

AutoICE: Automatically Synthesizing Verifiable C Code via LLM-driven Evolution

Weilin Luo^[0000–0002–3733–9361], Xueyi Liang^[0009–0003–8661–8396], Haotian Deng^[0009–0007–7010–8278], Yanan Liu^[0000–0001–7357–1793], and Hai Wan^[0000–0001–5357–9130]

Sun Yat-sen University, School of Computer Science and Engineering, Guangzhou, China
 {luowlin5, wanhai}@mail.sysu.edu.cn,
 {liangxy233, denght7, liuyn56}@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

Abstract. Automatically synthesizing verifiable code from natural language requirements ensures software correctness and reliability while significantly lowering the barrier to adopting the techniques of formal methods. With the rise of large language models (LLMs), long-standing efforts at autoformalization have gained new momentum. However, existing approaches suffer from severe syntactic and semantic errors due to the scarcity of domain-specific pre-training corpora and often fail to formalize implicit knowledge effectively. In this paper, we propose **AutoICE**, an LLM-driven evolutionary search for synthesizing verifiable C code. It introduces the diverse individual initialization and the collaborative crossover to enable diverse iterative updates, thereby mitigating error propagation inherent in single-agent iterations. Besides, it employs the self-reflective mutation to facilitate the discovery of implicit knowledge. Evaluation results demonstrate the effectiveness of **AutoICE**: it successfully verifies 90.36% of code, outperforming the state-of-the-art (SOTA) approach. Besides, on a developer-friendly dataset variant, **AutoICE** achieves a 88.33% verification success rate, significantly surpassing the 65% success rate of the SOTA approach.

Keywords: Autoformalization · Verifiable C Code · Large Language Model · Evolutionary Search.

1 Introduction

Autoformalization, the process of automatically translating informal requirements, *e.g.*, natural language, into formal, machine-verifiable specifications, *e.g.*, ANSI/ISO C specification language (ACSL) [3], plays an increasingly pivotal role in formal methods. Due to the widespread use of C code, one of the practical and impactful directions of autoformalization is the automated synthesis of verifiable C code, namely ACSL-annotated code. Unlike standard code generation, synthesizing verifiable C code requires generating not only C code but also the corresponding formal specifications, *e.g.*, pre-conditions, post-conditions, and

loop invariants. By leveraging mature symbolic solvers, the correctness of the generated code can be mathematically proven. However, manually writing formal specifications is a creative process that requires developers to invest a lot of extra effort, experience, and expertise, because formal specification languages are closer to mathematics than traditional programming languages [63, 45, 25, 65]. The automated generation of high-quality, verifiable C code is crucial and urgent. It would significantly lower the barrier to entry for formal methods, which is of paramount importance for safety-critical domains such as finance, healthcare, and autonomous systems [40, 39, 45].

However, achieving high-quality autoformalization is challenging. *Semantic gap*: natural language is ambiguous, polysemous, and expressive, whereas formal languages require absolute precision and singularity. *Data scarcity*: high-quality pairs of informal requirements and formal specifications are extremely rare, hindering the development of learning-based approaches [47, 84, 58, 8].

With the rapid advancement of large language models (LLMs), their capabilities in natural language understanding and code generation have garnered significant attention [7, 10, 96]. Trained on ultra-large-scale text and code, LLMs offer a promising new avenue for autoformalization [11, 54]. LLMs demonstrate the ability to handle the semantic gap based on context. For example, Wu et al. [86] successfully utilized LLMs to translate mathematical competition problems into Isabelle/HOL, a task previously considered intractable. Cosler et al. [15] proposed a tool to interactively translate temporal properties in natural language to temporal logics with LLMs.

Building on this potential, Cao et al. [8] have explored synthesizing verifiable C code via LLMs. Despite some progress, existing LLM-based approaches still face severe limitations.

- Due to data scarcity and inherent hallucinations, LLMs frequently generate code with syntactic or semantic errors. While feedback from verifiers can signal verification failures, this feedback is often sparse. Furthermore, relying solely on LLMs to self-reflection code based on sparse feedback can lead to error accumulation rather than resolution.
- Due to variations in expertise among developers and the differences between formal languages and natural language, the requirements in natural language are often incomplete, making it difficult to formalize implicit knowledge. Natural language often omits implicit knowledge, *e.g.*, common-sense background knowledge and intermediate reasoning steps, yet formal systems strictly require complete logical chains to verify correctness.

Besides, current works often predicate their success on the availability of overly rich requirement descriptions. For example, Cao et al. [8] assume that the input requirements characterize not only the functionality of code but also provide explicit details regarding pre-conditions, post-conditions, and loop invariants. However, obtaining such detailed natural language requirements is challenging and imposes an additional cognitive burden on developers, requiring expertise they may not possess. A developer-friendly input should ideally consist solely of the functionality of code, leaving the complex formal intricacies




Fig. 1. Traditional requirements vs. developer-friendly requirements.

to be inferred by the automation tool. Fig. 1 illustrates the difference between traditional requirements and developer-friendly requirements.

To address these challenges, we propose **AutoICE**, a novel framework that leverages LLM-driven evolution to enhance the synthesis of verifiable C code. We model the synthesis task as the evolution of a code population, where each individual represents a candidate code. By integrating evolutionary search with logical verifiers, **AutoICE** effectively strikes a balance between exploration and exploitation. The exploration capability empowers LLMs to uncover implicit knowledge, while the exploitation capability facilitates the progressive generation of high-quality code. Specifically, **AutoICE** employs a diverse initialization strategy to guide the synthesis of diverse code as a population via diverse thinking. Intuitively, a diverse population provides a rich reservoir of implementation strategies. This heterogeneity increases the likelihood of capturing implicit knowledge and generating syntactically and semantically correct code. During evolutionary search, we introduce a cooperative crossover, which allows the insight of offspring synthesis to come from the comparison of parents, extracting valuable experience from parents to correct syntactic and semantic errors. Furthermore, to handle incomplete requirements, we design a self-reflective mutation that encourages LLMs to introduce new insights and discover implicit knowledge.

We assess **AutoICE** on 68 instances across two datasets. To ensure a comprehensive evaluation, we conduct experiments across a diverse set of LLM backbones, encompassing both open-source and closed-source models with varying parameter scales. We compare **AutoICE** against two state-of-the-art (SOTA) approaches: zero-shot prompting and fine-tuning approaches. Additionally, we introduce a strong LLM-verifier interactive baseline, where an LLM iteratively refines code based on feedback loops with verifiers. The results demonstrate that **AutoICE** achieves a consistent and significant improvement in the number of verifiable codes across all tested LLM backbones. In the best-performing scenario, **AutoICE** successfully verifies 90.36% of the instances, whereas the leading SOTA approach achieves only 85.36%, representing a substantial improvement of 5%. To further demonstrate practicality, we construct a developer-friendly variant

of the datasets by stripping away auxiliary specifications, such as pre/post-conditions and loop invariants, retaining only functional descriptions. On the developer-friendly variants, the performance gap between **AutoICE** and SOTA approaches widens (the average improvement increased from 15% to 26.66%). This result substantiates that our LLM-driven evolution is particularly effective at uncovering the implicit knowledge required for verification. Finally, ablation studies confirm the essential contributions of diverse individual initialization, collaborative crossover, the self-reflective mutation to the framework’s success.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 ANSI/ISO C Specification Language

The ANSI/ISO C specification language (ACSL) [3] is a behavioral specification language designed for formally annotating C code. An ACSL specification consists of several clause types that define the contract a function must fulfill. Common clause types include the *requires*, *assigns*, and *ensures* clauses. The *requires* clause states the preconditions that must hold before the function is executed. These conditions often involve constraints on input parameters and the validity of memory references. The *assigns* clause specifies which memory locations the function is permitted to modify during its execution. Besides, the *ensures* clause defines the postconditions that must be satisfied after the function completes, typically relating the output state to the inputs. The code that successfully verifies against its ACSL specification is guaranteed to adhere to the specified behavior. In addition to the three clauses, ACSL supports a variety of other clause types, which are detailed in its official documentation¹.

2.2 Frama-C and Its Weakest Precondition Plugin

As a platform for the static analysis and formal verification of C code, Frama-C [17, 38] has been used in safety-critical projects [6, 24, 80]. Frama-C can be used for syntax checking and basic validation of ACSL, *e.g.*, wrong order of clauses. To perform formal verification, the weakest precondition (WP) plugin of Frama-C can check whether the code behaviors conform to ACSL specifications and prove the properties of the code. Specifically, proof obligations are generated by the WP plugin of Frama-C, grounded in the principles of Hoare logic [30]. Then the Why platform [26] translates these obligations into logical goals. To prove the generated logical goals, Frama-C relies on automated theorem provers like Alt-Ergo [13], CVC4 [2], and Z3 [61] or on interactive proof assistants like Coq [14]. These provers attempt to verify these logical goals within specified limits. If a goal cannot be proven within the given limits, the plugin provides feedback to assist developers in refining either the code or its specification. A C code is considered formally verified with respect to its ACSL specification only after all goals generated by the WP plugin have been successfully proven.

¹ The official documentation of ACSL is publicly available at <https://frama-c.com/html/acsl.html>.

2.3 Large Language Models

With a large number of parameters, large language models (LLMs) are machine learning models trained on a vast corpus of data. Built on the Transformer architecture [81], SOTA LLMs employ decoder-only models [81] to generate text. Specifically, LLMs continuously predict the next token and append it to the input sequence until a stop token is predicted. The generation process enables LLMs to produce coherent and contextually relevant text. Decoder-only models have demonstrated strong performance on code-related tasks [11], such as code generation, comprehension, summarization, and transformation [27, 46, 86].

To effectively utilize LLMs for specialized tasks, *e.g.*, autoformalization, prompt engineering [1, 18, 20, 31, 36, 52] is essential. Prompt refers to the crafted inputs that guide LLMs toward desired outputs. While LLMs support conversational interaction, applying LLMs to specialized tasks needs carefully structured prompts that align with both the task objectives and the used LLMs [5, 71]. For example, program synthesis requires prompts to provide unambiguous task descriptions [1, 18] and include examples that conform to the target programming language.

3 Related Works

This section reviews existing works in the key areas: specification synthesis and the integration of LLMs with evolutionary search.

