

# Bootstrapping Fuzzers for Compilers of Low-Resource Language Dialects Using Language Models

SAIRAM VAIDYA, University of California San Diego, USA

MARCEL BÖHME, Max Planck Institute for Security and Privacy, Germany

LORIS D’ANTONI, University of California San Diego, USA

Modern extensible compiler frameworks—such as MLIR—enable rapid creation of domain-specific language dialects. This flexibility, however, makes correctness harder to ensure as the same extensibility that accelerates development also complicates maintaining the testing infrastructure. Extensible languages require automated test generation that is both *dialect-agnostic* (works across dialects without manual adaptation) and *dialect-effective* (targets dialect-specific features to find bugs). Existing approaches typically sacrifice one of these goals by either requiring manually constructed seed corpora for each dialect, or by failing to be effective.

We present a dialect-agnostic and dialect-effective grammar-based and coverage-guided fuzzing approach for extensible compilers that combines two key insights from existing work: (i) the grammars of dialects, which already encode the structural and type constraints, can often be extracted automatically from the dialect specification; and (ii) these grammars can be used in combination with pre-trained large language models to automatically generate representative and diverse seed inputs from the full dialect space without requiring any manual input or training data. These seeds can then be used to bootstrap coverage-guided fuzzers.

We built this approach into a tool, *Germinator*. When evaluated on six MLIR projects spanning 91 dialects, *Germinator* generated seeds improve line coverage by 10-120% over grammar-based baselines. We compare against grammar-based baselines because they are the only class of existing automatic seed generators that can be applied uniformly across MLIR’s heterogeneous dialect ecosystem. *Germinator* discovers 88 previously unknown bugs (40 confirmed), including 23 in dialects with no prior automated test generators, demonstrating effective and controllable testing of low-resource dialects at scale. *Germinator* is available at <https://github.com/large-loris-models/germinator>.

## 1 Introduction

Modern extensible compiler frameworks, such as the Multi-Level Intermediate Representation (MLIR) [27], allow developers to define custom dialects at the intermediate representation (IR) layer—the “middle” of a compiler between source code and machine code. Domain experts can prototype new compilation pipelines [34], integrate novel hardware targets [2], or express domain-specific optimizations [3, 39] without reimplementing entire compilers. This extensibility allows frontends to focus on designing language abstractions for a specific domain without reimplementing low-level compilation infrastructure, thus leveraging the compiler’s existing optimizations and code generation [24, 25, 38].

This extensibility introduces a critical bottleneck: new *dialects* often ship with limited and incomplete test suites, leaving custom dialect features largely untested. Compilers are foundational infrastructure, and even small miscompilations can silently propagate correctness failures into production systems [47, 56]. To avoid correctness bugs, fully verifying the compiler would be ideal, but in practice testing remains the primary method for validating compiler correctness at scale [7, 32], and this paper therefore focuses on improving testing for extensible compilers. Specifically, we focus on fuzzing compilers [27, 30, 48, 50, 53].

When trying to build a compiler fuzzer, we typically need to bootstrap the tool with some “representative” programs in the language and then randomly mutate (usually following some information about the language) programs to trigger different compiler behaviors. Language dialects

Table 1. Comparison of fuzzing approaches for extensible languages. *Dialect-agnostic*: works across dialects without manual adaptation per dialect. *Dialect-effective*: achieves high coverage and can target dialect-specific features to uncover bugs. Note that ★ indicates tools that are theoretically dialect-agnostic but *corpus-dependent*.

Approach	Dialect-agnostic	Dialect-effective
Grammarinator [21]	★	×
SynthFuzz [30]	★	✓
FLEX [48]	×	✓
MLIRSmith [53]	×	✓
MLIRod [49]	×	✓
<b>Germinator</b>	✓	✓

are by definition *low-resource languages* and lack large program corpora needed to bootstrap the search—i.e., it is hard for the fuzzer to sample “typical” programs in each dialect. Unlike mature languages with decades of testing infrastructure (e.g., C/C++ [33, 56]), emerging dialects may have only a handful of example programs and no dedicated “automatic program generators”. Hence, subtle bugs can persist for months, discovered only in production [37]. The core challenge is thus: *how can we automatically test (specifically fuzz) rapidly evolving compiler dialects without incurring substantial manual effort or requiring large training corpora?*

We argue that a good compiler-fuzzer for extensible languages should be:

- *Dialect-agnostic*—the fuzzer works across different dialects without manual adaptation;
- *Dialect-effective*—the fuzzer achieves high coverage and can target specific dialect features that uncover dialect-specific bugs.

Table 1 summarizes how existing compiler fuzzers require manual input or are dialect-ineffective.

The main insight for our approach is that effective compiler fuzzing for low-resource dialects fundamentally hinges on starting from a small set of seed programs whose distribution approximates that of the dialect under test, and then using coverage-guided fuzzers—i.e., a tool that mutates programs to exercise different execution paths—to randomly mutate such seeds to trigger rare events. That is, our approach reframes the compiler fuzzing problem as one of automatically generating high-quality, diverse seed programs—representative examples in a given dialect—rather than relying on manually constructed corpora as in prior work [30, 48, 49].

Following the above insight, our key innovation is to demonstrate that large language models (LMs) can serve as effective samplers even for low-resource dialects, provided that the language models are constrained to produce programs that adhere to the dialect’s syntax. This syntactic restriction can be enforced by providing the model with a context-free grammar for the dialect’s syntax and applying grammar-constrained sampling techniques [11, 16, 18, 20, 31, 40, 41, 43, 46, 52] to ensure that all generated programs are syntactically valid. In essence, our method combines the strengths of grammar-based fuzzers (which only sample syntactically valid programs) and coverage-guided fuzzing (which take into account coverage feedback to make sample effectively).

We implement our approach in a tool, Germinator, that is both *dialect-agnostic* and *dialect-effective*. Given a target dialect for the LLVM compiler framework, Germinator automatically extracts from the dialect’s TableGen definitions a context-free grammar encoding the dialect’s syntactic constraints. A TableGen definition is a declarative specification in LLVM’s domain-specific language that defines operations, their signatures, type constraints, and assembly syntax. Using the extracted grammar, Germinator employs state-of-the-art grammar-constrained sampling

algorithms [20] over pre-trained language models to generate diverse and syntactically valid seeds—without requiring additional training, fine-tuning, or large manually curated corpora. The generated seeds are then passed to an existing coverage-guided fuzzer.

We evaluate Germinator on six MLIR-based projects spanning 91 dialects and 1338 operations: base MLIR [27], Torch-MLIR [34], IREE [3], CIRCT [2], Triton [39], and HEIR [4]. Germinator discovered 88 previously unknown bugs (40 confirmed), including 23 in dialects with no prior automated test generators. Compared to the best-performing baselines, Germinator improves line coverage by 10–120% (see Section 6).

**Contributions.** This paper makes the following contributions:

- We formulate the challenge of designing compiler fuzzers that generalize across dialects—*dialect-agnostic*—while remaining effective within each specific dialect—*dialect-effective* (Section 2).
- We provide a probabilistic formulation of compiler fuzzing that shows that coverage-guided fuzzers are *dialect-effective*, provided that they begin from representative seeds. We thus reduce *dialect-agnostic* fuzzing to the automatically sampling representative dialect seeds (Section 3).
- We show how to build effective seed samplers by combining large language models with grammar-constrained decoding algorithms that force such models to only produce programs accepted by a given context-free grammar describing the dialect’s syntax (Section 4).
- We implement our approach in Germinator, a *dialect-agnostic* and *dialect-effective* tool that automatically extracts grammars from TableGen definitions and generates high-quality seeds using grammar-constrained sampling with language models (Section 5).
- Our evaluation demonstrates that Germinator is *dialect-agnostic*—extracting grammars for 88.9% of operations across all 91 MLIR dialects—and *dialect-effective*—it improved line coverage by 10–120% when compared to best-performing baselines and discovered 88 bugs (40 confirmed, 14 repaired) across six projects, including 23 bugs in dialects with no existing generators.

## 2 Overview: Testing an MLIR Dialect with Our Approach

We illustrate our approach through a concrete example: automatically testing the EmitC dialect in MLIR, a low-resource dialect that translates MLIR constructs into C/C++ code [1, 27]. The EmitC dialect is used by developers who need to lower MLIR-based IRs into portable C/C++ backends—for example, to integrate MLIR pipelines into embedded, safety-critical, or cross-platform toolchains where LLVM is unavailable. With only 47 test cases in its official repository [44], EmitC epitomizes the testing bottleneck faced by small or emerging dialects whose rapid evolution outpaces manual test creation: in just the past year, EmitC has seen over one hundred pull requests merged with multiple API changes—yet only *a few dozen new tests*—highlighting the difficulty of maintaining test coverage as dialect semantics shift.

In the EmitC dialect, control-flow constructs mirror the structure of C code. An `emitc.for` operation (see Figure 1) corresponds to a C-style for loop, where the body represents the loop body and the loop bounds specify the initialization, condition, and increment expressions. In typical usage, the loop body receives an induction variable argument that represents the loop counter.

```
func.func @test() {
  %0 = emitc.literal "0" : index
  %1 = emitc.literal "10" : index
  %2 = emitc.literal "1" : index
  emitc.for %iv = %0 to %1 step %2 {
    // Region body misses block arg for %iv
    emitc.yield
  }
  return
}
```

Fig. 1. A valid `emitc.for` loop missing its induction variable. The verifier assumes this variable always exists and crashes when trying to access it.

However, in the program in Figure 1, the body takes no arguments—yielding an unusual but valid loop form: it iterates over a fixed range without exposing the induction variable to its body.

This example exposes a real bug that *Germinator* automatically discovered in the *Emi tC* compiler (link omitted for anonymity). The program is syntactically valid: the *emi tC*.for operation accepts three operands (two bounds and a step) and a region. However, the program triggers an assertion failure because the verifier’s `getInductionVar()` method assumes a block argument exists without checking. This reveals a spec-implementation gap: the *TableGen* specification permits loops without block arguments, but the verifier implementation assumes one always exists. Such mismatches arise when verification code makes implicit assumptions not enforced by the formal specification.

## 2.1 Why Existing Approaches Fail

We explain why existing fuzzing approaches (Table 1) do not uncover this bug and similar ones.

*Grammar-based fuzzers*, e.g., *Grammarinator* [21] and *SynthFuzz* [30], generate programs from context-free grammars, either manually defined or mined. In *Grammarinator*, initial seed programs are retained and mutated, biasing generation toward known structures. While this approach avoids syntactically invalid programs, semantic constraints—such as type correctness and valid region usage—are often violated. Consequently, constructs like an *emi tC*.for loop with the precise operand types and region structure needed to trigger our bug are rarely produced. *SynthFuzz* extends grammar-based fuzzing with context-dependent mutations learned from seeds, increasing the likelihood of valid programs. However, in low-resource dialects like *Emi tC* only a few seeds contain relevant constructs (e.g., 3 *emi tC*.for loops), and the fuzzer is unlikely to produce the exact combination required to reach the bug.

*Hand-engineered fuzzers*, e.g., *MLIRSmith* [53] and *MLIRod* [49], ensure high syntactic and semantic validity through dialect-specific type systems and dependency models. However, neither tool supports the *Emi tC* dialect. To generate our running example one would need to *manually add* *Emi tC*-specific rules—an effort that is prohibitive for low-resource or rapidly evolving dialects.

*Learning-based generators*, like *FLEX* [48], learn patterns from large corpora, producing syntactically valid programs that satisfy semantic constraints. Their effectiveness depends on hundreds or thousands of seeds; in low-resource dialects like *Emi tC*, these tools overfit and cannot generalize to rare constructs such as loops without induction variables.

In summary, grammar-based fuzzers ignore semantic constraints, hand-engineered fuzzers require prohibitive per-dialect effort, and learning-based generators fail in low-resource settings.

## 2.2 Why Our Approach Succeeds

Section 2.1 makes it clear that the core challenge in fuzzing compilers is to generate programs that are simultaneously *diverse*—covering unexplored regions of the dialect’s design space—and *valid*—respecting both syntactic and semantic constraints—without relying on extensive human-written corpora or manual engineering. *Germinator* succeeds where existing fuzzers fail by addressing both dimensions: using pre-trained language models to achieve program *diversity* and grammar-constrained sampling to ensure syntactic and semantic *validity*—effectively combining the best ideas from machine learning and classical compiler testing.

