if num > 10 and num % 2 != 0: count += 1
    return count
```

Example 1: An *incorrect condition* example by CodeGen-16B

On the other hand, small models such as InCoder and CodeGen are more likely to generate *meaningless code* and code that *miss multiple steps*, while larger models such as GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 tend to make more *constant value errors* and *arithmetic operation errors*. Notably, incorrect code generated by GPT-4 only exhibited 7 of

Table 2: Taxonomy of semantic characteristics of code generation errors made by LLMs.

Error Characteristics		Incorrect Example	Ground Truth
Condition Error	Missing condition	<pre># [Task 151] CodeGen-16B def double_the_difference(lst): sum = 0 for i in lst: if i > 0 and i % 2 != 0: sum += i ** 2 return sum</pre>	<pre># [Task 151] Ground Truth def double_the_difference(lst): ans = 0 for num in lst: if num % 2 == 1 and num > 0 and "." not in str(num): ans += num ** 2 return ans</pre>
	Incorrect condition	<pre># [Task 44] GPT-3.5 def change_base(x: int, base: int): result = "" while x > 0: remainder = x % base result = str(remainder) + result x = x // base return result</pre>	<pre># [Task 44] Ground Truth def change_base(x: int, base: int): if x == 0: return "0" ret = "" while x != 0: ret = str(x % base) + ret x //= base return ret</pre>
Constant Value Error	Constant value error	<pre># [Task 91] GPT-3.5 def is_bored(S): sentences = S.split(',') sentences += S.split('?') sentences += S.split('!') count = 0 for sentence in sentences: if sentence.strip().startswith('I'): count += 1 return count</pre>	<pre># [Task 91] Ground Truth def is_bored(S): import re sentences = re.split(r'[?!]\s*', S) return sum(sentence[0:2] == 'I' for sentence in sentences)</pre>
Reference Error	Wrong method/variable	<pre># [Task 101] GPT-3.5 def words_string(s): words = s.split(", ") words = [word.split(" ") for word in words] return words</pre>	<pre># [Task 101] Ground Truth def words_string(s): words = (s.replace(", ", " ")).split() return [word for word in words if word != ""]</pre>
	Undefined name	<pre># [Task 83] CodeGen-16B def starts_one_ends(n): if n == 1: return 1 return starts_one_ends(n - 1) + ends_one_starts(n - 1)</pre>	<pre># [Task 83] Ground Truth def starts_one_ends(n): if n == 1: return 1 return 18 * 10 ** (n - 2)</pre>
Operation/ Calculation Error	Incorrect arithmetic operation	<pre># [Task 44] InCoder-1B def change_base(x: int, base: int): digits = [] while x: digits.append(str(x % base)) x /= base return ''.join(reversed(digits))</pre>	<pre># [Task 44] Ground Truth def change_base(x: int, base: int): if x == 0: return "0" ret = "" while x != 0: ret = str(x % base) + ret x //= base return ret</pre>
	Incorrect comparison operation		
Garbage Code	Only comments	<pre># [Task 152] InCoder-1B def compare(game, guess): # Regenerate the task description.</pre>	<pre># [Task 152] Ground Truth def compare(game, guess): return abs(game[i] - guess[i]) for i in range(len(game))]</pre>
	Meaningless code snippet	<pre># [Task 159] CodeGen-16B def eat(number, need, remaining): pass</pre>	<pre># [Task 159] Ground Truth def eat(number, need, remaining): if need < remaining: return [number + need, remaining - need] else: return [number + remaining, 0]</pre>
	Wrong (logical) direction	<pre># [Task 20] InCoder-1.3B def find_closest_elements(numbers): closest_to_one, closest_to_two = numbers[0], numbers[1] for number in numbers: if number < closest_to_one: closest_to_one = number if number > closest_to_two: closest_to_two = number return closest_to_one, closest_to_two</pre>	<pre># [Task 20] InCoder-1.3B def find_closest_elements(numbers): min_diff, min_pair = float("inf"), None for l, r in zip(numbers[:-1], numbers[1:]): diff = r - l if diff < min_diff: min_diff = diff min_pair = (l, r) return min_pair</pre>
Incomplete Code/ Missing Steps	Missing one step	<pre># [Task 16] InCoder-1B def count_distinct_characters(string: str) -> int: return len(set(string))</pre>	<pre># [Task 16] Ground Truth def count_distinct_characters(string: str) -> int: return len(set(string.lower()))</pre>
	Missing multiple steps		
Memory Error	Infinite loop	<pre># [Task 100] CodeGen-16B def make_a_pile(n: int): if n % 2 == 0: return [n] + make_a_pile(n + 2) else: return [n] + make_a_pile(n + 1)</pre>	<pre># [Task 100] Ground Truth def make_a_pile(n: int): ans, num = [], n for _ in range(n): ans.append(num) num += 2 return ans</pre>

the 13 semantic characteristics, while incorrect code generated by smaller models exhibited all sorts of errors. One plausible explanation is that GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 are much larger and thus are better at interpreting task descriptions. For instance, both CodeGen-16B and InCoder-1.3B missed the subtle requirement in Example 2 (Task 85) that “the elements must be even numbers”, resulting in missing steps within the generated code. However, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 were able to generate the correct solution successfully.

```
# [Task 85] Given a non-empty list of integers lst. Add the even
# elements that are at odd indices.
```

```
def add(lst):
    return sum(lst[1::2])
```

CodeGen-16B

```
def add(lst):
    return sum([lst[i] for i in
        range(1, len(lst), 2)])
```

InCoder-1.3B

```
def add(lst):
    sum_even = 0
    for i in range(1, len(lst),
        2):
        if lst[i] % 2 == 0:
            sum_even += lst[i]
    return sum_even
```

GPT-3.5

```
def add(lst):
    result = 0
    for i in range(1, len(lst),
        2):
        if lst[i] % 2 == 0:
            result += lst[i]
    return result
```

GPT-4

Example 2: Examples of missing multiple steps in code generated by CodeGen-16B and InCoder-1.3B

Finding 1: The most common semantic characteristics among six LLMs are *wrong (logical) direction* and *incorrect condition*. Compared with the other four LLMs, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 do not often generate code with missing steps.

Where Do Large Language Models Fail When Generating Code?




Figure 1: Distribution of *semantic characteristics* of code generation errors made by six LLMs.

Furthermore, we found that even for the same failure task, failed code generated by different LLMs could have different semantic characteristics. Example 3 shows an example of three LLMs that made different semantic characteristics. In this example, CodeGen-16B misses a few steps of handling the “unit digits” (*missing multiple steps*), while InCoder-1.3B completely ignored the task (*wrong (logical) direction*). GPT-3.5 only made a small mistake with parentheses (*incorrect arithmetic operation*). One takeaway from such observation is that *ensemble* of different LLMs might improve the code generation success rate.