3.1 Specification Synthesis

Formal verification provides a rigorous approach for assuring that a system possesses critical properties. A key challenge is specification synthesis, *i.e.*, generating a formal language for verification. We summarize existing works by describing the transformation of different forms of input into formal languages.

From Informal Language to Verifiable Formal Language. With the significant progress of LLMs, lots of works recently has focused on the transformation from informal requirements, such as natural language requirements, to verifiable formal languages. Misu et al. [58] explored the capability and potentiality of LLMs at synthesizing Dafny. Lu et al. [55] envisioned a framework that combines software engineering and formal approaches to achieve ACSL-annotated code from natural language requirements. However, they do not provide the code, and the technical details are too vague to reproduce. Cao et al. [8] further contributed to a comprehensive assessment of the LLMs’ capability through considering five formal specifications, including Coq, Dafny, Lean4, ACSL, and TLA+. However, it is confined to basic zero-shot prompting and fine-tuning, overlooking further avenues for enhancement. Additionally, their datasets contains requirement descriptions that are unrealistically detailed and thus hard to acquire in real-world scenarios.

We explore a high-performance specification synthesis approach for ACSL and expanded the datasets, hoping to promote the development of developer-friendly approaches.

From Formal Language to Verifiable Formal Language. Generating verifiable formal languages from formal languages, *e.g.*, JAVA and C code, has been extensively studied. The verifiable formal languages of interest include, but are not limited to, class specifications [59], typestate specifications [4], preconditions [70, 16, 66], postconditions [69, 78, 77], loop invariants [22, 50, 93, 73, 76, 90, 37, 48, 85, 67, 9, 92, 84, 68], termination specification [43], API specifications [75], Isabelle [49, 27], and formal proof [89].

We, in particular, focuses on the synthesis of ACSL. Wen et al. [83] synthesized full ACSL specifications based on static analysis and program verification, including not only loop invariants but also preconditions, postconditions, and assigned variables. Existing LLM-based approaches often struggle with programs containing complex loop structures, which can lead to the generation of irrelevant specifications. To address this issue, Chen et al.[12] proposed an approach tailored for such programs, utilizing program slicing and logical deletion. Although the inputs to the works [83, 12] differ from the natural language requirements we are concerned with, their idea of combining LLMs with other techniques inspired us to combine LLMs with evolutionary search.

From Multimodal Inputs to Verifiable Formal Language. In addition, a line of works focuses on synthesizing specifications from multimodal inputs, which combine both formal and informal languages. For instance, Zhai et al. [97] synthesized specifications from code and its natural language comments. Furthermore, leveraging LLMs, Mukherjee and Delaware [62] generated Rocq/Coq from a combination of formal and informal specifications and test cases.

3.2 LLM-driven Evolutionary Search

A recent emerging paradigm is LLM-based evolutionary search, which synergizes LLMs with evolutionary search to automatically generate heuristics. This powerful combination has found widespread application in areas including code generation [64, 29] and text generation [28, 95]. FunSearch [72] first employs island-based evolution with LLMs to solve mathematical problems. Similarly, Lu et al.[51] proposed EoH to combine genetic algorithms with chain-of-thought to tackle combinatorial optimization challenges. And ReEvo [91] introduces a reflective mechanism using dual LLMs to refine heuristics. More recently, Dat et al.[19] proposed an adaptive LLM-based framework to maintain a balance between diversity and convergence with a harmony search algorithm. These approaches highlight the potential of integrating LLMs with evolutionary search.

4 LLM-driven Evolution

In this section, we present **AutoICE**, a novel framework that leverages LLM-driven evolution to enhance the synthesis of verifiable C code.

4.1 Overview

AutoICE takes natural language requirements as input and outputs an ACSL-annotated code. An vanilla approach can be repeated LLM generations with feedback coming from verifiers to search the code space, which suffers from error accumulation and lacks the ability to discover implicit knowledge. Therefore, we propose three mechanisms to fully unleash the power of LLMs, namely diverse individual initialization, collaborative crossover, and self-reflective mutation.

Algorithm 1: AutoICE

```

Input      : A natural language requirement  $r_{NL}$ .
Output    : ACSL-annotated code or ‘Not Synthesized’.
1  $pop \leftarrow \text{INITIALIZEPOPULATIONLLM}(r_{NL}, S_P)$ 
2 if There exists an individual  $\hat{I} = (c_{ind}, s_{syn}, inf\hat{o}_{syn}, s_{sem}, inf\hat{o}_{sem})$  in  $pop$ 
   with fitness( $\hat{I}$ ) = 2 then
3   return  $c_{ind}$ 
4 for The generation from 1 to #gen do
5    $pop' \leftarrow$  Select the top #elite individuals from  $pop$ 
6   while  $|pop'| < S_P$  do
7      $par_1, par_2 \leftarrow$  Randomly select two individuals from  $pop$  with the
       highest fitness value
8      $off_1, off_2 \leftarrow \text{CROSSOVERLLM}(par_1, par_2, r_{NL})$ 
9     if Randomly generate a number in  $[0, 1]$   $< \rho$  then
10     $off_1 \leftarrow \text{MUTATELLM}(off_1, r_{NL})$ 
11    if Randomly generate a number in  $[0, 1]$   $< \rho$  then
12     $off_2 \leftarrow \text{MUTATELLM}(off_2, r_{NL})$ 
13     $pop' \leftarrow pop' \cup \{off_1, off_2\}$ 
14   $pop \leftarrow pop'$ 
15  if There exists an individual  $\hat{I} = (c_{ind}, s_{syn}, inf\hat{o}_{syn}, s_{sem}, inf\hat{o}_{sem})$  in  $pop$ 
   with fitness( $\hat{I}$ ) = 2 then
16    return  $c_{ind}$ 
17 return ‘Not Synthesized’

```

Algorithm 1 outlines the overall workflow of **AutoICE**. Within the evolutionary search, LLMs play three roles: initializer, generating the initial population; crossover operator, producing offspring from parent pairs; and mutator, introducing mutations to generate variant offspring. First, we initialize a population

of size S_{IP} based on diverse individual initialization (Section 4.2), where S_{IP} is a hyperparameter (line 1). Then, we iteratively evolve the population through generations (lines 4-16). At each generation, the evolutionary search begins with the population generated by the previous generation, followed by three iterative steps: selection, crossover (Section 4.3), and randomly mutation with mutation rate ρ (Section 4.4), where ρ is a hyperparameter. For selection, we randomly retain $\#elite$ elite individuals from this generation, *i.e.*, those with the highest fitness (Equ. (2)), to prevent the optimal solution from being lost (line 5). Evolutionary search iterates continuously until it reaches the maximum generations $\#gen$ or finds code that can pass the WP plugin of Frama-C. $\#elite$ and $\#gen$ are hyperparameters. Notably, we maintain a fixed population size S_P based on S_{IP} and $\#elite$, as computed in Equ. (1).

$$S_P = \#elite + \lceil (S_{IP} - \#elite)/2 \rceil \cdot 2 \quad (1)$$

Individual encoding. We define an individual as ACSL-annotated code along with its verification-related information. Formally, an individual is a 5-tuple $I = (c_{ind}, s_{syn}, info_{syn}, s_{sem}, info_{sem})$, where c_{ind} is an ACSL-annotated code, s_{syn} and s_{sem} are whether c_{ind} passes Frama-C and the WP plugin of Frama-C, respectively, and $info_{syn}$ and $info_{sem}$ are the hints output by Frama-C and the WP plugin of Frama-C, respectively. If c_{ind} passes Frama-C, then $s_{syn} = 1$; otherwise, $s_{syn} = 0$; if c_{ind} passes the WP plugin of Frama-C, then $s_{sem} = 1$; otherwise, $s_{sem} = 0$. Once c_{ind} changes, we will call the verifiers to update s_{syn} , $info_{syn}$, s_{sem} , and $info_{sem}$ synchronously.

Fitness. The fitness of an individual is defined as:

$$fitness((c_{ind}, s_{syn}, info_{syn}, s_{sem}, info_{sem})) = s_{syn} + s_{sem}. \quad (2)$$

The fitness value ranges from 0 to 2. An individual with a fitness value of 1 indicates that its code only passes Frama-C. An individual with a fitness value of 2 indicates that its code passes both Frama-C and the WP plugin of Frama-C, which is the optimal solution we aim to find. Once such an individual is found, the evolutionary search terminates immediately.

4.2 Diverse Individual Initialization

Our insight stems from the ‘mental set’ theory in psychology [35], which has recently shown promise in enhancing LLM reasoning and debate [53]. A mental set constitutes a cognitive bias that impedes divergent thinking. It traps individuals in habitual thinking patterns, making it difficult to complete tasks outside of established thinking patterns. However, evidence suggests that breaking the mental set often reveals solutions that were previously obscured. Recently, Liu et al. [53] have discovered that this theory also applies to LLMs.

Motivated by this, we employ diverse prompting reasoning strategies, *e.g.*, chain-of-thought prompting (CoT) [82], during initialization to facilitate the




Fig. 2. An example of the prompts for the two-phase, where colors indicate role definition (blue), task description (green), task constraint (orange), and inputs (gray). We omit the inputs and mark them as ‘//’.

synthesis of differentiated code. These strategies fully leverage the inherent capabilities of off-the-shelf LLMs without the need for training or fine-tuning, and can effectively represent distinct thinking patterns [53]. We prioritize selecting strategies with significant disparities to mitigate potential mental set issues arising from similar strategies. Intuitively, divergent code enhances population diversity, yielding a broader array of C code and ACSL specifications, which increases the potential of generating syntactically and semantically correct code snippets or discovering novel implicit knowledge.

The initialization of an individual adopts a two-phase strategy designed to mirror the logical workflow of developers. In the first phase, we synthesize C code directly from the natural language requirements. In the second phase, we synthesize the corresponding ACSL specifications, utilizing both the original requirements and the code generated in the previous step as context. The sequence of these phases is determined by the difficulty of the tasks. Due to the differences in the quantity and quality of pre-training data of LLMs, it is more challenging for LLMs to synthesize ACSL specifications than to synthesize C code [8]. Therefore, providing C code as an intermediate reference serves to lower the barrier for the subsequent formalization of ACSL specifications.

Technically, each phase is driven by a prompt consisting of four components: role definition, task description, task constraint, and inputs. Fig. 2 shows an example of the prompts for the two-phase. This prompt explicitly specifies the role of LLMs, defines the task objectives, and constrains the output format to guide the response of LLMs.




