

Framework-Aware Code Generation with API Knowledge Graph–Constructed Data: A Study on HarmonyOS

MINGWEI LIU, Sun Yat-Sen University, China
 ZHENG PEI, Sun Yat-Sen University, China
 YANLIN WANG, Sun Yat-Sen University, China
 ZIHAO WANG, Sun Yat-Sen University, China
 ZIKANG LI, Sun Yat-Sen University, China
 ENCI LIN, Sun Yat-Sen University, China
 XIN PENG, Fudan University, China
 ZIBIN ZHENG, Sun Yat-Sen University, China

In the context of software frameworks with limited resources (such as HarmonyOS), large language models (LLMs) often exhibit poor code generation performance because they lack sufficient exposure to such environments during pre-training. Although LLMs can usually maintain correct logical structures across programming languages, they frequently struggle when dealing with framework-specific APIs or syntax, resulting in errors. This indicates that while pre-training equips LLMs with general algorithmic capabilities, they remain unfamiliar with the distinctive syntax and API usage of underrepresented frameworks. As a result, even advanced commercial models like GPT-4o cannot reliably generate correct code without prior adaptation.

To address this issue, we propose APIKG4SYN, a framework designed to exploit API knowledge graphs for the construction of API-oriented question–code pairs, specifically tailored for low-resource frameworks without requiring executable code. APIKG4SYN integrates both single-API and multi-API knowledge, where the latter is derived through uncertainty estimation (UE)-driven Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS), enabling the creation of a diverse and informative dataset for fine-tuning LLMs. Using HarmonyOS as a case study, we build the first benchmark for HarmonyOS code generation. Experimental results show that fine-tuning Qwen with APIKG4SYN raises pass@1 accuracy to 25.00%, compared with 17.59% for the baseline GPT model. These results confirm that API-oriented data significantly enhance LLM performance in low-resource software development scenarios.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Code Generation, Adaptive Strategy, Language Model

ACM Reference Format:

Mingwei Liu, Zheng Pei, Yanlin Wang, Zihao Wang, Zikang Li, Enci Lin, Xin Peng, and Zibin Zheng. 2025. Framework-Aware Code Generation with API Knowledge Graph–Constructed Data: A Study on HarmonyOS. 1, 1 (December 2025), 23 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnnn>

Authors' addresses: Mingwei Liu, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China, liumw26@mail.sysu.edu.cn; Zheng Pei, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China, zhengpei516@gmail.com; Yanlin Wang, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China, wangylin36@mail.sysu.edu.cn; Zihao Wang, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China, wangzh778@mail2.sysu.edu.cn; Zikang Li, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China, lizk26@mail2.sysu.edu.cn; Enci Lin, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China, linenc@mail2.sysu.edu.cn; Xin Peng, Fudan University, Shanghai, China, pengxin@fudan.edu.cn; Zibin Zheng, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China, zhizbin@mail.sysu.edu.cn.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2025 Association for Computing Machinery.

XXXX-XXXX/2025/12-ART \$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

LLMs have demonstrated significant success across a wide range of software development tasks, including code completion, refactoring, generation, and comprehension [10, 22–24, 26, 29, 31, 43, 55, 59, 60]. Beyond these general capabilities, LLMs have also been applied to more specialized areas such as third-party library code generation [35] and modeling of coding styles [62]. Furthermore, there is a growing body of research that integrates knowledge graphs into software engineering with LLMs [12, 36]. Nevertheless, in emerging frameworks and domain-specific environments, the performance of LLMs often deteriorates due to their limited exposure during pretraining [63]. Nonetheless, low-resource scenarios—including private libraries, proprietary frameworks, and other settings with limited data—are commonly encountered in industrial practice. HarmonyOS, a relatively new operating system with distinctive APIs, exemplifies such a low-resource scenario. Developers working with HarmonyOS face unique challenges due to complex API structures and sparse training data, which restrict the model’s ability to generate accurate and contextually appropriate code [71]. As illustrated in Figure 1, this example shows the code generated by the GPT-4o model for a breadth-first traversal task in the HarmonyOS. Although the generated code is logically correct, it omits the required API import statements, employs the disallowed any type in HarmonyOS, and calls methods that do not exist in ArrayList. **This observation indicates that the model has internalized general algorithmic knowledge during pretraining, yet it lacks domain-specific knowledge for low-resource scenarios such as HarmonyOS.**




Fig. 1. The breadth-first traversal algorithm code under HarmonyOS generated by GPT-4o

A variety of benchmarks have been introduced to assess the capabilities of large language models across different aspects of software engineering [1, 4–6, 11, 15, 45], each emphasizing distinct evaluation perspectives. Nevertheless, the majority of these efforts predominantly target widely used programming languages such as Python and Java, while comparatively limited attention has been devoted to low-resource languages, such as ArkTS within the HarmonyOS framework.

For low-resource programming languages, LLMs often lack familiarity with their syntax and APIs. In contrast, they typically demonstrate stronger competence in code logic. Pan [46] et al. observed that in code translation tasks, when two languages are used to solve the same problem, models tend to preserve logical components such as control flow and algorithmic structures, while frequently introducing errors in API mapping and syntactic details. This is because, across languages such as C, Python, and Java, the solutions to a given problem are generally consistent in logic,

and language-specific features rarely invalidate the overall problem-solving approach. Similarly, Alessandro Giagnorio [18] et al. reported that models perform poorly in API mapping across programming frameworks, further indicating that LLMs exhibit uneven familiarity with APIs across different languages, although their understanding of code logic remains relatively clear.

Although domain-specific fine-tuning can improve model performance, acquiring high-quality datasets for emerging platforms remains challenging. Existing approaches, such as OSS-Instruct [64], synthesize training data for supervised fine-tuning (SFT), but they often suffer from incomplete coverage of API semantics, insufficient multi-API reasoning, or heavy reliance on real usage examples that are unavailable for newly released frameworks. These limitations leave significant gaps in training data quality and applicability for low-resource scenarios.

To address these challenges, **we propose APIKG4SYN, a knowledge-graph-based data synthesis framework specifically designed for domain-specific software development.** Our approach constructs a structured API knowledge graph from documentation, capturing function descriptions, parameters, return values, and hierarchical relationships. LLMs are then leveraged to quantify the familiarity with different API nodes, which in turn guides Monte Carlo Tree Search [42] (MCTS) to identify unfamiliar or highly correlated API nodes for generating multi-API joint scenarios. For single-APIs, we also provide representative single-API application scenarios. Based on this information, API-Oriented question-code tuples are synthesized to enrich LLMs' understanding of APIs in low-resource environments, and even to enable the construction of corresponding models in zero-resource scenarios. This, in turn, allows for the fine-tuning of models that are specifically tailored to software development in low-resource programming languages.

In addition, we construct a HarmonyOS code generation benchmark to quantitatively evaluate LLM performance in this low-resource scenario, providing a standard testbed for future research. We conduct extensive experiments (details in Section 3) to evaluate the effectiveness of our method. The results demonstrate that LLMs fine-tuned with our synthesized data achieve substantial improvements over baseline methods on both single-API and multi-API tasks. Specifically, our approach attains a pass@1 of 25.00% on HarmonyOS benchmark (OHBen), exceeding the strongest baseline (10.19%) by 14.81%. These findings validate the efficiency and effectiveness of API knowledge graph-guided data synthesis.

In summary, this paper makes the following contributions:

- We propose a knowledge-graph-driven data synthesis framework that generates targeted training data without relying on execution examples.
- We construct a HarmonyOS code generation benchmark to provide a standard evaluation testbed for future research.
- We validate the effectiveness of our method through quantitative experiments, showing improvements in LLM performance for both single-API and multi-API scenarios.
- All code and are publicly available at [2].
- We also release the APIKG4SYN-HarmonyOS Dataset, our generated training dataset, as an open-source contribution to support fine-tuning of HarmonyOS-related LLMs.

2 METHOD

LLMs often lack sufficient exposure to APIs in emerging frameworks, leading to poor generalization in low-resource settings. To address this gap, we design **APIKG4SYN**, a knowledge-graph-driven data synthesis framework that creates realistic, API-grounded training samples for HarmonyOS. The approach systematically constructs an API knowledge graph, generates single-API questions with factual grounding, and extends to multi-API scenarios using Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) [42].

