

LLMCFG-TGen: Using LLM-Generated Control Flow Graphs to Automatically Create Test Cases from Use Cases

ZHENZHEN YANG, School of Computer Science and Engineering, Macau University of Science and Technology, China and School of Artificial Intelligence, Zhejiang Polytechnic University of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering, China

CHENHUI CUI, **TAO LI**, and **RUBING HUANG**, School of Computer Science and Engineering, Macau University of Science and Technology, China

NAN NIU, School of Computing, University of North Florida, USA

DAVE TOWEY, School of Computer Science, University of Nottingham Ningbo China, China

SHIKAI GUO, School of Information Science and Technology, Dalian Maritime University, China

Appropriate test case generation is critical in software testing, significantly impacting the quality of the testing. *Requirements-Based Test Generation* (RBTG) derives test cases from software requirements, aiming to verify whether or not the system's behaviors align with user needs and expectations. Requirements are often documented in *Natural Language* (NL), with use-case descriptions being a popular method for capturing functional behaviors and interaction flows in a structured and readable form. Recently, *Large Language Models* (LLMs) have shown strong potential for automating test generation directly from NL requirements (including use-case descriptions). However, current LLM-based approaches may not provide comprehensive, non-redundant coverage. They may also fail to capture complex conditional logic in requirements, resulting in incomplete test cases. To address these limitations, we propose a new end-to-end approach that automatically generates test cases from NL use-case descriptions, called *Test Generation based on LLM-generated Control Flow Graphs* (LLMCFG-TGen). LLMCFG-TGen comprises the following three main steps: (1) CFG Generation: An LLM transforms a use case into a structured, JSON-based *Control Flow Graph* (CFG) that encapsulates all potential branches; (2) Test-Path Extraction: The generated CFG is explored, and all complete execution paths are enumerated; and (3) Test Case Creation: Finally, the execution paths are then used to generate the test cases. To evaluate our proposed approach, we conducted a series of experiments using four multi-domain use-case datasets spanning diverse application areas. The experimental results demonstrate that LLMs can effectively construct well-structured CFGs from NL use cases. Compared with the two baseline methods, LLMCFG-TGen achieves full path coverage, improving completeness and ensuring clear and accurate test cases. Practitioner assessments confirm that LLMCFG-TGen produces logically consistent and comprehensive test cases, while substantially reducing manual effort. The findings suggest that coupling LLM-based semantic reasoning with structured modeling effectively bridges the gap between NL requirements and systematic test generation.

Authors' Contact Information: **Zhenzhen Yang**, 3240002362@student.must.edu.mo, School of Computer Science and Engineering, Macau University of Science and Technology, Macau, China and School of Artificial Intelligence, Zhejiang Polytechnic University of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China; **Chenhui Cui**, 3230002105@student.must.edu.mo; **Tao Li**, 3220007015@student.must.edu.mo; **Rubing Huang**, rbhuang@must.edu.mo, School of Computer Science and Engineering, Macau University of Science and Technology, Macau, China; **Nan Niu**, nan.niu@unf.edu, School of Computing, University of North Florida, Jacksonville, FL, USA; **Dave Towey**, dave.towey@nottingham.edu.cn, School of Computer Science, University of Nottingham Ningbo China, Ningbo, Zhejiang, China; **Shikai Guo**, shikai.guo@dmlu.edu.cn, School of Information Science and Technology, Dalian Maritime University, Dalian, Liaoning, China.

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

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM XXXX-XXXX/2025/04-ART777

<https://doi.org/0000000.0000000>

CCS Concepts: • **Software and its engineering** → **Software testing and debugging**; **Requirements analysis**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Software testing, test case generation, use cases, control flow graph, large language model

ACM Reference Format:

Zhenzhen Yang, Chenhui Cui, Tao Li, Rubing Huang, Nan Niu, Dave Towey, and Shikai Guo. 2025. LLMCFG-TGen: Using LLM-Generated Control Flow Graphs to Automatically Create Test Cases from Use Cases. 77, 77, Article 777 (April 2025), 26 pages. <https://doi.org/00000000.00000000>

1 Introduction

Software testing is an important part of the software development process, aiming to ensure the quality and reliability of software systems. Test case generation is one of the most challenging testing tasks, often accounting for 40% to 70% of the overall testing effort [58]. Automated test case generation has emerged as a promising approach to reducing both effort and cost [32]. Test cases can be derived from various sources, including requirements specifications, design documents, source code, and other testing artifacts (such as bug reports) [64]. *Requirements-Based Test Generation* (RBTG) derives test cases directly from requirements, ensuring alignment with expected system behavior, without relying on access to the source code [64]. RBTG enables test design in the early stages of development, which not only facilitates customer validation, but also guides the system implementation. This helps developers form a clearer understanding of expected system behavior and reduces the risk of error propagation to later stages [16].

Early RBTG approaches typically generated test cases from requirements expressed in formal or semi-formal notations. Examples of this include *Unified Modeling Language* (UML) diagrams [48], and *Finite State Machines* (FSMs) [44]. Model-based approaches, in which abstract models are constructed from requirements and then used to derive test cases, have since emerged as the most popular strategy [64]. However, model-based strategies have not been widely adopted in industry, as developing and maintaining the models can be complex and incur high costs [2, 43, 64]. Due to its simplicity, *Natural Language* (NL) continues to be popular for documenting requirements in industry [15]. However, NL can be ambiguous, inconsistent, and incomplete, which can make automated test generation difficult. Use-case descriptions can help to address this: They follow standardized templates [5], and capture essential behavioral details through *main*, *alternative*, and *exception* flows [9, 31]. Use cases are also widely adopted in practice to validate and refine business processes with stakeholders, helping improve clarity and reduce ambiguity [60]. This has made textual use cases popular for automated test case generation [64]. Most methods involving use cases use an intermediate representation, such as an *Extended Finite State Machine* (EFSM) [31] or *Use-Case Maps* (UCMs) [34]. However, these models can be difficult to build and maintain, and also require that the use cases be sufficiently detailed and precisely specified to support effective test automation [60].

Due to their strong NL understanding and reasoning abilities, *Large Language Models* (LLMs) have become increasingly popular in software engineering, supporting tasks such as requirements analysis, code generation, test case generation, and defect prediction [25]. LLMs can generate test cases directly from NL requirements [62], using zero-shot [8, 40] and one-shot prompting [24], or through fine-tuning [33, 63]. However, extracting specific information from complex requirements documents can lead to hallucinations [53]. It is also difficult to generate large amounts of test cases reliably [35], with the process often producing redundant tests [8]. Furthermore, fine-tuning approaches may only work well in specific domains, and lack generality [63]. This has resulted in current LLM-based strategies remaining limited.

To address these limitations, we propose an automated approach for generating test cases from NL use-case descriptions, *Test Generation based on LLM-generated Control Flow Graphs* (LLMCFG-TGen). LLMCFG-TGen is driven by two carefully designed prompts, and comprises three main steps:

- (1) **CFG Generation:** An LLM transforms the use case into a structured, JSON-based *Control Flow Graph* (CFG) that is designed to encapsulate all branches. The CFG is then validated by checking its nodes and edges: It is rejected if any node is isolated, any non-root node has no incoming edge, or any edge references a non-existent node ID. The LLM regenerates the CFG until it satisfies all checks and is accepted as structurally complete. This step is guided by Prompt #1, which provides a concise instruction set and an explicit CFG-construction algorithm.
- (2) **Test-Path Extraction:** The system then automatically checks the constructed CFG to enumerate all complete execution paths. A *Depth-First Search* (DFS) algorithm identifies distinct node-level paths, and each node identifier in a path is replaced with its corresponding NL statement.
- (3) **Test Case Creation:** The statement-level paths are converted into detailed test cases by the LLM. Each test case is formatted according to predefined templates, and then presented to the user for review and confirmation. This step is guided by Prompt #2, specifying both the instructions and the test-case structure.

Without restricting use-case expressiveness, or requiring manual intervention, LLMCFG-TGen supports single-click test generation through a web interface, producing comprehensive, non-redundant, and highly readable test cases.

To evaluate the performance of the proposed approach and its acceptance among practitioners, we performed a comprehensive study using datasets from multiple domains, encompassing a total of 42 use cases. We compared the LLM-generated CFGs against manually constructed ones, to assess their correctness and completeness. The results show that LLMs can produce well-structured CFGs from NL use cases. Compared with two baselines, LLMCFG-TGen achieves better completeness and lower redundancy. The generated CFGs enable full path coverage in the model, with the path-based procedure improving the clarity and accuracy of the resulting test cases. Practitioner feedback further confirms that LLMCFG-TGen delivers high-quality tests, while substantially reducing the manual effort.