Fig. 3. An example of the crossover prompt and a schematic diagram of the collaborative crossover, where colors indicate domain description (purple).

4.3 Collaborative Crossover

The efficacy of evolutionary search hinges on meticulously designed crossover operators that enable offspring to inherit superior genetic traits from their progenitors. To this end, we propose a collaborative crossover, designed to synthesize the strengths of parent individuals, *i.e.*, correct syntax and semantics. Specifically, we first randomly select parent pairs from the pool of individuals that have the highest fitness value. The selection criterion aims to minimize the propagation of syntactically erroneous code fragments to the next generation. Subsequently, treating one parent as the baseline, we instruct LLMs to refine this baseline by incorporating insights and logic from the other parent.

Technically, the prompt of the collaborative crossover is structured into five components: role definition, domain description, task description, output constraint, and inputs. Fig. 3 illustrates an example of the crossover prompt. This prompt instructs LLMs to analyze two candidate solutions and perform crossover-based code refinement by combining their most advantageous characteristics.

4.4 Self-reflective Mutation

In evolutionary search, the mutation plays a pivotal role in encouraging offspring to transcend parental constraints, thereby facilitating the escape from local optima. Accordingly, we design a self-reflective mutation with the objective of enabling offspring to rectify syntactic and semantic errors or discover implicit knowledge through a process of self-reflection. Unlike the crossover, which relies on parents, the self-reflective mutation drives LLMs to critically analyze the code and generate variations based on verifier feedback.

```

Self-reflective Mutation

You are an expert in C code optimization and formal verification with ACSL.
The requirement written in natural language is provided. Below is an individual implemented
based on this requirement, with the following attributes:
- full_code: C code with ACSL annotations
- base_info: Frama-C verification report without WP plugin
- base_pass: Whether the base Frama-C verification passed
- wp_info: Frama-C verification report with WP plugin
- wp_pass: Whether the WP-based verification passed
Analyze the provided full_code with its verification reports. Your goal is to generate an improved
mutated version, focusing on:
- Consistency between the full_code and requirement
- ACSL Annotations: Check completeness, correctness, and consistency with code behavior
- Verification Gaps: Identify why base_pass or wp_pass failed (if applicable)
- Code Logic: Review for potential bugs, inefficiencies, or specification mismatches
Then, propose a refined full_code of the individual that:
- Ensure all Frama-C verification warnings are addressed
- Maintain functional correctness and code clarity
You only need to return the refined full_code of the individual without explanation.
// requirement and individual's attributes

```

Fig. 4. An example of the mutation prompt and a schematic diagram of the self-reflective mutation.

Technically, the prompt of the self-reflective mutation is similarly composed of a role definition, domain description, task description, output constraint, and inputs. Fig. 4 also provides a representative example of the self-reflective mutation prompt. By analyzing verification reports and requirements, it must autonomously diagnose and resolve inconsistencies, simulating an analytical process of an expert to ensure correctness.

5 Experimental Evaluation

In this section, we conduct experiments to answer four research questions².

RQ 1 *What is the performance of **AutoICE**?*

RQ 2 *How effective is **AutoICE** on developer-friendly datasets?*

RQ 3 *Is every step of **AutoICE** designed reasonably?*

RQ 4 *How strong is the robustness to the hyperparameters of **AutoICE**?*

5.1 Datasets

FM-ALPACA and FM-BENCH. We adopt two datasets FM-ALPACA and FM-BENCH constructed by Cao et al. [8]³. These datasets encompass five formal

² Our code and datasets are publicly available at: <https://github.com/lbearxy/AutoICE>.

³ The datasets are publicly available at <https://huggingface.co/fm-universe/datasets>.

specification languages, *i.e.*, Coq [32], Lean4 [60], Dafny [44], ACSL [3, 17], and TLA+ [94, 42], across six formal-verification-related tasks, generated through distillation from GPT-4o [34]. We specifically focuses on ACSL and the task of formalizing natural language requirements into ACSL-annotated code. FM-ALPACA contains 56 instances, while FM-BENCH contains 14. We exclude two instances from FM-BENCH as they involve lambda functions, which is not yet implemented in Frama-C.

Developer-friendly Variants. The natural language requirements primarily include descriptions of the target function, preconditions, postconditions, loop annotations, and assertions. To address the lack of ACSL expertise among most developers, we extend the datasets to include only the description of the target function, called FM-ALPACA-DF and FM-BENCH-DF.

5.2 Baselines

We establish a comprehensive set of SOTA approaches that encompass three distinct paradigms. Following the prior work of Cao et al. [8], we include the zero-shot and fine-tuning baselines to serve as fundamental approaches of comparison. Furthermore, to provide a more competitive comparison, we extend the baselines to include an LLM-verifier interaction approach. The interaction paradigm demonstrates SOTA performance on other problems [49, 56, 84, 74]. We do not compare with ReDeFo [55] because they only provide an envision and not the available code.

Zero-shot Approach. The zero-shot approach, denoted by ZS, provides only a task instruction and inputs, instruct LLMs to generate an ACSL-annotated code immediately without any examples or training. We utilize the same prompt template as Cao et al. [8] to ensure a fair comparison.

Fine-tuning Approach. We directly employ the fine-tuning LLMs provided by Cao et al. [8] with zero-shot prompting for baseline evaluation⁴. It includes the instruction-tuned versions of llama3.1-instruct (8B) [57], qwen2.5-instruct (7B) [88], qwen2.5-coder-instruct (7B) [33], and deepseek-coder-instruct (7B) [21], all of which were fine-tuning on FM-ALPACA, denoted by FT-fma. Besides, to ensure a comprehensive comparison, llama3.1-instruct (8B) [57] was fine-tuned on two widely-used datasets: UltraChat [23] and Tulu-V3 [41] before fine-tuning on FM-ALPACA, denoted by FT-ultrachat-fma and FT-tulu-fma, respectively.

LLM-verifier Interaction Approach. Algorithm 2 shows the iterative refinement process of LLM-verifier interaction approach, denoted by LLMVer. This

⁴ The fine-tuning LLMs are publicly available at <https://huggingface.co/fm-universe/models>.

```

Refinement
You are an expert in C code optimization and formal verification with ACSL.
The requirement written in natural language is provided. The ACSL-annotated code you gener-
ated failed verification with error information reported by Frama-C.
Your task is to analyze the error messages and provide precise corrections to make the ACSL-
annotated code verifiable.
You only need to return the completed ACSL formal specification with the code without expla-
nation.
// requirement, ACSL-annotated code and error messages

```

Fig. 5. An example of the refinement prompt.

approach establishes a self-correcting, verifier-driven closed-loop system based on a ‘generate–verify–correct’ workflow. For fairness, the initialization of Algorithm 2 (lines 1-2) uses the same prompts as the individual initialization of AutoICE. Fig. 5 demonstrates the refinement prompt for LLMs (line 9 and 16), which consists of five components: role definition, domain description, task specification, output constraint, and inputs.

Algorithm 2: LLMVer

```

Input      : A natural language requirement  $r_{NL}$ .
Output    : ACSL-annotated code or ‘Not Synthesized’.
1  $c_C \leftarrow$  Synthesize C code from  $r_{NL}$  via LLMs
2  $c_{ACSL} \leftarrow$  Synthesize ACSL-annotated code from  $c_C$  and  $r_{NL}$  via LLMs
3  $n_{iter} \leftarrow \#iter$ 
4 for  $n_{iter} > 0$  do
5    $err_{FC} \leftarrow$  Verify  $c_{ACSL}$  using Frama-C
6   if verification succeeds then
7     break
8   else
9      $c_{ACSL} \leftarrow$  Refine  $c_{ACSL}$  based on  $r_{NL}$  and  $err_{FC}$  via LLMs
10     $n_{iter} \leftarrow n_{iter} - 1$ 
11 for  $n_{iter} > 0$  do
12    $err_{wp} \leftarrow$  Verify  $c_{ACSL}$  using the WP plugin of Frama-C
13   if verification succeeds then
14     return  $c_{ACSL}$ 
15   else
16      $c_{ACSL} \leftarrow$  Refine  $c_{ACSL}$  based on  $r_{NL}$  and  $err_{wp}$  via LLMs
17      $n_{iter} \leftarrow n_{iter} - 1$ 
18 return ‘Not Synthesized’

```

5.3 Experimental Setups

Evaluation Metrics. Following prior works [8], we adopt Pass@1, average Pass@1, and Pass@5 accuracy over five independent trials as the primary metrics.

- Pass@1 measures the rate of ACSL-annotated code that pass formal verification on their first generation attempt. It reflects the baseline accuracy of approaches in a one-attempt setting.
- Average Pass@1 is computed as the mean of Pass@1 accuracy across five independent generation runs. This metric smooths out variability caused by randomness in the generation process and offers a more stable estimate.
- Pass@5 measures the probability that at least one of five independently generated ACSL-annotated code passes formal verification. It evaluates the ability to produce a valid specification within a bounded number of attempts.

Configurations. Following prior works [8], we conduct tests on 8 LLM backbones with different parameter scales, specifically llama3.1-instruct (8B/70B) [57], qwen2.5-instruct (7B/72B) [88], qwen2.5-coder-instruct (7B/32B) [33], deepseek-coder-instruct (7B) [21]. Besides, we conduct tests on two representative open-source LLMs, qwen3-AWQ (32B) [87] and deepseek-R1 (671B) [21], with significantly different parameters, and one representative closed-source LLM, gemini-2.5-pro [79]. Given that FM-ALPACA and FM-BENCH are generated by GPT-4o [34], we exclude LLMs from the GPT series to prevent potential evaluation bias. For all LLMs, we set the temperature to 1 and use the default values for other hyperparameters. We select the following two widely used prompting reasoning strategies: CoT [82] and step-back prompting (SBP) [98]. For verifying the ACSL-annotated code, we employ Frama-C 31.0 (Gallium). All experiments are run on a GPU server equipped with Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6248R CPU @3.0GHz, 810 GB RAM and NVIDIA A100 GPU acceleration. The main hyperparameters of **AutoICE** are set as follows: $S_{IP} = 5$, $\#elite = 2$, $\rho = 0.5$, and $\#gen = 5$. To ensure a fair comparison between **AutoICE** and **LLMVer**, we impose the same upper bound on the number of LLM calls, denoted as $call_{max}$. The expected $call_{max}$ of **AutoICE** is computed as: $\mathbb{E}[call_{max}] = 2 \cdot S_{IP} + \#gen \cdot (S_P - \#elite) \cdot (1 + \rho \cdot 1)$, where S_P is defined in Equ. (1). Specifically, $2 \cdot S_{IP}$ accounts for the two LLM calls per initial individual. $S_P - \#elite$ is the number of new offspring created in each generation. Each offspring requires one call for crossover plus an additional call for mutation with probability ρ . Therefore, we set the hyperparameter $\#iter$ of **LLMVer** as $\#iter = \mathbb{E}[call_{max}] - 2$, since the initialization calls LLM for two times. This constraint ensures that both approaches are evaluated under comparable computational limits.