**2.2.1 Mining Grammars to Enforce Validity.** First, *Germinator* automatically extracts a context-free grammar from the dialect’s *TableGen* specification (see Figure 2). *TableGen* files declaratively encode the syntax of operations, types, and attributes. For the *TableGen* file in Figure 2(a), *Germinator* identifies assembly formats and type vocabularies for which grammar rules can be directly extracted (highlighted in blue) as well as custom formats for which extracting a grammar rule requires more complex inference using language models (highlighted in magenta). These elements are converted

Listing 1. (a) EmitC TableGen specifications

```

1 def EmitC_LiteralOp : EmitC_Op<"literal", [Pure]> {
2   // explicit format -> direct extraction
3   let assemblyFormat = "$value attr-dict `:` type($result)"; ...
4 }
5 def EmitC_ForOp : EmitC_Op<"for"> {
6   let arguments = (ins IntegerIndexOrOpaqueType:$lowerBound, ...);
7   let hasCustomAssemblyFormat = 1; ... // custom printer -> needs inference
8 }
9 def EmitC_YieldOp : EmitC_Op<"yield", [Terminator]> {
10  // explicit format -> direct extraction
11  let assemblyFormat = "attr-dict ($result^ `:` type($result))?"; ...
12 }

```

Listing 2. (b) Extracted grammar rules

```

# Directly extracted from assemblyFormat
emitc_literal: op_result_list? "emitc.literal" ... attribute_dict? ":" type
integer_index_or_opaque: "index" | "i1" | ... | "i128"
emitc_yield: "emitc.yield" attribute_dict? (ssa_use ":" type)?

# Inferred from custom format + LM
emitc_for: "emitc.for" SSA_ID "=" ssa_use "to" ssa_use "step" ... ? region

```

Fig. 2. Grammar extraction for the EmitC dialect. (a) Snippet of TableGen operation definitions: directly extracted assembly formats are highlighted in blue and custom C++ formats requiring inference are highlighted in magenta. (b) Grammar rules extracted from TableGen enforcing syntactic constraints, while semantic constraints—such as operand compatibility—are handled implicitly by the language model.

into grammar rules (Figure 2(b)) that enforce syntactic constraints, ensuring generated programs adhere to the dialect’s structural rules. Patterns not fully captured by the grammar—such as optional attributes, complex control-flow combinations, or region-specific constraints—are handled in the next step via language model sampling, which takes advantage of learned structural priors.

**2.2.2 Constrained Sampling with Language Models for Diverse and Valid Seed Generation.** Second, Germinator takes advantage of the broad knowledge embedded in pre-trained language models (LMs) to generate diverse programs. Because pre-trained models have already learned general MLIR patterns from large corpora, they provide a strong starting point even for previously unseen dialects. However, because the dialects are out of the model’s learned distribution, the model alone cannot enforce dialect-specific constraints and will mostly produce samples that are invalid in the dialect (Figure 3)—i.e., language models suffer the same limitations as existing approaches.

Germinator uses recent advances in *grammar-constrained sampling* [11, 16, 20, 40, 41, 43, 46] to guide the language model to only produce programs that are valid with respect to the grammar extracted in the first step, effectively combining the strengths of grammar-based (through the grammar) and learning-based approaches (the universal knowledge learned by the language model). The grammar enforces syntactic validity wherever explicit rules exist, while the LM introduces diversity and statistical patterns not captured by the grammar, making Germinator a universal generator for low-resource dialects.

Prompt: Generate a short test case directly in MLIR in assembly format for the EmitC dialect that uses an emitc.for loop with literals as bounds.

(a) Unconstrained

```
module @test {
  !i32 3 = arith.constant 3
  !i32 5 = arith.constant 5
  %i = emitc.for %i in [%3, %4]
    : (i32) to (i32) step (i32 1) {
    !i32 10 = arith.constant 10
    emitc.print %i0 : (i32)
  }
  return %i : (i32)
}
```

(b) Grammar-Constrained

```
func.func @emitc_example() -> i32 {
  %i = emitc.literal "5" : i32
  %j = emitc.literal "10" : i32
  %k = emitc.literal "2" : i32
  emitc.for %iv = %i to %j
    step %k {
    emitc.yield
  }
  return %i : i32
}
```

Fig. 3. Grammar-constrained sampling ensures syntactic validity. Given the same prompt (the specific prompt is not one used by Germinator and is for illustrative purposes), (a) unconstrained LLM generation produces multiple syntax errors (highlighted in red): incorrect SSA value declarations (!i32 3 = ...), invalid loop syntax (in [%3, %4]), non-existent operations (emitc.print), and invalid module-level return. (b) Grammar-constrained sampling (highlighted in green) follows the extracted grammar rules exactly, producing syntactically valid code that respects the EmitC dialect’s constraints.

**2.2.3 Coverage-guided Fuzzing for Diverse Generation.** Because grammar-constrained LM sampling is computationally (and financially!) expensive, we can typically generate only a few hundred/thousand seeds in reasonable time (minutes) in the second step.

In the third and final step, the hundreds of high-quality seed programs generated by the language model are used as seeds for a coverage-guided fuzzer, which can cheaply produce thousands or millions of additional inputs through mutation and coverage feedback. Since the seeds already represent meaningful, well-formed compiler programs, a coverage-guided fuzzer can use coverage feedback from the compiler to efficiently explore variations of the existing programs that explore new execution paths and uncovers subtle bugs, such as the induction-variable issue shown earlier in Figure 1 that prior approaches missed.

For the EmitC dialect, Germinator achieves approximately 75% higher code coverage than baseline tools and uncovers a previously unknown bug, demonstrating its ability to generate semantically valid programs that exercise rare control-flow and type patterns.

### 3 Fuzzing as Distribution Exploration

We now formalize the problem tackled in this paper and the intuition from §2 by viewing the task of fuzzing a compiler for a dialect of an extensible language as the problem of efficiently exploring a distribution over programs in that dialect. This perspective clarifies what makes a fuzzer effective, why extensible languages make this setting uniquely challenging, and motivates the design principles underlying our approach.

#### 3.1 Fuzzing as Sampling from a Program Distribution

We model an extensible language by starting from a *core language* and defining dialects as extensions of it. The core of the extensible language  $C$  is described by a grammar  $G$ , which generates its programs, and a set of validity rules  $\varphi$  (e.g., typing or well-formedness checks). The set of valid programs in the core language is defined as

$$L = \{ p \mid p \text{ is generated by } G \text{ and } p \text{ satisfies } \varphi \}.$$



A dialect  $\mathcal{D}$  defines additional constructs independent of the core language  $\mathcal{C}$ . It has its own grammar  $G_{\mathcal{D}}$  that can generate dialect-specific operations, types, and attributes, along with validity rules  $\varphi_{\mathcal{D}}$ . The set of valid dialect programs is

$$L_{\mathcal{D}} = \{p \mid p \text{ is generated by } G_{\mathcal{D}} \text{ and } p \text{ satisfies } \varphi_{\mathcal{D}}\}.$$

In practice, MLIR programs mix constructs from multiple dialects and the core language by explicitly registering the required dialects in the compiler context. Therefore, programs using dialect  $\mathcal{D}$  may contain dialect-specific operations mixed with operations in the core language. Specifically, dialects are *extensions* in the sense that the  $G_{\mathcal{D}}$  contains a superset of the productions of the grammar  $G$ , and, similarly the semantic constraints are the form  $\varphi_{\mathcal{D}} = \varphi \wedge \varphi_{\text{new}}$ , where the semantic constraints  $\varphi_{\text{new}}$  are those added by the dialect.

**EXAMPLE 3.1 (EMITC COMPOSES WITH CORE MLIR).** *The core language is MLIR, described by grammar  $G_{\text{MLIR}}$  and validity rules  $\varphi_{\text{MLIR}}$  (for example, productions and typing rules for `func.func`, `func.return`, etc.). The EmitC dialect extends MLIR by adding dialect-specific productions (for instance, rules for `emitc.for`, `emitc.literal`, and `emitc.yield`) and additional semantic constraints. Concretely, the dialect grammar  $G_{\text{EmitC}}$  contains the productions of  $G_{\text{MLIR}}$  together with the new EmitC productions, and its validity rules take the form  $\varphi_{\text{EmitC}} = \varphi_{\text{MLIR}} \wedge \varphi_{\text{EmitC,new}}$ , where  $\varphi_{\text{EmitC,new}}$  captures EmitC-specific invariants (e.g., constraints on loop bounds or type relations).*

*Program distributions and coverage.* Developers do not write programs uniformly at random: some constructs are idiomatic and frequent, while others are rare boundary cases. We model this aspect using a (latent) *program distribution*  $P_{\mathcal{D}} : L_{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , where  $P_{\mathcal{D}}(p)$  reflects how likely program  $p$  is to appear in realistic use of the dialect.

A *gray-box coverage-guided compiler fuzzer* samples programs  $p \in L_{\mathcal{D}}$  and executes them to probe the compiler [12, 55]. To quantify how much a program  $p$  exercises the compiler, the fuzzer can measure its *coverage*: the parts of the compiler implementation executed when compiling the program  $p$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}$  denote the set of coverage events (e.g., basic blocks or branches) we are interested in triggering. For a program  $p$ , let  $\text{Cov}(p) \subseteq \mathcal{E}$  be the events it covers, and for a set of programs  $S$ , let  $\text{Cov}(S) = \cup_{p \in S} \text{Cov}(p)$  be the union of the individual programs’ coverage. A fuzzer is effective if it produces a set of samples  $S$  that achieves large  $|\text{Cov}(S)|$ .

In practice, effective compiler fuzzing requires evaluating millions of programs and a fuzzer must generate valid programs at high throughput; even a small slowdown or low validity rate makes large-scale exploration infeasible in practice. Typically, we are interested in the set of samples  $S$  being produced over a finite amount of time—e.g., 24 hours. Simply “searching for programs that trigger new events” is intractable. Effective fuzzing therefore requires the ability to *sample* from a distribution that (i) resembles  $P_{\mathcal{D}}$ —to generate realistic programs—and (ii) upweights programs that exercise rare behaviors—those that  $P_{\mathcal{D}}$  assigns low probability to but are crucial for testing.

To formalize this goal, we define a *coverage-oriented target distribution*:

**Definition 3.1** (Coverage-Weighted Target Distribution). *The coverage weight of a program  $p$  is*

$$cw(p) := \sum_{e \in \text{Cov}(p)} \frac{1}{\Pr_{p \sim P_{\mathcal{D}}} [e \in \text{Cov}(p)]},$$

*and the coverage-weighted target fuzzing distribution is*

$$P_{\mathcal{D}}^{\star}(p) \propto P_{\mathcal{D}}(p) \cdot cw(p), \quad p \in L_{\mathcal{D}}.$$

Here,  $\propto$  means *proportional to*. Intuitively,  $P_{\mathcal{D}}^{\star}$  preserves the realistic structure and idioms of  $P_{\mathcal{D}}$ , but amplifies rare behaviors (thus increasing coverage) that are valuable for testing. For simplicity, Definition 3.1 assumes that every coverage event has non-zero probability under  $P_{\mathcal{D}}$ .

**Algorithm 1:** Coverage-Guided Fuzzing Loop**Input:** Dialect  $\mathcal{D}$ ; seed generator  $\text{gen}$ ; mutator  $\text{Mutate}$ ; time budget  $T$ **Output:** Corpus  $S \subseteq L_{\mathcal{D}}$  with monotonically increasing  $\text{Cov}(S)$ 


---

```

1  $S \leftarrow \text{gen}(\mathcal{D})$                                      // Initial seeds
2 while  $\text{time} < T$  do
3    $p \sim S$                                              // Sample a program to mutate
4    $q \leftarrow \text{Mutate}(p)$                              // Mutate  $p$ 
5   if  $\text{Cov}(q) \not\subseteq \text{Cov}(S)$  then
6      $S \leftarrow S \cup \{q\}$                            // Add  $q$  to  $S$  if it increases coverage
7 return  $S$ 

```

---

This distributional perspective provides a unifying lens: fuzzers can be understood by how well they approximate  $P_{\mathcal{D}}^*$ . A *fuzzing strategy*  $F$  for an extensible language  $\mathcal{C}$  is any procedure that given a dialect  $\mathcal{D}$  of the core language generates programs in  $L_{\mathcal{D}}$ ; we denote by  $F_{\mathcal{D}}$  the distribution over  $L_{\mathcal{D}}$  induced by the strategy’s program generation when targeting dialect  $\mathcal{D}$ .

**Definition 3.2** (Dialect-Agnostic and Dialect-Effective Fuzzing Strategy). *A fuzzing strategy  $F$  for dialects in core language  $\mathcal{C}$  should be:*

- **Dialect-agnostic.**  $F$  requires no manual, dialect-specific engineering for each dialect  $\mathcal{D}$ : no hand-written generators, encodings, or bespoke type rules crafted by experts.
- **Dialect-effective.** For each dialect  $\mathcal{D}$ , the distribution  $F_{\mathcal{D}}$  induced by  $F$  approximates the target distribution  $P_{\mathcal{D}}^*$ , yielding inputs that achieve high coverage on the dialect’s compiler.

When considering the approaches in Section 2.1, grammar-based [21, 30] and learning-based fuzzers [48] are not dialect-effective: the former generate mostly invalid programs because they ignore semantic constraints, while the latter collapse onto frequent patterns when training data is scarce. Conversely, hand-engineered fuzzers [49, 53] can be dialect-effective but are not dialect-agnostic, as they require substantial per-dialect manual engineering of syntax and type rules.

### 3.2 Coverage-Guided Fuzzing is Dialect-Effective (With the Right Seeds)

Most practical compiler fuzzers—whether grammar-based, learning-based, or hand-engineered—embed the same underlying mechanism: a *coverage-guided loop* that mutates a seed corpus and retains programs that increase coverage. Rather than being a separate class of techniques, coverage guidance is the common amplifier that all these systems rely on.