This paper contributes the following:

- We use LLMs to generate CFGs from use-case specifications, without limiting the expressiveness of the use cases.
- We present an approach for automatically generating test cases from NL use-case descriptions, eliminating the need for manual behavioral modeling.
- We provide an implementation of the approach as a practical web-based tool.
- We report on a comprehensive evaluation of the tool's effectiveness and practitioner satisfaction.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces the background to the proposed approach, and reviews related work. Section 3 provides a detailed description of the methodology. Section 4 outlines the experimental setup. The results of the experiments and the threats to validity are in Section 5. Section 6 discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the approach. Finally, Section 7 concludes the paper and discusses some potential future work.

2 Background and Related Work

This section provides the background information for the study, including use cases, CFGs, and types of test cases. Some related work is also discussed.

2.1 Use-Case Description

Use cases can be used to document many elements of the software development process, including business workflows [11]. They can facilitate requirements discussions, helping to define functional specifications, and to record system design decisions [11, 38]. This paper focuses on their use to describe functional requirements [15].

A use-case description is a structured textual artifact that describes the system's behavior in response to interactions initiated by external actors [60]. It can capture possible sequences of events that lead to achieving a specific goal [11]. Compared to full requirements specifications, use-case descriptions are shorter narratives that focus on a single function. They differ from UML use-case diagrams, which graphically depict the relationships among actors and use cases (or among related use cases) [11]. They have a strict syntax, but lack behavioral detail, making them suitable for early-stage communication [38]. When used for testing, use-case descriptions provide much (though not all) of the information needed to develop a complete system test suite [9].

Writing high-quality use cases can be challenging, because no precise rules exist for their composition, and a diverse range of templates and styles have been produced [13]. Jacobson [29] used a paragraph-style format with fields such as name, actors, preconditions, postconditions, basic flow, and alternate flows. Later work proposed constraints and authoring guidelines: Cockburn's template, for example, has been widely adopted, and is recognized as one of the most comprehensive formats [11, 57]. Our proposed approach is template-agnostic and can accommodate use cases written in diverse formats, without the need for structural standardization.

2.2 Control Flow Graphs

Graphical models are widely used in requirements engineering to support communication among stakeholders, and to guide system design [18]. A CFG is an abstract representation of all possible execution paths through a component or system [10]. It is typically defined as a directed graph $G = (S, E)$, where S denotes the set of nodes and $E \subseteq S \times S$ represents the set of directed edges [42]. Nodes typically represent basic blocks, and edges denote control transfers between them.

In our context, the nodes correspond to the main, alternative, and exception steps within a use case, while the edges represent control transitions between steps (including sequencing, branching, and looping). Edges may be annotated with guard conditions, reflecting the decision logic. (It is assumed that the CFG has no unreachable nodes or edges.) An execution path is any path from a unique root node to one or more exit nodes [39]: They serve as the foundation for our path-based test case creation.

2.3 Types of Test Cases

A *test case* defines a specific condition to be evaluated, and consists of the inputs, conditions of execution, and expected outcomes [10]. Test cases can be categorized into three types [64]: *Abstract test cases* capture test logic at a high level, without specifying concrete (implementation-level) input values or expected outcomes; *Concrete test cases* specify detailed, executable inputs, along with the corresponding expected results; and *Test scenarios* describe functional behaviors, or business processes, to be validated from a user's perspective. Our study used textual *abstract test cases*, which typically include a title, precondition, test steps, and expected results [65]. Figure 1 presents an example of a test case created by our approach.

2.4 Related Work

Traditional testing approaches derive test cases from use-case descriptions using intermediate models. Fröhlich and Link [20] outlined a strategy that maps use-case elements to UML state

TC-001: Verify borrowing process cancellation by member		
Preconditions:		
Member is logged into the library system		
Test Steps:		
Step 1	Input: Navigate to borrowing section	Result: System displays a GUI with a list of items to borrow
Step 2	Input: Select one or more items to borrow	Result: Selected items are highlighted in the list
Step 3	Input: Click 'Cancel' button	Result: System shows a warning 'Confirm cancellation?'
Step 4	Input: Confirm the cancellation	Result: System does not record the borrowed items and returns to the list of items

Fig. 1. Example test case.

machines for deriving test suites, but did not provide an implementation or case study. de Figueiredo et al. [12] proposed using a formal CSP (*Communicating Sequential Processes*) behavioral model, built from use cases, as a basis for test generation. However, this remained a conceptual proposal, without implementation or empirical validation. Alrawashed et al. [5] defined a pipeline that refines Cockburn-style use cases and converts them into a CFG for test generation. Transformations have also targeted UML activity diagrams [22, 56], meta-models [3, 4, 66], and *Use Case Test Models* (UCTMs) [60]: These approaches typically use predefined use-case templates or require manual refinement of use-case descriptions before transforming them into intermediate models. The intermediate models themselves were manually constructed or heavily guided by human input, adding complexity and effort to the process. Abstract test cases could then be derived from the manually-constructed models.

Recent studies have shown the effectiveness of LLMs for generating tests directly from NL requirements [62]. LLMs can produce test cases directly from NL requirements [62], using zero-shot [8, 40] and one-shot prompting [24], or through fine-tuning [33, 63]. However, these approaches may often suffer from issues of completeness, redundancy, and clarity — due to hallucinations, and the inherent difficulty of extracting accurate information from lengthy or ambiguous requirements [53]. Mathur et al. [46] incorporated use-case context and conversational cues to enhance LLM prompting. De Vito et al. [14] introduced the AGORA pipeline, leveraging LLMs to automate the generation of acceptance tests from use-case descriptions: They could achieve results comparable to those of manual testing by experienced engineers. Overall, LLM-based methods can reduce the dependency on test-design expertise, minimize manual effort, and improve efficiency: This supports scalable test generation for complex systems. Nevertheless, there are still challenges to achieving sufficient coverage, and to eliminating redundancy [8].

To address these challenges, we combine the reasoning capability of LLMs with the structural rigor of CFGs as an intermediate representation. Unlike previous work [5], our approach imposes no constraints on the format of use cases, and requires no manual intervention. Integrating CFG-guided generation into the LLM pipeline enhances coverage, reduces redundancy, and produces more consistent and interpretable test cases. The next section presents the proposed approach in detail, describing its architecture and key processing steps.




Fig. 2. Overview of the proposed approach, LLMCFG-TGen.

3 Approach

This section mainly explains the proposed approach, LLMCFG-TGen.

3.1 Overview

Figure 2 shows an overview of LLMCFG-TGen, which, without any preprocessing or format constraints, transforms an NL use-case description into a set of high-coverage test cases. The process comprises the following three main steps:

Step 1 CFG Generation: The NL use-case description is passed to an LLM, which, guided by a prompt that integrates the description with predefined control-flow rules, produces a CFG (in JSON format). The CFG is then checked for completeness, with the LLM being re-prompted until a fully connected graph is obtained.

Step 2 Test-Path Extraction: Starting from the root node, the CFG is traversed to enumerate all test paths. Any cyclic branch is pruned to keep the graph acyclic: This ensures that all feasible paths are collected.

Step 3 Test Case Creation: The LLM converts each extracted path into a detailed test case comprising a title, preconditions, and an ordered sequence of steps and expected result pairs. Figure 3 shows an example use case, with its generated CFG, corresponding test paths, and structured test cases (formatted in JSON). We have also developed a user-friendly web application that automates the workflow, enabling users (without expertise in LLMs or software testing) to generate high-quality test cases efficiently.

3.2 Step 1: CFG Generation

Step 1 consists of three tasks: Prompt construction; CFG generation using an LLM; and CFG verification.

3.2.1 Prompt Construction. Prompt engineering [62] is used to interact with the LLM (GPT-4o [26]). This involves designing a task description, which is passed as input to the LLM. Zero-shot and few-shot prompting are among the most widely used strategies. With zero-shot prompting, the




Fig. 3. End-to-end process, from an NL use case, to the LLM-generated CFG and derived test cases.

model receives only the task description (without any examples), and must generate the output based only on these instructions.

Our study used a streamlined (but effective) zero-shot prompting strategy. Specifically, we designed two prompts: Prompt #1 for generating the CFG and Prompt #2 for creating the corresponding test cases. Prompt #1 provides unambiguous guidance to the LLM by combining a concise, well-structured instruction set with an explicit CFG-construction algorithm. The LLM is also instructed to present the generated CFG in JSON format.




Fig. 4. LLM prompt for generating the CFG from a use case.

Figure 4 shows how Prompt #1 is used to generate a CFG from an NL use-case description. The prompt consists of five components, the final one being the input use case. The remaining four components are:

- (1) *Role definition*: This specifies that the LLM should act as a software engineering expert.
- (2) *Task instructions*: These provide high-level operational guidance. They describe how to extract nodes from the main, alternative, and extension flows; how to handle conditional branches; and how to ensure that there are no orphan nodes [30].
- (3) *Algorithm specification* (Algorithm 1): The algorithm provides the LLM with a formalized mapping process that translates the extracted elements into CFG nodes and edges. It includes detailed rules for conditional branching and edge-weight assignment.
- (4) *Output specification*: This requires the CFG to be returned in valid JSON, following a predefined schema with nodes and edges fields.