5.4 Result Analysis

Compared with SOTA Approaches. Table 1 summarizes the average Pass@1. Overall, **AutoICE** almost outperforms all approaches across all LLM backbones

Table 1. Average Pass@1 (%) across different approaches, where ‘Size’ means the parameter size of LLMs, ‘/’ means the parameter size is not disclosed, ‘FC’ means the verifier is Frama-C, ‘WP’ means the verifier is the WP plugin of Frama-C, and **boldface** numbers refer to the better results for each LLM. The larger, the better.

LLMs	Sizes	Approaches	FM-ALPACA		FM-BENCH		FM-ALPACA-DF		FM-BENCH-DF	
			FC	WP	FC	WP	FC	WP	FC	WP
llama3.1-instruct	8B	ZS	7.86	1.43	8.33	0.00	11.79	1.07	8.33	1.67
		FT-fma	24.29	1.07	51.67	0.00	50.36	2.14	65.00	0.00
		FT-ultrachat-fma	10.00	0.36	10.00	0.00	18.57	1.43	11.67	1.67
		FT-tulu-fma	13.57	3.57	3.33	0.00	26.07	1.07	20.00	1.67
		LLMVer	31.43	1.43	36.67	5.00	36.43	1.43	43.33	3.33
		AutoICE (our)	78.21	7.50	81.67	5.00	75.71	9.29	76.67	10.00
	70B	ZS	23.21	8.21	25.00	8.33	30.00	4.64	35.00	5.00
		LLMVer	62.50	29.29	63.33	33.33	62.86	21.79	78.33	18.33
		AutoICE (our)	78.93	32.86	85.00	36.67	84.29	29.64	91.67	28.33
	qwen2.5-instruct	7B	ZS	22.50	3.57	21.67	5.00	31.79	2.50	41.67
FT-fma			36.43	7.14	31.67	0.00	52.86	3.57	45.00	0.00
LLMVer			83.57	36.07	95.00	40.00	83.93	21.43	90.00	21.67
AutoICE (our)			90.36	46.79	96.67	43.33	88.57	21.07	96.67	23.33
72B		ZS	32.14	10.71	40.00	8.33	46.43	7.14	68.33	0.00
		LLMVer	72.86	8.57	70.00	1.67	74.64	5.71	78.33	5.00
		AutoICE (our)	85.00	13.21	86.67	10.00	88.21	8.21	90.00	3.33
qwen2.5-coder-instruct	7B	ZS	2.86	0.71	5.00	0.00	2.50	0.36	0.00	0.00
		FT-fma	15.36	2.86	5.00	0.00	30.00	2.86	16.67	0.00
		LLMVer	30.00	4.29	30.00	0.00	36.43	2.86	20.00	1.67
		AutoICE (our)	88.21	16.07	73.33	11.67	90.71	12.86	93.33	13.33
	32B	ZS	32.86	12.50	36.67	8.33	46.79	5.00	78.33	3.33
		LLMVer	66.07	18.57	76.67	21.67	58.21	10.36	66.67	11.67
		AutoICE (our)	77.14	29.29	85.00	36.67	76.43	18.57	81.67	38.33
deepseek-coder-instruct	7B	ZS	19.64	1.07	6.67	3.33	19.64	1.07	6.67	3.33
		FT-fma	23.93	0.00	38.33	0.00	59.29	3.57	48.33	0.00
		LLMVer	43.57	5.36	28.33	3.33	62.50	3.57	53.33	3.33
		AutoICE (our)	75.00	11.61	72.22	5.56	83.04	4.46	91.67	8.33
qwen3-AWQ	32B	ZS	23.57	8.57	31.67	6.67	22.14	4.64	36.67	1.67
		LLMVer	92.14	57.86	93.33	66.67	88.57	46.43	96.67	56.67
		AutoICE (our)	92.5	56.79	100.00	75.00	91.43	55.71	100.00	58.33
deepseek-r1	671B	ZS	44.64	15.00	55.00	20.00	28.21	5.36	36.67	1.67
		LLMVer	94.64	66.79	90.00	71.67	92.50	68.21	85.00	65.00
		AutoICE (our)	96.43	72.14	100.00	78.33	98.21	77.14	100.00	88.33
gemini-2.5-pro	/	ZS	68.21	43.93	66.67	43.33	63.57	29.29	73.33	26.67
		LLMVer	98.93	85.36	98.33	80	96.79	81.79	100.00	81.67
		AutoICE (our)	98.21	90.36	100.00	86.67	99.29	88.21	100.00	83.33

Table 2. Pass@1 (%) across different approaches.

LLMs	Sizes	Approaches	FM-ALPACA		FM-BENCH		FM-ALPACA-DF		FM-BENCH-DF	
			FC	WP	FC	WP	FC	WP	FC	WP
llama3.1-instruct	8B	ZS	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	12.50	1.79	8.33	0.00
		FT-fma	28.57	0.00	50.00	0.00	46.43	1.79	58.33	0.00
		FT-ultrachat-fma	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.50	0.00	8.33	0.00
		FT-tulu-fma	14.29	5.36	0.00	0.00	30.36	1.79	25.00	0.00
		LLMVer	32.14	1.79	41.67	16.67	41.07	1.79	50.00	8.33
		AutoICE (our)	80.36	8.93	83.33	8.33	73.21	7.14	66.67	8.33
	70B	ZS	30.36	8.93	25.00	0.00	37.50	5.36	33.33	0.00
		LLMVer	55.36	26.79	66.67	41.67	64.29	32.14	75.00	25.00
		AutoICE (our)	80.36	28.57	83.33	25.00	83.93	41.07	100.00	16.67
qwen2.5-instruct	7B	ZS	21.43	3.57	25.00	8.33	33.93	3.57	50.00	0.00
		FT-fma	35.71	3.57	33.33	0.00	51.79	3.57	50.00	0.00
		LLMVer	80.36	41.07	91.67	50.00	89.29	21.43	83.33	16.67
		AutoICE (our)	92.86	44.64	100.00	33.33	91.07	21.43	91.67	16.67
	72B	ZS	25.00	7.14	33.33	8.33	46.43	7.14	66.67	0.00
		LLMVer	71.43	10.71	58.33	0.00	71.43	1.79	75.00	0.00
		AutoICE (our)	83.93	12.50	100.00	16.67	91.07	7.14	83.33	0.00
qwen2.5-coder-instruct	7B	ZS	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	1.79	1.79	0.00	0.00
		FT-fma	14.29	3.57	8.33	0.00	35.71	5.36	16.67	0.00
		LLMVer	35.71	0.00	33.33	0.00	30.36	0.00	16.67	0.00
		AutoICE (our)	92.86	17.86	75.00	8.33	96.43	12.50	83.33	8.33
	32B	ZS	30.36	10.71	33.33	8.33	44.64	3.57	75.00	0.00
		LLMVer	60.71	21.43	75.00	16.67	62.50	8.93	58.33	8.33
		AutoICE (our)	75.00	28.57	83.33	33.33	76.79	16.07	66.67	33.33
deepseek-coder-instruct	7B	ZS	21.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	21.43	0.00	8.33	0.00
		FT-fma	25.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	58.93	3.57	41.67	0.00
		LLMVer	35.71	3.57	33.33	0.00	62.50	3.57	58.33	0.00
		AutoICE (our)	67.86	8.93	75.00	8.33	80.36	3.57	100.00	8.33
qwen3-AWQ	32B	ZS	17.86	3.57	33.33	0.00	25.00	5.36	50.00	0.00
		LLMVer	96.43	51.79	91.67	58.33	92.86	37.50	100.00	58.33
		AutoICE (our)	92.86	57.14	100.00	75.00	91.07	50.00	100.00	66.67
deepseek-r1	671B	ZS	44.64	17.86	66.67	16.67	32.14	12.50	50.00	8.33
		LLMVer	96.43	67.86	100.00	75.00	96.43	71.43	91.67	75.00
		AutoICE (our)	98.21	76.79	100.00	75.00	98.21	78.57	100.00	83.33
gemini-2.5-pro	/	ZS	67.86	41.07	50.00	41.67	71.43	26.79	75.00	33.33
		LLMVer	100.00	82.14	100.00	83.33	98.21	78.57	100.00	83.33
		AutoICE (our)	100.00	96.43	100.00	83.33	98.21	89.29	100.00	83.33

Table 3. Pass@5 (%) across different approaches.