Figure 2 illustrates the overall workflow. The framework operates through three key stages:




Fig. 2. Approach Overview of APIKG4SYN

- (1) **API Knowledge Graph Construction:** HarmonyOS API documentation is parsed to extract modules, classes, methods, and properties, along with hierarchical and semantic relationships. Each node is enriched with metadata such as functional description, parameters, and return values.
- (2) **Single-API Seed Selection:** Leveraging the API knowledge graph, single-API information is recommended based on usage scenarios
- (3) **Multi-API Seed Selection:** Leveraging the API knowledge graph, we employ LLMs to compute UE, which guides a Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS [42]) to identify node paths with the highest cumulative uncertainty. The relevant nodes along these paths are then extracted and combined to construct multi-API information.
- (4) **API-Oriented Question-Code Tuples Dataset Construction:** Using the provided single-API and multi-API information, LLMs generate appropriately tailored API-Oriented problem scenarios. The models then retrieve fine-grained API information from the API knowledge graph to produce corresponding API-Oriented code solutions, thereby constructing an API-Oriented question-code tuple dataset.
- (5) **Dataset Integration and Post-processing:** The single-API and multi-API generated API-Oriented data are combined into a unified dataset. Post-processing steps include deduplication, formatting, and validation of questions and answers, ensuring consistency and quality for downstream fine-tuning tasks.

These three steps form the core of the APIKG4SYN methodology. Details regarding implementation, dataset construction, and descriptive statistics are provided in Section ??.

2.1 API Knowledge Graph Construction

In this stage, We parse the API documentation of low-resource frameworks(HarmonyOS) to build a structured knowledge graph representing the API ecosystem. The graph captures hierarchical relationships among modules, classes, methods, and properties. Each node is enriched with metadata including functional descriptions, parameters, and return values. This structured representation serves as the foundation for generating both single-API and multi-API training data. The construction process involves:

- Extract code information and text information from the API documentation.
- Transform restructured code and semantic information into a professional API knowledge graph.

Data Reorganization. As illustrated in Figure 3, we extracted all API documentation from the SDK folders of DevEco Studio, the official IDE for HarmonyOS. We scanned the entire set of API documents and applied rule-based matching to extract information from each line. The extracted data typically comprise two categories: code-related information and textual information.




Fig. 3. API Documentation Conversion Workflow

Code Info. The code-related information contains all code snippets from the API documentation, which inherently encode the graph structure of the APIs. By analyzing these code snippets, we can determine the hierarchical organization of different methods, properties, classes, interfaces, namespaces, and enums.

Text Info. The textual information includes metadata for the corresponding APIs, such as functional descriptions, parameters, and return values. This information can be leveraged by large language models as reliable evidence for subsequent code generation.

API Knowledge Graph Construction. All entities are extracted from the code information, and their relationships are constructed based on nesting structures to generate an initial graph. The corresponding textual information is then parsed, with rule-based matching and filtering applied to obtain the most up-to-date and valid semantic information. By integrating this semantic information with the initial graph structure, as illustrated in Figure 4, an API knowledge graph is constructed.

2.2 Single-API Seed Selection

At this stage, the APIKG4SYN framework traverses all non-leaf nodes in the knowledge graph, such as classes and interfaces, and retrieves the semantic and code information of these nodes along with their child nodes for output. The selection of single-API seeds is illustrated in Figure 5.

2.3 Multi-API Seed Selection

At this stage, for multi-API information, we first employ a large language model to compute the UE for each non-leaf node, thereby quantifying the model's unfamiliarity with the node. This UE then guides a Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) [42] to identify the top-5 highest-scoring paths. From each path, which contains several high-scoring nodes, 2–3 nodes are randomly sampled and combined to construct multi-API information. The detailed procedure for synthesizing multi-API information is as follows:

- Compute the UE for each non-leaf node.
- MCTS [42] is executed with the UE value serving as the reward function.




Fig. 4. API Knowledge Graph and Node Metadata




Fig. 5. Single-API Non-Leaf Node Selection and Data Retrieval

Uncertainty estimation Construction. Shannon (1948) proposed that uncertainty estimation [50] quantifies the information content carried by an individual “fact” under a given probability distribution. In the API knowledge graph we constructed, a “fact” is defined by a non-leaf node together with its code information, semantic information, and its associated child nodes. Such a fact can be formalized as a triplet $\tau = \langle u, \rho, v \rangle$. To quantify the extent to which a large language model understands such factual information, we transform the triples into a form suitable for computing conditional probability distributions, namely $P(v \mid u, \rho)$. Specifically, given a head entity u and a predicate ρ , we estimate the probability that a tail entity v belongs to u . The negative logarithm of this probability yields the uncertainty estimation, which is computed using the following formula:

$$I(u, \rho, v) = -\log_2 P(v \mid u, \rho) \quad (1)$$

Let u denote a non-leaf node, such as the *ArrayList* class, and v denote one of its child nodes, such as the *add* method. The relation ρ represents the membership of v under u , and in our knowledge graph, ρ is modeled as a directed relationship. $P(v \mid u, \rho)$ thus represents the probability of v belonging to u given the leaf node, while $I(u, \rho, v)$ denotes the computed uncertainty estimation. This value reflects the extent to which a large language model understands the internal structure of the upper-level API, providing a quantifiable measure that can be used in further analyses. Finally, the computed uncertainty estimation value is stored as a property of the corresponding node.

MCTS. The overall workflow of integrating the MCTS [42] algorithm into our APIKG4SYN framework is illustrated in Figure 6.

Node Selection. Starting from a root node, the algorithm recursively selects child nodes according to the chosen selection strategy until a leaf node or an unexpanded node is reached. In our implementation, we adopt the Upper Confidence Bound (UCB1 [3]) strategy. Importantly, the root




Fig. 6. Multi-API Non-Leaf Node Selection and Data Retrieval

node is not fixed; instead, each node is treated as a root once, aiming to explore a broader range of API combination paths. The UCB1 [3] strategy is defined as follows:

$$UCB1(n) = \begin{cases} +\infty, & N(n) = 0, \\ Q(n) + c \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\ln N_{\text{total}}}{N(n)}}, & N(n) > 0 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

$$Q(n) = \frac{W(n)}{N(n)} \quad (3)$$

In the above formula, n denotes the current node, $N(n)$ represents the visit count of node n , and $W(n)$ is the total accumulated reward of node n . In our implementation, the reward for each node is defined as the uncertainty estimation introduced in Section 2.1. The term $Q(n) = W(n)/N(n)$ corresponds to the average reward of the node. The parameter c is the exploration coefficient, which balances the trade-off between exploration and exploitation. N_{total} indicates the total visit count of the parent node or the sum of visits of all sibling nodes. The value $+\infty$ ensures that unvisited nodes are selected at least once.

Expansion. During the expansion step, if the selected leaf node has unvisited neighboring nodes, one of them is randomly chosen and added to the search tree as a new child node. This process incrementally grows the tree and allows the algorithm to explore previously unvisited states.

Simulation. Following expansion, a simulation is performed starting from the newly expanded node. The algorithm generates a random trajectory by repeatedly selecting unvisited successor nodes until a terminal node or a leaf node with no unvisited successors is reached. Let the simulated path be denoted as

$$\pi = (n_0, n_1, \dots, n_T), \quad (4)$$

where n_0 is the newly expanded node and n_T is the terminal node. The cumulative reward of this path is calculated as:

$$R(\pi) = \sum_{t=0}^T r(n_t), \quad (5)$$

where $r(n_t)$ represents the reward of node n_t . In our implementation, the reward for each node is defined as the uncertainty estimation introduced in Section 2.1. This simulation step provides an

estimate of the potential value of the newly expanded node, guiding subsequent backpropagation and selection.

Backup. After simulation, the reward obtained from the simulated path is propagated back along the nodes traversed during selection and expansion. For each node n in the path $\pi = (n_0, n_1, \dots, n_T)$, the visit count and total accumulated reward are updated as follows:

$$N(n) \leftarrow N(n) + 1, \quad W(n) \leftarrow W(n) + R(\pi), \quad Q(n) = \frac{W(n)}{N(n)}, \quad (6)$$

where $R(\pi)$ is the cumulative reward of the simulated path. This backpropagation step refines the estimated value of each node, influencing future selection decisions and guiding the search towards nodes with higher expected rewards.

Max Score Trajectory. After repeating the aforementioned process multiple times, numerous paths are obtained. We select the top five high-scoring paths, each containing multiple non-leaf API nodes. From these nodes, a random number of API nodes—ranging between two and three—are selected, and their corresponding code and semantic information are returned together. This procedure yields multi-API nodes along with their associated code and semantic information.

2.4 API-Oriented Question-Code Tuples Generation

This stage focuses on the generation of an API-Oriented question-code tuple dataset. Specifically, we leverage the code information and semantic descriptions of API nodes retrieved from the API knowledge graph. By utilizing these reliable sources in combination with carefully designed prompts, the system generates well-structured, low-resource framework-related questions. Subsequently, finer-grained API information is retrieved based on these questions and provided to LLMs, which then produce the corresponding code solutions. The key steps include:

- **Target API Information Retrieval:** Select non-leaf nodes as targets and provide reliable code information and semantic information.
- **API-Oriented Questions Generation:** LLMs are employed to generate well-structured low-resource framework-related questions grounded in the provided API information.
- **API-Oriented Code Generation:** LLMs address low-resource framework-related questions by leveraging the questions themselves together with fine-grained API information retrieved from the API knowledge graph.