Algorithm 1 formalizes the mapping process from the use case to its corresponding CFG. Nodes represent steps in the use case, and edges are established based on sequential and conditional relationships. Alternative and extension flows are explicitly linked to the main flow, unless otherwise specified. This ensures the generation of a complete and valid CFG, enabling the direct parsing and seamless integration into all subsequent processing stages.

3.2.2 CFG Generation using an LLM. CFGs are generated using an LLM, such as GPT-4o [26]. The proposed LLMCFG-TGen approach is model-agnostic, meaning that it can be adapted to other LLMs without additional modifications. A comparative evaluation of multiple LLMs is presented in Section 5.4. Several key parameters affect the LLM’s behavior: The *temperature* [14] (ranging from 0 to 1) regulates output randomness, with higher values encouraging creative variation, and lower values leading to more deterministic outputs; while the *top-p* parameter [14] (also ranging from 0

Algorithm 1 CFG Generation**Input:** Steps in main flow and other flows of use-case description**Output:** CFG $G = (S, E)$ with root R

```

1: Preprocess: Merge all steps into one ordered sequence
2: Let  $S = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n\}$  be the resulting ordered nodes
3: Set root  $R := S_1$ ; Initialize edge sequence  $E := \emptyset$  and edge weight  $W := \emptyset$ 
4: Add edge  $E_1 := S_1 \rightarrow S_2$ , set  $W(E_1) := 1$ 
5: for each step  $S_i$  do
6:   if  $S_{i+1}$  contains a condition then
7:     add edge  $E_i := S_i \rightarrow S_{i+1}$                                 ▶ For the true condition
8:     add edge  $E_{i+1} := S_i \rightarrow S_{i+2}$                                 ▶ For the false condition
9:     set  $W(E_i), W(E_{i+1}) := W(E_{i-1}) + 1$ 
10:  else
11:    add edge  $E_i := S_i \rightarrow S_{i+1}$ 
12:    set  $W(E_i) := W(E_{i-1}) + 1$ 
13:  end if
14: end for

```

to 1) limits token choices to the smallest set whose cumulative probability surpasses p , filtering out unlikely tokens.

Following OpenAI's guidelines [49], and previous work [14], we set the temperature to 0.0 (to ensure reproducibility), and *top-p* to 1.0 (to maintain controlled diversity). Both the *frequency penalty* and *presence penalty* [14] were kept at their default values (0.0), ensuring no additional constraints on repeated terms, and preserving a natural output structure.

The prompt (Section 3.2.1) containing a use case is input to the LLM, which then generates the CFG. Figure 3 shows an example use case, with its generated CFG, corresponding test paths, and structured test cases formatted in JSON format — all generated using GPT-4o. The JSON-encoded CFG consists of *nodes* and *edges*. Conditional nodes may have two child nodes, each labeled with a textual statement corresponding to a step in the use-case scenario. Edges are assigned weights to indicate the execution order in the control flow. However, we did not use these weights, and only included them for structural consistency with conventional CFGs [5]. When applicable, edges can also include *conditions* extracted from the logical flow of the use case.

3.2.3 CFG Verification. Although the LLM is explicitly instructed to avoid producing isolated nodes or edges, its inherent non-determinism [50] may, nevertheless, produce such things. A post-generation validation step is therefore applied.

A CFG is considered invalid if any of the following conditions are true:

- (1) *Isolated node*: If any node listed in the node set does not appear in any edge.
- (2) *Unreachable "secondary root"*: If a non-root node lacks incoming edges, it is inaccessible from the designated root.
- (3) *Orphaned reference*: If a node ID specified in the from or to field of an edge does not exist in the node list.

All node identifiers are first retrieved from the CFG: If the list is empty, the graph is deemed invalid. The first node in the list is treated as the root, and all node IDs appearing in the from and to fields of the edges are recorded. The node list is checked for each from and to element of each edge reference, with any mismatch indicating an orphaned reference. Any nodes that are not in either edge field are flagged as isolated. Each non-root node is checked for incoming edges, without

which it is also marked as invalid. If none of these situations are detected, the CFG is considered valid.

If the validation fails, then the LLM is re-prompted to regenerate the CFG until a valid structure is produced. The validated CFG is then used in the subsequent test-path extraction.

3.3 Step ②: Test-Path Extraction

Given a verified CFG $G = (S, E)$, this step enumerates all feasible test paths, ensuring that every node and edge is covered at least once. Figure 3 illustrates an example of the resulting test paths. DFS with pruning is used to avoid infinite expansion due to cycles: If a node is revisited within the current path, the traversal stops, and the path is recorded. If an edge includes an associated condition, then the condition is preserved as a distinct step in the path, providing additional context for subsequent test case creation.

This step involves the following stages (Algorithm 2):

- (1) *Adjacency-list construction*: This transforms the edge set E into an adjacency list Adj , where each entry stores the target node and any associated condition.

Algorithm 2 Test-Path Extraction

Input: Verified CFG $G = (S, E)$, where each node $s \in S$ has an identifier and statement; each edge $(u, v) \in E$ may have an optional condition

Output: Set of test paths T , each as an ordered list of textual steps

```

1: Let  $root :=$  first node in  $S$ 
2: Build adjacency list  $Adj$  from  $E$ , storing  $(neighbor, condition)$  for each edge
3: Initialize empty set  $P := \emptyset$  to store all paths
4: Define recursive procedure  $DFS(curr, path)$ 
5: if  $curr \in path$  then
6:   Append copy of  $path$  to  $P$  ▶ Save current path when cycle detected to avoid infinite loops
7:   return
8: end if
9: Append  $curr$  to  $path$  ▶ Add current node to path
10: if  $Adj[curr]$  is empty then
11:   Append  $path$  to  $P$  ▶ Save complete path when path completion
12:   return
13: end if
14: for all  $(nbr, cond) \in Adj[curr]$  do
15:    $path' :=$  copy of  $path$ 
16:   if  $cond \neq \text{null}$  then
17:     Append "condition:  $cond$ " to  $path'$  ▶ Add condition step
18:   end if
19:    $DFS(nbr, path')$  ▶ Recursive exploration
20: end for
21: Call  $DFS(root, [])$  ▶ Start traversal from root
22: Map each node ID in  $P$  to its corresponding statement
23: Insert each preserved condition as a separate step
24: Collect the resulting step sequences into  $T$ 
25: return  $T$ 

```




Fig. 5. LLM prompt for generating test cases based on a test path.

- (2) *Path enumeration*: Starting from the root node, DFS enumerates all distinct paths that terminate at leaf nodes or cycle entry points (previously visited nodes), recording conditions as separate steps.
- (3) *Path translation*: Node identifiers are replaced in each path with their corresponding NL statements. Conditions are retained as independent steps, producing readable test scenarios.

3.4 Step ③: Test Case Creation

The test-creation step involves passing each textual test path (from Step ②) and the original use-case description to the LLM. Figure 5 shows the prompt (Prompt #2), which defines the role, specifies the instructions, and includes a test-case example. The LLM produces a complete test case for each test path. Any LLM output not conforming to the expected format cannot be rendered correctly in the web interface: In such cases, the LLM is prompted to regenerate the test case, enabling a fully automated workflow.

This per-path strategy ensures that the created test cases are internally coherent, directly traceable to a specific execution path in the CFG, and provide comprehensive coverage of the original use case. This design enhances clarity, preserves contextual integrity, and ensures semantic completeness.

4 Experimental Setup

4.1 Research Questions

Four research questions (RQs) guided the evaluation of the proposed approach's effectiveness. These RQs examined the correctness of the LLM-generated CFGs; the coverage and quality of the resulting test cases; and the impact of using different LLMs.

- **RQ1**: How accurate are LLM-generated CFGs compared to a manually-constructed ground truth?
- **RQ2**: How comprehensively does the proposed approach achieve test case coverage, compared with the baseline?
- **RQ3**: How does the quality of test cases created by LLMCFG-TGen compare with the baseline?

- **RQ4:** How do different LLMs perform, in terms of efficiency and accuracy, when generating CFGs?

4.2 Datasets

To answer the RQs, we conducted experiments using multiple use-case datasets. Four datasets were collected from previous studies and public repositories: The key details are summarized in Table 1, where the datasets are referred to as UC1, UC2, UC3, and UC4:

- **UC1:** UC1 has 12 use cases focusing on remote patient monitoring in the healthcare domain. It includes non-human “Device” actors, emphasizing device-patient-system interactions. Its format lacks explicit “Title” or “Postconditions” fields, unlike UC3 and UC4.
- **UC2:** UC2 has 13 use cases that cover cross-domain scenarios (including e-commerce, logistics, and automotive). Unlike the single-domain focus of UC1, UC3, and UC4, the UC2 format is flexible, with domain-specific elements (e.g., “Bounded Alternative Flow” for automotive use cases): This helps test the adaptability of the proposed method.
- **UC3:** UC3 has five use cases, and is a manually-refined healthcare dataset centered on vital sign management. It focuses on human-human interactions (in contrast to UC1’s device-centric design), and has the most standardized format (each use case includes “ID”, “Title”, and detailed “Error Handling” elements).
- **UC4:** UC4 has 12 use cases targeting the game domain, including gamer-oriented operations (e.g., adding new AI) and high-level abstract use cases. The UC4 format integrates user roles into functional descriptions and includes unique “Comments” for cross-referencing (a feature not present in the other datasets).