LLMs	Sizes	Approaches	FM-ALPACA		FM-BENCH		FM-ALPACA-DF		FM-BENCH-DF	
			FC	WP	FC	WP	FC	WP	FC	WP
llama3.1-instruct	8B	ZS	33.93	5.36	33.33	0.00	42.86	5.36	41.67	8.33
		FT-fma	48.21	5.36	66.67	0.00	67.86	5.36	75.00	0.00
		FT-ultrachat-fma	28.57	1.79	25.00	0.00	39.29	5.36	33.33	8.33
		FT-tulu-fma	26.79	8.93	16.67	0.00	37.50	3.57	41.67	8.33
		LLMVer	78.57	7.14	100.00	16.67	82.14	5.36	83.33	8.33
		AutoICE (our)	96.43	17.86	100.00	16.67	94.64	17.86	100.00	16.67
	70B	ZS	51.79	21.43	66.67	33.33	62.50	10.71	91.67	16.67
		LLMVer	89.29	51.79	100.00	66.67	91.07	46.43	91.67	25.00
		AutoICE (our)	91.07	55.36	100.00	75.00	91.07	53.57	100.00	50.00
qwen2.5-instruct	7B	ZS	53.57	12.50	41.67	8.33	62.50	8.93	83.33	0.00
		FT-fma	57.14	12.50	50.00	0.00	67.86	7.14	75.00	0.00
		LLMVer	96.43	57.14	100.00	66.67	94.64	39.29	100.00	50.00
		AutoICE (our)	100.00	64.29	100.00	66.67	98.21	35.71	100.00	33.33
	72B	ZS	64.29	21.43	66.67	16.67	76.79	14.29	91.67	0.00
		LLMVer	91.07	25.00	100.00	8.33	98.21	17.86	100.00	25.00
		AutoICE (our)	96.43	28.57	100.00	33.33	98.21	28.57	100.00	16.67
	qwen2.5-coder-instruct	ZS	10.71	1.79	16.67	0.00	8.93	1.79	0.00	0.00
		FT-fma	26.79	8.93	8.33	0.00	48.21	8.93	25.00	0.00
		LLMVer	76.79	14.29	83.33	0.00	82.14	8.93	83.33	8.33
		AutoICE (our)	100.00	25.00	100.00	25.00	100.00	32.14	100.00	25.00
deepseek-coder-instruct	32B	ZS	41.07	14.29	50.00	8.33	51.79	7.14	83.33	8.33
		LLMVer	82.14	26.79	83.33	33.33	78.57	21.43	91.67	33.33
		AutoICE (our)	80.36	37.5	91.67	41.67	82.14	33.93	91.67	50.00
	7B	ZS	32.14	3.57	25.00	8.33	32.14	3.57	16.67	8.33
		FT-fma	30.36	0.00	50.00	0.00	60.71	3.57	66.67	0.00
		LLMVer	85.71	14.29	75.00	16.67	94.64	10.71	83.33	16.67
		AutoICE (our)	91.07	17.86	91.67	16.67	96.43	7.14	100.00	25.00
	qwen3-AWQ	ZS	50.00	19.64	66.67	16.67	55.36	12.50	91.67	8.33
		LLMVer	100.00	80.36	100.00	91.67	100.00	76.79	100.00	91.67
		AutoICE (our)	100.00	83.93	100.00	83.33	100.00	82.14	100.00	75.00
deepseek-r1	671B	ZS	64.29	30.36	66.67	50.00	60.71	19.64	66.67	8.33
		LLMVer	100.00	85.71	100.00	91.67	100.00	85.71	100.00	91.67
		AutoICE (our)	100.00	87.5	100.00	91.67	100.00	91.07	100.00	100.00
	gemini-2.5-pro	/	89.29	69.64	91.67	58.33	91.07	50.00	91.67	50.00
		LLMVer	100.00	98.21	100.00	91.67	100.00	91.07	100.00	91.67
		AutoICE (our)	100.00	98.21	100.00	91.67	100.00	94.64	100.00	83.33

Table 4. Average number of LLM calls across **LLMVer** and **AutoICE**, where ‘DSCI’ is short for ‘deepseek-coder-instruct’, ‘QWA’ is short for ‘qwen3-AWQ’, ‘DSR’ is short for ‘deepseek-R1’, and ‘GMP’ is short for ‘gemini-2.5-pro’. The smaller, the better.

LLMs	Sizes	Approaches	FM-ALPACA	FM-BENCH	FM-ALPACA-DF	FM-BENCH-DF
llama3.1-instruct	8B	LLMVer	39.57	39.02	39.46	38.77
		AutoICE (our)	38.11	38.40	38.10	36.52
	70B	LLMVer	30.49	30.80	32.82	34.45
		AutoICE (our)	29.41	28.97	31.02	31.72
qwen2.5-instruct	7B	LLMVer	29.66	28.77	34.15	34.02
		AutoICE (our)	27.33	29.02	33.96	35.33
	72B	LLMVer	37.39	39.47	38.22	38.42
		AutoICE (our)	36.26	37.10	37.71	39.75
qwen2.5-coder-instruct	7B	LLMVer	38.94	40.00	39.33	39.87
		AutoICE (our)	36.04	37.85	36.89	36.32
	32B	LLMVer	33.10	31.77	36.15	35.57
		AutoICE (our)	30.18	26.78	34.42	27.58
DSCI	7B	LLMVer	38.76	39.105	38.73	39.1
		AutoICE (our)	37.83	38.89	38.47	38.22
QWA	32B	LLMVer	23.30	19.50	27.43	24.38
		AutoICE (our)	23.36	19.22	25.71	23.25
DSR	671B	LLMVer	17.54	17.30	17.54	16.60
		AutoICE (our)	17.76	16.30	17.36	12.73
GMP	/	LLMVer	10.82	10.52	11.41	10.27
		AutoICE (our)	9.85	8.98	10.39	9.90

and datasets: average improvement of at least 17.64% FC and 6.29% WP. For example, on qwen2.5-coder-instruct (7B), **AutoICE** achieves 88.21% FC and 16.07% WP on FM-ALPACA, significantly surpassing the SOTA approach (LLMVer: 30.00% FC and 4.29% WP). Similarly, on the LLMs with larger parameters, *e.g.*, qwen2.5-instruct (72B) and deepseek-r1 (671B), **AutoICE** maintains clear superiority in both verifiers. Table 2 and Table 3 summarizes the Pass@1 and Pass@5, respectively. They exhibit a similar trend to the average Pass@1 (Table 1).

On the developer-friendly datasets, the advantage of **AutoICE** becomes even more pronounced. For all LLM backbones, compared with the SOTA approach (LLMVer), **AutoICE** achieves an average improvement of 17.42% FC and 5.85% WP on the original dataset, and an average improvement of 17.87% and 6.74% WP on the developer-friendly dataset. For example, on qwen2.5-coder-instruct (32B), **AutoICE** achieves 76.43% FC and 18.57% WP on FM-ALPACA-DF, compared to the performance of LLMVer 58.21% FC and 10.36% WP. This trend holds across most model families. Besides, both the maximum 73.33% FC improvement and 26.66% WP improvement are achieved on developer-friendly datasets. It demonstrates the strong capability of **AutoICE** in inferring implicit formal specifications from purely functional descriptions.

Table 5. Ablation results (%) about diverse individual initialization, collaborative crossover, and self-reflective mutation, where ‘ave. Pass@1’ means average Pass@1, ‘w/o RS’ indicates **AutoICE** without reasoning strategies in the individual initialization, *i.e.*, all individuals are initialized using the same prompt, ‘w/o SBP’ indicates **AutoICE** without SBP in the individual initialization, *i.e.*, all individuals are initialized using CoT, ‘w/o CoT’ indicates **AutoICE** without CoT in the individual initialization, *i.e.*, all individuals are initialized using SBP, ‘w/o E’ indicates **AutoICE** without the evolutionary process, ‘w/o E & TS’ indicates **AutoICE** without the evolutionary process and directly requires LLMs to synthesize ACSL-annotated code from requirements, ‘w/o crossover’ indicates **AutoICE** without the collaborative crossover in the evolutionary process, and ‘w/o mutation’ indicates **AutoICE** without the mutation in the evolutionary process.

Approaches	FC			WP		
	ave. Pass@1	Pass@1	Pass@5	ave. Pass@1	Pass@1	Pass@5
AutoICE	100.00	100.00	100.00	75.00	83.33	83.33
w/o RS	96.67	91.67	100.00	60.00	58.33	83.33
w/o SBP	95.00	83.33	100.00	51.67	50.00	75.00
w/o CoT	96.67	91.67	100.00	53.33	66.67	83.33
w/o E	71.67	91.67	100.00	25.00	25.00	50.00
w/o E & TS	55.00	58.33	100.00	10.00	8.33	16.67
w/o crossover	91.70	91.67	100.00	51.67	50.00	75.00
w/o mutation	100.00	100.00	100.00	61.67	58.33	75.00

When paired with SOTA LLMs such as gemini-2.5-Pro, **AutoICE** achieves excellent pass rates on multiple datasets. Note that using these LLMs, which are claimed to possess powerful reasoning abilities, alone is still insufficient to generate high-quality verifiable code, shown the results of **ZS**. This indicates that **AutoICE** effectively leverages the enhanced reasoning and code generation capabilities of advanced LLMs, translating their raw potential into higher rates of formally verified code synthesis. At the same time, we also see how the improved performance of LLMs has benefited **AutoICE**. Therefore, the synergy between a powerful LLM backbone and our structured evolutionary search enables more robust exploration of the solution space.

Despite leveraging domain-specific fine-tuning, the fine-tuning approaches demonstrate only modest improvements over zero-shot prompting and fall considerably short of **AutoICE** on all datasets. These results suggest that fine-tuning does not adequately resolve the challenges of autoformalization, such as hallucination of syntax and semantic misalignment. This underscores the need for more sophisticated synthesis mechanisms beyond supervised adaptation.

Table 4 compares the average number of LLM calls per instance between **LLMVer** and **AutoICE**. We can observe that **AutoICE** requires fewer or comparable LLM calls in most cases. This indicates that **AutoICE** not only enhances synthesis quality but also maintains computational efficiency.

Overall, these results confirm that **AutoICE** effectively mitigates error propagation and hallucination issues inherent in single-agent iterative approaches,




Fig. 6. Comparisons for different settings of S_{IP} , #elite, ρ , and #gen over FM-BENCH.

while successfully uncovering implicit knowledge necessary for formal verification. Above conclusions answer RQ 1 and 2.

Ablation Study. The experiments are performed on FM-BENCH using qwen3-AWQ (32B), with results presented in Table 5. The results are similar on other datasets and with other LLMs. When examining initialization reasoning strategies, ‘w/o RS’ reduces average Pass@1 from 100.00% to 96.67% for FC and from 75.00% to 60.00% for WP. ‘w/o SBP’ causes significant performance drops, especially in WP (51.67% average Pass@1). While ‘w/o CoT’ also degrades performance, though less severely than ‘w/o SBP’. This demonstrates the importance of reasoning diversity. The evolutionary process emerges as a critical component, with its complete removal (‘w/o E’) reducing average Pass@1 to 71.67% on FC and causing a severe decline to 25% on WP. However, ‘w/o E & TS’ leads to a more pronounced degradation, underscoring the significance of the two-phase strategy. For evolutionary operators, both ‘w/o crossover’ and ‘w/o mutation’ yield performance degradation. Notably, the impact is greater when crossover is removed. It indicates that although mutation and crossover jointly contribute to search-space exploration, crossover plays a dominant role in AutoICE.