Prompting For Generate Question. For both single-API and multi-API data generation, the previous step provides the code and semantic information of the target nodes, as well as the code and semantic information of their corresponding child APIs. With this information, we populate a specially designed prompt for question generation. This prompt is tailored to generate programming questions in the low-resource framework environment and is capable of producing questions involving single-API as well as multi-API usage, as illustrated in Figure 7

Prompting For Generate Code. Once low-resource framework-related questions are formulated, LLMs are employed to solve them. To enhance problem-solving, the APIKG4SYN approach retrieves fine-grained code and semantic information from the knowledge graph for the relevant single-API or multi-API elements mentioned in each question. This retrieved information is incorporated into a carefully designed code-generation prompt, as illustrated in Figure 7. By leveraging this enriched knowledge, the model gains a comprehensive understanding of how each API is used and the functionalities they provide, thereby enabling more effective solutions to low-resource framework-related problems.

You are given the definition of an/multiple {framework} API(s), including its methods, properties, and documentation. <div>Instruction</div>		You are an expert {framework} developer and need to implement code for the following question: <div>Instruction</div>	
[API]: {API_name}\n [API Members]: {API_member} <div>API Info</div>		Question: {question} Here is the API definition you should use: [API]: {API_name} [Function]: {function}, [Meta data]: {meta_data} [Relevant API details]: {corpus} <div>Question & API Details</div>	
Your task: Design **{num} simple programming exercises** based on this/these API. [Guidelines]: 1. For each exercise, first **reason step by step** about how it can be solved using both the **sub-API methods/properties** and the **parent API methods/properties**. 2. Each exercise must **explicitly specify the exact API methods/properties that must be used to solve the problem** (e.g., "use the 'sort' and 'remove' methods"). 3. Each exercise must combine **at least two different methods/properties**. 4. Output only the **final problem statements**, not the reasoning process. <div>Requirements</div>		Please write the implementation code. Return only the code without any explanations. [Requirements]: 1. The code must use only the provided sub-methods and properties of these APIs, and the use of any other methods or properties is strictly prohibited. 2. All functions, classes, or implementations must be marked with export. 3. Usage of 'any' or 'unknown' types is prohibited. 4. The first line must include: import {{ {API_name} }} from '{module}'; 5. {type_statement} <div>Requirements</div>	
[Example]: problem 1: ["Write a function that takes an 'ArrayList' object and removes its maximum value **using the 'sort' and 'remove' methods**."] <div>Single API Example</div>		[Example]: problem 1: ["Write a function that uses an 'ArrayList' s 'forEach' and a 'buffer' s 'write' / 'alloc' methods to write all elements to the 'buffer'."] <div>Multi API Example</div>	
[Output Format]: {{ "problem": {{ ["Problem statement with explicit API usage"], ["Problem statement with explicit API usage"], ...] }} }} <div>Output Format</div>		[Output Format]: {{ "code": "Your implementation code" }} <div>Output Format</div>	

Fig. 7. Left: Prompt for question generation. Right: Prompt for code generation.

2.5 Dataset Integration and Post-processing

Dataset integration and post-processing occur after the generation of both single-API and multi-API data. In total, our method produces 6,400 single-API data points and 1,600 multi-API data points. The generated API-oriented questions of different types are shown in Figure 8.

Single-API Question	Multi-API Question
Write a function that takes a 'Blob' object and returns its size in kilobytes (KB) rounded to 2 decimal places. Use the 'size' property and perform the necessary calculations."	Create a function that first uses the 'getFirst' and 'getLast' methods of 'LinkedList' to retrieve the first and last elements of a list, then uses these elements to construct an XML event log (using the 'EventType' enum of 'xml') and stores the log in a new 'LinkedList' instance using the 'addFirst' and 'addLast' methods."

Fig. 8. Single-API Scenario Questions and Multi-API Scenario Questions

The generated datasets are then merged and subjected to post-processing to ensure consistency and quality. This step includes:

- Deduplication of questions and answers.
- Standardizing the format of dataset entries.
- Preparing the dataset for downstream training and evaluation.

Deduplication. To ensure that the generated dataset does not contain samples similar to those in the benchmark (i.e., with similar questions or solutions), we employ a fuzzy text-matching algorithm based on the Levenshtein distance to identify and remove similar samples. Equivalent numbers of new samples are then generated to maintain the dataset size, thereby preserving the rigor and consistency of the experiments.

Standardization. Our original data format does not conform to the training format required by LLaMA-Factory [73]. Therefore, we standardize the dataset into the format adopted by LLaMA-Factory [73], to facilitate subsequent fine-tuning.

2.6 Implementations

The APIKG4SYN framework is implemented in Python and leverages the **DeepSeek-V3** LLM for question and answer synthesis. Knowledge graph construction, MCTS [42], and data integration are automated to produce a structured dataset in JSON format. Each record contains:

- **question:** a natural-language programming query.
- **code:** corresponding explanation or code snippet.
- **api_nodes:** the set of API nodes involved in generating the sample.

Model Selection.

Deepseek-V3. Deepseek-V3 [14] is selected to generate uncertainty estimation values, low-resource framework-related questions, and their corresponding code solutions. The choice of Deepseek-V3 [14] is motivated by its strong coding capabilities, superior reasoning ability, and relatively low cost, making it a suitable model within our methodological pipeline.

Fine-tuned LLMs. We select Qwen2.5-Coder-7B, Mistral-7B, and Deepseek-R1-7B as the LLMs for fine-tuning, as they are relatively lightweight in terms of parameter size while still exhibiting strong coding capabilities. In addition, Mistral-7B is a model fine-tuned with the OSS-Instruct [64] approach, which further motivated our interest in including it in our study.

LLMs used for comparison. We select Qwen3-32B, GPT-4o, o4-mini, and Deepseek-R1-671B as LLMs for comparison. Qwen3-32B is the upgraded version of Qwen2.5-Coder-7B, and we specifically choose the 32B variant to facilitate a direct comparison between the fine-tuned Qwen2.5-Coder and its successor. Deepseek-R1-671B represents the full-scale version of Deepseek-R1-7B, which further motivates our interest. In addition, we include GPT-4o and o4-mini from OpenAI: GPT-4o is known for its exceptional capabilities and stands among the leading commercial closed-source models, while o4-mini, a smaller-scale variant released by OpenAI, is chosen to assess the performance of lightweight models from the same provider.

Fine-tune configuration. For the hardware configuration, we employed an RTX 4090 GPU for fine-tuning, along with an Intel Xeon Platinum 8352V CPU under a Linux operating system. The fine-tuning platform used in this study is LLaMA-Factory [73], a convenient and comprehensive framework designed for LLM fine-tuning. All models in our experiments were fine-tuned using this platform. We employed the Lora method, training for 6 epochs using the AdamW optimizer with an initial learning rate of 5e-5 and a batch size of 2.

3 EVALUATION

We conduct extensive experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of APIKG4SYN. Specifically, we aim to answer the following research questions:

- **RQ1 (Effectiveness):** Is the APIKG4SYN method more effective than data synthesized using the OSS-Instruct [64] method?
- **RQ2 (Data Scale Impact):** The scale of synthetic data and the ratio between independent API code data and linked API code data influence the fine-tuning of LLMs.
- **RQ3 (Single-API Data vs. Multi-API Data):** How does Single-API Data compare with Multi-API Data in enhancing the fine-tuning effectiveness of LLMs?

3.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets. In this study, we introduce the first dedicated HarmonyOS benchmark designed to assess the proficiency of LLMs in HarmonyOS programming. As no existing benchmark for HarmonyOS currently exists, As shown in the Figure 11, we devoted approximately 300 human-hours to manually curate a comprehensive suite of tasks covering algorithms, graphics, gaming, and audio. Each task includes minimal yet essential test cases to rigorously evaluate code correctness and logical consistency. Specifically, for each sample in the benchmark, as illustrated in Figure 9, it comprises a problem that requires a solution using HarmonyOS APIs, a corresponding code implementation, and a complete test script.