These datasets span diverse domains and vary in specification detail, ensuring sufficient representativeness for evaluating the CFG generation, test-path extraction, and test-case creation.

4.3 Baseline Approaches

Two baseline approaches were used in our evaluations: (1) Direct test-case creation from use case using LLMs, denoted LLM (Direct); and (2) AGORA [14]:

- **LLM (Direct):** Using LLMs to create test cases directly is a common approach [24, 40]. This involves providing the LLM with a prompt containing the requirements, and asking it to generate test cases that adhere to the specified format. Our evaluation prompt had four main

Table 1. Use-Case Datasets Utilized in the Experiment

Dataset	Source	Description	#UCs	#Words (Total/Range)
UC1	AGORA: An Approach for Generating Acceptance Test Cases from Use Cases [14]	Remote monitoring of patients using wearable devices (e.g., smartwatch) that transmit physiological data to the system.	12	1782 (111 – 218)
UC2	Use cases collected from multiple prior studies [4, 22, 27, 28, 31, 34, 56, 60]	Case studies from different domains such as <i>search</i> , <i>seller submits an offer</i> , etc.; overall well-structured and representative.	13	1793 (57 – 287)
UC3	ECHO: An Approach to Enhance Use Case Quality Exploiting Large Language Models [13]	Patient measurement management system; use cases refined and standardized by domain engineers.	5	1202 (176 – 304)
UC4	PURE: A Dataset of Public Requirements Documents [19]	From the requirements document <i>triangle.pdf</i> , describing core functions of a simple game (e.g., startup, save/load, AI setting).	12	1324 (85 – 183)
All	–	–	42	6100 (57 – 304)

components: A role definition; instructions for creating the test cases; an output example; and the original use case. The design of this prompt aligns with the LLMCFG-TGen Prompt #2 (Section 3.4). The prompt was provided to the LLM, and its test case generation capability was assessed.

- **AGORA:** AGORA uses LLMs in a two-step pipeline designed to create acceptance test cases automatically [14]. In the first step, AGORA analyzes the use case to identify testable flows (such as main, alternative, and exception flows), producing a list of test cases. In the second step, it generates detailed information for each test-case entry (including preconditions, participating actors, and step-by-step instructions with inputs and expected results).

LLM (Direct) is a straightforward, commonly-used approach: It enables us to assess the core capability of LLMs in test case generation from minimal input. In contrast, AGORA is a structured and systematic methodology that ensures comprehensive test coverage through a multi-step pipeline. The combination of these two baselines enables a balanced and diverse assessment of other test-case creation techniques.

4.4 Evaluation Procedure and Metrics

To answer the RQs, we assessed the quality and reliability of the CFGs and the test cases produced by LLMCFG-TGen. The evaluation examined both the **effectiveness** and the practitioners' **satisfaction**. The *effectiveness evaluation* quantitatively measured the correctness and completeness of the generated artifacts (CFGs and test cases) against a manually-established ground truth, comparing the results with those of the baseline methods. The ground-truth CFGs were developed independently by three doctoral students specializing in computer technology and applications. All three had prior industry experience (two had worked in software testing, and one in software development), and had a solid understanding of use-case modeling and control flow structures. Their domain expertise ensured the quality and consistency of the reference CFGs. Any discrepancies among their initial versions were resolved through collaborative discussion, resulting in a consolidated and reliable reference set for evaluation. In contrast, the *satisfaction evaluation* relied on industry experts to review and judge the generated test cases.

4.4.1 Effectiveness Evaluation. The effectiveness evaluation quantitatively assessed the structural accuracy of the LLM-generated CFGs, and the consistency of the generated test paths (compared with those derived from the ground-truth CFGs). Four complementary metrics were employed: *Precision/Recall/F1-score* [51]; *normalized Graph Edit Distance (nGED)* [1, 55]; *Discrepancy Rate*; and *Average Absolute Difference (Avg. $|\Delta|$)*.

- **Precision/Recall/F1-score for Nodes and Edges:** To evaluate the structural quality of the generated CFGs, the nodes and edges of each LLM-generated CFG were compared with a manually-constructed ground truth. The cosine similarity measured the node similarity [35] between sentence embeddings generated by a pre-trained BERT-based model (*all-mpnet-base-v2* [17] within the *SentenceTransformers* framework [54]). The Hungarian algorithm [37] (implemented with the `linear_sum_assignment` function in the SciPy package [59]) established the optimal node correspondences. Two nodes were considered equivalent when their cosine similarity exceeded a predefined threshold. Based on pilot experiments and earlier studies [24], a cosine similarity threshold of 0.75 was selected to balance the precision and recall. When nodes were matched, their identifiers were synchronized, and their edge relationships in the graph were compared to assess the accuracy of connectivity. The graphs were constructed using the *NetworkX* library [23]. Suppose *TP*, *FP*, and *FN* denote the numbers of true positives (correctly matched nodes/edges), false positives (extra nodes/edges not in the ground truth), and false negatives (ground-truth nodes/edges missing in the

generated outputs), respectively. Precision, recall, and F1 can be calculated as:

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \quad (2)$$

$$F1 = \frac{2 \times \text{Precision} \times \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}} \quad (3)$$

Higher precision indicated that a larger proportion of the generated items were correctly matched to the manually constructed CFG — meaning fewer false generations. A higher recall meant that the generated nodes successfully matched more items in the manually constructed CFG — meaning fewer missing nodes. (These interpretations apply to both the nodes and the edges.) The F1-score offers a unified metric that balances precision and recall, reflecting overall matching quality. Together, these metrics quantified the structural accuracy and completeness of the generated CFGs.

- **Normalized Graph Edit Distance (nGED):** The normalized Graph Edit Distance (nGED) [1, 55] was also used to quantify the overall structural similarity. The nGED measures the minimum number of edits needed to convert one graph into another. Formally:

$$\text{nGED}(G_1, G_2) = 1 - \frac{\text{GED}(G_1, G_2)}{|V_1| + |E_1| + |V_2| + |E_2|} \quad (4)$$

(where $|V_i|$ and $|E_i|$ denote the numbers of nodes and edges, respectively, in graph G_i .) An nGED value close to 1.0 indicates strong structural alignment, while values nearer to 0.0 represent significant topological differences. (The graph constructions and comparisons were implemented in Python using the *NetworkX* library [23].)

- **Discrepancy Rate:** The *Discrepancy Rate* measured the proportion of use cases in which the number of test paths generated from the LLM-derived CFGs differed from that obtained from the ground truth CFGs.

$$\text{Discrepancy Rate (\%)} = \frac{N_{\text{diff}}}{N_{\text{UCs}}} \times 100\%, \quad (5)$$

(where N_{diff} denotes the number of use cases with mismatched path counts, and N_{UCs} represents the total number of use cases.) A lower discrepancy rate indicates greater consistency between generated and reference path enumerations, suggesting behavioral alignment in the underlying CFG structures.

- **Average Absolute Difference (Avg. $|\Delta|$):** We computed the *Average Absolute Difference* (Avg. $|\Delta|$), across all use cases, to quantify the magnitude of deviation in the number of generated test paths:

$$\text{Avg. } |\Delta| = \frac{1}{N_{\text{UCs}}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{UCs}}} |\text{LLM}_{\text{path count}, i} - \text{GroundTruth}_{\text{path count}, i}| \quad (6)$$

(where N_{UCs} is the total number of use cases; $\text{LLM}_{\text{path count}, i}$ is the number of test paths generated from the LLM-based CFG for the i -th use case; and $\text{GroundTruth}_{\text{path count}, i}$ is the number of paths derived from the ground truth CFGs.) A smaller Avg. $|\Delta|$ value indicates that the generated test paths more closely reflect the behavioral complexity captured by the ground-truth CFGs.

These four metrics collectively captured both the structural and behavioral alignment between the generated and ground-truth CFGs, providing a comprehensive and objective assessment of generation effectiveness.

4.4.2 Satisfaction Evaluation. Answering RQ3 required an evaluation of the perceived quality of the LLMCFG-TGen test cases, compared to the baseline, as judged by industry practitioners. The expert panel consisted of one quality assurance (QA) manager and three senior test engineers from a large international company specializing in consumer multimedia software for managing, editing, and sharing digital photos, videos, and music. Each expert had 13–20 years of professional experience in software testing.