In summary, the ablation results collectively demonstrate that the complete AutoICE framework is essential for achieving state-of-the-art performance in automated, verifiable code synthesis. Above conclusions answer RQ 3.

Robustness to Hyperparameters. The main hyperparameters of AutoICE are S_{IP} , #elite, ρ , and #gen. We conducted experiments to show the impact

of different values of these hyperparameters, as illustrated in Fig. 6. Since the trends of all datasets are exactly the same, we only show the results for on FM-BENCH using qwen3-AWQ (32B). We only vary the hyperparameter being discussed and keep the default values for the other hyperparameters.

As S_{IP} increases, performance initially improves, then declines. Considering that increasing S_{IP} will increase computational cost, an intermediate value of S_{IP} likely yields the best performance, achieving near-optimal performance while balancing computational efficiency. $\#elite$ exhibits robust behavior, with average Pass@1 remaining stable for values ranging from 0 to 2, but slightly declines when $\#elite = 3$. It is because increasing $\#elite$, while guaranteeing high-quality individuals, can inhibit exploration, causing **AutoICE** to easily get stuck in a local optimum. It indicates that our default setting of $\#elite = 2$ effectively preserves optimal solutions without sacrificing population diversity. ρ and $\#elite$ exhibit similar trends, with our default value of $\rho = 0.5$ providing an excellent balance between exploration and exploitation. For $\#gen$, we can find that excessive generations may lead to diminishing performance and increased computational cost. So the setting of $\#gen = 5$ achieves satisfactory results while maintaining reasonable computational overhead.

In summary, increasing the values of the four hyperparameters has a positive impact on performance, but this positive effect gradually diminishes and may even become negative. Besides, within a certain range, **AutoICE** is robust to hyperparameters, which answers RQ 4.

5.5 Case Study

We provide two representative cases to demonstrate the utility of collaborative crossover and self-reflective mutation. Such cases are ubiquitous during the evolutionary process of **AutoICE**.

The instance is sourced from FM-BENCH-DF, with its natural language requirement described as follows: ‘The function `arraymax` is designed to find the maximum value in an array of integers. The function iterates through the array, updating the `max` variable whenever it finds a larger value, and finally returns the maximum value found in the array.’ As shown in Fig. 7, the code of par_1 is successfully verified by Frama-C but fails to pass the verification of the WP plugin, while the code of par_2 fails to pass the verification of both Frama-C and the WP plugin.

On the one hand, par_1 learns from par_2 the missing precondition `requires n > 0`; and loop variant clause `loop variant n - i`; Additionally, par_1 recognizes and corrects the inaccurate interval bounds in the loop invariant, *i.e.*, `loop invariant 0 <= i <= n`. This process generates the verifiable code of $of f_1$. The partial thinking of qwen3-AWQ, shown as follows, demonstrates the aforementioned learning process.

```

1 // parent1.c
2
3 /*@ requires \valid_read(a + (0..n-1));
4   ensures \forallall integer k; 0 <= k < n ==> \result >= a[k];
5   ensures \exists integer k; 0 <= k < n && \result == a[k];
6   assigns \nothing;
7 */
8 int arraymax(int *a, int n) {
9   int max = a[0];
10  /*@ loop invariant 0 <= i < n;
11    loop invariant \forallall integer k; 0 <= k < i ==> max >= a[k];
12    loop invariant \exists integer k; 0 <= k < i && max == a[k];
13    loop assigns i, max;
14  */
15  for (int i = 1; i < n; i++) {
16    if (a[i] > max) {
17      max = a[i];
18    }
19  }
20  return max;
21 }
22
23 // offspring1.c
24
25 /*@ requires \valid_read(a + (0..n-1));
26   requires n > 0;
27   ensures \forallall integer k; 0 <= k < n ==> \result >= a[k];
28   ensures \exists integer k; 0 <= k < n && \result == a[k];
29   assigns \nothing;
30 */
31 int arraymax(int *a, int n) {
32   int max = a[0];
33   /*@ loop invariant 0 <= i <= n;
34     loop invariant \forallall integer k; 0 <= k < i ==> max >= a[k];
35     loop invariant \exists integer k; 0 <= k < i && max == a[k];
36     loop assigns i, max;
37     loop variant n - i;
38   */
39   for (int i = 1; i < n; i++) {
40     if (a[i] > max) {
41       max = a[i];
42     }
43   }
44   return max;
45 }
46
47 // parent2.c
48
49 /*@ requires \valid_read_only(a + (0..n-1));
50   requires n > 0;
51   ensures \forallall integer k; 0 <= k < n --> \result >= a[k];
52   ensures \exists integer k; 0 <= k < n && \result == a[k];
53   assigns \nothing;
54 */
55 int arraymax(int *a, int n) {
56   int max = a[0];
57   /*@ loop invariant 0 <= i <= n;
58     loop invariant \forallall integer k; 0 <= k < i --> max >= a[k];
59     loop invariant \exists integer k; 0 <= k < i && max == a[k];
60     loop assigns i, max;
61     loop variant n - i;
62   */
63   for (int i = 1; i < n; i++) {
64     if (a[i] > max) {
65       max = a[i];
66     }
67   }
68   return max;
69 }
70
71 // offspring2.c
72
73 /*@ requires \valid_read(a + (0..n-1));
74   requires n > 0;
75   ensures \forallall integer k; 0 <= k < n ==> \result >= a[k];
76   ensures \exists integer k; 0 <= k < n && \result == a[k];
77   assigns \nothing;
78 */
79 int arraymax(int *a, int n) {
80   int max = a[0];
81   /*@ loop invariant 0 <= i <= n;
82     loop invariant \forallall integer k; 0 <= k < i ==> max >= a[k];
83     loop invariant \exists integer k; 0 <= k < i && max == a[k];
84     loop assigns i, max;
85     loop variant n - i;
86   */
87   for (int i = 1; i < n; i++) {
88     if (a[i] > max) {
89       max = a[i];
90     }
91   }
92   return max;
93 }

```

Fig. 7. A case of collaborative crossover. The top left and right subfigures are the codes in parent par_1 and par_2 , respectively. The bottom left and right subfigures are the codes in their offspring off_1 and off_2 , respectively.

Thinking of Refining par_1

Parent2's code has a requires clause that includes $n > 0$, which might be a necessary condition. Also, parent2 uses a loop variant $n - i$, which helps in proving termination. The main issues with parent1 are: 1. Missing the $n > 0$ condition in the requires clause to prevent division by zero or invalid array access. 2. The loop variant is missing in parent1, which could cause the WP plugin to have trouble proving termination. So to improve parent1's code: - Add a requires clause that $n > 0$, ensuring the array has at least one element. - Add a loop variant to help the prover with termination (like $n - i$). When the loop is done, i is n . Therefore, the loop invariant should be $0 \leq i \leq n$. Because during the loop, before each iteration, i starts at 1, and after the loop, i is n . So the loop invariant should be $0 \leq i \leq n$. Therefore, adjusting the loop invariant to include $i \leq n$ would make it more accurate. The original parent1's loop invariant says $i < n$, which is true during the loop iterations but not after.

On the other hand, par_2 successfully incorporates the strengths of par_1 , replacing the invalid forms `valid_read_only` and `-->` with the correct predicate `\valid_read` and implication operator `==>`, respectively. This correction results in the verifiable code of off_2 . The partial thinking of qwen3-AWQ, shown as follows, shows the aforementioned process.

```

// individual.c
1
2
3 /*@ requires \valid_read(a + (0..n-1));
4   requires n > 0;
5   ensures \forall integer k; 0 <= k < n ==> \result >= a[k];
6   ensures \exists integer k; 0 <= k < n && \result == a[k];
7   assigns \nothing;
8 */
9 int arraymax(int *a, int n) {
10   int max = a[0];
11   /*@ loop invariant 0 <= i <= n;
12     loop assigns i, max;
13     loop variant n - i;
14   */
15   for (int i = 1; i < n; i++) {
16     if (a[i] > max) {
17       max = a[i];
18     }
19   }
20   return max;
21 }

// mutated_individual.c
1
2
3 /*@ requires \valid_read(a + (0..n-1));
4   requires n > 0;
5   ensures \forall integer k; 0 <= k < n ==> \result >= a[k];
6   ensures \exists integer k; 0 <= k < n && \result == a[k];
7   assigns \nothing;
8 */
9 int arraymax(int *a, int n) {
10   int max = a[0];
11   /*@ loop invariant 1 <= i <= n;
12     loop invariant \forall integer j; 0 <= j < i ==> a[j] <= max;
13     loop invariant \exists integer j; 0 <= j < i && max == a[j];
14     loop assigns i, max;
15     loop variant n - i;
16   */
17   for (int i = 1; i < n; i++) {
18     if (a[i] > max) {
19       max = a[i];
20     }
21   }
22   return max;
23 }

```

Fig. 8. An example of self-reflective mutation. The left and right subfigures are the codes in individual *off* and the mutated individual *off'*, respectively.

Thinking of Refining *par*₂

Okay, let's start by comparing parent1 and parent2's code to see what can be improved. First, looking at parent1's full code. In the same line, parent1's code uses `==>` while parent2's uses `-->`. In ACSL, the logical implication is written as `==>`, not `-->`. That's likely causing the parsing error. So parent2's code has invalid symbols in the ACSL annotations. So the first step is to fix the ACSL syntax in parent2's code. Replace all `-->` with `==>`. Now, parent1's code has a different requires clause: `valid_read_only(a + (0..n-1))`. But there's a problem here because `valid_read_only` isn't a standard ACSL predicate. That's why Frama-C gave an error, and the `base_pass` is 0. So parent1's code is invalid due to a typo or incorrect predicate.

This case demonstrates how the collaborative crossover effectively relieves the hallucination problem, wherein they tend to generate plausible but syntactically or semantically incorrect specifications. The mechanism cross-validates and combines complementary valid fragments from different candidate codes.

As shown in Fig. 8, due to the missing loop invariant clauses, the code in individual *off* fails verification of the WP plugin. Given that its verification feedback indicated the error '`typed_arraymax_ensures`', it motivates LLMs to introduce additional loop invariant clauses to support the proof of the postcondition. After mutation, the loop invariant clauses in the mutated individual *off'* are correctly inserted, enabling it to pass verification by both Frama-C and the WP plugin. The partial thinking of qwen3-AWQ, shown as follows, confirm the aforementioned process.