<p>Given an integer n, return the n-th Fibonacci number. The Fibonacci sequence is defined as: $F(0) = 0$, $F(1) = 1$, $F(n) = F(n-1) + F(n-2)$, for $n > 1$. Use <code>@kit.ArkTS.ArrayList<number></code> if needed to store intermediate results (memoization). Use <code>.add(value)</code> to append, <code>.get(index)</code> to access, and <code>.size()</code> to check the size of the list.</p> <p>Question</p>	<pre>import { describe, it, expect } from '@ohos/hypium'; import { fibonacci } from './main/ets/Algorithms/fibonacci'; export default function fibonacciTest() { describe('fibonacci', () => { it('should return 0 for n=0', () => { expect(fibonacci(0)).toEqual(0); }); it('should return 1 for n=1', () => { expect(fibonacci(1)).toEqual(1); }); it('should return 5 for n=5', () => { expect(fibonacci(5)).toEqual(5); }); it('should return 55 for n=10', () => { expect(fibonacci(10)).toEqual(55); }); it('should return 832040 for n=30', () => { expect(fibonacci(30)).toEqual(832040); }); }); }</pre> <p>Test</p>
<pre>import { ArrayList } from '@kit.ArkTS'; export function fibonacci(n: number): number { if (n === 0) return 0; if (n === 1) return 1; const memo = new ArrayList<number>(); memo.add(0); memo.add(1); for (let i = 2; i <= n; i++) { memo.add(memo[i - 1] + memo[i - 2]); } return memo[n]; }</pre> <p>Code</p>	

Fig. 9. An example from the OHBen

Moreover, when executing the benchmark, we employ the prompt illustrated in Figure 10, which facilitates the construction of testable code based on the unit tests to verify whether the implementation passes.

<p>You are an expert {framework} developer. Analyze the following unit tests to identify the exact function/class/method signature or object under test. Then, based on the instruction and the tested API or object in the unit tests, implement the correct code.</p> <p>Instruction</p>	<p>### Instruction: {inst}\n ### Unit Tests: {test} Input</p> <p>Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The implementation must define exactly the function/class/method that is being tested. 2. Ensure the name, parameters, and return type exactly match the unit tests. 3. Return only the {framework} code, with no explanations. 4. No Markdown formatting, just plain code. <p>Requirements</p>
---	---

Fig. 10. Prompt Used for Evaluating HarmonyOS Benchmark

As shown in Figure 11, when constructing the HarmonyOS benchmark, 40.7% of the samples belong to the algorithm category, which is higher than any other category. This predominance is due to the fact that algorithm-related tasks involve numerous fundamental APIs, such as **Stack**, **HashMap**, and **ArrayList**, which are essential for development. Therefore, we intentionally included a larger proportion of algorithmic tasks to evaluate models' understanding of core APIs.

To better highlight the models' capability in applying the HarmonyOS for practical application development, we also designed a substantial number of application-oriented tasks, accounting

for approximately 17.6% of the benchmark. Subsequent categories include system, game, and graphics-related tasks, which reflect common scenarios in HarmonyOS development.




Fig. 11. Distribution of HarmonyOS benchmark sample categories

Baselines. We selected OSS-Instruct [64] as a baseline to compare with our proposed APIKG4SYN method. OSS-Instruct [64] is a highly effective and well-established program synthesis approach, renowned for its ability to fine-tune 7-billion-parameter models using synthetic data with strong performance. This method represents a mature and robust reference in code generation and is widely adopted in the field of code data synthesis. To the best of our knowledge, there are currently no other methods specifically leveraging code synthesis data for model fine-tuning. Therefore, we select OSS-Instruct [64] as the sole baseline for comparison.

When using OSS-Instruct [64], the method relies on a so-called heuristic dataset. However, to date, no publicly available HarmonyOS-related datasets are known. To ensure a fair comparison, we crawled 19,070 code snippets from the HarmonyOS documentation to construct a heuristic dataset, thereby adapting OSS-Instruct [64] for HarmonyOS-specific tasks.

LLM. For fine-tuning, we selected the 7B-parameter versions of Deepseek-R1-7B, Qwen2.5-Coder-7B, and Mistral-7B. The 7B scale was chosen as it represents a relatively efficient configuration that balances computational feasibility with experimental rigor. Both Deepseek-R1-7B and Qwen2.5-Coder-7B have gained recognition for their strong code generation capabilities, making them natural candidates for our experiments. In addition, Mistral-7B was included since it serves as a representative model trained with the OSS-Instruct [64] method, which we adopt as our baseline; therefore, it was selected as one of the fine-tuned models.

For LLMs without fine-tuning, we evaluated GPT-4o, o4-mini, Deepseek-R1-671B, and Qwen3-32B. GPT-4o was chosen as a powerful commercial LLM with strong reasoning abilities, while o4-mini, a lightweight model from OpenAI, also provides competitive reasoning capacity. To benchmark the fine-tuned Deepseek-R1-7B against its full-scale counterpart, we included Deepseek-R1-671B. Similarly, to assess the fine-tuned Qwen2.5-Coder-7B in comparison with a larger variant, we evaluated Qwen3-32B.

3.2 RQ1: Effectiveness

Design. Table 1 reports a comparative analysis of fine-tuning results obtained using synthetic data generated by our APIKG4SYN method and the OSS-Instruct approach [64], evaluated across a diverse set of LLMs, including both commercial and open-source variants. The models under consideration

Table 1. Compare the pass@1 performance of three LLMs on the HarmonyOS benchmark when fine-tuned with enhanced data using the APIKG4SYN and OSS-Instruct methods versus without supervised fine-tuning.

Model	Release Date	Method	pass@1
Deepseek-R1-671B	2025-01-20	w/o SFT	3.70%
o4-mini-7B	2025-04-16	w/o SFT	9.26%
GPT-4o	2024-05-13	w/o SFT	17.59%
Qwen3-32B	2025-04-29	w/o SFT	9.26%
		w/o SFT	0%
Deepseek-R1-7B	2025-01-20	OSS-Instruct	0.93%
		APIKG4SYN	9.26%
		w/o SFT	4.63%
Mistral-7B	2023-09-27	OSS-Instruct	4.63%
		APIKG4SYN	14.81%
		w/o SFT	8.33%
Qwen2.5-Coder-7B	2024-11-12	OSS-Instruct	10.19%
		APIKG4SYN	25.00%

comprise Qwen2.5-Coder-7B, Deepseek-R1-7B, Mistral-7B, Deepseek-R1-671B, Qwen3-32B, GPT-4o, and o4-mini. Owing to computational resource constraints, fine-tuning experiments were conducted exclusively on the 7B-parameter versions of Qwen2.5-Coder, Deepseek-R1, and Mistral. Given its consistently strong performance across a wide range of tasks, GPT-4o was selected as the representative commercial LLM. In addition, o4-mini was included as a lightweight GPT variant to assess its effectiveness on the HarmonyOS benchmark. Among open-source LLMs, Qwen3 [54] and Deepseek-R1 have demonstrated particularly competitive capabilities, and were therefore chosen as representative models in this category.

For 7B-scale models such as Deepseek-R1, Mistral, and Qwen2.5-Coder, we first evaluated their zero-shot performance on the HarmonyOS benchmark, thereby assessing their intrinsic ability to generate HarmonyOS programs without fine-tuning. To further validate the effectiveness of our synthetic training data, we employed OSS-Instruct [64] as a baseline. Each of the 7B models was subsequently fine-tuned with both OSS-Instruct [64]-generated data and data produced by our APIKG4SYN method. The fine-tuned models were then re-evaluated on the HarmonyOS benchmark to compare their improved capabilities in HarmonyOS program generation. Finally, to highlight the performance of commercial-scale LLMs, we also directly evaluated GPT-4o, o4-mini, and the large-scale Deepseek-R1-671B.

Results.

Comparison with the OSS-Instruct [64] Method. Using the OSS-Instruct [64] method, we scanned and extracted all HarmonyOS code blocks from the documentation in the Gitee repositories of HarmonyOS, and organized them into a heuristic library as described in the OSS-Instruct [64] framework. To evaluate the fine-tuning performance under an equal data scale, we generated 8000 HarmonyOS samples with OSS-Instruct [64]. As shown in Table 1, under the same model architecture, fine-tuning with data generated by the APIKG4SYN method yields an average improvement of 11.11% in pass@1 across three models, compared with fine-tuning on OSS-Instruct [64] data. The improvements are substantial, primarily because, given the same data volume, our synthesized data more closely adhere to API usage conventions and logical patterns. In contrast, OSS-Instruct [64] relies on high-quality prompt libraries, which are not available in low-resource environments. This, in turn, further demonstrates the superior effectiveness of our approach, and we will further analyze the results across different models in the following discussion.

Qwen2.5-Coder-7B. For Qwen2.5-Coder-7B, the pass@1 score without fine-tuning is 8.33%, which is the highest among all models prior to fine-tuning. We hypothesize that this may be due to Qwen2.5-Coder-7B having acquired preliminary exposure to HarmonyOS during pre-training, thereby demonstrating stronger baseline performance compared to other models. When fine-tuned with OSS-Instruct [64] data, Qwen2.5-Coder-7B achieves a modest improvement of 1.86%. In contrast, fine-tuning with data generated by the APIKG4SYN method results in a substantial improvement of 15.74%, clearly outperforming OSS-Instruct [64]. After fine-tuning, the model demonstrates a deeper understanding of API information. As shown in Figure 12, for the same problem, the fine-tuned model successfully addresses issues such as using APIs without proper import statements and invoking non-existent methods. This provides evidence that fine-tuning enables the model to acquire and apply API-specific knowledge.