From the distributional perspective, the coverage-guided loop adjusts the induced sampling distribution  $F_{\mathcal{D}}$  toward  $P_{\mathcal{D}}^*$ : once a program with high coverage weight  $\text{cw}(\cdot)$  is discovered, mutation operators generate nearby variants, increasing the probability mass assigned to regions of the program space that trigger rare behaviors. Algorithm 1 provides a simplified view of this process.

The effectiveness of this amplification relies on a structural property of compilers for extensible languages: *programs that trigger rare behaviors are typically syntactically close to common programs in the dialect*. That is, reaching new coverage often requires only small edits—e.g., changing an operand, altering a type, or adding a dialect-specific operation. Local mutation is therefore well-suited to refine a seed distribution that already resembles  $P_{\mathcal{D}}$ . More formally, for every coverage event  $e \in \mathcal{E}$  there exists a program  $q \in L_{\mathcal{D}}$  that covers  $e$ —i.e.,  $e \in \text{Cov}(q)$ —and is syntactically close to a likely program in the dialect distribution—i.e., there exists a program  $p \in L_{\mathcal{D}}$  such that  $P_{\mathcal{D}}(p) \gg P_{\mathcal{D}}(q)$  and the edit distance  $d(p, q)$  is small.



Because mutation operators apply only local edits and are entirely automated (and can even rely on user-provided grammars to avoid syntactic mistakes), the quality of the initial seed set is crucial. This is one of the key reasons why learning-based fuzzers and hand-engineered fuzzers are effective on the dialects they are tailored to: they can rely on high-quality seeds that approximate the dialect distribution  $P_{\mathcal{D}}$ .

### Key Observation: Seeds Make or Break Coverage-Guided Fuzzing

Coverage-guided fuzzing can *amplify* a good seed distribution, but it cannot *repair* a bad one. If seeds induce a distribution close to  $P_{\mathcal{D}}$ , then coverage guidance efficiently steers toward  $P_{\mathcal{D}}^*$ , discovering rare high-value behaviors. If the seeds lack basic coverage of common dialect constructs, mutation is unlikely to reach the rare behaviors.

*Thus, to obtain a dialect-agnostic and dialect-effective strategy, it suffices to produce a small set of seeds whose induced distribution approximates the dialect’s program distribution  $P_{\mathcal{D}}$ .*

The above observation reduces the challenge of dialect-agnostic and dialect-effective fuzzing to constructing a *good seed generator*: a sampling mechanism  $\text{gen}$  that for any dialect  $\mathcal{D}$ , without manual engineering, even when producing a small numbers of seeds, induces a distribution that is representative of the dialect’s distribution.

**Definition 3.3** (Good Seed Generator). A seed generator  $\text{gen}$  is a sampling algorithm that given a dialect  $\mathcal{D}$ , can sample seed programs. A good seed generator should be:

- **Dialect-agnostic**: requires no manual per-dialect engineering.
- **Representative**: samples seeds approximately proportionally to the dialect’s distribution  $P_{\mathcal{D}}$ .
- **Efficient**: produces hundreds of seeds in minutes.

Efficiency is necessary to avoid delaying the fuzzer’s mutation phase. Representativeness is critical because modern fuzzers execute  $10^4$ – $10^7$  programs per minute; even modest reductions in seed validity or valid-program generation throughput (e.g., from hundreds to tens of valid programs per minute) severely limit the reachable coverage within a fixed fuzzing budget.

## 4 Seed Generation via Grammar-Constrained Language Model Sampling

Having reduced dialect-effective fuzzing to constructing a seed generator that satisfies the criteria in Definition 3.3, we now present a practical realization that is *dialect-agnostic*, *representative*, and *efficient*. Our approach combines pre-trained *language models* (LMs)—which act as dialect-agnostic and distributionally representative samplers—with *grammar-constrained sampling*, which enforces syntactic validity and thus efficiency.

### 4.1 Generating Seeds using Language Models

(Large) Language models (LMs) trained on code corpora learn programming regularities (e.g., variable binding, SSA structure, type-coherent arithmetic) and host-language idioms (e.g., C/C++/LLVM syntax). When an LM has internalized the *core language*  $C$ , prompting it with minimal context about a dialect  $\mathcal{D}$  can already yield programs that *resemble* valid dialect programs.

Formally, the LM induces a distribution  $Q_{\text{LM}} : \Sigma^* \rightarrow [0, 1]$  over strings, where  $\Sigma$  is a set of characters (typically called tokens). Typically we are interested in using LMs with input prompts and sample possible continuations of such prompts. For notation simplicity, in this section we assume a fixed “prompt”  $\pi$  and the LM only produces outputs for that particular prompt—i.e.,  $Q_{\text{LM}}(p)$  is actually the probability that  $LM$  produces program  $p$  on the fixed prompt  $\pi$ . When

projected onto the set of valid programs  $L_{\mathcal{D}}$ , its mass

$$Q_{\text{LM}|L_{\mathcal{D}}}(p) = \frac{Q_{\text{LM}}(p) \cdot \mathbf{1}[x \in L_{\mathcal{D}}]}{\sum_{p' \in L_{\mathcal{D}}} Q_{\text{LM}}(p')} \quad (1)$$

tends to correlate with  $P_{\mathcal{D}}(p)$  because both distributions are shaped by the same host-language statistics and training data—i.e., the model is trained on data that is representative of how people write code. Formally, we write that is  $Q_{\text{LM}|L_{\mathcal{D}}} \approx P_{\mathcal{D}}$ . In other words, though of course such a statement is not formally provable, the LM approximates the marginal of  $P_{\mathcal{D}}$  on shared syntax and “fills in” dialect-specific gaps with semantically nearby constructs.

This aspect makes LMs inherently *dialect-agnostic* and, at a high level, *representative*: their samples respect realistic structural priors of the programming ecosystem. However, as shown in Figure 3, naïve sampling from  $Q_{\text{LM}|L_{\mathcal{D}}}$  is inefficient because an LM is unlikely to sample valid programs in  $L_{\mathcal{D}}$  for low-resource dialects and will often produce programs that are not in the grammar  $G_{\mathcal{D}}$  or programs that violate semantic constraints  $\varphi_{\mathcal{D}}$ .

## 4.2 Generating Valid Seeds Using Grammar-Constrained Sampling

To satisfy the *efficiency* requirement of a good seed generator, we need to condition the LM distribution to only (or at least mostly) sample valid programs in  $L_{\mathcal{D}}$ —i.e., we would like to directly sample from the distribution  $Q_{\text{LM}|L_{\mathcal{D}}}$  and not generate many invalid programs along the way.

Given a context-free grammar  $G_{\mathcal{D}}$  that specifies the dialect’s concrete syntax, we make LM sampling *syntax-aware* by restricting the model to produce only sequences in the language defined by  $G_{\mathcal{D}}$ . This technique is called grammar-constrained sampling [11, 16, 20, 40, 41, 43, 46, 52], and intuitively it is implemented by augmenting the LM’s generative process with a parser that throws away ungrammatical sequence. At each generation step, the model proposes candidate next tokens (i.e., symbols to add to the output being produced) according to its learned distribution, while the grammar’s parser determines which of these tokens keep the generate string in the possible language induced by the grammar. Invalid continuations—those that would lead to a string outside the grammar’s language—are excluded from consideration.

Grammar-constrained sampling can draw from the following *conditional distribution*:

$$Q_{\text{LM}|G_{\mathcal{D}}}(p) = \frac{Q_{\text{LM}}(p) \cdot \mathbf{1}[x \in G_{\mathcal{D}}]}{\sum_{p' \in G_{\mathcal{D}}} Q_{\text{LM}}(p')} \quad (2)$$

The distribution  $Q_{\text{LM}|G_{\mathcal{D}}}(p)$  is not the same distribution as  $Q_{\text{LM}|L_{\mathcal{D}}}(p)$  because it may sample syntactically valid programs that do not satisfy the semantic constraints  $\varphi_{\mathcal{D}}$ . However, because every program in  $L_{\mathcal{D}}$  is also syntactically valid in  $G_{\mathcal{D}}$ , we have that the two distributions are identical with respect to  $L_{\mathcal{D}}$ —i.e.,  $Q_{\text{LM}|L_{\mathcal{D}}} = Q_{\text{LM}|G_{\mathcal{D}}, L_{\mathcal{D}}}$ . Therefore, grammar-constrained sampling provides a strictly more efficient way to obtain valid programs than naïve unconstrained sampling.<sup>1</sup>

Putting everything together, a constrained-sampling seed generator repeatedly produces syntactically valid samples via grammar-constrained decoding and collects them until  $N$  samples are obtained that also satisfy the dialect’s semantic constraints.

**Definition 4.1** (Constrained-Sampling Seed Generator). *Given a language model  $M$ , a constrained-sampling seed generator  $\mathcal{G}$  for a dialect  $\mathcal{D}$  produces  $N$  samples  $\{s_1, \dots, s_N\}$  as follows:*

- (1) Obtain the dialect grammar  $G_{\mathcal{D}}$  (Section 5.1).
- (2) For  $i = 1 \dots N$ : repeat  $s_i \sim Q_{\text{LM}|G_{\mathcal{D}}}$  until  $\varphi(s_i)$ .

<sup>1</sup>Park et al. [40] showed that naïve grammar-constrained sampling may actually sample from an incorrect conditional distribution, but many sampling algorithms have been proposed to solve this problem [18, 31, 42].

Although  $G_{\mathcal{D}}$  encodes only syntactic constraints, many MLIR dialect grammars also embed shallow semantic information (operand counts, attribute shapes, and type forms). Thus, a large fraction of validity checks are enforced directly during generation. As we show in Section 6, because grammatically invalid seeds are never produced, many samples are accepted by the compiler front end—i.e., they satisfy the semantic constraint  $\varphi_{\mathcal{D}}$ —drastically reducing the number of times the loop in item (2) of Definition 4.1 is executed. Within the valid space  $L(G_{\mathcal{D}})$ , the LM’s priors continue to guide token choices, maintaining representativeness.

For example, grammar-constrained sampling prevents generating the incomplete program in Figure 3b by recognizing that the `emitc` for production requires three operands plus a region; tokens that would prematurely close the operation (e.g., `" :`") are masked out until all required components are present, forcing the LM to complete the structure.

Overall, grammar-constrained sampling transforms the LM from a high-variance, low-yield generator into an efficient seed generator. The resulting generator satisfies all properties of a good seed generator (Definition 3.3): *Dialect-agnostic*—it requires only grammars automatically derived from dialect definitions; *Representative*—LM priors bias sampling toward realistic programs within the grammar’s space; and *Efficient*—yields hundreds of seeds per minute, enabling immediate large-scale coverage-guided fuzzing.

## 5 Implementation

Germinator is implemented as a coverage-guided fuzzer built on top of SYNTHFUZZ [30], but with a new dialect-agnostic front end that automatically produces high-quality initial seeds. Two technical components underpin this design:

- (1) **Automatic Dialect Grammar Extraction:** A pipeline that translates TableGen specifications into context-free grammars with principled fallbacks for custom formats (Section 5.1).
- (2) **Grammar-Constrained LM Sampling:** A seed generator that uses these grammars to constrain the outputs produced by a pre-trained LM, producing syntactically valid, diverse, and representative programs without any dialect-specific tuning (Section 5.2).

The generated seeds are fed into SynthFuzz (Section 5.3), which uses its mutation engine to adapt based on coverage signals, efficiently steering exploration toward high-value code regions.

### 5.1 Automatic Grammar Extraction

Germinator automatically extracts (when possible) a context-free grammar (CFG) encoding the dialect’s *assembly syntax*, requiring no dialect-specific engineering. The translation operates in two steps: (i) mechanically translate TableGen specifications to grammar rules (Section 5.1.1); (ii) use LMs to infer grammar rules for custom formats specified in C++ outside TableGen, with a fallback to MLIR’s generic format when inference fails (Section 5.1.2).

**5.1.1 Extracting from TableGen Specifications.** Germinator takes advantage of the fact that MLIR dialects are described in TableGen, a declarative language specifying operation syntax, operand/result constraints, and attribute schemas. For each TableGen operation definition, we extract the following information:

- Operations with explicit `assemblyFormat` declarations directly encode their syntax (e.g., `"$value attr-dict ' : ' type($result)"` for `emitc.literal` in Figure 2a).
- Type constraints define valid types for operands and results (e.g., `IntegerIndexOrOpaqueType` allows `index`, `i1`, `i8`, ..., `i128` types, as shown in Figure 2).
- Attribute constraints specify metadata types (e.g., `I64ArrayAttr` for integer arrays).
- Operations inherit format specifications from parent classes through TableGen’s class system.

These specifications are translated into context-free grammar rules using the Lark grammar format, which is supported by many grammar-constrained sampling LM libraries. Figure 2.b shows example extracted rules for the `emitc` dialect. The resulting grammar  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{D}}$  extends a core MLIR template grammar (Section J) with dialect-specific productions.

**5.1.2 Handling Custom Assembly Formats.** In MLIR, operations with `hasCustomAssemblyFormat = 1` specify syntax in C++ rather than TableGen (see `emitc.for` in Figure 2a), so their format cannot be extracted automatically. To extract grammar rules for this type of operation, Germinator uses a two-tier fallback strategy. First, it searches test files for occurrences of the operation and infers a grammar rule using an LM. The LM is prompted with multiple usage examples from tests, infers their common syntactic structure, and produces a candidate grammar rule that is then validated against the examples. For the `emitc.for` operation from Figure 2a, examples are found in test files showing usage like `emitc.for %i = %lb to %ub step %s : index { emitc.yield }`, and the LM infers the rule shown in Figure 2 (highlighted in magenta), capturing the `SSA_ID = ssa_use` to `ssa_use step ssa_use` pattern.