```
# [Task 97] Returns the product of two integers' unit digits.
```

```
def multiply(a, b):
    return a * b
```

CodeGen-16B

```
def multiply(a, b):
    product = 1
    while a > 0:
        product *= a
        a -= 1
    while b > 0:
        product *= b
        b -= 1
    return product
```

InCoder-1.3B

```
def multiply(a, b):
    return abs(a % 10 * b % 10)
```

GPT-3.5

Example 3: Three LLMs made different errors on one task

Finding 2: Even for the same task, different LLMs produce failed code with varying semantic characteristics. This encourages future enhancements in LLM code generation could be model-specific.

3.1.2 Syntactic Characteristics. We identified 7 types and 14 subtypes of syntactic characteristics, pinpointing the specific locations of errors in the code generated by LLMs.

- **Conditional Error** indicates there is an error within the ‘if’ statement, causing the code to behave incorrectly.
- **Loop Error** indicates there is an iteration mistake in the ‘for’ or ‘while’ loop, either through incorrect loop boundaries or mismanagement of loop variables.
- **Return Error** indicates the error is in a return statement that returns a wrong value or a value not in the expected format.
- **Method Call Error** indicates the error is in a function call. It can be an incorrect function call name (*incorrect function name*), wrong arguments (*incorrect function arguments*), or incorrect target of a method call (*incorrect method call target*).
- **Assignment Error** indicates the error is in an assignment statement. It can be an incorrect constant/variable name/comparison operator used in an assignment, leading to errors or unexpected behaviors in the code’s execution.
- **Import Error** indicates the error is in an import statement.
- **Code Block Error** indicates multiple statements are incorrectly generated or omitted, leading to the task failure.

Comparison between LLMs. Fig. 2 shows the distribution of the 14 syntactic characteristics across the six LLMs. We observed similar distribution patterns as semantic characteristics. On the one hand, for all models, the top 3 error locations are either in entire code blocks (i.e., multiple statements in a sequence) or in an if statement. The fact that all LLMs struggle with generating entire code blocks correctly implies that many code generation errors are not small errors and require substantial efforts to fix, which we further investigated in RQ2.

Compared with other models, the code generation errors from GPT-4 are more well-contained in a few types of code constructs.

Table 3: Taxonomy of syntactic characteristics of code generation errors made by LLMs.

Error Characteristics		Incorrect Example	Ground Truth
Conditional Error	If error	<pre># [Task 151] CodeGen-16B def double_the_difference(lst): sum = 0 for i in lst: if i > 0 and i % 2 != 0: sum += i ** 2 return sum</pre>	<pre># [Task 151] Ground Truth def double_the_difference(lst): ans = 0 for num in lst: if num % 2 == 1 and num > 0 and "." not in str(num): ans += num ** 2 return ans</pre>
Loop Error	For error	<pre># [Task 121] GPT-3.5 def solution(lst): sum = 0 for i in range(1, len(lst), 2): if lst[i] % 2 != 0: sum += lst[i] return sum</pre>	<pre># [Task 121] Ground Truth def solution(lst): return sum([x for idx, x in enumerate(lst) if idx%2==0 and x%2==1])</pre>
	While error	<pre># [Task 44] GPT-3.5 def change_base(x: int, base: int): result = "" while x > 0: remainder = x % base result = str(remainder) + result x = x // base return result</pre>	<pre># [Task 44] Ground Truth def change_base(x: int, base: int): if x == 0: return "0" ret = "" while x != 0: ret = str(x % base) + ret x //= base return ret</pre>
Return Error	Incorrect return value	<pre># [Task 103] GPT-3.5 def rounded_avg(n, m): if n > m: return -1 avg = round(sum(range(n, m+1)) / (m-n+1)) return bin(avg)[2:]</pre>	<pre># [Task 103] Ground Truth def rounded_avg(n, m): if n > m: return -1 avg = round((n + m) / 2) return bin(avg)</pre>
Method Call Error	Incorrect function name	<pre># [Task 101] GPT-3.5 def words_string(s): words = s.split(" ") words = [words.split(" ") for word in words for word in sublist] return words</pre>	<pre># [Task 101] Ground Truth def words_string(s): words = (s.replace(" ", " ")).split() return [word for word in words if word != ""]</pre>
	Incorrect function arguments	<pre># [Task 120] GPT-3.5 def maximum(arr, k): arr.sort(reverse=True) return arr[:k]</pre>	<pre># [Task 120] Ground Truth def maximum(arr, k): return sorted(sorted(arr)[::-1][:k])</pre>
	Incorrect method call target		
Assignment Error	Incorrect constant	<pre># [Task 118] CodeGen-16B def get_closest_vowel(word): vowels = set('aeiou') for i in range(len(word) - 1): if word[i] not in vowels and word[i + 1] in vowels: return word[i] return ''</pre>	<pre># [Task 118] Ground Truth def get_closest_vowel(word): if len(word) < 3: return "" vowels = {"a", "e", "i", "o", "u", "A", "E", "O", "U", "I"} for i in range(len(word)-2, 0, -1): if word[i] in vowels: if (word[i+1] not in vowels) and (word[i-1] not in vowels): return word[i]</pre>
	Incorrect arithmetic		
	Incorrect variable name		
	Incorrect comparison		
Import Error	Import error	<pre># [Task 162] CodeGen-16B def string_to_md5(text): if not text: return None return hashlib.md5(text.encode('utf-8')).hexdigest()</pre>	<pre># [Task 162] Ground Truth def string_to_md5(text): if text == "": return None import hashlib m = hashlib.md5() m.update(text.encode("utf-8")) return m.hexdigest()</pre>
Code Block Error	Incorrect code block	<pre># [Task 83] GPT-3.5 def starts_one_ends(n): count = 0 for i in range(10**(n-1), 10**n): if str(i)[0] == '1' or str(i)[-1] == '1': count += 1 return count</pre>	<pre># [Task 83] Ground Truth def starts_one_ends(n): if n == 1: return 1 return 18 * 10 ** (n - 2)</pre>
	Missing code block	<pre># [Task 31] CodeGen-16B def is_prime(n): if n == 1: return False for i in range(2, n): if n % i == 0: return False return True</pre>	<pre># [Task 31] Ground Truth def is_prime(n): if n <= 1: return False n_sqrt = int(n**.5) while n_sqrt ** 2 < n: n_sqrt += 1 for i in range(2, min(n_sqrt + 1, n)): if n % i == 0: return False return True</pre>

GPT-4 did not introduce any errors in method call expressions, variable references, or constant values used in an assignment statement. By contrast, GPT-3.5 still hallucinates when generating method calls. Other models exhibited a more diverse set of error locations compared with GPT-4 and GPT-3.5. Interestingly, CodeGen-16B and InCoder-1.3B have more cases of *incorrect function name*, while GPT-3.5, SantaCoder and, StarCoder encounter *incorrect function arguments* more frequently. This implies that during pre-training, CodeGen and InCoder are less effective in learning the mappings between task descriptions and which functions to use to achieve the tasks. One interesting direction to improve these models is to design pre-training tasks that predict function names and arguments to strengthen the model’s memory of function usage.