For every use case within the datasets, two sets of test cases were evaluated: One generated by AGORA and the other by LLMCFG-TGen. Both sets were created under identical experimental conditions, using the same GPT-4o settings and source use-case descriptions. To ensure consistent and efficient assessment, we developed a web-based HTML interface that presented the original use case alongside two anonymized test case sets (MethodA vs. MethodB) in a side-by-side layout: This enabled a direct comparison and rating across predefined dimensions, thus minimizing cognitive load and ensuring fairness (by maintaining a consistent level of contextual information). Figure 6 shows a simplified screenshot of the interface (the complete tool is accessible via our public GitHub repository <https://github.com/aimeenorwind/LLMCFG-TGen/>).

The interview-based evaluation session lasted approximately two hours. We first introduced the procedure and then provided a brief overview of the use cases. Due to the limited expert availability, detailed feedback was only collected for 20 use cases (the first five from each dataset): This covered 113 corresponding test cases generated by AGORA and LLMCFG-TGen.

Following the evaluation criteria established in previous studies [7, 61], the practitioners were asked to assess the two sets of test cases across four quality dimensions: *Relevance*, *Completeness*, *Correctness*, and *Clarity*.

- **Relevance:** This assesses whether or not the test case preserves the intent of the original requirement or use case. A relevant test case should accurately reflect the intended behavior, avoiding ambiguity, misunderstanding, or hallucinated content.
- **Completeness:** This evaluates whether or not the test case fully covers all critical behaviors, conditions, and paths described in the source use case. Possible situations include a complete omission of a test case, or some test suites may be incomplete (lacking essential elements such as titles, preconditions, steps, inputs, or outputs).
- **Correctness:** This refers to the logical and semantic validity of the test case. A correct test case should follow a coherent structure, aligned with the domain logic and requirements' constraints. Redundant, illogical, or contradictory elements negatively impact the correctness.
- **Clarity:** The clarity refers to how readable and unambiguous the test case is: Clear test cases present titles, preconditions, and steps concisely and unambiguously. This then facilitates interpretation by human testers or use by other tools.

The test cases were evaluated across each of the four dimensions using a five-point Likert scale [41], where 5 indicates Strongly Agree, 4 Agree, 3 Neutral, 2 Disagree, and 1 Strongly Disagree. Each test case was evaluated by the four domain experts according to the criteria, with the scores then aggregated and analyzed. These scores represented satisfaction, quantifying the practitioners' subjective judgments. Qualitative feedback was also collected from the experts, about their experiences with LLMCFG-TGen and their perceptions of the generated test cases.




Table 2. Evaluation of LLMCFG-TGen and Ground-Truth CFGs (Similarity Threshold = 0.75)

Dataset	Manual	LLMCFG-TGen	Manual	LLMCFG-TGen	Nodes			Edges			nGED
	CFG Nodes	CFG Nodes	CFG Paths	CFG Paths	Precision	Recall	F1	Precision	Recall	F1	
UC1	70	72	22	22	0.951	0.979	0.963	0.892	0.928	0.908	0.980
UC2	119	121	40	39	0.865	0.850	0.849	0.765	0.766	0.754	0.912
UC3	53	54	19	19	0.846	0.868	0.856	0.598	0.658	0.623	0.894
UC4	62	61	23	23	0.899	0.933	0.912	0.746	0.781	0.760	0.946
Total/Avg.	304	308	104	103	0.890	0.907	0.895	0.750	0.783	0.761	0.933

0.0 (to ensure deterministic outputs), and other parameters set at their default values. *GPT-4o* was used in the evaluations for RQ1–RQ3; and all three LLMs were used for RQ4.

To support reproducibility, all datasets, configuration files, and evaluation scripts are available on GitHub (<https://github.com/aimeenorwind/LLMCFG-TGen/>).

5 Experimental Results

This section presents the experimental findings and provides detailed answers to the four RQs (Section 4.1).

5.1 Answer to RQ1: How Accurate are LLM-generated CFGs Compared to A Manually-Constructed Ground Truth?

RQ1 was addressed by comparing the CFGs generated by *GPT-4o* with Prompt #1 against a manually-constructed ground truth.

Table 2 provides a summary of the results, reporting the total number of nodes and paths across all use cases in each dataset. The table includes the precision, recall, and F1-score for both nodes and edges, as well as the nGED. The reported values are the averages across all use cases in each dataset. The bottom row of the table provides the total number of nodes and paths, as well as the average precision, recall, F1-score, and nGED values.

As shown in Table 2, the number of CFG nodes generated in each dataset by *GPT-4o* only differs by one or two from the ground truth. Furthermore, three of the four datasets have the same number of paths, with UC2 differing by just one path. These results show that the LLM-generated CFGs closely match the manual versions, in terms of size. The average node-level precision, recall, and F1 scores — 0.890, 0.907, and 0.895, respectively — also show that *GPT-4o* can effectively capture the semantics of the ground-truth CFGs. Lower similarity cases typically occur when *GPT-4o* paraphrases or condenses the original statements, resulting in slight reductions in the alignment scores. The edge-level scores are slightly lower — this may be due to deviations in a single node affecting multiple edges, thereby amplifying local structural differences. Nevertheless, the average nGED was 0.933, confirming that the generated CFGs remain structurally close to their manually-constructed counterparts.

Figure 7 shows box plot distributions of the evaluations across individual use cases. The node-level values are largely concentrated between 0.8 and 1.0, with many CFGs showing perfect alignment (scores of 1.0). The edge-level scores are more widely dispersed, typically ranging from 0.5 to 1.0: This is expected, since a single node deviation can affect multiple edges and amplify the local structural differences. Nonetheless, several cases do show complete edge-level matches. The nGED scores also cluster between 0.8 and 1.0, indicating a strong structural similarity between the generated and ground-truth CFGs. These results show that using *GPT-4o* in our method, when guided by the provided prompts, is consistently successful in both the structural and semantic aspects of CFG construction, capturing the logic of the original use cases.




Fig. 7. CFG evaluation comparison (LLM-generated compared with ground-truth).

Summary of Answers to RQ1: The CFGs generated by LLMCFG-TGen closely match the ground truths. The precision, recall, F1, and nGED scores are consistently high, confirming that LLMCFG-TGen can synthesize CFGs that are both structurally and semantically aligned with manually-constructed ground-truth CFGs.

5.2 Answer to RQ2: How Comprehensively Does the Proposed Approach Achieve Test Case Coverage, Compared with the Baseline?

Test-case effectiveness can be measured not only by correctness, but also by overall coverage [36]. To answer RQ2, we compared LLMCFG-TGen test cases against two baselines, LLM (Direct) and AGORA (Section 4.3). Table 3 reports the results in terms of total number of test cases (#TC), *Discrepancy Rate*, and *Avg. |Δ|*. As explained in Section 4.4.1, the *Discrepancy Rate* is the proportion of use cases for which the number of generated test cases differs from that of the ground-truth. The *Avg. |Δ|* captures the average size of any differences, reflecting how substantial the deviations are (if they occur).

Each use case typically corresponds to multiple paths in the manually-constructed CFG. These paths determines the expected number of test cases. Table 3 shows that only the LLMCFG-TGen test-case count closely aligns with the number of manually-constructed CFG paths: LLM (Direct) generates 33 more test cases, suggesting possible redundancy; and AGORA has seven fewer, indicating possible omissions. LLMCFG-TGen also has the lowest *Discrepancy Rate* (2.38), introducing the fewest use cases with mismatched path counts: LLM (Direct) and AGORA are substantially higher, at 57.00 and 33.33, respectively. LLMCFG-TGen also has the lowest *Avg. |Δ|* value (0.02),

Table 3. Comparison of Test-Case Creation Approaches (LLM: GPT-4o)

Dataset	#UCs	Manual CFG Paths	#TCs			Discrepancy Rate (%)			Avg. Δ		
			LLM (Direct)	AGORA	LLMCFG-TGen	LLM (Direct)	AGORA	LLMCFG-TGen	LLM (Direct)	AGORA	LLMCFG-TGen
UC1	12	22	32	20	22	50.00	25.00	0.00	0.83	0.33	0.00
UC2	13	40	54	37	39	69.00	38.46	7.69	1.69	0.54	0.08
UC3	5	19	22	22	19	60.00	60.00	0.00	0.60	0.60	0.00
UC4	12	23	29	18	23	50.00	25.00	0.00	1.00	0.42	0.00
Total	42	104	137	97	103	57.00	33.33	2.38	1.12	0.45	0.02




Fig. 8. “View alert” use case with generated test cases.

indicating minimal deviation when discrepancies do occur. These results confirm that LLMCFG-TGen provides the most consistent test-case coverage, relative to the manually-generated CFG paths, outperforming both baselines in terms of completeness.