Fig. 12. A comparative example illustrating the outputs of the Qwen model on the same problem, with and without fine-tuning

Deepseek-R1-7B. An interesting observation arises with the Deepseek-R1-7B model: without fine-tuning, it fails to pass any test cases in the HarmonyOS benchmark (i.e., a pass@1 of 0). Even after fine-tuning with OSS-Instruct [64] data, its pass@1 only reaches 0.93%, indicating negligible improvement. However, when fine-tuned with APIKG4SYN-generated data, the pass@1 increases significantly to 9.26%, representing a 8.33% gain over OSS-Instruct [64].

Mistral-7B. For the Mistral-7B model, the pass@1 score remains identical (4.63%) both without fine-tuning and after fine-tuning with OSS-Instruct [64] data. We attribute this to the OSS-Instruct [64] dataset lacking sufficient API-related information, which limits the model's ability to correctly generate HarmonyOS programs. By contrast, APIKG4SYN-generated data provides more comprehensive API information, enabling more effective fine-tuning. Consequently, the pass@1 for Mistral-7B improves to 14.81% with APIKG4SYN, demonstrating a clear advantage over OSS-Instruct [64].

Comparison with the non-fine-tuned model. The comparison between Deepseek-R1-671B and Deepseek-R1-7B reveals that, despite being the full-scale version, Deepseek-R1-671B achieves only a 3.70% pass rate, likely due to limited exposure to HarmonyOS-related data. By contrast, the

Table 2. The Impact of Data Volume on Model Fine-Tuning

Model	Data Scale				
	0	2000	4000	6000	8000
Deepseek-R1-7B	0%	5.56%	1.85%	6.48%	9.26%
Mistral-7B	4.63%	6.48%	5.56%	10.19%	14.81%
Qwen2.5-Coder-7B	8.33%	9.26%	16.67%	21.30%	25.00%

APIKG4SYN fine-tuned Deepseek-R1-7B significantly outperforms it. Similarly, although Qwen3-32B possesses a larger parameter size and a more extensive pretraining corpus than Qwen2.5-Coder-7B, the fine-tuned Qwen2.5-Coder-7B surpasses Qwen3-32B, demonstrating the effectiveness of our fine-tuning approach. For GPT-4o and o4-mini, GPT-4o shows the strongest performance among non-fine-tuned models (pass@1 = 17.59%), aligning with expectations, yet it still falls short compared to our best fine-tuned model, Qwen2.5-Coder. These findings highlight that fine-tuning with the APIKG4SYN method can yield substantial improvements, enabling smaller models to outperform larger-scale counterparts.

Finding 1: In low-resource settings, model performance does not increase monotonically with scale; appropriate fine-tuning can even enable smaller models to outperform larger ones. Our APIKG4SYN method effectively enhances model capabilities under such conditions.

3.3 RQ2: Impact of Data Scale on Model Performance

We conducted a systematic investigation into the influence of data volume on LLM fine-tuning by training models with varying quantities of synthesized code data. To minimize stochastic variability, experiments were performed on three LLMs across multiple data scales. This study aims to investigate the impact of data volume on the training performance of 7B-parameter LLMs.

Design. To investigate the impact of data volume on model fine-tuning, we randomly sample datasets of sizes 2,000, 4,000, and 6,000 while preserving the original ratio between single-API and multi-API data. This allows us to examine how different data volumes affect model performance under identical fine-tuning conditions.

Results. Overall, as shown in Table 2, the three models exhibit an upward performance trend with increasing data volume. However, when fine-tuned with a dataset size of 4,000, both Mistral and Deepseek-R1-7B demonstrate performance degradation to varying degrees. This phenomenon will be further elaborated in the subsequent discussion.

Deepseek-R1-7B. For Deepseek-R1, a substantial performance drop is observed at a data volume of 4,000 compared to 2,000. This may be attributed to the fact that, within the 4,000-sample dataset, the coverage of APIs frequently used in the benchmark is lower than in the 2,000-sample dataset. However, when the data volume increases to 6,000 or more, the dataset covers the majority of benchmark APIs, thereby enhancing the model’s capability.

Mistral-7B. For Mistral-7B, although performance at 4,000 samples also decreases relative to 2,000, the decline is marginal. We attribute this slight drop to the inherent randomness in model outputs rather than to data distribution effects.

Finding 2: For API-Oriented question-code tuples, a larger dataset generally leads to better fine-tuning performance. Given sufficient time, we posit that increasing the data volume is likely to yield models with enhanced effectiveness.

3.4 RQ3: Distinction and Roles of Single-API and Multi-API Data

Design. To better investigate the impact of single-API and multi-API data, we conducted both quantitative and qualitative experiments. For the quantitative study, all multi-API samples were removed from the original 8,000-sample dataset to assess their effect on fine-tuning performance. For the qualitative study, the 1,600 multi-API samples and 6,400 single-API samples were partitioned into three groups, each containing 100 randomly selected single-API and multi-API samples. The sampling process was strictly random to ensure unbiased representativeness.

Investigating the Impact of Removing Multi-API Data on Model Fine-Tuning. We selected the best-performing model, Qwen2.5-Coder-7B, and fine-tuned it on the dataset with multi-API data removed, in order to investigate the impact of multi-API data.

Investigating the Distribution of Different Types of API Data. To explore the relationship between multi-API and single-API data, we first approach it from a feature-based perspective. By embedding the questions and code in each sample, we obtain high-dimensional representations for both single-API and multi-API data. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is then applied to reduce the dimensionality, resulting in the visualization shown in Figure 13.




Fig. 13. PCA plots for three groups of different data types. Within each row, from left to right, the plots correspond to the principal component analysis of 100 features for each data type within the same group. Red points indicate the distribution of single-API samples, while blue points indicate the distribution of multi-API samples. The rightmost plot shows a comparison of both data types combined.

Results. Table 3 shows that removing multi-API data reduces the pass@1 score from 25.00% to 10.19%, indicating a substantial performance drop. This highlights the critical role of multi-API data in fine-tuning, which is further illustrated by the qualitative results below. In the figure 13, darker regions indicate areas where features are densely concentrated, while lighter regions correspond to sparser distributions. From the overlapping plots, it can be observed that multi-API data

Table 3. Comparison of fine-tuning performance between the full dataset and the dataset without multi-API data.

Model	Data Type	
	6400(Single-API)	8000(ALL)
Qwen2.5-Coder-7B	10.19%	25.00%

complements regions underrepresented by single-API data, as areas not covered by red are covered by blue. These observations provide qualitative evidence that multi-API data helps to fill the gaps left by single-API data

Finding 3: Multi-API data can, to some extent, compensate for the knowledge deficiencies inherent in single-API data

4 THREATS TO VALIDITY

Internal Validity. A key threat to internal validity lies in whether the training data may contain samples similar to those in the benchmark. Such overlap could lead to artificially inflated model performance in the subsequent RQ2 experiments on varying data volumes. To mitigate this threat, we applied a fuzzy text-matching deduplication procedure, as described in Section 2.3, to remove similar samples and thereby preserve internal validity.

External Validity. A major threat to external validity concerns the potential influence of model pretraining on fine-tuning, as models released later may have greater exposure to low-resource data over time. However, RQ1 findings indicate that although Deepseek-R1-7B and Qwen2.5-Coder-7B were released around the same time, Qwen2.5-Coder-7B achieves better performance. Similarly, Mistral-7B, released earlier than Deepseek-R1-7B, also demonstrates superior performance. These observations indirectly suggest that the timing and data of model pretraining have limited impact in low-resource scenarios.

Threats to Generalizability. Our current experiments and data generation were conducted solely within low-resource scenarios on HarmonyOS. This limitation may pose a threat to the generalizability of our findings. To further examine the applicability of the APIKG4SYN approach, we plan to extend our deployment to a wider range of low-resource environments in the future, thereby validating the generalizability of our method.

5 RELATED WORK

5.1 Data Synthesis for Code LLMs

In recent years, LLMs have shown remarkable capabilities in software engineering tasks such as code generation [8, 16, 17, 25, 40], code completion [19, 70], fault localization and repair [48, 66, 69], and code summarization [52, 65]. The performance of modern LLMs is largely dependent on the quality of the training data. Given that manually constructing high-quality and large-scale instruction datasets is both time-consuming and costly, leveraging LLMs to automatically generate synthetic data has become a key enabling technology driving progress in this field.