Finding 3: More than 40% of the syntactic characteristics made by six LLMs could be grouped into *missing code block* and *incorrect code block*. Besides, the studied LLMs also encountered a significant number of *if error*, *incorrect function name*, and *incorrect function arguments*. Compared to *missing code block* and *incorrect code block*, these are generally simpler to correct, as they often require only minor adjustments rather than extensive code restructuring.

3.2 RQ2: How much repair effort is needed for the incorrect code generated by LLMs?

To investigate RQ2, we employ two different token-level metrics to measure the similarity between the incorrect code and the ground truth: (1) Jaccard similarity [33], and (2) Levenshtein distance [42]. Jaccard similarity treats code as a set of tokens and measures code

Where Do Large Language Models Fail When Generating Code?




Figure 2: Distribution of syntactic characteristics of code generation errors made by six LLMs.




Figure 3: Jaccard similarity between the incorrect code and ground truth. The vertical dashed lines indicate the medians.

similarity by computing the token overlap between two code snippets. Levenshtein distance measures the minimum number of edits (i.e., insertions, deletions, or substitutions) required to change incorrect code snippets into ground truth. This provides a direct measure of how many token-level changes are needed to correct the code, offering an indication of the repair effort.

Fig. 3 shows the distribution of Jaccard similarity scores. All six LLMs have low Jaccard similarity scores, which are generally concentrated in the lower ranges—0%-40% similarity, with median values falling between 10%-20%. Fig. 4 shows the distribution of Levenshtein distances. All models exhibit a wide range of Levenshtein distances for incorrect code, with median distances around or greater than 100. Notably, 84.89% of the incorrectly generated

code has Levenshtein distance scores above 50 edits, with 25.92% of them requiring more than 200 edits. Overall, these results indicate that LLM-generated code often exhibits big differences from the ground truth, not just minor errors. Addressing these issues would require extensive modifications rather than small edits. This underscores the heavy repair effort needed to align the incorrectly generated code with the ground truth.

Interestingly, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, despite having high performance (Table 1), exhibit larger deviations when generating incorrect code, with greater median Levenshtein distances compared to other models. This suggests that though GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 are more accurate in general, when they make mistakes, the mistakes are




Figure 4: Levenshtein distance between the incorrect code and ground truth. The vertical dashed lines indicate the medians.




Figure 5: Distribution of *single-line*, *single-hunk*, and *multi-hunk* faults in different LLMs.


likely to cause a larger deviation from the ground truth and thus require more edits to fix.

Following the automated program repair literature [73], we also classify all incorrect code snippets into three categories based on the effort required to fix them: (1) single-line errors, (2) single-hunk errors, and (3) multi-hunk errors. A “hunk” refers to several contiguous lines in a program. Fig. 5 shows the distribution. Overall, the majority of errors are single-hunk or multi-hunk errors, which require substantial effort to repair compared with single-line errors. Compared with other LLMs, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 exhibit a more balanced distribution among the three categories. SantaCoder made the most single-line errors (43%). StarCoder made the most single-hunk errors (47%). Notably, the least accurate model, InCoder-1.3B, made the most multi-hunk errors (39%).


Finding 4: The majority of incorrect code snippets produced by the six LLMs deviate significantly from the ground truth code. This implies that fixing LLM-generated code requires non-trivial efforts.

3.3 RQ3: How does the prompt complexity affect an LLM’s code generation?

To the best of our knowledge, there is no established metric for estimating a prompt’s complexity for LLMs. Therefore, we use a



(a) Density plot of the number of words in HumanEval’s prompts



(b) Distribution of passed/failed tasks’ prompt length
Figure 6: Distribution of prompt length

prompt’s length (i.e., the number of words) as a proxy metric for task complexity. It is a pragmatic choice but we acknowledge its limitation and discuss the potential threats to validity in Sec. 6. Fig. 6a displays the distribution of prompt lengths of the HumanEval [15] dataset. Overall, the average prompt length in HumanEval is 67.7 words per prompt. The minimum prompt length is 17 words, while the longest prompt includes 249 words. We observed that 40.9% prompts only include 50 words or less. These results indicate that a large portion of the prompts in HumanEval are concise.

We investigate if there is any correlation between a task’s prompt length and its success across different LLMs. As shown in Fig. 6b, we observed a distribution difference between the passed tasks’ prompt lengths and the failed tasks’ prompt lengths. According to Mann-Whitney U -test results, such difference is statistically significant ($p < 0.005$) across all six LLMs. We also notice that all these six LLMs fail to solve any tasks with a prompt longer than 180 words, which indicates that current code LLMs still lack the capabilities of handling long and complex prompts.

We further dig into each LLM’s failed tasks with a prompt longer than 150 words. We found that a large portion (64.0%) of these failed tasks are *Garbage Code*, defined as unnecessary parts of the code that do not contribute to the intended functionality. Additionally,

37.5% are identified as *meaningless code snippet*, which specifically denote parts of code that, despite potentially being syntactically correct, fail to address or relate to the given programming task. This could happen even when the task itself is not actually complex. For instance, Task 78’s prompt includes 165 words, which requires counting the prime digits in a hexadecimal number. The ground truth code solves this task with only one line of code. However, CodeGen-16B failed to understand the task requirement and only returned a number 0, resulting in *meaningless code snippet*.