Second, if no usage examples exist for the operation, or inference produces a rule that fails validation on the usage example, we mark the operation for generation in the MLIR *generic format*, which every operation supports by construction. Briefly, MLIR supports two equivalent representations: *assembly format* (human-readable, dialect-specific syntax) and *generic format* (uniform, machine-oriented syntax). This last format is uniform across all dialects and always syntactically valid. While both formats support grammar-constrained generation, they differ in expressiveness: Assembly format grammars capture dialect-specific syntax—type vocabularies (`IntegerIndexOrOpaqueType`), operation keywords (`to`, `step`), attribute schemas—enabling the LM to generate dialect-conforming programs during constrained generation. Generic format grammars only enforce MLIR’s universal structure (`"dialect.op"(...) : (...) -> (...)`) without encoding which operations, types, or attributes belong to the dialect. Consequently, generic format generation requires post-hoc filtering: the LM may generate syntactically valid but dialect-inappropriate operations (e.g., `arith.addi` in an `emitc`-only program), leading to invalid programs.

For our running example, if the LM had generated an invalid rule that does not match the examples found in the test files for `emitc.for`, we would mark `emitc.for` for generic format generation only as shown in Figure 4. Since MLIR prohibits mixing formats in a single file, if any operation lacks an extractable assembly grammar, the entire program must use generic format.

```
"emitc.for"(%lb, %ub, %s) ({
  ^bb0:
    "emitc.yield"() : () -> ()
}) : (index, index, index) -> ()
```

Fig. 4. Generic format.

## 5.2 Grammar-Constrained Seed Generation

Given the extracted grammar  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{D}}$ , Germinator generates seed programs using a pre-trained LM equipped with grammar-constrained sampling. We note that grammar-constrained sampling libraries support any open-source model that exposes its token logits—i.e., the probabilities associated with individual tokens. Concretely, Germinator uses vLLM [26] with the Guidance [20] backend.

**5.2.1 Assembly vs. Generic Format.** When grammar extraction does not fall back to the generic format, the extracted grammars describe assembly format since TableGen specifies assembly syntax. However, the generic format exposes bugs that assembly parsers mask through automatic corrections. For example, assembly parsers may infer missing type annotations or silently fix malformed attributes, preventing such inputs from reaching the verifier where bugs lurk.

We thus adopt a two-stage strategy: First, if a grammar over assembly has been extracted, we use grammar-constrained sampling with  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{D}}$  to generate seeds. Second, we convert seeds to generic

format using MLIR’s standard `mlir-opt` tool with the `-mlir-print-op-generic` flag. Generic format directly reflects in-memory IR structure, bypassing custom parser corrections that mask verifier bugs. If a grammar over assembly was not extracted, we simply grammar-constrained sample over the generic grammar (with all the dialect operations).

This could also explain why assembly format achieves higher validity rates (Table 2): dialect-specific constraints reduce the LM’s search space to valid combinations. Still, the generic format’s universal structure provides a guaranteed fallback when assembly grammars cannot be extracted.

**5.2.2 Prompt Construction.** When test files exist, we automatically build few-shot prompts with 4 example programs selected to span diverse complexities (measured by AST depth and operation count). This encourages structural diversity in generated seeds.

When *no examples exist*—in low-resource dialects—we construct zero-shot prompts from:

- A generic MLIR module skeleton (e.g., “You are generating an MLIR program for the <dialect> dialect. Generate a valid module with multiple operations.”),
- 1–2 syntactic scaffolds—template code snippets showing basic structure like region syntax (`{^bb0: ... }`), block organization, and type declarations,
- A description of available operations and their signatures extracted from TableGen (e.g., “emit.c.literal: takes a string attribute, returns an EmitCType”).

Section I shows complete examples of both few-shot and zero-shot prompts. We stress that all prompts are generated automatically.

**5.2.3 Semantic Filtering.** When grammar-constrained generation produces syntactically valid candidates, Germinator applies semantic filtering to avoid producing invalid outputs (step 2 of Definition 4.1). While constrained sampling increases semantic validity, not all syntactically valid programs pass semantic constraints—deeper constraints like SSA form, type consistency, and dominance cannot be enforced by context-free grammars. In our implementation, we decide to retain both *strictly valid* programs (passing  $\varphi_D$ ) and what we call *soft valid* programs, which are not strictly valid but judged to be semantically plausible by the LM. Soft valid programs provide structural patterns that mutation operators can repair during fuzzing—i.e., soft valid samples are very effective in practice. We validate this design empirically in Section 6.3.1; the LM judging mechanism is detailed in Section F. To summarize, programs are classified into three categories: **Strictly valid:** Pass MLIR’s semantic verifier  $\varphi_D$  (SSA form, type consistency, dominance, etc.); **Soft valid:** Fail  $\varphi_D$  but judged semantically plausible by the LM (threshold  $\tau = 7$ ; see Section F); and **Rejected:** Fundamentally malformed programs.

### 5.3 Coverage-Guided Fuzzing Loop

The seed corpus  $S$  generated in Section 5.2 is fed into our coverage-guided fuzzing engine, which integrates SynthFuzz [30] as its core mutation engine. SynthFuzz is a state-of-the-art, grammar-aware fuzzer that automatically infers and synthesizes context-dependent mutations from a seed corpus. Unlike traditional coverage-guided fuzzers that use random bit-flips, SynthFuzz analyzes syntactic patterns in the seeds to learn complex, valid mutations (e.g., statement insertion, operand substitution, type changes). This makes it well-suited for structured languages like MLIR.

After feeding the initial seed corpus  $S$ , Germinator wraps SynthFuzz in a coverage-guided feedback loop, which at each iteration: (i) Selects a seed from the corpus, prioritizing inputs that recently increased code coverage. (ii) Invokes SynthFuzz to apply a synthesized, context-aware mutation to the seed. (iii) Executes the mutated program on the project under test using `mlir-opt`. (iv) Records any crashes or verifier failures as potential bugs. (v) If the mutant increases coverage, it is added to the corpus for future iterations. In summary, our grammar-based seeds ensure broad

initial coverage and provide the foundational patterns for SynthFuzz to learn from, while the coverage-guided loop steers these intelligent mutations towards deeper program exploration.

## 6 Evaluation

We evaluate Germinator across six MLIR-based compiler projects, discovering 88 previously unknown bugs and demonstrating substantial improvements in both bug discovery and code coverage compared to existing approaches. Our evaluation answers:

- **RQ1 (Bug Discovery):** Can Germinator discover real bugs in production compilers, and how does discovery timing compare to baselines?
- **RQ2 (Seed Quality):** How does Germinator’s seed generation improve fuzzer effectiveness compared to existing seed sources?

### 6.1 Experimental Setup

**6.1.1 Target Projects.** We evaluate on six MLIR-based projects representing diverse domains and maturity levels (full statistics in Section E): **MLIR** (base infrastructure, 45 dialects, 964 ops), **Torch-MLIR** (PyTorch import, 7 dialects, 215 ops), **IREE** (ML runtime, 38 dialects, 659 ops), **CIRCT** (hardware, 20 dialects, 114 ops), **Triton** (GPU kernels, 13 dialects, 76 ops), and **HEIR** (cryptography, 14 dialects, 75 ops). These span mature ecosystems with extensive tests (MLIR: 2,000; IREE: 1,100), high-profile projects with limited testing (Triton: 17,500 stars, 80 tests), and emerging dialects where testing lags development (HEIR: 600 stars, 170 tests). MLIR serves as the baseline, hosting core dialects upon which other projects build.

**6.1.2 Baseline Fuzzers.** The only *dialect-agnostic* tools we can compare against across all six projects are: **Grammarinator** [21]—a grammar-based fuzzer that generates and evolves existing test cases using context-free grammars through sampling, mutation, and recombination—and **SynthFuzz** [30]—a Grammar-based fuzzer that automatically learns and applies context-dependent, parameterized mutations from existing test cases.

For the base MLIR project, we can additionally compare against MLIR-specific fuzzers (extending these approaches to other projects would require substantial manual effort per dialect, which is what this paper tries to avoid): **MLIRSmith** [53]—a hand-engineered type-consistent generator with manual rules per dialect—and **MLIRod** [49]—a coverage-guided fuzzer that uses operation dependency graphs and directed mutations to guide test generation.

We excluded **FLEX** [48] from our evaluation as it does not satisfy our design goal of enabling rapid, dialect-agnostic fuzzing. FLEX requires iterative fine-tuning before fuzzing can begin: the paper reports 30 training iterations totaling 45-60 GPU-hours per dialect on RTX 4090 GPUs. Applying this to our six-project evaluation would require over 270 GPU-hours of upfront training. Additionally, FLEX assumes the availability of substantial training data (15,344 seed programs in the paper), which is unavailable for low-resource dialects.

**6.1.3 Evaluation Design.** Our evaluation uses two complementary settings:

**End-to-End Fuzzer Comparison.** We compare Germinator as a complete system against baseline fuzzers using default configurations. Each fuzzer uses its native seed strategy: Germinator uses 1000 generated seeds via grammar-constrained LM sampling over the project’s existing test suite, while baselines use only the project’s existing test suite.

**Seed Quality Isolation.** To isolate seed generation from the effect of different fuzzing algorithms, we test baseline fuzzers with three configurations: **Original**: Seeds from the project’s existing test suite; **Original + Random-CFG (1K)**: Original corpus plus 1,000 random samples generated using Grammarinator; and **Original + Germinator (1K)**: Original corpus plus 1,000 Germinator seeds.



**6.1.4 Evaluation Metrics and Procedure.** We assess fuzzer effectiveness along two dimensions: **Line Coverage**: Number of compiler implementation lines exercised during fuzzing, and **Bug Discovery**: Cumulative unique crashes over time, deduplicated by stack trace. All bugs are manually triaged to eliminate false positives and reported to maintainers.

For each configuration, we conduct five independent 24-hour fuzzing trials to account for randomness, reporting average coverage and total unique bugs across trials. In total, the study comprises 100 end-to-end experiments (five projects  $\times$  three tools  $\times$  five trials, plus one project  $\times$  five tools  $\times$  five trials) and 195 seed-quality-isolation experiments (six projects  $\times$  three seed configurations  $\times$  three tools  $\times$  five trials, excluding 75 that overlap with the end-to-end setting), amounting to 7,080 fuzzer-hours. All evaluations are executed on dedicated Ubuntu 22.04 LTS nodes equipped with Intel Xeon Gold 6230 processors (2.10 GHz, 10 cores, 20 threads allocated), 384 GB of memory, and—where applicable—a single NVIDIA RTX A6000 accelerator. The software environment consists of Python 3.10.12, PyTorch 2.8.0 with CUDA 12.8, Transformers 4.55.4, and llguidance 0.7.30, ensuring consistent and reproducible execution across all workloads.

Germinator employs Qwen-2.5-7B-Coder-Instruct [23]—a relatively small, open-source model that can run locally without API costs or cloud infrastructure. We use temperature 1.0, top-p 1.0, and 4 few-shot examples per dialect. We deliberately chose a mid-sized model (7B parameters) rather than larger alternatives to demonstrate that Germinator’s effectiveness stems from its grammar-constrained approach rather than model scale. Complete implementation details and hyperparameters appear in Sections B, C and D.

## 6.2 RQ1: Can Germinator discover real bugs in production compilers, and how does discovery timing compare to baselines?

**6.2.1 Bug Discovery Effectiveness.** Figure 5 shows cumulative unique bugs discovered over 24-hour campaigns across all projects. Each crash is deduplicated by stack trace and manually triaged to confirm genuine compiler defects.

Germinator substantially outperforms baselines in bug discovery. Section H summarizes final counts after 24 hours. Across all projects, Germinator discovers 88 unique bugs compared to 8 for Grammarinator and 16 for SynthFuzz—a 5.5 $\times$  cumulative improvement over the best baseline. Critically, in Torch-MLIR and Triton, baseline fuzzers found zero bugs while Germinator discovered 7 and 3, respectively.

**6.2.2 Bug Characteristics.** We manually analyzed all 88 bugs discovered by Germinator to understand their nature and severity.

Figure 6 categorizes bugs by root cause and affected compiler component.

- **Type system violations (29.5%)** dominated the bug reports, revealing fundamental challenges in MLIR’s complex type hierarchy and casting operations across diverse dialects.
- **Dialect conversion errors (22.7%)** highlighted interoperability issues, particularly during legalization patterns and multi-dialect lowering pipelines.
- The distribution shows Germinator effectively stresses core MLIR components, with over 70% of bugs affecting critical compiler infrastructure rather than peripheral features.

Fig. 6. Bug types discovered by Germinator.