We examined the use cases with discrepancies to identify why LLM (Direct) and AGORA underperformed relative to LLMCFG-TGen: Most of these cases involved multiple conditional branches. Figure 8 shows a representative example of the “View alert” use case, for which LLM (Direct) generated four separate test cases to achieve full coverage. However, TC-003 already subsumes the logic of TC-001 and TC-002, making these additional cases redundant. AGORA, which relies on the structured format of the use case, overlooked the relationship between the main scenario and alternative flows, producing redundant test cases by treating them as independent paths. In contrast, LLMCFG-TGen used the CFG to interpret conditions expressed in NL statements, enabling precise identification of valid paths and generation of comprehensive test cases without redundancies. In the use cases, conditional sentences often appear in forms such as “If ... then ... otherwise ...” or “In a solitaire game, ...; In a two-player game, ...”: LLMCFG-TGen consistently identified the correct branch structure in these cases, producing more precise and coherent test cases.

Summary of Answers to RQ2: Compared with the baselines, LLMCFG-TGen produces several test cases that most closely match the path count of the ground-truth CFG, achieving a *Discrepancy Rate* of 2.38 and an Avg. $|\Delta|$ of 0.02. This demonstrates the benefit of using a CFG as an explicit intermediate representation (with its explicit conditions, branches, and joins), reducing both missing and redundant test cases.

Table 4. Expert Evaluation of Generated Test Cases

Evaluator	Relevance		Completeness		Correctness		Clarity	
	AGORA	LLMCFG-TGen	AGORA	LLMCFG-TGen	AGORA	LLMCFG-TGen	AGORA	LLMCFG-TGen
Test Engineer 1	4.10	4.85	4.10	4.90	4.65	5.00	4.10	4.95
Test Engineer 2	4.80	4.95	3.80	4.95	3.75	4.90	4.15	4.95
Test Engineer 3	3.85	4.40	3.45	4.20	3.40	4.00	3.10	4.10
QA Manager	4.25	4.80	4.00	4.50	3.15	4.15	3.55	3.90
Average	4.25	4.75	3.84	4.64	3.74	4.51	3.73	4.48

5.3 Answer to RQ3: How Does the Quality of Test Cases Created by LLMCFG-TGen Compare with the Baseline?

We conducted interviews with four domain experts to answer RQ3. Each expert used the four evaluation criteria described in Section 4.4.2 to assess 20 use cases and the 113 corresponding test cases produced by AGORA and LLMCFG-TGen. Given the substantial amount of discrepancies in the test cases produced by LLM (Direct), as explained in Section 5.2, we limited this comparison to AGORA and LLMCFG-TGen. Table 4 summarizes the results, where scores are the average for that expert across all use cases. The bottom row presents the overall averages across all experts.

As shown in Table 4, all practitioners rated LLMCFG-TGen higher than AGORA, across all four evaluation dimensions. The *Relevance* difference was modest, with both methods scoring above 4.0 (4.25 for AGORA vs. 4.75 for LLMCFG-TGen): This indicates that the created test cases were generally consistent with the intent of the source use cases. In contrast, the *Completeness*, *Correctness*, and *Clarity* differences were more pronounced, highlighting LLMCFG-TGen’s advantages in coverage, accuracy, and readability. The one LLMCFG-TGen score less than 4.0 (3.90), for *Clarity*, was given by the QA manager, who commented that although the test cases were clear, they were occasionally verbose. To better support the fast-paced testing process, the QA manager emphasized that more concise phrasing is preferred. This suggests that enhancing the summarizing capability of the underlying LLM could further improve usability.

The qualitative feedback reinforced the quantitative findings. Experts noted that the LLMCFG-TGen test cases were more comprehensive, had clearer titles, well-defined preconditions, and coherent step flows that were complete and easy to follow. They also said that LLMCFG-TGen substantially reduced the manual effort required for test design, and that it was beneficial for junior engineers or new project members, as it provides explicit guidance on executing test procedures. In contrast, the senior testers familiar with the project context identified some outputs as being slightly verbose, indicating a preference for more concise formats (such as checklists with only test-case titles). All experts agreed that the LLMCFG-TGen test cases performed well across all evaluated dimensions. They suggested that extending LLMCFG-TGen to support the generation of executable test scripts would further enhance its practical value.

Summary of Answers to RQ3: The expert evaluations confirm that the LLMCFG-TGen test cases achieve higher coverage with fewer cases, and were more accurate and readable than those produced by the baseline method. Since each test case is derived from explicit CFG paths that encode actor actions, system responses, and conditions, the resulting test suites are clearer and more aligned with manually-created ones.

Table 5. Comparison of Different LLMs Generating CFGs with LLMCFG-TGen

LLM	Release Date	CFG Nodes (vs. 304)	CFG Paths (vs. 103)	Disc. Rate (%)	Avg. $ \Delta $	Node F1	Edge F1	nGED	CFG Gen. Time (s)
GPT-4o	2024.05	308	103	2.30	0.02	0.895	0.761	0.933	335.73
Gemini 2.5 Flash	2025.06	314	110	16.67	0.17	0.862	0.683	0.912	1005.61
LLaMA4 Scout-Inst.	2025.04	314	106	11.90	0.17	0.865	0.696	0.909	539.64

5.4 Answer to RQ4: How Do Different LLMs Perform, in Terms of Efficiency and Accuracy, When Generating CFGs?

To assess the performance of LLMCFG-TGen with different LLMs, we conducted a comparative study using *Gemini 2.5 Flash* [21], *LLaMA4 Scout Instruct* [47], and *GPT-4o* [26]. Because the quality of the generated CFGs directly determines the reliability of the test cases, our analysis focused on the accuracy and structural completeness of the generated CFGs. To ensure a fair comparison and minimize potential bias, all models were prompted with the same task description and evaluated under identical experimental settings, as detailed in Section 4.5.

Table 5 presents the results, including the number of CFG nodes and paths, *Discrepancy Rate* (“Disc. Rate (%)”), Avg. $|\Delta|$, node-level F1, edge-level F1, nGED, and CFG generation time. The *Discrepancy Rate*, Avg. $|\Delta|$, node-level F1, edge-level F1, and nGED were computed by comparing with the ground-truth CFG. The CFG generation time refers to the time taken from receiving the use-case input to producing the corresponding valid CFG output.

As shown in Table 5, GPT-4o was able to generate the CFGs that were most consistent with the manual ones, with only four additional nodes, and matching the number of paths exactly. In contrast, the CFGs produced by both Gemini 2.5 and LLaMA4 had ten additional nodes, and seven and three additional paths, respectively. These differences suggest that Gemini 2.5 and LLaMA4 may introduce redundant test paths. GPT-4o had the lowest *Discrepancy Rate* (2.30%) and Avg. $|\Delta|$ (0.02); with Gemini 2.5 (16.67%, 0.17) and LLaMA4 (11.90%, 0.17) both having deviations. Despite these differences, the results are all better than those observed for AGORA (Table 3). GPT-4o also performed best for the node-level F1, edge-level F1, and nGED (0.895, 0.761, and 0.933, respectively), with Gemini 2.5 and LLaMA4 showing comparable but slightly poorer scores. In terms of generation efficiency, GPT-4o was the fastest (335.73 s), followed by LLaMA4 (539.64 s), with Gemini 2.5 being the slowest (1005.61 s) — due to repeated model invocations triggered by CFG-validation failures during generation. The superior GPT-4o’s performance may have been due to the prompt having been optimized for GPT-4o inference behavior (Section 3.2.1).

Summary of Answers to RQ4: Although all three evaluated LLMs were capable of generating high-quality CFGs under a consistent prompting setup, GPT-4o had the best overall performance. This may have been because the prompt used was originally optimized for GPT-4o’s inference behavior. The results suggest that model-specific prompt tuning could further enhance the quality, and reduce redundant model invocations resulting from CFG-validation retries.

5.5 Threats to Validity

Some factors may impact the generalizability and robustness of our findings. This section discusses possible validity threats and describes the measures taken to manage them.

Internal validity. The results may be influenced by variability in the “LLM-as-judge” procedure. Because LLMs can produce different outputs for the same prompt, due to stochastic decoding,

we fixed the prompt and set the temperature to 0 to ensure deterministic behavior. Furthermore, to minimize evaluator bias during the expert assessment, we concealed the origin of each test case: The evaluators were not informed which method generated which case, either during the interviews or during the evaluation.

Construct validity. Three complementary sets of metrics were used in the study: (1) CFG-level metrics (node-level and edge-level precision, recall, F1, and nGED); (2) test-case metrics (*Discrepancy Rate* and *Avg. $|\Delta|$*); and (3) practitioner metrics (Relevance, Completeness, Correctness, and Clarity). Each set has limitations: For example, although the *Discrepancy Rate* shows the number of differing use cases, it does not capture the magnitude of those differences. To address this, we reported the results across all metric sets, providing a multi-perspective view that reduces the risk of misinterpretation from any single metric.

External validity. We also acknowledge the limitations of our dataset selection. Although the evaluation spans multiple domains and formats, the coverage was not exhaustive. Certain domain-specific structures or linguistic patterns may be underrepresented, introducing potential selection bias, and limiting generalizability. Future work should adopt a broader sampling strategy to include a wider range of styles and domain characteristics.