```
# [Task 78] You have been tasked to write a function that receives
# a hexadecimal number as a string and counts the number of
# hexadecimal digits that are primes.Hexadecimal digits are 0, 1,
# 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, A, B, C, D, E, F... (165 words in total)

def hex_key(num):
    return 0
```

Example 4: An example of *meaningless code snippets* with long task description made by CodenGen-16B

Also, 37.5% are *only comments*, defined as the generated code consists solely of comments and lacks executable statements to solve the given task. Besides, 25.0% of them fall into *wrong (logical) direction*, indicating a significant misinterpretation of the task requirements. In these cases, the LLM generates code that not only fails to solve the problem but also produces solutions that contradict the intended outcome. For instance, in Task 115, GPT-3.5 wrongly assumes that water from different wells can be combined into a single bucket operation, whereas each well should be considered separately according to its capacity constraints.

```
# [Task 115] You are given a rectangular grid of wells. Each row
# represents a single well, and each 1 in a row represents a
# single unit of water. Each well has a corresponding bucket that
# can be used to extract water from it, and all buckets have the
# same capacity. Your task is to use the buckets to empty the
# wells. Output the number of times you need to lower the buckets.

def max_fill(grid, bucket_capacity):
    import math
    total_water = sum(sum(row) for row in grid)
    num_buckets = math.ceil(total_water / bucket_capacity)
    return num_buckets
```

Example 5: A *wrong (logical) direction* example by GPT-3.5

Finding 5: All six LLMs are more capable of solving short-prompt tasks compared with solving long-prompt ones. Besides, current LLMs also face challenges in solving tasks with long prompts. When the given task prompt was extremely long (i.e., longer than 150 words), 64.0% of the incorrect code snippets ran into *Garbage Code*. This indicates the need to optimize long and complex prompts for code generation.

3.4 RQ4: How does code length relate to the types of LLMs’ code generation errors?

We did not find any statistical evidence that the generated code length is related to a specific task’s success. As shown in Fig. 7, in most cases, the passed tasks’ code length is similar to the failed tasks’ code length on all six LLMs. Mann-Whitney *U*-test [57] results further suggest that the mean differences are not statistically significant in all cases ($p = 0.5214$).




Figure 7: Distribution of passed/failed tasks’ code length

Finding 6: There is no statistical evidence indicating that there is a difference between the passed tasks’ code length and the failed tasks’ code length.

Though the average lengths of the code generated by CodeGen-16B, InCoder-1.3B, GPT-3.5, GPT-4, SantaCoder, and StarCoder (29.3, 32.3, 25.2, 29.6, 26.5, and 15.4 words, respectively) are short, we noticed a small portion of the generated code with a large length (i.e., longer than 100 words). Therefore, we further investigated these long code snippets generated by LLMs.

In particular, we found that out of 36 code snippets with a length longer than 100 words, only 4 of them were correct. These results indicate that when the generated code is extremely long, there is a small chance that the code is correct. We further dug into those failure cases. Specifically, we found that 28 out of the 32 failed code snippets (87.5%) are *Garbage Code*, where 22 are *Meaningless code snippet*, 4 are *Only comments*, and only 2 are *Wrong (logical) direction*. Regarding *Meaningless code snippet*, we manually checked the 22 code snippets and found that all of them encountered the same problem: *repeatedly generating similar lines/blocks of code*. For instance, Task 6 requires the program to output the deepest level of nested parentheses. However, SantaCoder repeatedly generated the code to replace the parentheses with empty strings.

```
# [Task 6] Task description omitted.

def parse_nested_parens(paren_string: str):
    paren_string = paren_string.replace('(', '')
    paren_string = paren_string.replace(')', '')
    paren_string = paren_string.replace(' ', '')
    paren_string = paren_string.replace(')', '')
    ...
```

Example 6: An example of repeatedly generating similar lines/blocks of code made by SantaCoder

Finding 7: When a code snippet generated by LLMs is too long (longer than 100 words), there is a higher chance (87.5%) that this code snippet is *Garbage Code*.

3.5 RQ5: Does partially failed code exhibit different characteristics compared with fully failed code?

Since HumanEval [15] provides test cases for each task, we are interested in whether a completely failed task (all test cases failed) would yield different error characteristic patterns compared with a partially failed task (a subset of test cases failed). Overall, we find that there are 244 completely failed tasks and 314 partially failed tasks among 558 incorrect code snippets.




Figure 8: Semantic characteristics vs. test pass rates

Fig. 8 shows the distribution of task failure rates for incorrect solutions with different semantic characteristics. *Only comments* and *meaningless code* are the top two characteristics that lead to complete failures. Despite a small mistake, the majority of code with *undefined names* also leads to complete test failures due to compile-time or runtime crashes. Surprisingly, we found that while some error characteristics, such as missing multiple steps, sound severe by definition, they do not often lead to complete failures. After digging into the concrete instances, we noticed that this is because LLMs do not completely misunderstand the task description and the generated code can still pass some weak test cases. For instance, Task 125 requires the program to split on commas if there is no space in the string. If there is also no comma in the string, the program should perform other operations. However, the code generated by CodeGen-16B only split the input string into spaces while missing the remaining steps. As a result, it can only pass the test cases that include spaces, leading to a partially failed task.

```
# [Task 125] Given a string of words, return a list of words split
# on whitespace, if no whitespaces exist in the text you should
# split on commas ', ' if no commas exist you should return the
# number of lower-case letters with odd order in the alphabet
def split_words(txt):
    return txt.split()
```

Example 7: Missing multiple steps by CodeGen-16B

Another surprising finding is that code with the wrong direction can pass some test cases accidentally. For example, in Task 75, the code generated by InCoder-1.3B does not follow the task instructions. However, it can pass a few test cases, such as 5, 10, and 30. One possible reason is that since the prompt includes test cases, LLMs may have memorized a superficial correlation between test cases and some other irrelevant solutions that pass those test cases.

```
# [Task 75] Write a function that returns true if the given number
# is the multiplication of 3 prime numbers and false otherwise.
def is_multiply_prime(a):
    return a < 100 and a % 3 == 0
```

Example 8: Wrong (logical) direction by InCoder-1.3B

Finding 8: In terms of the semantic characteristics, when the LLMs only passed a subset of the given test cases (partially failed), they were more likely to commit *missing multiple steps* and *incorrect condition*. By contrast, completely failed tasks (no test cases passed) led to *meaningless code snippet* more frequently.




Figure 9: Syntactic characteristics vs. test pass rates

In terms of syntactic characteristics (Fig. 9), we observed an obvious difference on *if error*, where the majority of code with this error led to partial failure (84% v.s. 16%). This is because when encountering *if error*, LLMs were more likely to only misinterpret a specific condition requirement while generating correct code for the other parts. For instance, in Task 0, SantaCoder only considered the adjunct elements in the given list numbers. As a result, it failed to pass the test case where the two closet elements were not adjunct.