Bug Category	#	%
Type system violations	26	29.5%
Dialect conversion errors	20	22.7%
Optimization pass crashes	16	18.2%
Verifier inconsistencies	12	13.6%
Lowering failures	8	9.1%
Memory safety issues	6	6.8%




Fig. 5. Cumulative bug discovery over 24 hours across all six target projects. Germinator discovers substantially more bugs and finds them earlier than baselines. In Torch-MLIR and Triton, baselines discover zero bugs while Germinator finds 7 and 3 bugs respectively. Shaded regions indicate 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals across 5 trials.

**6.2.3 Bug Confirmation and Reporting.** We reported all 88 bugs to project maintainers. As of submission, 40 have been confirmed and 14 have been fixed, demonstrating that Germinator discovers genuine, previously unknown defects rather than test harness artifacts. The remaining bugs await triage.

To validate the practical relevance of discovered bugs, we shared our findings with MLIR maintainers and dialect developers on the official LLVM Discord server. We received permission to report their feedback. A core MLIR contributor (Developer A) reviewed our bug reports and assessed them as substantive: *"These all seem substantive to me"* (August 2025). Two additional maintainers emphasized that our findings aligned with established quality expectations for MLIR infrastructure. Regarding verifier crashes, Developer B noted: *"Verifiers should handle invalid IR without crashing. I think the bugs you've found there are great!"* (August 2025). These responses confirm that Germinator’s bug discoveries address real robustness issues and that the tool generates test cases exercising important corner cases that existing test suites miss.

**RQ1 Summary:** Germinator discovers 5.5× more bugs than baselines (88 vs 16), finds bugs in projects where baselines discover zero, and receives confirmation from MLIR maintainers that findings are substantive and address real robustness issues.

### 6.3 RQ2: How does Germinator’s seed generation improve fuzzer effectiveness?

**6.3.1 Seed Validity.** We empirically validate the three-level validity classification from Definition 4.1 and our semantic filtering implementation (Section 5.2.3). Table 2 reports validity rates and time to produce 1,000 soft valid seeds—the seed budget used in all evaluations.

Grammar-constrained generation ensures 100% syntactic validity by construction, enabling high soft validity. Unconstrained LM generation achieves only 4-5% syntactic validity, constraining soft

Table 2. Seed validity across generation strategies, averaged over all six projects.

Strategy	Format	Syntax Valid	Strictly Valid	Soft Valid	Time (1K seeds)
Germinator	Assembly	100%	14.1%	36.2%	6 min
Germinator	Generic	100%	6.6%	28.8%	6 min
LM (rejection)	Assembly	4.2%	1.4%	2.8%	107 min
LM (rejection)	Generic	5.1%	2.1%	3.5%	86 min
Random-CFG	Assembly	100%	0.01%	0.015%	<1 min
Random-CFG	Generic	100%	0.01%	0.012%	<1 min

validity to 2.8-3.5%. In contrast, Germinator achieves 36.2% (assembly) and 28.8% (generic) soft validity—a  $\sim 14\times$  improvement—by ensuring all outputs can be judged for semantic plausibility.

Germinator’s strict validity (14.1% assembly, 6.6% generic) represents  $100\times$  improvement over random sampling and  $10\times$  over unconstrained generation. Random-CFG ensures syntactic validity but achieves only 0.15% soft validity due to unrealistic combinations from uniform sampling. Germinator generates 1,000 soft valid seeds in  $\sim 6$  minutes,  $16\text{--}20\times$  faster than unconstrained generation (86-107 minutes).

**6.3.2 Grammar Extraction Success.** Across all six projects, Germinator successfully extracts grammars for 88.9% of the operations spanning 137 dialects (More details in Appendix G). For 82.8% of the operations following standard TableGen patterns (declarative assembly format) require no manual intervention (e.g., `arith.addi`, `emitc.literal`, `func.call`). For 6.1% of the operations with non-standard TableGen definitions, Germinator could infer rules using an LM base on existing examples and available information (e.g., `emitc.for`, `gpu.func`).

The 11.1% of the operations that cannot be automatically extracted are due to: (a) missing/malformed TableGen specs, (b) pure C++ definitions without declarative specs, or (c) highly irregular syntax requiring dialect-specific parsing. These represent edge cases in mature dialects—often deprecated operations or internal details not intended for direct construction. Even for the 11.1% where extraction fails, Germinator’s LM component can generate syntactically valid programs by falling back to a generic MLIR grammar.

**6.3.3 Line Coverage.** Figure 7 presents 24-hour line coverage trajectories across our six projects in the end-to-end comparison. Germinator consistently achieves higher final coverage and faster growth compared to baselines, with noticeable gains in low-resource dialects.

Across all projects, Germinator achieves 10-120% higher final coverage than the best baseline. Advantages are most pronounced in limited-test-infrastructure projects: Triton (80 tests,  $2.2\times$  improvement), HEIR (170 tests,  $1.45\times$ ), CIRCT (650 tests,  $1.34\times$ ). Even in mature IREE (1,100 tests), Germinator achieves 33% higher coverage (74.6 KLOC vs 65.0 KLOC).

Divergent trajectories reveal fundamental differences in exploration strategies. Baseline approaches—Grammarinator’s grammar-based enumeration and SynthFuzz’s learned mutations—operate without coverage feedback. While they maintain diversity through mutation, they lack mechanisms to guide generation toward unexplored regions.

Germinator incorporates coverage-guided feedback into its fuzzing loop. This explains both higher final coverage and delayed saturation—the system actively learns which regions remain unexplored and steers generation accordingly rather than relying on static diversity heuristics.

Beyond absolute gains, Germinator demonstrates superior exploration efficiency through faster early growth. Within 4 hours, Germinator typically reaches coverage levels requiring 15-20 hours




Fig. 7. Line coverage evolution over 24 hours across all six projects. Performance gaps are most pronounced in projects with limited test infrastructure. Shaded regions indicate 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals across 5 trials.

for baselines or never attained. In Torch-MLIR, Germinator reaches 11.7 KLOC in 4 hours—a threshold baselines approach only after 20+ hours. This early advantage stems from Germinator’s ability to generate diverse, structurally complex seeds exposing deep compiler paths immediately rather than gradually building complexity through mutation of simple initial seeds.

**6.3.4 Seed Quality Isolation.** To isolate Germinator’s seed generation contribution from its fuzzing algorithm, we evaluate how different seed sources affect baseline fuzzer performance. Table 3 compares 24-hour line coverage achieved by Grammarinator and SynthFuzz when augmented with different seed corpora.

Augmenting baseline fuzzers with Germinator seeds yields substantial coverage improvements. Compared to using only original tests, adding 1,000 Germinator seeds improves Grammarinator by 3-41% and SynthFuzz by 4-43%.

Interestingly, Random-CFG frequently *degrades* performance—reducing coverage by 1-27% in Torch-MLIR, CIRCT, and Triton. The seed quality gap is most pronounced in low-resource settings. In Triton, Germinator seeds enable Grammarinator to reach 6.8 KLOC whereas Random-CFG seeds degrade the coverage to 3.3 KLOC—a 106% gap between the two. This result reveals that naïve seed augmentation can harm effectiveness: low-quality seeds dilute the corpus and waste mutation budget on unpromising starting points.

Even in mature projects with extensive tests, Germinator seeds provide meaningful gains. In IREE (1,100 tests), Germinator improves Grammarinator coverage by 6% (59.5 vs 56.0 KLOC) and SynthFuzz by 4% (67.2 vs 65.0 KLOC), while Random-CFG provides negligible benefit (<1%). This suggests handwritten test suites, despite their size, can exhibit structural biases limiting mutation-based exploration. Germinator can generate qualitatively different programs exposing under-tested paths even when thousands of existing tests are available.

Table 3. Impact of seed corpus augmentation on baseline fuzzer coverage. All configurations include original test suite plus 1,000 additional seeds from specified strategy. Germinator seeds consistently improve coverage by 20-55% over original seeds and 15-55% over random grammar sampling.

Project	Fuzzer	Original (KLOC)	+Random- CFG (KLOC)	+Germinator (KLOC)
MLIR	Grammarinator	48.1	48.2	49.1
	SynthFuzz	58.1	58.1	59.4
Torch-MLIR	Grammarinator	9.0	6.7	9.1
	SynthFuzz	8.1	6.5	9.8
IREE	Grammarinator	56.0	56.2	59.5
	SynthFuzz	65.0	65.2	67.2
CIRCT	Grammarinator	38.8	38.1	44.7
	SynthFuzz	48.5	49.0	53.9
Triton	Grammarinator	4.5	3.3	6.8
	SynthFuzz	4.7	3.9	7.2
HEIR	Grammarinator	10.1	10.1	12.5
	SynthFuzz	11.7	11.5	13.3

The consistent advantage of Germinator seeds over both original tests and random generation demonstrates that effective seed quality requires more than syntactic validity—it demands semantic diversity and structural complexity that LM guidance can reliably produce at scale.

**RQ2 Summary:** Germinator achieves 14× higher soft validity than unconstrained generation, extracts grammars for 88.9% of operations, reaches 10–120% higher coverage than baselines, and improves baseline fuzzer coverage by 20–55% when used as seed source alone.

## 7 Related Work

We have discussed grammar-based fuzzing, learning-based fuzzing, hand-engineered MLIR fuzzers, and their dialect-(in)effectiveness in Section 2.1. Here we situate Germinator within broader research on fuzzing, program generation, and compiler testing.

*Coverage-Guided Fuzzing.* Coverage-guided fuzzing originated with AFL++ [14] and has since evolved through improved mutation heuristics, energy allocation, greybox feedback, and ensemble techniques [6, 8, 15, 29]. Grammar-guided fuzzers such as Grammarinator [21] and LangFuzz [22] incorporate syntactic structure to avoid invalid inputs, while tools such as Skyfire [54] use probabilistic models to capture program distributions. Our work brings coverage-guided fuzzing to extensible compiler frameworks by making seed generation dialect-agnostic: Germinator automatically extracts grammars from dialect specifications, eliminating the need for manual grammar authoring for each new dialect.

*Compiler and IR Fuzzing.* Fuzzing compiler intermediate representations (IRs) has a rich history. Early work such as Csmith [56] generated well-defined C programs to expose miscompilations. EMI [28] used equivalence modulo inputs to discover semantic inconsistencies. Other approaches target LLVM IR specifically, such as the “Alive” family [35, 36], superoptimizer-guided fuzzing [45], or YARPGen [33] for generating random C/C++ programs to test compiler optimizations. For MLIR specifically, MLIRSmith [53] and MLIRod [49] implement hand-engineered fuzzers for specific

dialects, while recent work has explored directed testing strategies [51]. Our work complements these approaches and enables dialect-agnostic and dialect-effective IR fuzzing across *all* MLIR dialects without expert intervention.

*Grammar Extraction.* Prior work on automatic grammar extraction falls into two categories: dynamic approaches that infer grammars from execution traces [19], and static approaches that extract grammars from documentation [9]. Because MLIR dialects are defined via TableGen specifications that explicitly encode syntax through assemblyFormat strings—providing a declarative, machine-readable source of truth—our approach exploits this structure: rather than inferring approximate grammars from behavior, we extract precise grammars directly from TableGen definitions, ensuring consistency with the actual parser. The primary technical challenge is handling the subset of operations with custom C++ formatters (Section 5.1), which we address using LMs.

*Language Models for Program Generation.* Recent work has explored using LMs to generate programs for testing and verification. FLEX [48] uses LMs to generate test inputs for fuzzing language interpreters. Other approaches leverage LMs to synthesize unit tests [13], or guide symbolic execution [5]. Learn&Fuzz [17] pioneered combining neural models with mutation-based fuzzing, while recent work applies large language models directly to compiler testing [10].

Germinator differs in two key respects: First, we enforce syntactic validity through grammar-constrained decoding using grammars extracted automatically from TableGen specifications, eliminating invalid programs by construction rather than through post-hoc filtering. Second, we use the LM only for seed generation within a coverage-guided fuzzing loop—the fuzzer then mutates these seeds to explore the program space—rather than relying on the LM for all test generation.

*Grammar-Constrained Sampling.* Grammar-constrained sampling has been explored in NLP and code generation [11, 16, 20, 40, 41, 43, 46], including for producing structured JSON/XML or type-safe code. While several sampling algorithms with different tradeoffs exist, our implementations uses the guidance grammar-constrained decoding library due to its efficiency [20].

## 8 Conclusion

We showed that large language models can serve as effective oracles for *bootstrapping* coverage-guided fuzzers for dialects in extensible languages: when combined with grammars automatically extracted from dialect specifications, language models produce small sets of representative, valid seeds that enable dialect-effective fuzzing without manual engineering. Using this approach, our tool Germinator uncovered 88 previously unknown bugs across MLIR dialects.

In terms of limitations, Germinator depends on information available in TableGen: dialects with heavily custom C++ assembly formats fall back to MLIR’s generic syntax, reducing seed representativeness. Additionally, Germinator does not perform automatic test case minimization: when bugs are found, manual effort is required to distill reproducible examples for bug reports. Our approach enforces syntactic well-formedness but relies on the LM to satisfy deep semantic constraints such as SSA invariants (single static assignment, def-use consistency) or operation-specific preconditions encoded in dialect verifiers. Finally, our evaluation focuses on MLIR, whose declarative TableGen specifications make grammar extraction feasible; adapting Germinator to other frameworks would require similar declarative infrastructure.