Recent work explores synthesizing training data for code generation to improve LLMs without extensive manual annotation. Ma et al. [39] propose UnitCoder, a scalable pipeline that generates verifiable programs guided by unit tests, improving code LLMs via synthetic training data. Majumdar et al. [41] introduce Genetic Instruct, an evolutionary method to scale instruction-tuning data for code generation by bootstrapping LLMs from seed samples. Shao et al. [51] present Case2Code, a method to synthesize input-output behavior-based code generation data, enabling effective model

training without human annotations. Gupta et al. [20] propose TarGEN, a self-correcting synthetic data generation framework using multi-step prompting for diverse NLP tasks, including code.

Existing approaches to data synthesis often rely on simple code snippets, fixed templates, or single-path API usage examples. In contrast, our work introduces subgraph-based prompts that explicitly encode element-level invocation and dependency relationships, leading to more realistic and semantically coherent data generation. Moreover, the adoption of a multi-path sampling strategy significantly enhances the diversity of the synthesized data.

5.2 Domain-Specific and Low-Resource Code Generation

Recent advances in code generation have increasingly addressed challenges associated with domain-specific languages (DSLs) and low-resource programming languages, such as limited data availability, unique syntax, and semantic constraints. Such as Bridge-Coder [72] and SPEAC [44], enhance code generation for low-resource and DSLs by generating synthetic bridging data or intermediate representations that improve alignment between natural language and target code syntax. These techniques help mitigate data scarcity and improve syntactic and semantic correctness. Giagnorio et al. [18] further investigate fine-tuning strategies across different model sizes, showing that careful pretraining and adaptation significantly impact performance on languages like R and Racket. DreamCoder [13] takes a program synthesis approach, using a wake-sleep learning cycle to construct and expand DSLs, enabling the generation of structured, domain-relevant programs from natural language. AceCoder [30] explores prompt engineering and retrieval-based augmentation by incorporating in-context examples selected from a code corpus, leading to substantial improvements in generation accuracy.

Significant progress has been made in the field of ArkTS code, with a large number of studies actively promoting tasks such as code generation and conversion for ArkTS. Liu et al. [37] present a Java-to-ArkTS code converter by leveraging LLMs combined with a ThreadBridge library that simulates shared memory concurrency, enabling effective translation of concurrent Java programs to ArkTS. chen et al. [7] develop ArkAnalyzer, the first static analysis framework tailored for ArkTS, which identifies performance bottlenecks and potential vulnerabilities through deep code inspection. And we propose an automated data generation method tailored for the ArkTs code domain. The system synthesizes high-quality training data for code generation that encompasses multi-API combinations and complex semantic relationships within ArkTs, significantly alleviating the data scarcity problem in low-resource domain code generation. This enhances the model's understanding of domain-specific API usage patterns and its generative capabilities.

5.3 Knowledge Graph in Software Engineering

Knowledge Graphs, as an efficient data representation method, have been widely applied in software engineering to enhance the efficiency of various tasks. In software maintenance, they assist in identifying code dependencies and issues, thus simplifying debugging [21, 68] and refactoring processes. In code analysis, Knowledge Graphs provide a structured view of software components, supporting more effective static and dynamic analysis [27, 49]. Furthermore, Knowledge Graphs are increasingly utilized in automation to enable intelligent systems by reasoning over data relationships, thereby accomplishing tasks such as code generation, code repair [9], and testing. These applications highlight the tremendous potential of Knowledge Graphs in optimizing the software engineering life cycle.

In the domain of software engineering, researchers have established knowledge graphs for diverse objectives, encompassing domain terminology [56–58], programming cases [32], bug tracking [53, 61], API concepts [28, 33, 38, 67], API documentation [34, 47]. The knowledge graph we have constructed focuses on the HarmonyOS API documentation, with an emphasis on capturing

the hierarchical and semantic relationships between different APIs (such as functional descriptions, input parameters, and return values). By structuring the real-world connections between APIs, the graph brings the representation closer to actual application scenarios, thus providing more realistic and practical support for generating training data for both single-API and multi-API use cases.

6 CONCLUSION

This paper proposes a novel method for generating API-Oriented question-code tuple datasets in low-resource framework scenarios by leveraging API knowledge graphs. Prior studies have shown that LLMs demonstrate strong proficiency in reasoning about code logic, but often struggle with the syntax and API usage of low-resource languages, which hinders their ability to produce correct and executable programs. In contrast, our approach, APIKG4SYN, does not require executable code; instead, it synthesizes high-quality API-Oriented question-code tuples solely from the API documentation of low-resource languages. This provides a practical solution for enterprises or proprietary frameworks that wish to fine-tune private LLMs without access to large-scale training corpora. In our empirical study, we use HarmonyOS as a representative low-resource case. The results reveal that a smaller parameter model (e.g., Qwen2.5-Coder), once fine-tuned with API-Oriented data, outperforms larger models (e.g., GPT-4o) without fine-tuning. These findings highlight the effectiveness of API-Oriented data in compensating for API knowledge deficiencies and open new directions for fine-tuning LLMs in low-resource settings.

7 DATA AVAILABILITY

To facilitate the replication study, we have released our data and code at :

[Code]: <https://github.com/SYSUSELab/APIKG4SYN>.

[OHBen]: <https://huggingface.co/datasets/SYSUSELab/OHBen>

[HarmonyOS Dataset]: <https://huggingface.co/datasets/SYSUSELab/APIKG4Syn-HarmonyOS-Dataset>