Thinking of Mutating *off*

Okay, let me try to figure out how to improve the given code. The problem is in the ensures clauses. The first ensures says that the result is `>=` all elements. The second ensures states that the result is equal to some element in the array. The WP plugin's output shows that there are timeouts in proving these ensures clauses, which suggests that the loop invariant might not be sufficient to establish the postconditions. So, the loop invariant needs to be updated. The original loop invariant doesn't state that `max` is the maximum of `a[0..i-1]`. Wait, let me think: when `i` starts at 1, the initial `max` is `a[0]`. Then, for `i=1`, the loop checks `a[1]` against `max`. So after each iteration, the `max` should be the maximum of the first `i` elements. So the loop invariant should include: `loop invariant \forall integer j; 0 <= j < i ==> a[j] <= max`. Additionally, the loop invariant should also state that `max` is one of the elements in the array up to `i`. So, the second part of the postcondition requires that the result exists in the array. So the loop invariant should also have that `max` is one of `a[0..i]`. So, adding: `loop invariant \exists integer j; 0 <= j < i && max == a[j]`.

This case demonstrates the effectiveness of self-reflective mutation in enabling LLM-driven code correction. Specifically, the model is able to interpret verifier feedback and bridge the gap between verification failure and correctness without human intervention.

6 Conclusion and Future Works

We have investigated the autoformalizing natural language requirements into verifiable C code, a process essential for democratizing formal methods but hindered by the semantic gap between human intuition and rigorous machine logic. While LLMs offer promising code generation capabilities, existing approaches struggle with hallucinations, error propagation during self-reflection, and an unrealistic reliance on overly detailed requirement descriptions. To bridge these gaps, we have presented **AutoICE**, a novel framework that integrates LLMs with evolutionary search. By modeling code synthesis as a code evolutionary process, **AutoICE** employs the diverse individual initialization to simulate varied thinking patterns, the collaborative crossover, and the self-reflective mutation to mitigate syntactic and semantic errors as well as uncover implicit knowledge often omitted in natural language requirements. Extensive evaluations across varying LLM backbones and 68 instances have demonstrated that **AutoICE** significantly outperforms state-of-the-art approaches. Notably, **AutoICE** exhibits a clear advantage on developer-friendly datasets lacking explicit requirements, proving its practical value in automating the synthesis from concise functional descriptions.

In future work, we will extend our approach to other formal languages, *e.g.*, Dafny, and investigate more sophisticated evolutionary strategies to further enhance the synthesis performance, especially on the developer-friendly datasets.

References

1. Bach, S.H., Sanh, V., Yong, Z.X., Webson, A., Raffel, C., Nayak, N.V., Sharma, A., Kim, T., Bari, M.S., Févry, T., Alyafeai, Z., Dey, M., Santilli, A., Sun, Z., Ben-David, S., Xu, C., Chhablani, G., Wang, H., Fries, J.A., AlShaibani, M.S., Sharma, S., Thakker, U., Almubarak, K., Tang, X., Radev, D.R., Jiang, M.T., Rush, A.M.: Promptsource: An integrated development environment and repository for natural language prompts. In: ACL (demo). pp. 93–104 (2022)
2. Barrett, C.W., Conway, C.L., Deters, M., Hadarean, L., Jovanovic, D., King, T., Reynolds, A., Tinelli, C.: CVC4. In: CAV. vol. 6806, pp. 171–177 (2011)
3. Baudin, P., Filliâtre, J.C., Marché, C., Monate, B., Moy, Y., Prevosto, V.: Acsl: Ansi/iso c specification. <https://frama-c.com/html/acsl.html> (2021)
4. Beckman, N.E., Nori, A.V.: Probabilistic, modular and scalable inference of type-state specifications. In: PLDI. pp. 211–221 (2011)
5. Beurer-Kellner, L., Fischer, M., Vechev, M.T.: Prompting is programming: A query language for large language models. Proc. ACM Program. Lang. **7**(PLDI), 1946–1969 (2023)
6. Brito, E., Pinto, J.S.: Program verification in SPARK and ACSL: A comparative case study. In: Ada-Europe. vol. 6106, pp. 97–110 (2010)

7. Brown, T.B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D.M., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., Amodei, D.: Language models are few-shot learners. In: NeurIPS (2020)
8. Cao, J., Lu, Y., Li, M., Ma, H., Li, H., He, M., Wen, C., Sun, L., Zhang, H., Qin, S., Cheung, S., Tian, C.: From informal to formal - incorporating and evaluating llms on natural language requirements to verifiable formal proofs. In: ACL (1). pp. 26984–27003 (2025)
9. Cao, W., Wu, G., Xu, T., Yao, Y., Wei, H., Chen, T., Ma, X.: Clause2inv: A generate-combine-check framework for loop invariant inference. Proc. ACM Softw. Eng. **2**(ISSTA), 1009–1030 (2025)
10. Chang, Y., Wang, X., Wang, J., Wu, Y., Yang, L., Zhu, K., Chen, H., Yi, X., Wang, C., Wang, Y., Ye, W., Zhang, Y., Chang, Y., Yu, P.S., Yang, Q., Xie, X.: A survey on evaluation of large language models. ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol. **15**(3), 39:1–39:45 (2024)
11. Chen, M., Tworek, J., Jun, H., Yuan, Q., de Oliveira Pinto, H.P., Kaplan, J., Edwards, H., Burda, Y., Joseph, N., Brockman, G., Ray, A., Puri, R., Krueger, G., Petrov, M., Khlaaf, H., Sastry, G., Mishkin, P., Chan, B., Gray, S., Ryder, N., Pavlov, M., Power, A., Kaiser, L., Bavarian, M., Winter, C., Tillet, P., Such, F.P., Cummings, D., Plappert, M., Chantzis, F., Barnes, E., Herbert-Voss, A., Guss, W.H., Nichol, A., Paino, A., Tezak, N., Tang, J., Babuschkin, I., Balaji, S., Jain, S., Saunders, W., Hesse, C., Carr, A.N., Leike, J., Achiam, J., Misra, V., Morikawa, E., Radford, A., Knight, M., Brundage, M., Murati, M., Mayer, K., Welinder, P., McGrew, B., Amodei, D., McCandlish, S., Sutskever, I., Zaremba, W.: Evaluating large language models trained on code. CoRR **abs/2107.03374** (2021)
12. Chen, Z., Zhang, L., Zhang, Z., Zhang, J., Zhou, R., Shen, Y., Ma, J., Yang, L.: Sld-spec: Enhancement llm-assisted specification generation for complex loop functions via program slicing and logical deletion. CoRR **abs/2509.09917** (2025)
13. Conchon, S., Contejean, E., Kanig, J.: Ergo: A theorem prover for polymorphic first-order logic modulo theories (2006)
14. Coq Development Team: The Coq proof assistant reference manual – version 8.4 (2010)
15. Cosler, M., Hahn, C., Mendoza, D., Schmitt, F., Trippel, C.: nl2spec: Interactively translating unstructured natural language to temporal logics with large language models. In: CAV. pp. 383–396 (2023)
16. Cousot, P., Cousot, R., Fähndrich, M., Logozzo, F.: Automatic inference of necessary preconditions. In: VMCAI. vol. 7737, pp. 128–148 (2013)
17. Cuoq, P., Kirchner, F., Kosmatov, N., Prevosto, V., Signoles, J., Yakobowski, B.: Framac - A software analysis perspective. In: SEFM. vol. 7504, pp. 233–247 (2012)
18. Dang, H., Mecke, L., Lehmann, F., Goller, S., Buschek, D.: How to prompt? opportunities and challenges of zero- and few-shot learning for human-ai interaction in creative applications of generative models. CoRR **abs/2209.01390** (2022)
19. Dat, P.V.T., Doan, L., Binh, H.T.T.: Hsevo: Elevating automatic heuristic design with diversity-driven harmony search and genetic algorithm using llms. In: AAAI. pp. 26931–26938 (2025)
20. Deckers, N., Fröbe, M., Kiesel, J., Pandolfo, G., Schröder, C., Stein, B., Potthast, M.: The infinite index: Information retrieval on generative text-to-image models. In: CHIIR. pp. 172–186 (2023)