```
# [Task 0] Check if in the given list of numbers, are any two
# numbers
# closer to each other than given threshold.
# Examples omitted.
def has_close_elements(numbers, threshold):
    if len(numbers) < 2:
        return False
    for i in range(len(numbers) - 1):
        if abs(numbers[i] - numbers[i + 1]) > threshold:
            return True
    return False
```

Example 9: An *if error* example by SantaCoder

Finding 9: For syntactic characteristics, LLMs made more *if error* in partially failed tasks (84%) than in fully failed ones (16%). These subtle error characteristics in partially failed tasks, likely due to missed conditions, may be fixable with traditional automated program repair techniques.

4 IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this section, we discuss several significant implications of our study for code generation by LLMs and research opportunities to improve the quality and reliability of code LLMs.

Implication 1: Prompt engineering for better code generation. Our Finding 5 reveals that when the input prompt is too long, the LLMs may fail to understand the given complex task requirements, leading to *Garbage Code* generation. By contrast, a short and concise task description usually leads to better code generation. Therefore, optimizing long and complex task requirements into short and concise prompts could be another research opportunity. This could be highly related to the field of *prompt engineering*. Recent studies from other domains (e.g., computer vision and natural language processing) have shown the promise of prompt engineering techniques such as chain-of-thought prompting [82, 92], automated prompt refinement [66], and interactive

prompt engineering tools [23, 75]. Simultaneously, software engineering researchers have also been working on prompt tuning and prompt design for code generation [79]. Our work further offers practical insights into how the length of the prompt could affect the success of LLMs’ code generation. Therefore, in future work, researchers may work on investigating to what extent the existing prompt engineering techniques can facilitate code generation tasks or propose new techniques to optimize prompts.

Implication 2: Developing fault localization techniques for LLMs’ code generation. Our Finding 1 and Finding 2 reveal that non-trivial efforts may be required to repair incorrect code snippets generated by LLMs. This could be largely attributed to the low similarity between the incorrect code snippets and the correct ground truth code, as well as the diversity of error characteristics that LLMs may produce. As a result, identifying the root causes of these incorrect code snippets becomes challenging. Without precise fault localization, the effectiveness of automated program repair techniques could also be significantly affected [84].

Although there has been a large body of work about fault localization approaches (especially spectrum-based ones) in SE [2, 84], we argue that two obvious challenges still exist for fault localization in LLMs’ generated code. First, spectrum-based fault localization usually targets generating a fault space at *statement* granularity [84]. However, our study results reveal that LLMs tend to produce a significant number of errors at the block level (e.g., *incorrect code block* and *missing code block*). In these cases, statement-level fault localization may be ineffective. Second, existing fault localization methods may not distinguish different types of error characteristics in an incorrect code snippet. Our study results show that the incorrect code snippets generated by LLMs could include not only simple characteristics (e.g., *incorrect condition*, which may be addressed by existing APR techniques) but also complex ones such as *wrong (logical) direction*. These issues are usually related to the LLMs’ misinterpretation of task requirements. Without accurately identifying these types of errors, fixing them could be even more challenging.

Therefore, in future work, researchers may consider developing techniques to automatically identify the types of semantic and syntactic error characteristics in LLM-generated code, considering the unique patterns and complexities introduced by LLMs.

Implication 3: Developing error repair techniques for LLMs’ code generation. Our study discovers that some of the syntactic characteristics may be easy to fix, such as *if error* and *incorrect function arguments*. To repair these *one-line* errors, practitioners could leverage existing techniques for automated program repair (APR) [22, 28, 36–38, 46, 48, 52, 55, 58, 72, 76, 85–88]. However, applying APR techniques could still be challenging in some cases. For instance, *if error* could originate from the miss of specific task requirements by LLMs (Task 0 in Sec. 3.5), where APR techniques may not work.

Moreover, our findings reveal that a larger number of syntactic characteristics made by code LLMs could cover multiple lines and statements (e.g., *incorrect code block*, *missing code block*), which also result in the low similarity between the incorrect code snippets and the correct ground truth code. Such errors usually go beyond simple fixes and require substantial restructuring and logical corrections. It

would be worth investigating to what extent the novel LLM-based APR methods could resolve these issues [22], as well as developing new techniques to repair block-level code errors.

5 RELATED WORK

5.1 LLM-based Code Generation

In recent years, Large Language Models (LLMs) have not only demonstrated great performance in various natural language processing tasks [1, 21], but also shown great potential in code-related tasks, such as generation [15, 26, 60, 81, 93], summarization [3, 13, 61], understanding [20, 80], search [24, 34, 91] and translation [71].

As such, several LLMs specifically trained or fine-tuned on code data have been introduced, e.g., AlphaCode [45], SantaCoder [5], StarCoder [44], CodeGen [60] and Qwen [9]. A notable example is CodeLlama [70], an adaptation of Llama-2 [78]. To enhance its code understanding and generation, CodeLlama introduced three significant modifications: (1) the collection of higher-quality code data for training, (2) the implementation of Fill-in-the-Middle (FIM) task [26] and (3) the adoption of instruction fine-tuning to better respond to code-related queries. Additionally, CodeLlama employed the self-instruct technique, where models generate programming questions and answers that are subsequently used for fine-tuning.

Follow-up work can then be roughly categorized into three groups: (1) those that focus more on collecting more diverse, high-quality code-related training data, (2) those that seek better instruction fine-tuning techniques, and (3) those that utilize existing LLMs and devise better prompting strategies [10, 14, 19, 27, 43, 62, 89]. For the first line of work, StarCoder 2 [53] built the Stack v2 dataset, which is 4x larger than its predecessor, with up to 4.3 trillion tokens from more diverse sources such as GitHub pull requests, Kaggle notebooks, and code documentation. Additionally, DeepSeek-coder [29] introduced an approach for analyzing dependencies between code files using topological sorting, aggregating linked code lines into a single training sample, enabling LLMs to understand repository-level code bases better.

For the second line of work, a representative example is WizardCoder [54], which implemented an “instruction evolution” strategy, where LLMs are iteratively guided to generate increasingly complex instructions covering a broader range of topics and skills. Later, MagicCoder [83] introduced OSS-Instruct, a dataset where GPT-3.5 Turbo is prompted to create coding problems and their solutions based on collected code snippets. OSS-Instruct consists of 75k fine-tuning instances, and the resulting MagicCoder, based on Code Llama, has demonstrated superior performance over GPT-3.5 on the HumanEval benchmark.

The third line of the work focuses on designing more complex prompting strategies based on existing pre-trained LLMs. For example, Self-Debugging [16] enables LLMs to debug their own code by prompting with execution results and instructions for code explanations, demonstrating better accuracy than GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 on the MBPP dataset [8]. Self-Refine [56] iteratively enhances code generation by instructing the LLM to provide feedback on its outputs and refine them, achieving up to 13% improvement on CodeX [15]. Cycle [19] also leverages a similar idea of self-refinement based on the execution results of test suites. Different from Self-Debugging and Self-Refine, the Cycle includes a fine-tuning stage to enhance