REFERENCES

- [1] Gabin An, Minhyuk Kwon, Kyunghwa Choi, Jooyong Yi, and Shin Yoo. 2023. BUGSC++: A Highly Usable Real World Defect Benchmark for C/C++. In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. 2034–2037. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE56229.2023.00208>
- [2] anonymous. 2025. ADADEC. <https://github.com/SYSUSELab/APIKG4SYN>.
- [3] Peter Auer, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, and Paul Fischer. 2002. Finite-Time Analysis of the Multiarmed Bandit Problem. *Machine Learning* 47, 3 (2002), 235–256. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1013689704352>
- [4] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, and Charles Sutton. 2021. Program Synthesis with Large Language Models. arXiv:2108.07732 [cs.PL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.07732>
- [5] Jialun Cao, Yuk-Kit Chan, Zixuan Ling, Wenxuan Wang, Shuqing Li, Mingwei Liu, Ruixi Qiao, Yuting Han, Chaozheng Wang, Boxi Yu, Pinjia He, Shuai Wang, Zibin Zheng, Michael R. Lyu, and Shing-Chi Cheung. 2025. How Should We Build A Benchmark? Revisiting 274 Code-Related Benchmarks For LLMs. arXiv:2501.10711 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.10711>
- [6] Jialun Cao, Zhiyong Chen, Jiarong Wu, Shing-Chi Cheung, and Chang Xu. 2024. JavaBench: A Benchmark of Object-Oriented Code Generation for Evaluating Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 39th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (Sacramento, CA, USA) (ASE '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 870–882. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3691620.3695470>
- [7] Haonan Chen, Daihang Chen, Yizhuo Yang, Lingyun Xu, Liang Gao, Mingyi Zhou, Chunming Hu, and Li Li. 2025. ArkAnalyzer: The Static Analysis Framework for OpenHarmony. arXiv:2501.05798 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.05798>
- [8] 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 Hebgens Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. arXiv:2107.03374 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03374>
- [9] Zimin Chen, Yue Pan, Siyu Lu, Jiayi Xu, Claire Le Goues, Martin Monperrus, and He Ye. 2025. Prometheus: Unified Knowledge Graphs for Issue Resolution in Multilingual Codebases. arXiv:2507.19942 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.19942>
- [10] Yifeng Di and Tianyi Zhang. 2025. Enhancing Code Generation via Bidirectional Comment-Level Mutual Grounding. arXiv:2505.07768 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.07768>
- [11] Xueying Du, Mingwei Liu, Kaixin Wang, Hanlin Wang, Junwei Liu, Yixuan Chen, Jiayi Feng, Chaofeng Sha, Xin Peng, and Yiling Lou. 2023. ClassEval: A Manually-Crafted Benchmark for Evaluating LLMs on Class-level Code Generation. arXiv:2308.01861 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.01861>
- [12] Xueying Du, Yiling Lou, Mingwei Liu, Xin Peng, and Tianyong Yang. 2023. KG4CraSolver: Recommending Crash Solutions via Knowledge Graph (ESEC/FSE 2023). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1242–1254. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3611643.3616317>
- [13] Kevin Ellis, Catherine Wong, Maxwell Nye, Mathias Sable-Meyer, Luc Cary, Lucas Morales, Luke Hewitt, Armando Solar-Lezama, and Joshua B. Tenenbaum. 2020. DreamCoder: Growing generalizable, interpretable knowledge with wake-sleep Bayesian program learning. arXiv:2006.08381 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.08381>
- [14] DeepSeek-AI et al. 2025. DeepSeek-V3 Technical Report. arXiv:2412.19437 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.19437>
- [15] Mark Chen et al. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. (2021). arXiv:2107.03374 [cs.LG]
- [16] Tom B et al. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. arXiv:2005.14165 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.14165>
- [17] Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Xiaocheng Feng, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Bing Qin, Ting Liu, Daxin Jiang, and Ming Zhou. 2020. CodeBERT: A Pre-Trained Model for Programming and Natural Languages. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 1536–1547. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.findings-emnlp.139>
- [18] Alessandro Giagnorio, Alberto Martin-Lopez, and Gabriele Bavota. 2025. Enhancing Code Generation for Low-Resource Languages: No Silver Bullet. arXiv:2501.19085 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.19085>
- [19] Daya Guo, Canwen Xu, Nan Duan, Jian Yin, and Julian McAuley. 2023. LongCoder: a long-range pre-trained language model for code completion. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning* (Honolulu, Hawaii, USA) (ICML '23). JMLR.org, Article 486, 10 pages.
- [20] Himanshu Gupta, Kevin Scaria, Ujjwala Ananthaswaran, Shreyas Verma, Mihir Parmar, Saurabh Arjun Sawant, Chitta Baral, and Swaroop Mishra. 2024. TarGEN: Targeted Data Generation with Large Language Models. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=gpgMRWgv9Q>
- [21] Zhuobing Han, Xiaohong Li, Hongtao Liu, Zhenchang Xing, and Zhiyong Feng. 2018. DeepWeak: Reasoning common software weaknesses via knowledge graph embedding. In *2018 IEEE 25th International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*. 456–466. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SANER.2018.8330232>
- [22] Junda He, Christoph Treude, and David Lo. 2025. LLM-Based Multi-Agent Systems for Software Engineering: Literature Review, Vision and the Road Ahead. arXiv:2404.04834 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.04834>
- [23] Kaifeng He, Mingwei Liu, Chong Wang, Zike Li, Yanlin Wang, Xin Peng, and Zibin Zheng. 2025. Towards Better Code Generation: Adaptive Decoding with Uncertainty Guidance. arXiv:2506.08980 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.08980>
- [24] Xue Jiang, Yihong Dong, Yongding Tao, Huanyu Liu, Zhi Jin, Wenpin Jiao, and Ge Li. 2025. RCODE: Integrating Backtracking Mechanism and Program Analysis in Large Language Models for Code Generation. arXiv:2411.07112 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.07112>
- [25] Xue Jiang, Yihong Dong, Lecheng Wang, Zheng Fang, Qiwei Shang, Ge Li, Zhi Jin, and Wenpin Jiao. 2024. Self-Planning Code Generation with Large Language Models. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* 33, 7, Article 182 (Sept. 2024), 30 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3672456>
- [26] Amir Hossein Kargaran, Nafiseh Nikeghbal, Abbas Heydarnoori, and Hinrich Schütze. 2024. MenuCraft: Interactive Menu System Design with Large Language Models. arXiv:2303.04496 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.04496>
- [27] Saravanan Krishnan, Amith Singhee, Keerthi Narayan Raghunath, Alex Mathai, Atul Kumar, and David Wenk. 2025. Incremental Analysis of Legacy Applications Using Knowledge Graphs for Application Modernization. arXiv:2505.06885 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.06885>
- [28] Hongwei Li, Sirui Li, Jiamou Sun, Zhenchang Xing, Xin Peng, Mingwei Liu, and Xuejiao Zhao. 2018. Improving API Caveats Accessibility by Mining API Caveats Knowledge Graph. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution, ICSME 2018, Madrid, Spain, September 23-29, 2018*. IEEE Computer Society, 183–193. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSME.2018.00028>

- [29] Jia Li, Yongmin Li, Ge Li, Zhi Jin, Yiyang Hao, and Xing Hu. 2023. SKCODER: A Sketch-Based Approach for Automatic Code Generation. In *Proceedings of the 45th International Conference on Software Engineering* (Melbourne, Victoria, Australia) (ICSE '23). IEEE Press, 2124–2135. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00179>
- [30] Jia Li, Yunfei Zhao, Yongmin Li, Ge Li, and Zhi Jin. 2023. AceCoder: Utilizing Existing Code to Enhance Code Generation. arXiv:2303.17780 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.17780>
- [31] Feng Lin, Dong Jae Kim, Tse-Husn, and Chen. 2024. SOEN-101: Code Generation by Emulating Software Process Models Using Large Language Model Agents. arXiv:2403.15852 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.15852>
- [32] Mingwei Liu, Xin Peng, Andrian Marcus, Christoph Treude, Jiazhan Xie, Huanjun Xu, and Yanjun Yang. 2022. How to formulate specific how-to questions in software development?. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE 2022, Singapore, Singapore, November 14–18, 2022*. ACM, 306–318. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3540250.3549160>
- [33] Mingwei Liu, Xin Peng, Andrian Marcus, Zhenchang Xing, Wenkai Xie, Shuangshuang Xing, and Yang Liu. 2019. Generating query-specific class API summaries. In *Proceedings of the ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/SIGSOFT FSE 2019, Tallinn, Estonia, August 26–30, 2019*. ACM, 120–130. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3338906.3338971>
- [34] Mingwei Liu, Xin Peng, Xiujie Meng, Huanjun Xu, Shuangshuang Xing, Xin Wang, Yang Liu, and Gang Lv. 2020. Source Code based On-demand Class Documentation Generation. In *IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution, ICSME 2020, Adelaide, Australia, September 28 - October 2, 2020*. IEEE, 864–865. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSME46990.2020.00114>
- [35] Mingwei Liu, Tianyong Yang, Yiling Lou, Xueying Du, Ying Wang, and Xin Peng. 2023. CodeGen4Libs: A Two-Stage Approach for Library-Oriented Code Generation. In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. 434–445. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE56229.2023.00159>
- [36] Mingwei Liu, Yanjun Yang, Yiling Lou, Xin Peng, Zhong Zhou, Xueying Du, and Tianyong Yang. 2023. Recommending Analogical APIs via Knowledge Graph Embedding. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering* (San Francisco, CA, USA) (ESEC/FSE 2023). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1496–1508. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3611643.3616305>
- [37] Runlin Liu, Yuhang Lin, Yunge Hu, Zhe Zhang, and Xiang Gao. 2024. LLM-Based Java Concurrent Program to ArkTS Converter. In *Proceedings of the 39th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE '24)* (Sacramento, CA, USA). Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), 2403–2406. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3691620.3695362>
- [38] Yang Liu, Mingwei Liu, Xin Peng, Christoph Treude, Zhenchang Xing, and Xiaoxin Zhang. 2020. Generating Concept based API Element Comparison Using a Knowledge Graph. In *35th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2020, Melbourne, Australia, September 21–25, 2020*. IEEE, 834–845. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3324884.3416628>
- [39] Yichuan Ma, Yunfan Shao, Peiji Li, Demin Song, Qipeng Guo, Linyang Li, Xipeng Qiu, and Kai Chen. 2025. UnitCoder: Scalable Iterative Code Synthesis with Unit Test Guidance. arXiv:2502.11460 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.11460>
- [40] Yingwei Ma, Yue Yu, Shanshan Li, Yu Jiang, Yong Guo, Yuanliang Zhang, Yutao Xie, and Xiangke Liao. 2023. Bridging Code Semantic and LLMs: Semantic Chain-of-Thought Prompting for Code Generation. arXiv:2310.10698 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.10698>
- [41] Somshubra Majumdar, Vahid Noroozi, Mehrzad Samadi, Sean Narenthiran, Aleksander Ficek, Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Jocelyn Huang, Jagadeesh Balam, and Boris Ginsburg. 2025. Genetic Instruct: Scaling up Synthetic Generation of Coding Instructions for Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 6: Industry Track)*, Georg Rehm and Yunyao Li (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Vienna, Austria, 208–221. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2025.acl-industry.16>
- [42] Nicholas Metropolis and Stanislaw Ulam. 1949. The Monte Carlo method. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 44, 247 (1949), 335–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1949.10483310>
- [43] Alessandro Midolo and Massimiliano Di Penta. 2025. Automated Refactoring of Non-Idiomatic Python Code: A Differentiated Replication with LLMs. arXiv:2501.17024 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.17024>
- [44] Federico Mora, Justin Wong, Haley Lepe, Sahil Bhatia, Karim Elmaaroufi, George Varghese, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Elizabeth Polgreen, and Sanjit A. Seshia. 2024. Synthetic Programming Elicitation for Text-to-Code in Very Low-Resource Programming and Formal Languages. arXiv:2406.03636 [cs.PL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.03636>
- [45] Guangsheng Ou, Mingwei Liu, Yuxuan Chen, Xin Peng, and Zibin Zheng. 2025. Repository-level Code Translation Benchmark Targeting Rust. arXiv:2411.13990 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.13990>
- [46] Rangeet Pan, Ali Reza Ibrahimzada, Rahul Krishna, Divya Sankar, Lambert Pouguem Wassi, Michele Merler, Boris Sobolev, Raju Pavuluri, Saurabh Sinha, and Reyhaneh Jabbarvand. 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 (ICSE '24)*. ACM, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597503.3639226>