6 Discussion

This section analyzes the strengths and limitations of LLMCFG-TGen in generating test cases from NL use-case descriptions across four multi-domain datasets, taking into account multiple evaluation metrics, including user satisfaction.

6.1 Strengths

6.1.1 Input Flexibility and Domain Independence. Unlike traditional methods [5, 60] that depend on rigid use-case templates or domain-specific models, LLMCFG-TGen accepts diverse use-case formats, and does not require manual preprocessing. The experimental results show that, across the four datasets spanning diverse domains and use-case formats, LLMCFG-TGen consistently produced high-quality test cases.

6.1.2 Full Automation and Model Validation. In contrast to approaches that require manual construction of intermediate models, LLMCFG-TGen automatically generates CFGs, in JSON format, using an LLM. Automated validation then ensures the completeness and correctness of the generated CFGs. A web-based interface enables one-click generation of test cases from NL use cases, substantially reducing manual effort, and improving accessibility.

6.1.3 High Coverage and Clarity of Generated Test Cases. The experimental results show that the LLMCFG-TGen test cases have comprehensive coverage, minimal redundancy, and high correctness and clarity. Practitioner evaluations confirmed that LLMCFG-TGen creates test suites that are both relevant and easy to interpret, emphasizing its practical value for test case generation from requirements.

6.2 Weaknesses

6.2.1 Single-Use-Case Processing. The current implementation processes one use case at a time. It does not yet support batch generation. Future work will extend the approach to handle multiple related use cases by identifying relationships such as inclusion and extension before CFG construction. By clustering related use cases into modules, the LLM could generate CFGs more efficiently, while preserving consistency across connected use cases. Furthermore, to support large-scale use cases, the efficiency and scalability of path enumeration will need to be enhanced.

6.2.2 Lack of Test Prioritization. The created test cases are not prioritized or ranked: Although LLMCFG-TGen produces comprehensive coverage, it does not consider execution order. Introducing prioritization — for example, executing main flows before exceptional paths — would improve testing efficiency, and better align with real-world testing practices. Future work will explore extending CFGs with path-level priority to enable automated test-case ranking.

6.2.3 Abstract Test Cases without Executable Scripts. The approach generates abstract test cases that can guide test engineers, but they do not include concrete input data or executable scripts. Linking abstract test cases to source code or runtime environments could enable the generation of fully executable test cases, thereby reducing manual effort and supporting end-to-end automation.

7 Conclusions and Future Work

This paper has proposed an end-to-end pipeline for generating test cases from NL use-case descriptions: It is called *Test Generation based on LLM-generated Control Flow Graphs* (LLMCFG-TGen). LLMCFG-TGen involves three steps: (1) generating a CFG using an LLM; (2) enumerating feasible execution paths; and (3) creating test cases from the paths. Experiments showed that LLMCFG-TGen produces CFGs that align closely with manually-constructed ones. Compared with direct LLM-based generation or another existing pipeline, LLMCFG-TGen generated test suites with higher coverage, lower redundancy, greater correctness, and clearer wording. LLMCFG-TGen has no specific use-case template requirements, does not need manual modeling, and is adaptable across different LLMs. Practitioner evaluations further confirmed that the generated test cases were comparable to manually-created ones, in terms of both readability and structural coherence.

Our future work will include expanding support to a wider spectrum of datasets and diverse types of NL requirements, including user stories and unstructured requirement specifications. This will require enhancing the robustness of CFG generation to better handle noisy, incomplete, or domain-specific inputs. Furthermore, incorporating interactive or adaptive mechanisms, such as human-in-the-loop feedback [45], may enable more comprehensive requirements analysis, integrating multimodal information (including text, images, and graphs). Finally, establishing a unified LLM-driven framework that connects requirements analysis, model generation, and test creation, execution, and evaluation, is an interesting direction for self-adaptive and explainable test generation from requirements. We look forward to engaging further with this goal.

Acknowledgment

This work in this paper was partly supported by the Science and Technology Development Fund of Macau, Macau SAR (Grant No. 0021/2023/RIA1), and the General Research Project of Zhejiang Provincial Department of Education (Grant No. Y202558065).

References

- [1] Zeina Abu-Aisheh, Romain Raveaux, Jean-Yves Ramel, and Patrick Martineau. 2015. An exact graph edit distance algorithm for solving pattern recognition problems. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Pattern Recognition Applications and Methods*. 271–278.
- [2] Tanwir Ahmad, Junaid Iqbal, Adnan Ashraf, Dragos Truscan, and Ivan Porres. 2019. Model-based testing using UML activity diagrams: A systematic mapping study. *Computer Science Review* 33 (2019), 98–112.
- [3] Sai Chaithra Allala, Juan P Sotomayor, Dionny Santiago, Tariq M King, and Peter J Clarke. 2019. Towards transforming user requirements to test cases using MDE and NLP. In *Proceedings of the IEEE 43rd Annual Computer Software and Applications Conference*, Vol. 2. 350–355.
- [4] Sai Chaithra Allala, Juan P Sotomayor, Dionny Santiago, Tariq M King, and Peter J Clarke. 2022. Generating abstract test cases from user requirements using MDSE and NLP. In *Proceedings of the 22th International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability and Security*. 744–753.

- [5] Thamer A Alrawashed, Ammar Almomani, Ahmad Althunibat, and Abdelfatah Tamimi. 2019. An automated approach to generate test cases from use case description model. *Computer Modeling in Engineering & Sciences* 119, 3 (2019), 409–425.
- [6] Anaconda, Inc. 2024. Conda Package Files, Version 24.5.0. <https://anaconda.org/anaconda/conda/files?version=24.5.0>. Accessed: November 25, 2025.
- [7] Chetan Arora, Tomas Herda, and Verena Himm. 2024. Generating test scenarios from NL requirements using retrieval-augmented LLMs: An industrial study. In *Proceedings of the IEEE 32nd International Requirements Engineering Conference*. 240–251.
- [8] Shreya Bhatia, Tarushi Gandhi, Dhruv Kumar, and Pankaj Jalote. 2024. System test case design from requirements specifications: Insights and challenges of using ChatGPT. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.03693* (2024). Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.03693>.
- [9] Robert Binder. 2000. *Testing Object-Oriented Systems: Models, Patterns, and Tools*. Addison-Wesley Professional.
- [10] International Software Testing Qualifications Board. 2014. Standard glossary of terms used in software testing.
- [11] Alistair Cockburn and Lord Cockburn. 2008. *Writing Effective Use Cases*. Pearson Education India.
- [12] André LL de Figueiredo, Wilkerson L Andrade, and Patrícia DL Machado. 2006. Generating interaction test cases for mobile phone systems from use case specifications. *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes* 31, 6 (2006), 1–10.
- [13] Gabriele De Vito, Fabio Palomba, Carmine Gravino, Sergio Di Martino, and Filomena Ferrucci. 2023. ECHO: An approach to enhance use case quality exploiting large language models. In *Proceedings of the 49th Euromicro Conference on Software Engineering and Advanced Applications*. 53–60.
- [14] Gabriele De Vito, Gabriele Vassallo, Fabio Palomba, and Filomena Ferrucci. 2024. AGORA: An approach for generating acceptance test cases from use cases. In *Proceedings of the 50th Euromicro Conference on Software Engineering and Advanced Applications*. 126–133.
- [15] Anurag Dwarakanath and Shubhashis Sengupta. 2012. Litmus: Generation of test cases from functional requirements in natural language. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Applications of Natural Language Processing and Information Systems*. 58–69.
- [16] Mohamed El-Attar and James Miller. 2010. Developing comprehensive acceptance tests from use cases and robustness diagrams. *Requirements Engineering* 15, 3 (2010), 285–306.
- [17] Hugging Face. 2021. sentence-transformers/all-mpnet-base-v2. <https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-mpnet-base-v2>. Accessed: November 24, 2025.
- [18] Alessio Ferrari, Sallam Abualhaija, and Chetan Arora. 2024. Model generation with LLMs: From requirements to UML sequence diagrams. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Requirements Engineering Conference Workshops*. 291–300.
- [19] Alessio Ferrari, Giorgio Oronzo Spagnolo, and Stefania Gnesi. 2017. PURE: A dataset of public requirements documents. In *Proceedings of the IEEE 25th International Requirements Engineering Conference*. 502–505.
- [20] Peter Fröhlich and Johannes Link. 2000. Automated test case generation from dynamic models. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming*. 472–491.
- [21] Google DeepMind. 2025. Gemini 2.5 Flash Model Documentation. https://ai.google.dev/gemini-api/docs/models?hl=zh-cn#gemini-2.5-flash_1. Accessed: November 25, 2025.
- [22] Javier J Gutierrez, Maria J Escalona, Manuel Mejias, Jesus Torres, and Arturo H Centeno. 2008. A case study for generating test cases from use cases. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Research Challenges in Information Science*. 209–214.
- [23] Aric Hagberg, Daniel Schult, Pieter Swart, and NetworkX Developers. 2025. NetworkX: Network Analysis in Python. <https://networkx.org/>. Accessed: November 24, 2025.
- [24] Navid Bin Hasan, Md Ashrafur Islam, Junaed Younus Khan, Sanjida Senjik, and Anindya Iqbal. 2025. Automatic high-level test case generation using large language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 22nd International Conference on Mining Software Repositories*. 674–685.
- [25] Xinyi Hou, Yanjie Zhao, Yue Liu, Zhou Yang, Kailong Wang, Li Li, Xiapu Luo, David Lo, John Grundy, and Haoyu Wang. 2024. Large language models for software engineering: A systematic literature review. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* 33, 8 (2024), 1–79.
- [26] Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al. 2024. GPT-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276* (2024). Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.21276>.
- [27] Adisak Intana, Kuljaree Tantayakul, Kanjana Laosen, and Suraiya Charoenreh. 2023. An approach of test case generation with software requirement ontology. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications* 14, 8 (2023).
- [28] Adisak Intana, Monchanok Thongthep, Phatcharee Thepnimit, Phaplak Saethapan, and Tanawat Monpipat. 2020. SYNTesT: Prototype of syntax test case generation tool. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Information Technology*. 259–264.