## Acknowledgments

The project is supported in part by a Microsoft Faculty Fellowship; a UCSD JSOE Scholarship; NSF under grants CCF-2422214, CCF-2506134 and CCF-2446711; and the European Union, ERC grant (Project AT SCALE, 101179366).



We thank John Regehr for examining bug reports, and Maksim Levental for providing feedback on reported bugs.

Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the sponsoring entities.

Loris D’Antoni holds concurrent appointments as a Professor at the University of California San Diego and as an Amazon Scholar. This paper describes work performed at the University of California San Diego and is not associated with Amazon.

## References

- [1] 2024. EmitC Dialect — MLIR Documentation. <https://mlir.llvm.org/docs/Dialects/EmitC/>. Accessed: 2025-10-09.
- [2] 2025. CIRCT: Circuit IR Compilers and Tools. <https://circuit.llvm.org/>. Accessed: 2025-09-04.
- [3] 2025. IREE: Intermediate Representation Execution Environment. <https://iree.dev/>. Accessed: 2025-09-04.
- [4] Asra Ali, Jaeho Choi, Bryant Gipson, Shruthi Gorantala, Jeremy Kun, Wouter Legiest, Lawrence Lim, Alexander Viand, Meron Zerihun Demissie, and Hongren Zheng. 2025. HEIR: A Universal Compiler for Homomorphic Encryption. arXiv:2508.11095 [cs.CR] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.11095>
- [5] Matej Balog, Rishabh Singh, Petros Maniatis, and Charles Sutton. 2020. Neural Program Synthesis with a Differentiable Fixer. arXiv:2006.10924 [stat.ML] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.10924>
- [6] Marcel Böhme, Van-Thuan Pham, and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2019. Coverage-Based Greybox Fuzzing as Markov Chain. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 45, 5 (2019), 489–506. doi:10.1109/TSE.2017.2785841
- [7] Junjie Chen, Jibesh Patra, Michael Pradel, Yingfei Xiong, Hongyu Zhang, Dan Hao, and Lu Zhang. 2020. A Survey of Compiler Testing. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 53, 1, Article 4 (Feb. 2020), 36 pages. doi:10.1145/3363562
- [8] Yuanliang Chen, Yu Jiang, Fuchen Ma, Jie Liang, Mingzhe Wang, Chijin Zhou, Xun Jiao, and Zhuo Su. 2019. EnFuzz: Ensemble Fuzzing with Seed Synchronization among Diverse Fuzzers. In *28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 19)*. USENIX Association, Santa Clara, CA, 1967–1983. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity19/presentation/chen-yuanliang>
- [9] Yongheng Chen, Rui Zhong, Hong Hu, Hangfan Zhang, Yupeng Yang, Dinghao Wu, and Wenke Lee. 2021. One engine to fuzz’em all: Generic language processor testing with semantic validation. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 642–658.
- [10] Yinlin Deng, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Haoran Peng, Chenyuan Yang, and Lingming Zhang. 2023. Large Language Models are Zero-Shot Fuzzers: Fuzzing Deep-Learning Libraries via Large Language Models. arXiv:2212.14834 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.14834>
- [11] Yihong Dong, Xue Jiang, Yuchen Liu, Ge Li, and Zhi Jin. 2023. CodePAD: Sequence-based Code Generation with Pushdown Automaton. arXiv:2211.00818 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.00818>
- [12] Karine Even-Mendoza, Arindam Sharma, Alastair F Donaldson, and Cristian Cadar. 2023. Grayc: Greybox fuzzing of compilers and analysers for c. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 1219–1231.
- [13] Sarah Fakhoury, Aaditya Naik, Georgios Sakas, Saikat Chakraborty, and Shuvendu K. Lahiri. 2024. LLM-Based Test-Driven Interactive Code Generation: User Study and Empirical Evaluation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 50, 9 (Sept. 2024), 2254–2268. doi:10.1109/tse.2024.3428972
- [14] Andrea Fioraldi, Dominik Maier, Heiko Eißfeldt, and Marc Heuse. 2020. AFL++ : Combining Incremental Steps of Fuzzing Research. In *14th USENIX Workshop on Offensive Technologies (WOOT 20)*. USENIX Association. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/woot20/presentation/fioraldi>
- [15] Shuitao Gan, Chao Zhang, Peng Chen, Bodong Zhao, Xiaojun Qin, Dong Wu, and Zuoning Chen. 2020. GREYONE: Data Flow Sensitive Fuzzing. In *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*. USENIX Association, 2577–2594. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity20/presentation/gan>
- [16] Saibo Geng, Martin Josifoski, Maxime Peyrard, and Robert West. 2023. Grammar-Constrained Decoding for Structured NLP Tasks without Finetuning. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 10932–10952. doi:10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.674
- [17] Patrice Godefroid, Hila Peleg, and Rishabh Singh. 2017. Learn&Fuzz: Machine Learning for Input Fuzzing. arXiv:1701.07232 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.07232>
- [18] Emmanuel Anaya Gonzalez, Sairam Vaidya, Kanghee Park, Ruyi Ji, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Loris D’Antoni. 2025. Constrained Sampling for Language Models Should Be Easy: An MCMC Perspective. arXiv:2506.05754 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.05754>

- [19] Rahul Gopinath, Björn Mathis, and Andreas Zeller. 2020. Mining input grammars from dynamic control flow. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering* (Virtual Event, USA) (*ESEC/FSE 2020*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 172–183. doi:10.1145/3368089.3409679
- [20] Guidance AI. 2023. Guidance: A language model programming framework. <https://github.com/guidance-ai/guidance>. Accessed: 2024-07-01.
- [21] Renáta Hodován, Ákos Kiss, and Tibor Gyimóthy. 2018. Grammarinator: a grammar-based open source fuzzer. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGSOFT International Workshop on Automating TEST Case Design, Selection, and Evaluation* (Lake Buena Vista, FL, USA) (*A-TEST 2018*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 45–48. doi:10.1145/3278186.3278193
- [22] Christian Holler, Kim Herzig, and Andreas Zeller. 2012. Fuzzing with Code Fragments. In *21st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 12)*. USENIX Association, Bellevue, WA, 445–458. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity12/technical-sessions/presentation/holler>
- [23] Binyuan Hui, Jian Yang, Zeyu Cui, Jiayi Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Lei Zhang, Tianyu Liu, Jiajun Zhang, Bowen Yu, Keming Lu, Kai Dang, Yang Fan, Yichang Zhang, An Yang, Rui Men, Fei Huang, Bo Zheng, Yibo Miao, Shanghaoran Quan, Yunlong Feng, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. 2024. Qwen2.5-Coder Technical Report. arXiv:2409.12186 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.12186>
- [24] Tian Jin, Gheorghe-Teodor Bercea, Tung D. Le, Tong Chen, Gong Su, Haruki Imai, Yasushi Negishi, Anh Leu, Kevin O'Brien, Kiyokuni Kawachiya, and Alexandre E. Eichenberger. 2020. Compiling ONNX Neural Network Models Using MLIR. arXiv:2008.08272 [cs.PL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.08272>
- [25] Abhinav Kumar, Atharva Khedkar, Hwiso So, Megan Kuo, Ameya Gurjar, Partha Biswas, and Aviral Shrivastava. 2025. DSP-MLIR: A Domain-Specific Language and MLIR Dialect for Digital Signal Processing. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGPLAN/SIGBED International Conference on Languages, Compilers, and Tools for Embedded Systems (LCTES '25)*. ACM, 146–157. doi:10.1145/3735452.3735527
- [26] Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. Efficient Memory Management for Large Language Model Serving with PagedAttention. arXiv:2309.06180 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.06180>
- [27] Chris Lattner, Mehdi Amini, Uday Bondhugula, Albert Cohen, Andy Davis, Jacques Pienaar, River Riddle, Tatiana Shpeisman, Nicolas Vasilache, and Oleksandr Zinenko. 2021. MLIR: Scaling Compiler Infrastructure for Domain Specific Computation. In *2021 IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO)*. 2–14. doi:10.1109/CGO51591.2021.9370308
- [28] Vu Le, Mehrdad Afshari, and Zhendong Su. 2014. Compiler validation via equivalence modulo inputs. *SIGPLAN Not.* 49, 6 (June 2014), 216–226. doi:10.1145/2666356.2594334
- [29] Caroline Lemieux and Koushik Sen. 2018. FairFuzz: a targeted mutation strategy for increasing greybox fuzz testing coverage. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering* (Montpellier, France) (*ASE '18*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 475–485. doi:10.1145/3238147.3238176
- [30] Ben Limpanukorn, Jiyuan Wang, Hong Jin Kang, Zitong Zhou, and Miryung Kim. 2025. Fuzzing MLIR Compilers with Custom Mutation Synthesis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 47th International Conference on Software Engineering* (Ottawa, Ontario, Canada) (*ICSE '25*). IEEE Press, 217–229. doi:10.1109/ICSE55347.2025.00037
- [31] Benjamin Lipkin, Benjamin LeBrun, Jacob Hoover Vigly, João Loula, David R. MacIver, Li Du, Jason Eisner, Ryan Cotterell, Vikash Mansinghka, Timothy J. O'Donnell, Alexander K. Lew, and Tim Vieira. 2025. Fast Controlled Generation from Language Models with Adaptive Weighted Rejection Sampling. arXiv:2504.05410 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.05410>
- [32] Xiao Liu, Xiaoting Li, Rupesh Prajapati, and Dinghao Wu. 2019. DeepFuzz: automatic generation of syntax valid C programs for fuzz testing. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirty-First Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference and Ninth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence* (Honolulu, Hawaii, USA) (*AAAI'19/IAAI'19/EAAI'19*). AAAI Press, Article 129, 8 pages. doi:10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33011044
- [33] Vsevolod Livinskii, Dmitry Babokin, and John Regehr. 2020. Random testing for C and C++ compilers with YARPGen. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 4, OOPSLA, Article 196 (Nov. 2020), 25 pages. doi:10.1145/3428264
- [34] LLVM Project. 2025. Torch-MLIR. <https://github.com/llvm/torch-mlir>. Accessed: 2025-09-04.
- [35] Nuno P. Lopes, Juneyoung Lee, Chung-Kil Hur, Zhengyang Liu, and John Regehr. 2021. Alive2: bounded translation validation for LLVM. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation* (Virtual, Canada) (*PLDI 2021*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 65–79. doi:10.1145/3453483.3454030
- [36] Nuno P. Lopes, David Menendez, Santosh Nagarakatte, and John Regehr. 2015. Provably correct peephole optimizations with alive. In *Proceedings of the 36th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*

- (Portland, OR, USA) (*PLDI '15*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 22–32. doi:10.1145/2737924.2737965
- [37] Michaël Marcozzi, Qiyi Tang, Alastair F. Donaldson, and Cristian Cadar. 2019. Compiler fuzzing: how much does it matter? *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 3, OOPSLA (Oct. 2019), 1–29. doi:10.1145/3360581
  - [38] Alexander McCaskey and Thien Nguyen. 2021. A MLIR Dialect for Quantum Assembly Languages. arXiv:2101.11365 [quant-ph] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.11365>
  - [39] OpenAI. 2021. Triton: Open-source GPU Programming for Neural Networks. <https://openai.com/index/triton/>. Accessed: 2025-09-04.
  - [40] Kanghee Park, Jiayu Wang, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, Nadia Polikarpova, and Loris D'Antoni. 2024. Grammar-Aligned Decoding. arXiv:2405.21047 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.21047>
  - [41] Kanghee Park, Timothy Zhou, and Loris D'Antoni. 2025. Flexible and Efficient Grammar-Constrained Decoding. arXiv:2502.05111 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.05111>
  - [42] Paweł Parys, Sairam Vaidya, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Loris D'Antoni. 2025. Constrained Adaptive Rejection Sampling. arXiv:2510.01902 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.01902>
  - [43] Gabriel Poesia, Oleksandr Polozov, Vu Le, Ashish Tiwari, Gustavo Soares, Christopher Meek, and Sumit Gulwani. 2022. SynchroMesh: Reliable code generation from pre-trained language models. arXiv:2201.11227 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11227>
  - [44] LLVM Project. 2024. EmitC Dialect Test Directory. <https://github.com/llvm/llvm-project/tree/main/mlir/test/Dialect/EmitC> Accessed: 2024-08-01.
  - [45] Raimondas Sasnauskas, Yang Chen, Peter Collingbourne, Jeroen Ketema, Gratian Lup, Jubi Taneja, and John Regehr. 2018. Souper: A Synthesizing Superoptimizer. arXiv:1711.04422 [cs.PL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.04422>
  - [46] Torsten Scholak, Nathan Schucher, and Dzmitry Bahdanau. 2021. PICARD: Parsing Incrementally for Constrained Auto-Regressive Decoding from Language Models. arXiv:2109.05093 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.05093>
  - [47] Chengnian Sun, Vu Le, and Zhendong Su. 2016. Finding compiler bugs via live code mutation. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, Systems, Languages, and Applications (Amsterdam, Netherlands) (OOPSLA 2016)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 849–863. doi:10.1145/2983990.2984038
  - [48] Zeyu Sun, Jingjing Liang, Weiyi Wang, Chenyao Suo, Junjie Chen, and Fanjiang Xu. 2025. Interleaved Learning and Exploration: A Self-Adaptive Fuzz Testing Framework for MLIR. arXiv:2510.07815 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.07815>
  - [49] Chenyao Suo, Junjie Chen, Shuang Liu, Jiajun Jiang, Yingquan Zhao, and Jianrong Wang. 2024. Fuzzing MLIR Compiler Infrastructure via Operation Dependency Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (Vienna, Austria) (ISSTA 2024)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1287–1299. doi:10.1145/3650212.3680360
  - [50] Chenyao Suo, Jianrong Wang, Yongjia Wang, Jiajun Jiang, QingChao Shen, and Junjie Chen. 2025. DESIL: Detecting Silent Bugs in MLIR Compiler Infrastructure. arXiv:2504.01379 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.01379>
  - [51] Weiyuan Tong, Zixu Wang, Zhanyong Tang, Jianbin Fang, Yuqun Zhang, and Guixin Ye. 2025. Directed Testing in MLIR: Unleashing Its Potential by Overcoming the Limitations of Random Fuzzing. *Proceedings of the ACM on Software Engineering* 2, FSE (2025), 2288–2310.
  - [52] Shubham Ugare, Tarun Suresh, Hangoo Kang, Sasa Misailovic, and Gagandeep Singh. 2024. SynCode: LLM Generation with Grammar Augmentation. arXiv:2403.01632 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.01632>
  - [53] Haoyu Wang, Junjie Chen, Chuyue Xie, Shuang Liu, Zan Wang, Qingchao Shen, and Yingquan Zhao. 2024. MLIRSmith: Random Program Generation for Fuzzing MLIR Compiler Infrastructure. In *Proceedings of the 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (Echternach, Luxembourg) (ASE '23)*. IEEE Press, 1555–1566. doi:10.1109/ASE56229.2023.00120
  - [54] Junjie Wang, Bihuan Chen, Lei Wei, and Yang Liu. 2017. Skyfire: Data-Driven Seed Generation for Fuzzing. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 579–594. doi:10.1109/SP.2017.23
  - [55] Mingyuan Wu, Minghai Lu, Heming Cui, Junjie Chen, Yuqun Zhang, and Lingming Zhang. 2023. JITfuzz: Coverage-Guided Fuzzing for JVM Just-in-Time Compilers. In *Proceedings of the 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (Melbourne, Victoria, Australia) (ICSE '23)*. IEEE Press, 56–68. doi:10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00017
  - [56] Xuejun Yang, Yang Chen, Eric Eide, and John Regehr. 2011. Finding and understanding bugs in C compilers. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (San Jose, California, USA) (PLDI '11)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 283–294. doi:10.1145/1993498.1993532