LLMs’ abilities to refine faulty programs. As a result, Cycle outperforms models with 3 times more parameters in self-refinement. CodeT adopts a test-driven prompting method [14]. Rather than relying on existing test suites, CodeT instructs LLMs to simultaneously generate multiple code snippets and their corresponding tests, selecting the final output based on the highest consensus. SKCoder [43] utilizes a retriever-based pipeline to extract code sketches from existing databases.

Distinct from these efforts that aim to train better LLMs, our research focuses on analyzing the errors LLMs produce. We aim to develop a taxonomy of these errors, with the hope that our findings will assist the development of new methods in the direction and contribute to better LLM-enabled intelligent software engineering.

5.2 Quality of LLM-generated Code

Evaluating the quality of LLM-generated code can reveal the current approach’s shortcomings and guide future improvement. While prior research has delved into various facets such as robustness [7, 50], security [67], and usability [4, 11], studies specifically examining the correctness of LLM-generated code [15, 35, 49, 51, 59] are of particular relevance to our work.

Liu et al. [49] evaluated the quality of code generated by ChatGPT, addressing various factors, including compilation and runtime errors, output correctness, coding style, maintainability, and performance. Their work, however, focused more on concrete error types. By contrast, our work focuses on code generation. We investigate a broader range of LLMs and examine the error characteristics’ correlations with prompt complexity, code similarity, etc.

Pan et al. [65] introduced a taxonomy centered on code translation bugs. These bug types include code translate-specific problems (e.g., semantics differences between different programming languages) and logic and data-related bugs (e.g., the inclusion of logic not in source code and mismatched output data structure), which share some similarities with us. However, there is a key distinction in the origin of errors where Pan et al.’s work focuses on code-to-code translation, while our focus is on the issues in LLMs’ code generation from natural language specifications.

Finally, Liu et al. [51] conducted a study of the quality of code generated by ChatGPT, assessing their correctness, understandability, and security. In their examination of code correctness, they primarily focused on compile errors and runtime crashes. Our research differs from theirs in two key respects: (1) Our study subjects are more diverse with both open-source and closed-source models; (2) our taxonomy also considers behavior deviations informed by test failures in addition to compiling errors and crashes. Based on the findings, we further provide actionable suggestions and implications for future enhancements in LLM-enabled code generation.

5.3 Taxonomy on Software Defects

In software engineering, collecting, classifying, and analyzing software defects has been recognized as an important research topic for improving software quality. Building a systematic taxonomy of software bugs can help stakeholders understand the pitfalls of target systems and guide developers for better development practices. One of the early attempts along the direction was the orthogonal defect classification (ODC) proposed by IBM Research [17, 18].

Since then, numerous endeavors have been made to construct defect taxonomies from various angles. These include investigations targeting different programming languages, such as C [41, 77], Javascript [30, 31], Java [64], Python [90], Julia [68], and multi-language programs [39, 47]. Others delve into different applications, such as Infrastructure as Code (IaC) [69] and deep learning stacks [32]. Different from these attempts, our work mainly focuses on building a systematic taxonomy for LLM-generated code.

6 THREATS TO VALIDITY

Threats to Internal Validity. One potential threat comes from our manual analysis process, where labelers may have different opinions and sometimes may make mistakes. To mitigate this, four of the authors first performed open-coding and iteratively refined our codebook until a substantial agreement was achieved before one of the authors labeled the complete dataset. Our final Fleiss’ Kappa regarding the semantic and syntactic characteristics are 0.84 and 0.71, respectively, indicating substantial agreement.

Threats to External Validity. One potential threat lies in the choice of dataset. Considering the extensive labeling effort (e.g., running the code in an IDE and performing step-by-step debugging to locate the root cause), we have only labeled one dataset. In future work, one may consider labeling more datasets to confirm the generalizability of our findings. Nevertheless, given the size of our labeled dataset (558 code snippets), we believe our findings can be generalized to other similar datasets, such as MBPP and APPS.

Besides, our study only covers Python programs, which might not generalize to programming languages that are very different from Python (e.g., PHP and Rust). We chose Python because it is one of the most popular object-oriented programming languages. In future work, we plan to expand our study with programming tasks from other languages.

Threats to Construct Validity. In RQ3, we use the prompt length to estimate the prompt complexity. Although prompt length may not be the best metric for such estimation, we believe this is a pragmatic choice since there is no commonly used metric for prompt complexity. In future work, researchers may consider designing new metrics to estimate the prompt complexity and investigate its correlation with LLM’s code generation capabilities.

7 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we present an empirical study on code generation errors made by large language models. We first derived a taxonomy of LLMs’ code generation errors based on six popular LLMs’ failure cases on the HumanEval dataset [15] through open coding and thematic analysis. We labeled a total of 558 errors committed by these code LLMs according to the established taxonomy. We found that these LLMs exhibited different distributions of semantic and syntactic error characteristics. We further analyzed these error characteristics from various perspectives, such as prompt complexity and test-pass rate. At the end of the paper, we discuss the implications of our study and propose future research opportunities for improving the quality and reliability of code LLMs.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2023. ChatGPT. <http://chat.openai.com>.

- [2] Rui Abreu, Peter Zoetewij, and Arjan JC Van Gemund. 2009. Spectrum-based multiple fault localization. In *2009 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. IEEE, 88–99.
- [3] Wasi Ahmad, Saikat Chakraborty, Baishakhi Ray, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2020. A Transformer-based Approach for Source Code Summarization. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 4998–5007.
- [4] Naser Al Madi. 2022. How readable is model-generated code? examining readability and visual inspection of github copilot. In *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. 1–5.
- [5] Loubna Ben Allal, Raymond Li, et al. 2023. SantaCoder: don't reach for the stars! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.03988* (2023).
- [6] Axel Antoine, Sylvain Malacria, Nicolai Marquardt, and G ery Casiez. 2021. Interaction illustration taxonomy: Classification of styles and techniques for visually representing interaction scenarios. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–22.
- [7] Shushan Arakelyan, Rocktim Das, Yi Mao, and Xiang Ren. 2023. Exploring distributional shifts in large language models for code analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 16298–16314.
- [8] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. 2021. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732* (2021).
- [9] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. 2023. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609* (2023).
- [10] Ramakrishna Bairi, Atharv Sonwane, et al. 2024. Codeplan: Repository-level coding using llms and planning. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*.
- [11] Shraddha Barke, Michael B James, and Nadia Polikarpova. 2023. Grounded copilot: How programmers interact with code-generating models. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 7, OOPSLA1 (2023), 85–111.