- [29] Ivar Jacobson. 1987. Object-oriented development in an industrial environment. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Object-Oriented Programming Systems, Languages and Applications*. 183–191.
- [30] Joxan Jaffar, Jorge A Navas, and Andrew E Santosa. 2010. A Path-Sensitive Control Flow Graph.
- [31] Mingyue Jiang and Zuohua Ding. 2011. Automation of test case generation from textual use cases. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Interaction Sciences*. 102–107.
- [32] Kunxiang Jin and Kevin Lano. 2021. Generation of test cases from UML diagrams - A systematic literature review. In *Proceedings of the 14th Innovations in Software Engineering Conference*. 1–10.
- [33] Long Kang, Jun Ai, and Minyan Lu. 2024. Automated structural test case generation for human-computer interaction software based on large language model. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Dependable Systems and Their Applications*. 132–140.
- [34] Nader Kesserwan, Jameela Al-Jaroodi, Nader Mohamed, and Imad Jawhar. 2023. Transforming software requirements into test cases via model transformation. *International Journal of Software Engineering & Applications* 14, 4 (2023).
- [35] Hiroyuki Kirinuki and Haruto Tanno. 2024. ChatGPT and human synergy in black-box testing: A comparative analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13924* (2024). Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.13924>.
- [36] Brahma Reddy Korrapolu, Pavitra Pinninti, and Y Raghu Reddy. 2025. Test case generation for requirements in natural language-An LLM comparison study. In *Proceedings of the 18th Innovations in Software Engineering Conference*. 1–5.
- [37] Harold W Kuhn. 1955. The Hungarian method for the assignment problem. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly* 2, 1-2 (1955), 83–97.
- [38] Daryl Kulak and Eamonn Guiney. 2012. *Use Cases: Requirements in Context*. Addison-Wesley.
- [39] Mohammed Lafi, Thamer Alrawashed, and Ahmad Munir Hammad. 2021. Automated test cases generation from requirements specification. In *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Information Technology*. 852–857.
- [40] Yihao Li, Pan Liu, Haiyang Wang, Jie Chu, and W Eric Wong. 2025. Evaluating large language models for software testing. *Computer Standards & Interfaces* 93 (2025), 103942.
- [41] Rensis Likert. 1932. A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of psychology* (1932).
- [42] Hyun-il Lim. 2020. An approach to comparing control flow graphs based on basic block matching. *Indian Journal of Computer Science and Engineering* 11, 3 (2020), 289–296.
- [43] Jin Wei Lim, Thiam Kian Chiew, Moon Ting Su, Simying Ong, Hema Subramaniam, Mumtaz Begum Mustafa, and Yin Kia Chiam. 2024. Test case information extraction from requirements specifications using NLP-based unified boilerplate approach. *Journal of Systems and Software* 211 (2024), 112005.
- [44] Pan Liu and Huaikou Miao. 2010. A new approach to generating high quality test cases. In *Proceedings of the 19th IEEE Asian Test Symposium*. 71–76.
- [45] Nuno Marques, Rodrigo Rocha Silva, and Jorge Bernardino. 2024. Using ChatGPT in software requirements engineering: A comprehensive review. *Future Internet* 16, 6 (2024), 180.
- [46] Alok Mathur, Shreyaan Pradhan, Prasoon Soni, Dhruvil Patel, and Rajeshkannan Regunathan. 2023. Automated test case generation using T5 and GPT-3. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Advanced Computing and Communication Systems*, Vol. 1. 1986–1992.
- [47] Meta AI. 2025. Llama 4 Model Overview. <https://www.llama.com/models/llama-4/>. Accessed: November 25, 2025.
- [48] Ahmad Mustafa, Wan MN Wan-Kadir, Noraini Ibrahim, Muhammad Arif Shah, Muhammad Younas, Atif Khan, Mahdi Zareei, and Faisal Alanazi. 2021. Automated test case generation from requirements: A systematic literature review. *Computers, Materials and Continua* 67, 2 (2021), 1819–1833.
- [49] OpenAI. 2025. OpenAI API Reference. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/api-reference/introduction>. Accessed: 2025-11-24.
- [50] Shuyin Ouyang, Jie M Zhang, Mark Harman, and Meng Wang. 2025. An empirical study of the non-determinism of ChatGPT in code generation. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* 34, 2 (2025), 1–28.
- [51] David Powers. 2011. Evaluation: From precision, recall and F-measure to ROC, informedness, markedness and correlation. *Journal of Machine Learning Technologies* 2, 1 (2011), 37–63.
- [52] Python Software Foundation. 2024. Python 3.12.4 Release. <https://www.python.org/downloads/release/python-3124/>. Accessed: November 25, 2025.
- [53] Tajmilur Rahman and Yuecai Zhu. 2024. Automated user story generation with test case specification using large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01558* (2024). Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.01558>.
- [54] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. SentenceTransformers: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. <https://sbert.net/>. Accessed: November 24, 2025.
- [55] Kaspar Riesen and Horst Bunke. 2009. Approximate graph edit distance computation by means of bipartite graph matching. *Image and Vision computing* 27, 7 (2009), 950–959.
- [56] Saurabh Tiwari and Atul Gupta. 2015. An approach of generating test requirements for agile software development. In *Proceedings of the 8th India Software Engineering Conference*. 186–195.

- [57] Saurabh Tiwari and Atul Gupta. 2020. Use case specifications: How complete are they? *Journal of Software: Evolution and Process* 32, 1 (2020), e2218.
- [58] Ravi Prakash Verma and Md Rizwan Beg. 2013. Generation of test cases from software requirements using natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Emerging Trends in Engineering and Technology*. 140–147.
- [59] Pauli Virtanen et al. 2025. SciPy: Scientific Library for Python. <https://scipy.org/>. Accessed: November 24, 2025.
- [60] Chunhui Wang, Fabrizio Pastore, Arda Goknil, and Lionel C Briand. 2020. Automatic generation of acceptance test cases from use case specifications: An NLP-based approach. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 48, 2 (2020), 585–616.
- [61] Fanyu Wang, Chetan Arora, Yonghui Liu, Kaicheng Huang, Chakkrit Tantithamthavorn, Aldeida Aleti, Dishan Sambathkumar, and David Lo. 2025. Multi-modal requirements data-based acceptance criteria generation using LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.06888* (2025). Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.06888>.
- [62] Junjie Wang, Yuchao Huang, Chunyang Chen, Zhe Liu, Song Wang, and Qing Wang. 2024. Software testing with large language models: Survey, landscape, and vision. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 50, 4 (2024), 911–936.
- [63] Zhiyi Xue, Liangguo Li, Senyue Tian, Xiaohong Chen, Pingping Li, Liangyu Chen, Tingting Jiang, and Min Zhang. 2024. LLM4Fin: Fully automatic LLM-powered test case generation for fintech software acceptance testing. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 1643–1655.
- [64] Zhenzhen Yang, Rubing Huang, Chenhui Cui, Nan Niu, and Dave Towey. 2025. Requirements-based test generation: A comprehensive survey. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3771727>
- [65] Hang Yin, Hamza Mohammed, and Sai Boyapati. 2024. Leveraging pre-trained large language models (LLMs) for on-premises comprehensive automated test case generation: An empirical study. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Intelligent Informatics and Biomedical Sciences*, Vol. 9. 597–607.
- [66] Man Zhang, Tao Yue, Shaukat Ali, Huihui Zhang, and Ji Wu. 2014. A systematic approach to automatically derive test cases from use cases specified in restricted natural languages. In *Proceedings of the 2014 International Conference on System Analysis and Modeling*. 142–157.

Received 3 December 2025