## A Hardware and Software

Our experiments were conducted on Ubuntu 22.04 LTS nodes with Intel Xeon Gold 6230 CPUs (2.10 GHz, 10 cores, 20 threads allocated) and 384 GB RAM. For GPU-accelerated workloads, we provisioned 1x NVIDIA RTX A6000 GPUs. Our implementation is based on Python 3.10.12, PyTorch 2.8.0 with CUDA 12.8, Transformers 4.55.4 and llguidance 0.7.30.

## B Hyperparameters

For the language model decoding, we set the temperature to 1.0, top-p to 1.0, and top-k to 0 to allow sampling from the full token vocabulary without distributional distortion. We set the maximum number of newly generated tokens to 1024 tokens.

## C Model Checkpoint

We evaluate on one instruction-tuned model:

- **Qwen/Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Instruct** [23]: <https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Instruct> (commit a09a354)

The model uses BF16 precision with its default tokenizer and system prompt.

## D System Overview

Figure 8 provides a high-level overview of Germinator’s architecture and workflow. The system takes as input a dialect specification in TableGen and produces valid seed programs through three main stages: (1) grammar extraction from TableGen specifications (Section 5.1), (2) LM-guided seed generation with grammar-constrained decoding (Section 5.2), and (3) coverage-guided fuzzing using the generated seeds (Section 5.3). The extracted grammars serve as constraints during LM decoding, ensuring syntactic validity by construction, while the LM’s learned priors guide generation toward semantically plausible programs.

## E Evaluation Target Projects

We selected six projects spanning diverse maturity levels and application domains to evaluate Germinator’s effectiveness across the MLIR ecosystem (Table 4). Our selection criteria ensure representation of: **(1) Mature ecosystems** with extensive test infrastructure (MLIR with 2,000 tests, IREE with 1,100 tests), **(2) High-profile projects** with limited testing despite significant community adoption (Triton: 17,500 GitHub stars but only 80 tests), and **(3) Emerging dialects** where test creation lags behind development (HEIR: 600 stars, 170 tests).

This diversity demonstrates Germinator’s effectiveness across different resource settings: from well-tested infrastructure dialects to under-tested but widely-adopted production systems.

Table 4. Target projects with diverse maturity levels. Despite high community adoption, projects like Triton maintain limited test infrastructure, highlighting the need for automated test generation.

Project	Domain	Stars	Tests
MLIR	Infrastructure	35,200	2,000
Torch-MLIR	ML Frontend	1,700	60
IREE	ML Runtime	3,400	1,100
CIRCT	Hardware	1,900	650
Triton	GPU Kernels	17,500	80
HEIR	Cryptography	600	170




Fig. 8. Accuracy vs. efficiency for different sampling methods.

## F LLM-Based Semantic Filtering

When syntactically valid programs fail the MLIR verifier’s semantic checks, Germinator faces a filtering decision: which failures represent “nearly correct” programs (likely repairable through mutation) versus fundamentally malformed ones?

### F.1 Why Distance Metrics Fail

Traditional distance metrics (e.g., edit distance, AST similarity) are inadequate for judging semantic proximity in MLIR:

Table 5. Grammar extraction success rates by automation level. *Automatic*: Extracted directly from TableGen. *Inferred*: Derived from test examples. *Failed*: Cannot extract due to missing tests and custom specs.

Project	Total Dialects	Total Ops	Automatic (%)	Inferred (%)	Failed (%)
MLIR	45	964	83.5%	7.0%	9.5%
Torch-MLIR	7	215	56.0%	20.0%	24.0%
IREE	38	659	91.0%	1.5%	7.5%
CIRCT	20	114	87.0%	3.0%	10.0%
Triton	13	76	86.0%	5.0%	9.0%
HEIR	14	75	93.0%	0.0%	7.0%
<b>Average</b>	—	—	<b>82.8%</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>11.1%</b>

- **Small syntactic changes cause large semantic differences:** Swapping SSA value names ( $\%0 \leftrightarrow \%1$ ) is a minimal edit but can violate def-use chains.
- **Large syntactic differences may be semantically equivalent:** Operation reordering in commutative contexts involves significant structural changes but preserves semantics.
- **Semantic violations span heterogeneous categories:** Type errors, SSA violations, and dominance violations cannot be meaningfully compared via edit distance.

## F.2 LLM-Based Plausibility Scoring

Instead, Germinator queries the LM to score semantic plausibility. For each syntactically valid but semantically invalid program  $p$ , we prompt the LM:

Rate the semantic plausibility ( $\tau$ ) of this MLIR program on a scale of 0-100, where 100 is perfectly valid and 0 is nonsensical. Consider SSA form, type consistency, and common MLIR patterns. Output only a number.

Programs scoring above threshold  $\tau = 70$  are retained as seeds. The LM’s exposure to MLIR code during pre-training enables it to distinguish realistic semantic patterns from fundamentally malformed structures.

## F.3 Implementation Details

We use the same LM (Qwen/Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Instruct) for both generation and judging to avoid additional model overhead ( $\sim 200\text{ms}$  per program).

## G Grammar Extraction Statistics

Table 5 reports detailed grammar extraction success rates across all dialects in our six evaluated projects.

## H Detailed Bug Discovery Statistics

Table 6 provides complete bug counts for all six projects after 24-hour fuzzing campaigns.

## I Prompt Templates

Germinator automatically constructs prompts for seed generation without manual curation. This section provides representative templates for both assembly and generic format generation, as well as few-shot and zero-shot scenarios.



Table 6. Bug counts after 24-hour campaigns. Improvement calculated against the best baseline. Where baselines found zero bugs, improvement marked as “–” to indicate qualitative advantage.

Project	Grammarinator	SynthFuzz	Germinator	Improvement
MLIR	3	6	25	4.13×
Torch-MLIR	0	0	7	–
IREE	3	5	25	5.0×
CIRCT	1	3	15	5.0×
Triton	0	0	3	–
HEIR	1	2	13	6.5×
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>5.5×</b>

### 1.1 Assembly Format Prompt Template

When grammar extraction successfully produces assembly format rules, Germinator constructs prompts using the following template:

You are an MLIR code generator for the <DIALECT\_NAME> dialect.

Generate syntactically valid MLIR programs that:

1. Use only operations from: <SUPPORTED\_OPS\_LIST>
2. Follow MLIR semantic constraints (SSA form, type consistency, dominance)
3. Explore diverse operation combinations and control flow patterns

Target Operations (prioritized by rarity in test corpus):

<TOP\_K\_RARE\_OPS\_WITH\_USAGE\_COUNTS>

Complexity Target: ~<AVG\_OPS> operations per program

Grammar Constraints:

<EXTRACTED\_GRAMMAR\_RULES>

Few-Shot Examples:

<EXAMPLE\_1>

<EXAMPLE\_2>

...

<EXAMPLE\_N>

Generate ONE novel MLIR program following the grammar and semantic rules.

Output only raw MLIR code.

#### Placeholders:

- <DIALECT\_NAME>: Target dialect (e.g., torch, emitc)
- <SUPPORTED\_OPS\_LIST>: Operations with successfully extracted grammars
- <TOP\_K\_RARE\_OPS>: Operations ranked by inverse frequency in test corpus
- <AVG\_OPS>: Mean operation count from existing tests (or default 6-8)
- <EXTRACTED\_GRAMMAR\_RULES>: Lark grammar rules from TableGen extraction
- <EXAMPLE\_1...N>: 3-5 examples selected by structural diversity (AST depth, operation variety)

All placeholders are filled automatically from dialect specifications and test corpora.

## 1.2 Generic Format Prompt Template

When grammar extraction fails or falls back to generic format:

You are an MLIR code generator for the <DIALECT\_NAME> dialect.

Generate syntactically valid MLIR programs in GENERIC FORMAT:

- Syntax: "dialect.op"(operands) {regions} attributes : (types) -> (types)
- Use only operations from: <AVAILABLE\_OPS>
- Follow SSA form, type consistency, and dominance rules

Available Operations:

```
<OP_NAME_1>: <SIGNATURE_1>
<OP_NAME_2>: <SIGNATURE_2>
...
```

Common Type Vocabularies:

```
<TYPE_CONSTRAINTS>
```

Target: ~<AVG\_OPS> operations, <REGION\_DEPTH> region nesting

```
<IF_FEW_SHOT>
```

Few-Shot Examples:

```
<EXAMPLE_1>
```

```
...
```

```
<EXAMPLE_N>
```

```
</IF_FEW_SHOT>
```

```
<IF_ZERO_SHOT>
```

Structural Scaffolds:

- Basic module: "builtin.module"() ({...}) : () -> ()
  - Function: "func.func"() <{...}> ({...}) : () -> ()
  - Region syntax: ({^bb0: operations})
- ```
</IF_ZERO_SHOT>
```

Generate ONE novel generic-format MLIR program.

Output only raw MLIR code.

### Placeholders:

- <AVAILABLE\_OPS>: All operations in dialect (from TableGen)
- <SIGNATURE\_X>: Operation signatures extracted from TableGen (operand/result types)
- <TYPE\_CONSTRAINTS>: Valid type vocabularies (e.g., IntegerIndexOrOpaqueType)
- <IF\_FEW\_SHOT> / <IF\_ZERO\_SHOT>: Conditional sections based on test availability
- <REGION\_DEPTH>: Target nesting level (default 2-4)

## 1.3 Zero-Shot Prompt (Low-Resource Dialects)

For dialects with no existing tests:

You are an MLIR code generator for the <DIALECT\_NAME> dialect.

This dialect has no existing test corpus. Generate valid MLIR programs using:

Available Operations (from TableGen):

```
<OP_NAME>(<OPERAND_TYPES>) -> <RESULT_TYPES>
...
```

MLIR Structural Requirements:

1. SSA form: Each value defined once, used after definition
2. Modules contain functions: "builtin.module"() ({...})
3. Functions have signatures: "func.func"() <{function\_type = ...}>
4. Regions need terminators: "func.return"(...) at function end

Syntactic Templates:

- Generic op: "<dialect>.<op>"(%arg1, %arg2) : (type1, type2) -> type3
- Region: ({^bb0(%arg: type): <operations> })
- Attribute: <{key = value}>

Generate ONE valid MLIR program exploring <DIALECT\_NAME> operations.