- [12] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology* 3, 2 (2006), 77–101.
- [13] Yufan Cai, Yun Lin, Chenyan Liu, Jinglian Wu, Yifan Zhang, Yiming Liu, Yeyun Gong, and Jin Song Dong. 2024. On-the-Fly Adapting Code Summarization on Trainable Cost-Effective Language Models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [14] Bei Chen, Fengji Zhang, Anh Nguyen, Daoguang Zan, Zeqi Lin, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. 2023. CodeT5: Code Generation with Generated Tests. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [15] Mark Chen, Jerry Tjworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374* (2021).
- [16] Xinyun Chen, Maxwell Lin, Nathanael Sch arli, and Denny Zhou. 2024. Teaching Large Language Models to Self-Debug. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [17] Ram Chillarege, Inderpal S Bhandari, Jarir K Chaar, Michael J Halliday, Diane S Moebus, Bonnie K Ray, and Man-Yuen Wong. 1992. Orthogonal defect classification—a concept for in-process measurements. *IEEE Transactions on software Engineering* 18, 11 (1992), 943–956.
- [18] Ram Chillarege, Wei-Lun Kao, and Richard G Condit. 1991. Defect Type and Its Impact on the Growth Curve.. In *ICSE*, Vol. 91. 246–255.
- [19] Yangruibo Ding, Marcus J Min, Gail Kaiser, and Baishakhi Ray. 2024. CYCLE: Learning to Self-Refine the Code Generation. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 8, OOPSLA1 (2024), 392–418.
- [20] Yangruibo Ding, Benjamin Steenhoek, Kexin Pei, Gail Kaiser, Wei Le, and Baishakhi Ray. 2024. Traced: Execution-aware pre-training for source code. In *Proceedings of the 46th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1–12.
- [21] Li Dong, Nan Yang, Wenhui Wang, Furu Wei, Xiaodong Liu, Yu Wang, Jianfeng Gao, Ming Zhou, and Hsiao-Wuen Hon. 2019. Unified language model pre-training for natural language understanding and generation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).
- [22] Zhiyu Fan, Xiang Gao, Martin Mirchev, Abhik Roychoudhury, and Shin Hwei Tan. 2023. Automated repair of programs from large language models. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 1469–1481.
- [23] Yingchaojie Feng, Xingbo Wang, Kam Kwai Wong, Sijia Wang, Yuhong Lu, Minfeng Zhu, Baicheng Wang, and Wei Chen. 2023. PromptMagician: Interactive Prompt Engineering for Text-to-Image Creation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09036* (2023).
- [24] Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, et al. 2020. CodeBERT: A Pre-Trained Model for Programming and Natural Languages. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*. Online, 1536–1547.
- [25] Joseph L Fleiss. 1971. Measuring nominal scale agreement among many raters. *Psychological bulletin* 76, 5 (1971), 378.
- [26] Daniel Fried, Armen Aghajanyan, Jessy Lin, Sida Wang, Eric Wallace, Freda Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Scott Yih, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2022. InCoder: A Generative Model for Code Infilling and Synthesis. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [27] Shuzheng Gao, Xin-Cheng Wen, Cuiyun Gao, Wenxuan Wang, Hongyu Zhang, and Michael R Lyu. 2023. What makes good in-context demonstrations for code intelligence tasks with llms?. In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 761–773.
- [28] Ali Ghanbari, Samuel Benton, and Lingming Zhang. 2019. Practical program repair via bytecode mutation. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 19–30.
- [29] Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Y Wu, YK Li, et al. 2024. DeepSeek-Coder: When the Large Language Model Meets Programming—The Rise of Code Intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196* (2024).
- [30] P eter Gyimesi, B ela Vancsics, Andrea Stocco, Davood Mazinanian, Arp ad Beszedes, Rudolf Ferenc, and Ali Mesbah. 2019. Bugsjs: a benchmark of javascript bugs. In *2019 12th IEEE Conference on Software Testing, Validation and Verification (ICST)*. IEEE, 90–101.
- [31] Quinn Hanam, Fernando S de M Brito, and Ali Mesbah. 2016. Discovering bug patterns in JavaScript. In *Proceedings of the 2016 24th ACM SIGSOFT international symposium on foundations of software engineering*. 144–156.
- [32] Nargiz Humbatova, Gunel Jahangirova, Gabriele Bavota, Vincenzo Riccio, Andrea Stocco, and Paolo Tonella. 2020. Taxonomy of real faults in deep learning systems. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1110–1121.
- [33] Paul Jaccard. 1901.  tude comparative de la distribution florale dans une portion des Alpes et des Jura. *Bull Soc Vaudoise Sci Nat* 37 (1901), 547–579.
- [34] Nihal Jain, Dejiao Zhang, et al. 2023. ContraCLM: Contrastive Learning For Causal Language Model. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Toronto, Canada, 6436–6459.
- [35] Kevin Jesse, Toufique Ahmed, Premkumar T Devanbu, and Emily Morgan. 2023. Large language models and simple, stupid bugs. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 20th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. IEEE, 563–575.
- [36] Jiajun Jiang, Yingfei Xiong, Hongyu Zhang, Qing Gao, and Xiangqun Chen. 2018. Shaping program repair space with existing patches and similar code. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM SIGSOFT international symposium on software testing and analysis*. 298–309.
- [37] Nan Jiang, Kevin Liu, Thibaud Lutellier, and Lin Tan. 2023. Impact of code language models on automated program repair. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 1430–1442.
- [38] Nan Jiang, Thibaud Lutellier, Yiling Lou, Lin Tan, Dan Goldwasser, and Xiangyu Zhang. 2023. Knod: Domain knowledge distilled tree decoder for automated program repair. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 1251–1263.
- [39] Pavneet Singh Kochhar, Dinusha Wijedasa, and David Lo. 2016. A large scale study of multiple programming languages and code quality. In *2016 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution, and Reengineering (SANER)*, Vol. 1. IEEE, 563–573.
- [40] Jonathan Lazar, Jinjuan Heidi Feng, and Harry Hochheiser. 2017. *Research methods in human-computer interaction*. Morgan Kaufmann.
- [41] Claire Le Goues, Neal Holtschulte, Edward K Smith, Yuriy Brun, Premkumar Devanbu, Stephanie Forrest, and Westley Weimer. 2015. The ManyBugs and IntroClass benchmarks for automated repair of C programs. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 41, 12 (2015), 1236–1256.
- [42] Vladimir I Levenshtein et al. 1966. Binary codes capable of correcting deletions, insertions, and reversals. In *Soviet physics doklady*, Vol. 10. Soviet Union, 707–710.
- [43] Jia Li, Yongmin Li, Ge Li, Zhi Jin, Yiyang Hao, and Xing Hu. 2023. Skcoder: A sketch-based approach for automatic code generation. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2124–2135.
- [44] Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, et al. 2023. StarCoder: may the source be with you! *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2023).
- [45] Yujia Li, David Choi, Junyoung Chung, Nate Kushman, Julian Schrittwieser, R emi Leblond, Tom Eccles, James Keeling, Felix Gimeno, Agustin Dal Lago, et al. 2022. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. *Science* 378, 6624 (2022), 1092–1097.
- [46] Yi Li, Shaohua Wang, and Tien N Nguyen. 2022. Dear: A novel deep learning-based approach for automated program repair. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 511–523.
- [47] Derrick Lin, James Koppel, Angela Chen, and Armando Solar-Lezama. 2017. QuixBugs: A multi-lingual program repair benchmark set based on the Quixey Challenge. In *Proceedings Companion of the 2017 ACM SIGPLAN international conference on systems, programming, languages, and applications: software for humanity*. 55–56.

- [48] Kui Liu, Anil Koyuncu, Dongsun Kim, and Tegawendé F Bissyandé. 2019. Tbar: Revisiting template-based automated program repair. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGSOFT international symposium on software testing and analysis*. 31–42.
- [49] Yue Liu, Thanh Le-Cong, Ratnadira Widyasari, Chakkrit Tantithamthavorn, Li Li, Xuan-Bach D Le, and David Lo. 2023. Refining ChatGPT-Generated Code: Characterizing and Mitigating Code Quality Issues. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* (2023).
- [50] Yue Liu, Chakkrit Tantithamthavorn, Yonghui Liu, and Li Li. 2024. On the Reliability and Explainability of Automated Code Generation Approaches. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* (2024).
- [51] Zhijie Liu, Yutian Tang, Xiapu Luo, Yuming Zhou, and Liang Feng Zhang. 2024. No need to lift a finger anymore? Assessing the quality of code generation by ChatGPT. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (2024).