- [47] Xin Peng, Yifan Zhao, Mingwei Liu, Fengyi Zhang, Yang Liu, Xin Wang, and Zhenchang Xing. 2018. Automatic Generation of API Documentations for Open-Source Projects. In *IEEE Third International Workshop on Dynamic Software Documentation, DySDoc@ICSME 2018, Madrid, Spain, September 25, 2018*. IEEE, 7–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/DySDoc3.2018.00010>
- [48] Asif Mohammed Samir and Mohammad Masudur Rahman. 2025. Improved IR-based Bug Localization with Intelligent Relevance Feedback. arXiv:2501.10542 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.10542>
- [49] Dennis Schiese, Aleksandr Perevalov, and Andreas Both. 2024. Towards LLM-generated explanations for component-based knowledge graph question answering systems. (9 2024). <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.27079687.v2>
- [50] C. E. Shannon. 1948. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell System Technical Journal* 27, 3 (1948), 379–423. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x>
- [51] Yunfan Shao, Linyang Li, Yichuan Ma, Peiji Li, Demin Song, Qinyuan Cheng, Shimin Li, Xiaonan Li, Pengyu Wang, Qipeng Guo, Hang Yan, Xipeng Qiu, Xuanjing Huang, and Dahua Lin. 2025. Case2Code: Scalable Synthetic Data for Code Generation. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, Owen Rambow, Leo Wanner, Marianna Apidianaki, Hend Al-Khalifa, Barbara Di Eugenio, and Steven Schockaert (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, UAE, 11056–11069. <https://aclanthology.org/2025.coling-main.733/>
- [52] Chia-Yi Su, Aakash Bansal, Yu Huang, Toby Jia-Jun Li, and Collin McMillan. 2024. Context-aware Code Summary Generation. arXiv:2408.09006 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.09006>
- [53] Yanqi Su, Zhenchang Xing, Xin Peng, Xin Xia, Chong Wang, Xiwei Xu, and Liming Zhu. 2021. Reducing Bug Triaging Confusion by Learning from Mistakes with a Bug Tossing Knowledge Graph. In *36th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2021, Melbourne, Australia, November 15-19, 2021*. IEEE, 191–202. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE51524.2021.9678574>
- [54] Qwen Team. 2025. Qwen3 Technical Report. arXiv:2505.09388 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.09388>
- [55] Zhao Tian, Junjie Chen, and Xiangyu Zhang. 2024. Fixing Large Language Models' Specification Misunderstanding for Better Code Generation. arXiv:2309.16120 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.16120>
- [56] Chong Wang, Xin Peng, Mingwei Liu, Zhenchang Xing, Xuefang Bai, Bing Xie, and Tuo Wang. 2019. A learning-based approach for automatic construction of domain glossary from source code and documentation. In *Proceedings of the ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/SIGSOFT FSE 2019, Tallinn, Estonia, August 26-30, 2019*. ACM, 97–108. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3338906.3338963>
- [57] Chong Wang, Xin Peng, Zhenchang Xing, and Xiujie Meng. 2023. Beyond Literal Meaning: Uncover and Explain Implicit Knowledge in Code Through Wikipedia-Based Concept Linking. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 49, 5 (2023), 3226–3240. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2023.3250029>
- [58] Chong Wang, Xin Peng, Zhenchang Xing, Yue Zhang, Mingwei Liu, Rong Luo, and Xiujie Meng. 2023. XCoS: Explainable Code Search based on Query Scoping and Knowledge Graph. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* (2023).
- [59] Chengpeng Wang, Wuqi Zhang, Zian Su, Xiangzhe Xu, Xiaoheng Xie, and Xiangyu Zhang. 2024. LLMDFa: Analyzing Dataflow in Code with Large Language Models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, A. Globerson, L. Mackey, D. Belgrave, A. Fan, U. Paquet, J. Tomczak, and C. Zhang (Eds.), Vol. 37. Curran Associates, Inc., 131545–131574. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2024/file/ed9dcde1eb9c597f68c1d375bbecf3fc-Paper-Conference.pdf
- [60] Jian Wang, Xiaofei Xie, Qiang Hu, Shangqing Liu, Jiongchi Yu, Jiaolong Kong, and Yi Li. 2025. Defects4C: Benchmarking Large Language Model Repair Capability with C/C++ Bugs. In *Proceedings of the 40th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*.
- [61] Lu Wang, Xiaobing Sun, Jingwei Wang, Yucong Duan, and Bin Li. 2017. Construct bug knowledge graph for bug resolution: poster. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2017, Buenos Aires, Argentina, May 20-28, 2017 - Companion Volume*. IEEE Computer Society, 189–191. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE-C.2017.102>
- [62] Yanlin Wang, Tianyue Jiang, Mingwei Liu, Jiachi Chen, Mingzhi Mao, Xilin Liu, Yuchi Ma, and Zibin Zheng. 2025. Beyond functional correctness: Investigating coding style inconsistencies in large language models. *Proceedings of the ACM on Software Engineering* 2, FSE (2025), 690–712.
- [63] Yunkun Wang, Yue Zhang, Zhen Qin, Chen Zhi, Binhua Li, Fei Huang, Yongbin Li, and Shuiguang Deng. 2025. ExploraCoder: Advancing code generation for multiple unseen APIs via planning and chained exploration. arXiv:2412.05366 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.05366>
- [64] Yuxiang Wei, Zhe Wang, Jiawei Li, Yifeng Ding, and Lingming Zhang. 2024. Magicoder: Empowering Code Generation with OSS-Instruct. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 235)*. PMLR, 52632–52657. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v235/wei24h.html>
- [65] Yang Wu, Yao Wan, Zhaoyang Chu, Wenting Zhao, Ye Liu, Hongyu Zhang, Xuanhua Shi, and Philip S. Yu. 2024. Can Large Language Models Serve as Evaluators for Code Summarization? arXiv:2412.01333 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/>

2412.01333

- [66] Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yinlin Deng, Soren Dunn, and Lingming Zhang. 2024. Agentless: Demystifying LLM-based Software Engineering Agents. arXiv:2407.01489 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.01489>
- [67] Shuangshuang Xing, Mingwei Liu, and Xin Peng. 2021. Automatic Code Semantic Tag Generation Approach Based on Software Knowledge Graph. *Journal of Software* 33, 11 (2021), 4027–4045.
- [68] Xiangzhe Xu, Guangyu Shen, Zian Su, Siyuan Cheng, Hanxi Guo, Lu Yan, Xuan Chen, Jiasheng Jiang, Xiaolong Jin, Chengpeng Wang, Zhuo Zhang, and Xiangyu Zhang. 2025. ASTRA: Autonomous Spatial-Temporal Red-teaming for AI Software Assistants. arXiv:2508.03936 [cs.CR] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.03936>
- [69] Aidan Z. H. Yang, Ruben Martins, Claire Le Goues, and Vincent J. Hellendoorn. 2023. Large Language Models for Test-Free Fault Localization. arXiv:2310.01726 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.01726>
- [70] Dongjun Yu, Xiao Yan, Zhenrui Li, Jipeng Xiao, Haochuan He, Yongda Yu, Hao Zhang, Guoping Rong, and Xiaobo Huang. 2025. SynthCoder: A Synthetical Strategy to Tune LLMs for Code Completion. arXiv:2508.15495 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.15495>
- [71] Daoguang Zan, Bei Chen, Zeqi Lin, Bei Guan, Wang Yongji, and Jian-Guang Lou. 2022. When Language Model Meets Private Library. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 277–288. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.findings-emnlp.21>
- [72] Wei Zhang, Yi Zhang, Li Zhu, Qianghuai Jia, Feijun Jiang, Hongcheng Guo, Zhoujun Li, and Mengping Zhou. 2024. ADC: Enhancing Function Calling Via Adversarial Datasets and Code Line-Level Feedback. arXiv:2412.17754 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.17754>
- [73] Yaowei Zheng, Richong Zhang, Junhao Zhang, Yanhan Ye, Zheyuan Luo, Zhangchi Feng, and Yongqiang Ma. 2024. LlamaFactory: Unified Efficient Fine-Tuning of 100+ Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 3: System Demonstrations)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.13372>