## 1.4 Prompt Construction Algorithm

---

### Algorithm 2: Automatic Prompt Construction

---

**Input:** Dialect  $\mathcal{D}$ , extracted grammar  $G_{\mathcal{D}}$ , test corpus  $T$

**Output:** Prompt string  $P$

```
1  $P \leftarrow \text{BaseTemplate}(\mathcal{D})$ 
   // Select format based on grammar extraction
2 if  $G_{\mathcal{D}}$  is assembly format then
3    $P \leftarrow P + \text{AssemblyGrammarRules}(G_{\mathcal{D}})$ 
4 else
5    $P \leftarrow P + \text{GenericFormatTemplate}()$ 
6    $P \leftarrow P + \text{OperationSignatures}(\mathcal{D})$ 
   // Add examples if available
7 if  $|T| > 0$  then
8    $examples \leftarrow \text{SelectDiverse}(T, k = 4)$  // By AST depth, op variety
9    $P \leftarrow P + \text{FewShotExamples}(examples)$ 
10 else
11    $P \leftarrow P + \text{ZeroShotScaffolds}()$ 
   // Add operational guidance
12  $rare\_ops \leftarrow \text{RankByRarity}(\mathcal{D}, T)$ 
13  $P \leftarrow P + \text{RareOperationList}(rare\_ops[: 10])$ 
14  $P \leftarrow P + \text{ComplexityTargets}(\text{Mean}(|T|), \text{AvgDepth}(T))$ 
15 return  $P$ 
```

---

All prompt construction is fully automated, requiring no manual intervention per dialect.

## J Base MLIR Grammar Template

Germinator extends a base MLIR grammar template with dialect-specific rules extracted from Table-Gen specifications. This section presents the core grammar template in Lark format, highlighting extension points where dialect-specific productions are inserted.

## J.1 Grammar Structure

The base grammar provides the foundation for all MLIR programs, including:

- **Type system:** Standard types (integers, floats, tensors, memrefs), function types, and dialect type extension points
- **Attribute system:** Standard attributes (integers, floats, strings, arrays, dictionaries) and dialect attribute extension points
- **SSA infrastructure:** SSA value definitions, uses, and type annotations
- **Control flow:** Blocks, regions, successors, and branch targets
- **Module structure:** Top-level modules, functions, and nested regions
- **Affine maps:** Expressions, constraints, and integer sets for polyhedral compilation

## J.2 Extension Points

The template contains three primary extension points marked with placeholder tags:

- (1) `{{OPERATION_RULES}}`: Individual operation grammar rules extracted from TableGen
- (2) `{{DIALECT_AGGREGATES}}`: Dialect-level aggregation rules grouping related operations
- (3) `{{DIALECT_LIST}}`: Union of all dialect operation rules

For example, after extracting rules for the EmitC dialect, Germinator instantiates these placeholders as:

```
// {{OPERATION_RULES}} becomes:
emitc_literal: op_result_list? "emitc.literal"
    ESCAPED_STRING attribute_dict? ":" type
emitc_for: "emitc.for" SSA_ID "=" ssa_use "to" ssa_use
    "step" ssa_use (":" integer_index_or_opaque)? region
emitc_yield: "emitc.yield" attribute_dict?
    (ssa_use ":" type)?

// {{DIALECT_AGGREGATES}} becomes:
emitc_ops: emitc_literal | emitc_for | emitc_yield | ...

// {{DIALECT_LIST}} becomes:
all_dialect_ops: emitc_ops | arith_ops | func_ops | ...
```

## J.3 Abbreviated Grammar

The complete base grammar spans approximately 300 lines. Below is an abbreviated version highlighting key structures and extension points:

```
start: mlir_file
mlir_file: definition_and_module_list+ | definition_and_function_list+

// =====
// TYPES
// =====
type: TYPE_ALIAS | dialect_type | standard_type
standard_type: complex_type | FLOAT_TYPE | function_type | INDEX_TYPE
    | INTEGER_TYPE | memref_type | tensor_type | ...
dialect_type: "!" (opaque_dialect_item | pretty_dialect_item)

tensor_type: ranked_tensor_type | unranked_tensor_type
ranked_tensor_type: "tensor" "<" dimension_list_ranked?
    tensor_memref_element_type ">"
memref_type: ranked_memref_type | unranked_memref_type

// {{CUSTOM_TYPES}} - Placeholder for dialect-specific type vocabularies

// =====
// ATTRIBUTES
// =====
```

```

attribute_value: ATTRIBUTE_ALIAS | dialect_attribute | standard_attribute
standard_attribute: array_attribute | BOOL | dictionary_attribute
                  | elements_attribute | float_attribute | ...
dialect_attribute: "#" (opaque_dialect_item | pretty_dialect_item)

// {{CUSTOM_ATTRIBUTES}} - Placeholder for dialect-specific attributes

// =====
// SSA VALUES AND OPERATIONS
// =====
ssa_use: SSA_ID | CONSTANT
ssa_use_list: ssa_use ("," ssa_use)*
op_result_list: op_result ("," op_result)* "="

// {{OPERATION_RULES}} - Individual dialect operation grammar rules
// Example: emitc_literal: op_result_list? "emitc.literal" ...

// {{DIALECT_AGGREGATES}} - Dialect-level groupings
// Example: emitc_ops: emitc_literal | emitc_for | emitc_yield

all_dialect_ops: {{DIALECT_LIST}}
operation: (all_dialect_ops | module | function) location_attribute?

// =====
// REGIONS AND CONTROL FLOW
// =====
region: "{" block* "}"
block: block_label? operation_list
block_label: BLOCK_ID ("(" ssa_id_and_type_list? ")")? ":"

// =====
// MODULES AND FUNCTIONS
// =====
module: "module" SYMBOL_REF_ID? ("attributes" attribute_dict)? region
function: "func.func" SYMBOL_REF_ID "(" argument_list? ")"
         ("->" function_result_list)? region?

// =====
// TERMINALS
// =====
SSA_ID: "%" SUFFIX_ID ("#" DIGITS)?
SYMBOL_REF_ID: "@" (SUFFIX_ID | ESCAPED_STRING)
BLOCK_ID: "*" SUFFIX_ID
TYPE_ALIAS: "!" (ESCAPED_STRING | BARE_ID)
INDEX_TYPE: "index"
INTEGER_TYPE: /[si?[1-9][0-9]*/ | /ui[1-9][0-9]*/
FLOAT_TYPE: "f16" | "bf16" | "f32" | "f64"
BARE_ID: /[a-zA-Z_][a-zA-Z0-9_$]*/

```

The full grammar template is available in the Germinator repository at `grammars/mlir_base.lark`.

## J.4 Grammar Instantiation Process

For each dialect  $\mathcal{D}$ , Germinator:

- (1) Extracts operation rules from TableGen  $\rightarrow \{\{\text{OPERATION\_RULES}\}\}$
- (2) Groups operations by dialect  $\rightarrow \{\{\text{DIALECT\_AGGREGATES}\}\}$
- (3) Constructs union of all dialects  $\rightarrow \{\{\text{DIALECT\_LIST}\}\}$
- (4) Adds type vocabulary rules (e.g., `integer_index_or_opaque`) from TableGen constraints
- (5) Generates final Lark grammar file: `mlir_${dialect}.lark`

This modular design enables efficient grammar reuse across dialects while maintaining precise dialect-specific constraints.

## K Example Bug Reports

This section presents representative bugs discovered by Germinator across different MLIR dialects, demonstrating the tool's ability to find diverse crash and verification failures. Each bug includes a minimal reproducer that triggers the issue.

### K.1 Parser Crash: Mixed Type Literals in Dense Attributes

**Dialect:** TOSA

**Component:** Attribute parser

**Symptom:** Assertion failure in `getIntAttrElements()` when dense tensor attribute contains type-mismatched literals

**Minimal reproducer (generic format):**

```
"builtin.module"() ({
  "tosa.const"() <{value = dense<["string", 1]> : tensor<2xi32>>
    : () -> tensor<2xi32>
}) : () -> ()
```

**Root cause:** The parser assumes all elements in a dense integer tensor are integers or booleans, but does not validate this before attempting to parse. When a string literal appears, `getIntAttrElements()` asserts on line 642 of `AttributeParser.cpp`.

**Expected behavior:** Parser should emit a diagnostic error message rather than crashing.

### K.2 Verifier Crash: Negative Array Attribute Index

**Dialect:** GPU

**Component:** Operation verifier

**Symptom:** Heap buffer overflow when accessing negative `workgroup_attributions` index

**Minimal reproducer (assembly format):**

```
gpu.module @memref_conversions {
  gpu.func @kern(%arg0: memref<8xf32>) kernel
    workgroup(%wg: memref<8xf32>)
    attributes {workgroup_attributions = -1 : i64} {
      gpu.return
    }
}
```

**Equivalent generic format:**

```
"builtin.module"() ({
  "gpu.module"() <{sym_name = "memref_conversions"}> ({
    "gpu.func"() <{function_type = (memref<8xf32>) -> ()}> ({
      ^bb0(%arg0: memref<8xf32>):
        "gpu.return"() : () -> ()
    }) {gpu.kernel, sym_name = "kern",
      workgroup_attributions = -1 : i64} : () -> ()
  }) : () -> ()
}) : () -> ()
```

**Root cause:** The verifier's `verifyAttributions()` function (line 552 of `GPUDialect.cpp`) accesses block arguments using the `workgroup_attributions` value without bounds checking. A negative value causes out-of-bounds access.

**Expected behavior:** Verifier should reject negative attribution counts with a diagnostic error.



### K.3 Verifier Crash: Missing Loop Induction Variable

**Dialect:** EmitC

**Component:** Operation verifier

**Symptom:** Assertion failure when emitc.for loop body has no block arguments

**Minimal reproducer (assembly format):**

```
func.func @test() {
  %lb = emitc.literal "0" : index
  %ub = emitc.literal "10" : index
  %step = emitc.literal "1" : index
  emitc.for %lb to %ub step %step : index {
    emitc.yield
  }
func.return
}
```

**Equivalent generic format:**

```
"builtin.module"() ({
  "func.func"() <{function_type = () -> (), sym_name = "test"}> ({
    %0 = "emitc.literal"() <{value = "0"}> : () -> index
    %1 = "emitc.literal"() <{value = "10"}> : () -> index
    %2 = "emitc.literal"() <{value = "1"}> : () -> index
    "emitc.for"(%0, %1, %2) ({
      "emitc.yield"() : () -> ()
    }) : (index, index, index) -> ()
    "func.return"() : () -> ()
  }) : () -> ()
}) : () -> ()
```

**Root cause:** The `getInductionVar()` method assumes the loop region always contains a block argument (the induction variable) and attempts `getBody()->getArgument(0)` without checking if any arguments exist.

**Expected behavior:** While the TableGen specification permits loops without explicit induction variables, the verifier should either require them or handle their absence gracefully.

### K.4 Type System Crash: Invalid Tensor Element Type

**Dialect:** Torch

**Component:** Type verifier

**Symptom:** Segmentation fault when tensor uses unsupported element type

**Minimal reproducer (generic format):**

```
"builtin.module"() ({
  "func.func"() <{function_type = () -> !torch.vtensor<[4],none>,
    sym_name = "invalid_tensor"}> ({
    %0 = "torch.vtensor.literal"() <{value = dense<1> : tensor<4xi32>}>
      : () -> !torch.vtensor<[4],none>
    "func.return"(%0) : (!torch.vtensor<[4],none>) -> ()
  }) : () -> ()
}) : () -> ()
```

**Root cause:** The Torch dialect's tensor type construction does not validate that the element type is a valid tensor element type. The `none` type causes a null pointer dereference when the verifier attempts to check element type constraints.

**Expected behavior:** Type construction should validate element types and reject invalid types like `none` with a diagnostic error.

## K.5 Stack Overflow: Circular SSA Dependencies in Dialect Conversion

**Dialect:** Arith (during conversion to LLVM)

**Component:** Dialect conversion framework

**Symptom:** Stack overflow/segmentation fault when processing circular SSA value dependencies during dialect lowering

**Minimal reproducer (generic format):**

```
"builtin.module"() ({
  %0 = "arith.addi"(%1, %0) <{overflowFlags = #arith.overflow<none>}>
    : (index, index) -> index
  %1 = "arith.constant"() <{value = 0 : index}> : () -> index
  %2 = "arith.constant"() <{value = 1 : index}> : () -> index
}) : () -> ()
```

**Equivalent assembly format:**

```
module {
  %0 = arith.addi %1, %0 : index
  %1 = arith.constant 0 : index
  %2 = arith.constant 1 : index
}
```

**Root cause:** The program violates SSA form: `%0` is used in its own definition (`arith.addi %1, %0`), and `%1` is used before being defined. During dialect conversion with `-convert-ub-to-llvm`, the conversion framework attempts to recursively resolve value mappings, entering infinite recursion when encountering the circular dependency  $\%0 \rightarrow \%1 \rightarrow \%0$ .

**Expected behavior:** The MLIR verifier should reject this program during initial verification, catching SSA violations before any dialect conversion begins. If the verifier is bypassed (e.g., with `-verify-each=false`), the conversion framework should detect circular dependencies and fail gracefully with a diagnostic error rather than stack overflowing.

**Defense-in-depth failure:** This bug reveals a gap in MLIR’s multi-layer validation:

- (1) The parser accepts the syntactically valid but semantically invalid program
- (2) The verifier (if run) should catch SSA violations but may be bypassed
- (3) The conversion framework assumes well-formed IR and crashes on malformed input

This demonstrates the importance of robust verification at every stage, as downstream passes should not assume perfect input even within the same compiler infrastructure.