- [52] Fan Long and Martin Rinard. 2016. Automatic patch generation by learning correct code. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*. 298–312.
- [53] Anton Lozhkov, Raymond Li, et al. 2024. StarCoder 2 and The Stack v2: The Next Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19173* (2024).
- [54] Ziyang Luo, Can Xu, et al. 2024. WizardCoder: Empowering Code Large Language Models with Evol-Instruct. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [55] Thibaud Lutellier, Hung Viet Pham, Lawrence Pang, Yitong Li, Moshi Wei, and Lin Tan. 2020. Coconut: combining context-aware neural translation models using ensemble for program repair. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGSOFT international symposium on software testing and analysis*. 101–114.
- [56] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhunoye, Yiming Yang, et al. 2024. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [57] Henry B Mann and Donald R Whitney. 1947. On a test of whether one of two random variables is stochastically larger than the other. *The annals of mathematical statistics* (1947), 50–60.
- [58] Sergey Mechtaev, Jooyong Yi, and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2016. Angelix: Scalable multiline program patch synthesis via symbolic analysis. In *Proceedings of the 38th international conference on software engineering*. 691–701.
- [59] Nhan Nguyen and Sarah Nadi. 2022. An empirical evaluation of GitHub copilot’s code suggestions. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories*. 1–5.
- [60] Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Huan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. 2022. CodeGen: An Open Large Language Model for Code with Multi-Turn Program Synthesis. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [61] Changan Niu, Chuanyi Li, Vincent Ng, Jidong Ge, Liguang Huang, and Bin Luo. 2022. Spt-code: Sequence-to-sequence pre-training for learning source code representations. In *Proceedings of the 44th international conference on software engineering*. 2006–2018.
- [62] Theo X Olausson, Jeevana Priya Inala, Chenglong Wang, Jianfeng Gao, and Armando Solar-Lezama. 2023. Is Self-Repair a Silver Bullet for Code Generation?. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [63] OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. [arXiv:2303.08774](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774) [cs.CL]
- [64] Kai Pan, Sungjun Kim, and E James Whitehead. 2009. Toward an understanding of bug fix patterns. *Empirical Software Engineering* 14 (2009), 286–315.
- [65] Rangeet Pan, Ali Reza Ibrahimzade, et al. 2024. Lost in translation: A study of bugs introduced by large language models while translating code. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1–13.
- [66] Nikita Pavlichenko and Dmitry Ustalov. 2023. Best prompts for text-to-image models and how to find them. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 2067–2071.
- [67] Hammond Pearce, Baleegh Ahmad, Benjamin Tan, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Ramesh Karri. 2022. Asleep at the keyboard? assessing the security of github copilot’s code contributions. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 754–768.
- [68] Akond Rahman, Dibyendu Brinto Bose, Raunak Shakya, and Rahul Pandita. 2023. Come for syntax, stay for speed, understand defects: an empirical study of defects in Julia programs. *Empirical Software Engineering* 28, 4 (2023), 93.
- [69] Akond Rahman, Effat Farhana, Chris Parnin, and Laurie Williams. 2020. Gang of eight: A defect taxonomy for infrastructure as code scripts. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering*. 752–764.
- [70] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950* (2023).
- [71] Baptiste Roziere, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Lowik Chausson, and Guillaume Lample. 2020. Unsupervised translation of programming languages. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 20601–20611.
- [72] Ripon K Saha, Yingjun Lyu, Hiroaki Yoshida, and Mukul R Prasad. 2017. Elixir: Effective object-oriented program repair. In *2017 32nd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 648–659.
- [73] Seemanta Saha et al. 2019. Harnessing evolution for multi-hunk program repair. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 13–24.
- [74] Anselm L Strauss and Juliet Corbin. 2004. Open coding. *Social research methods: A reader* (2004), 303–306.
- [75] Hendrik Strobelt, Albert Webson, Victor Sanh, Benjamin Hoover, Johanna Beyer, Hanspeter Pfister, and Alexander M Rush. 2022. Interactive and Visual Prompt Engineering for Ad-hoc Task Adaptation with Large Language Models. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics* 29, 1 (2022), 1146–1156.
- [76] Shin Hwei Tan and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2015. relifix: Automated repair of software regressions. In *2015 IEEE/ACM 37th IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering*, Vol. 1. IEEE, 471–482.
- [77] Shin Hwei Tan, Jooyong Yi, Sergey Mechtaev, Abhik Roychoudhury, et al. 2017. Codeflaws: a programming competition benchmark for evaluating automated program repair tools. In *2017 IEEE/ACM 39th International Conference on Software Engineering Companion (ICSE-C)*. IEEE, 180–182.
- [78] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shriti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288* (2023).
- [79] Chaozheng Wang, Yuanhang Yang, Cuiyun Gao, Yun Peng, Hongyu Zhang, and Michael R Lyu. 2022. No more fine-tuning? an experimental evaluation of prompt tuning in code intelligence. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*. 382–394.
- [80] Deze Wang, Zhouyang Jia, Shanshan Li, Yue Yu, Yun Xiong, Wei Dong, and Xiangke Liao. 2022. Bridging pre-trained models and downstream tasks for source code understanding. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 287–298.
- [81] Yue Wang, Hung Le, Akhilesh Gotmare, Nghi Bui, Junnan Li, and Steven Hoi. 2023. CodeT5+: Open Code Large Language Models for Code Understanding and Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Singapore, 1069–1088.
- [82] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 24824–24837.
- [83] Yuxiang Wei, Zhe Wang, Jiawei Liu, Yifeng Ding, and Lingming Zhang. 2023. Magicoder: Source Code Is All You Need. [arXiv:2312.02120](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.02120) [cs.CL]
- [84] Ming Wen, Junjie Chen, Yongqiang Tian, Rongxin Wu, Dan Hao, Shi Han, and Shing-Chi Cheung. 2019. Historical spectrum based fault localization. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 47, 11 (2019), 2348–2368.
- [85] Ming Wen, Junjie Chen, Rongxin Wu, Dan Hao, and Shing-Chi Cheung. 2018. Context-aware patch generation for better automated program repair. In *Proceedings of the 40th international conference on software engineering*. 1–11.
- [86] Chunqiu Steven Xia and Lingming Zhang. 2022. Less training, more repairing please: revisiting automated program repair via zero-shot learning. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*. 959–971.
- [87] Yingfei Xiong, Jie Wang, Runfa Yan, Jiachen Zhang, Shi Han, Gang Huang, and Lu Zhang. 2017. Precise condition synthesis for program repair. In *2017 IEEE/ACM 39th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 416–426.
- [88] He Ye, Matias Martinez, Xiapu Luo, Tao Zhang, and Martin Monperrus. 2022. Selfapr: Self-supervised program repair with test execution diagnostics. In *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. 1–13.
- [89] Kechi Zhang, Zhuo Li, Jia Li, Ge Li, and Zhi Jin. 2023. Self-Edit: Fault-Aware Code Editor for Code Generation. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Toronto, Canada, 769–787.
- [90] Xin Zhang, Rongjie Yan, Jiwei Yan, Baoquan Cui, Jun Yan, and Jian Zhang. 2022. ExcePy: A Python Benchmark for Bugs with Python Built-in Types. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*. IEEE, 856–866.
- [91] Zhaowei Zhang, Hongyu Zhang, Beijun Shen, and Xiaodong Gu. 2022. Diet code is healthy: Simplifying programs for pre-trained models of code. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*. 1073–1084.
- [92] Zihao Zhao, Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Dan Klein, and Sameer Singh. 2021. Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 12697–12706.
- [93] Qihao Zhu, Qingyuan Liang, Zeyu Sun, Yingfei Xiong, Lu Zhang, and Shengyu Cheng. 2024. GrammarT5: Grammar-Integrated Pretrained Encoder-Decoder Neural Model for Code. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1–13.