21. DeepSeek-AI: Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. CoRR **abs/2501.12948** (2025)
22. Dillig, I., Dillig, T., Li, B., McMillan, K.L.: Inductive invariant generation via abductive inference. In: OOPSLA. pp. 443–456 (2013)
23. Ding, N., Chen, Y., Xu, B., Qin, Y., Hu, S., Liu, Z., Sun, M., Zhou, B.: Enhancing chat language models by scaling high-quality instructional conversations. In: EMNLP. pp. 3029–3051 (2023)
24. Dordowsky, F.: An experimental study using ACSL and frama-c to formulate and verify low-level requirements from a DO-178C compliant avionics project. In: FIDE. vol. 187, pp. 28–41 (2015)
25. Faria, J.P., Abreu, R.: Case studies of development of verified programs with dafny for accessibility assessment. In: FSEN. vol. 14155, pp. 25–39 (2023)
26. Filliâtre, J.C.: Why: a multi-language multi-prover verification tool. Tech. rep., Research Report 1366, LRI, Université Paris Sud (2003)
27. First, E., Rabe, M.N., Ringer, T., Brun, Y.: Baldur: Whole-proof generation and repair with large language models. In: FSE. pp. 1229–1241 (2023)
28. Guo, Q., Wang, R., Guo, J., Li, B., Song, K., Tan, X., Liu, G., Bian, J., Yang, Y.: Connecting large language models with evolutionary algorithms yields powerful prompt optimizers. In: ICLR (2024)
29. Hemberg, E., Moskal, S., O’Reilly, U.: Evolving code with a large language model. Genet. Program. Evolvable Mach. **25**(2), 21 (2024)
30. Hoare, C.A.R.: An axiomatic basis for computer programming. Commun. ACM **12**(10), 576–580 (1969)
31. Hou, Y., Dong, H., Wang, X., Li, B., Che, W.: Metaprompting: Learning to learn better prompts. In: COLING. pp. 3251–3262 (2022)
32. Huet, G.P.: The calculus of constructions: State of the art. In: FSTTCS. vol. 287, p. 372 (1987)
33. Hui, B., Yang, J., Cui, Z., Yang, J., Liu, D., Zhang, L., Liu, T., Zhang, J., Yu, B., Dang, K., Yang, A., Men, R., Huang, F., Ren, X., Ren, X., Zhou, J., Lin, J.: Qwen2.5-coder technical report. CoRR **abs/2409.12186** (2024)
34. Hurst, A., Lerer, A., Goucher, A.P., Perelman, A., Ramesh, A., Clark, A., Ostrow, A., Welihinda, A., Hayes, A., Radford, A., Madry, A., Baker-Whitcomb, A., Beutel, A., Borzunov, A., Carney, A., Chow, A., Kirillov, A., Nichol, A., Paino, A., Renzin, A., Passos, A.T., Kirillov, A., Christakis, A., Conneau, A., Kamali, A., Jabri, A., Moyer, A., Tam, A., Crookes, A., Tootoonchian, A., Kumar, A., Vallone, A., Karpathy, A., Braunstein, A., Cann, A., Codispoti, A., Galu, A., Kondrich, A., Tulloch, A., Mishchenko, A., Baek, A., Jiang, A., Pelisse, A., Woodford, A., Gosalia, A., Dhar, A., Pantuliano, A., Nayak, A., Oliver, A., Zoph, B., Ghorbani, B., Leimberger, B., Rossen, B., Sokolowsky, B., Wang, B., Zweig, B., Hoover, B., Samic, B., McGrew, B., Spero, B., Giertler, B., Cheng, B., Lightcap, B., Walkin, B., Quinn, B., Guarraci, B., Hsu, B., Kellogg, B., Eastman, B., Lugaresi, C., Wainwright, C.L., Bassin, C., Hudson, C., Chu, C., Nelson, C., Li, C., Shern, C.J., Conger, C., Barette, C., Voss, C., Ding, C., Lu, C., Zhang, C., Beaumont, C., Hallacy, C., Koch, C., Gibson, C., Kim, C., Choi, C., McLeavey, C., Hesse, C., Fischer, C., Winter, C., Czarnecki, C., Jarvis, C., Wei, C., Koumouzelis, C., Sherburn, D.: Gpt-4o system card. CoRR **abs/2410.21276** (2024)
35. Jersild, A.T.: Mental set and shift. No. 89 (1927)
36. Jiang, E., Olson, K., Toh, E., Molina, A., Donsbach, A., Terry, M., Cai, C.J.: Promptmaker: Prompt-based prototyping with large language models. In: CHI Extended Abstracts. pp. 35:1–35:8 (2022)

37. Karbyshev, A., Bjørner, N.S., Itzhaky, S., Rinetzky, N., Shoham, S.: Property-directed inference of universal invariants or proving their absence. *J. ACM* **64**(1), 7:1–7:33 (2017)
38. Kirchner, F., Kosmatov, N., Prevosto, V., Signoles, J., Yakobowski, B.: Frama-c: A software analysis perspective. *Formal Aspects Comput.* **27**(3), 573–609 (2015)
39. Klein, G., Andronick, J., Elphinstone, K., Murray, T.C., Sewell, T., Kolanski, R., Heiser, G.: Comprehensive formal verification of an OS microkernel. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.* **32**(1), 2:1–2:70 (2014)
40. Knight, J.C.: Safety critical systems: challenges and directions. In: ICSE. pp. 547–550 (2002)
41. Lambert, N., Morrison, J., Pyatkin, V., Huang, S., Ivison, H., Brahman, F., Miranda, L.J.V., Liu, A., Dziri, N., Lyu, S., Gu, Y., Malik, S., Graf, V., Hwang, J.D., Yang, J., Bras, R.L., Tafjord, O., Wilhelm, C., Soldaini, L., Smith, N.A., Wang, Y., Dasigi, P., Hajishirzi, H.: Tülu 3: Pushing frontiers in open language model post-training. *CoRR* **abs/2411.15124** (2024)
42. Lamport, L.: Specifying Systems, The TLA+ Language and Tools for Hardware and Software Engineers (2002)
43. Le, T.C., Qin, S., Chin, W.: Termination and non-termination specification inference. In: PLDI. pp. 489–498 (2015)
44. Leino, K.R.M.: Dafny: An automatic program verifier for functional correctness. In: LPAR (Dakar). vol. 6355, pp. 348–370 (2010)
45. Leroy, X.: Formal verification of a realistic compiler. *Commun. ACM* **52**(7), 107–115 (2009)
46. Li, Y., Lin, Z., Zhang, S., Fu, Q., Chen, B., Lou, J., Chen, W.: Making language models better reasoners with step-aware verifier. In: ACL (1). pp. 5315–5333 (2023)
47. Li, Y., Parsert, J., Polgreen, E.: Guiding enumerative program synthesis with large language models. In: CAV (2). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 14682, pp. 280–301 (2024)
48. Lin, S., Sun, J., Xiao, H., Liu, Y., Sanán, D., Hansen, H.: Fib: squeezing loop invariants by interpolation between forward/backward predicate transformers. In: ASE. pp. 793–803 (2017)
49. Lin, X., Cao, Q., Huang, Y., Wang, H., Lu, J., Liu, Z., Song, L., Liang, X.: FVEL: interactive formal verification environment with large language models via theorem proving. In: NeurIPS (2024)
50. Lin, Y., Zhang, Y., Chen, S., Song, F., Xie, X., Li, X., Sun, L.: Inferring loop invariants for multi-path loops. In: TASE. pp. 63–70 (2021)
51. Liu, F., Tong, X., Yuan, M., Lin, X., Luo, F., Wang, Z., Lu, Z., Zhang, Q.: Evolution of heuristics: Towards efficient automatic algorithm design using large language model. In: ICML (2024)
52. Liu, V., Chilton, L.B.: Design guidelines for prompt engineering text-to-image generative models. In: CHI. pp. 384:1–384:23 (2022)
53. Liu, Y., Cao, J., Li, Z., He, R., Tan, T.: Breaking mental set to improve reasoning through diverse multi-agent debate. In: ICLR (2025)
54. Lu, S., Guo, D., Ren, S., Huang, J., Svyatkovskiy, A., Blanco, A., Clement, C.B., Drain, D., Jiang, D., Tang, D., Li, G., Zhou, L., Shou, L., Zhou, L., Tufano, M., Gong, M., Zhou, M., Duan, N., Sundaresan, N., Deng, S.K., Fu, S., Liu, S.: Codexglue: A machine learning benchmark dataset for code understanding and generation. In: NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks (2021)
55. Lu, X., Sun, W., Zhang, Y., Hu, M., Tian, C., Jin, Z., Liu, Y.: Requirements development and formalization for reliable code generation: A multi-agent vision. In: ASE (2025)

56. Luo, W., Fang, W., Qiu, J., Wan, H., Liu, Y., Ye, R.: ITG: trace generation via iterative interaction between LLM query and trace checking. In: NIER@ICSE. pp. 11–15 (2024)
57. Meta AI: Introducing Meta Llama 3: The most capable openly available LLM to date. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/> (2024)
58. Misu, M.R.H., Lopes, C.V., Ma, I., Noble, J.: Towards ai-assisted synthesis of verified dafny methods. *Proc. ACM Softw. Eng.* **1**(FSE), 812–835 (2024)
59. Molina, F., d’Amorim, M., Aguirre, N.: Specfuzzer: A tool for inferring class specifications via grammar-based fuzzing. In: ASE. pp. 2094–2097 (2023)
60. de Moura, L., Ullrich, S.: The lean 4 theorem prover and programming language. In: CADE. vol. 12699, pp. 625–635 (2021)
61. de Moura, L.M., Bjørner, N.S.: Z3: an efficient SMT solver. In: TACAS. vol. 4963, pp. 337–340 (2008)
62. Mukherjee, P., Delaware, B.: Towards automated verification of llm-synthesized C programs. *CoRR* **abs/2410.14835** (2024)
63. Murray, T.C., Matichuk, D., Brassil, M., Gammie, P., Bourke, T., Seefried, S., Lewis, C., Gao, X., Klein, G.: sel4: From general purpose to a proof of information flow enforcement. In: IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. pp. 415–429 (2013)
64. Nejjar, M., Zacharias, L., Stiehle, F., Weber, I.: Llms for science: Usage for code generation and data analysis. *J. Softw. Evol. Process.* **37**(1) (2025)
65. Noble, J., Streader, D., Gariano, I.O., Samarakoon, M.: More programming than programming: Teaching formal methods in a software engineering programme. In: NFM. vol. 13260, pp. 431–450 (2022)
66. Padhi, S., Sharma, R., Millstein, T.D.: Data-driven precondition inference with learned features. In: PLDI. pp. 42–56 (2016)
67. Pei, K., Bieber, D., Shi, K., Sutton, C., Yin, P.: Can large language models reason about program invariants? In: ICML. vol. 202, pp. 27496–27520 (2023)
68. Pirzada, M.A.A., Reger, G., Bhayat, A., Cordeiro, L.C.: Llm-generated invariants for bounded model checking without loop unrolling. In: ASE. pp. 1395–1407 (2024)
69. Popeea, C., Chin, W.: Inferring disjunctive postconditions. In: ASIAN. vol. 4435, pp. 331–345 (2006)
70. Ramanathan, M.K., Grama, A., Jagannathan, S.: Static specification inference using predicate mining. In: PLDI. pp. 123–134 (2007)
71. Reynolds, L., McDonell, K.: Prompt programming for large language models: Beyond the few-shot paradigm. In: CHI Extended Abstracts. pp. 314:1–314:7 (2021)
72. Romera-Paredes, B., Barekatin, M., Novikov, A., Balog, M., Kumar, M.P., Dupont, E., Ruiz, F.J.R., Ellenberg, J.S., Wang, P., Fawzi, O., Kohli, P., Fawzi, A.: Mathematical discoveries from program search with large language models. *Nat.* **625**(7995), 468–475 (2024)
73. Ryan, G., Wong, J., Yao, J., Gu, R., Jana, S.: CLN2INV: learning loop invariants with continuous logic networks. In: ICLR (2020)
74. Sevenhuijsen, M., Etemadi, K., Nyberg, M.: Vecogen: Automating generation of formally verified C code with large language models. In: FormaliSE. pp. 101–112 (2025)
75. Shoham, S., Yahav, E., Fink, S.J., Pistoia, M.: Static specification mining using automata-based abstractions. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* **34**(5), 651–666 (2008)
76. Si, X., Dai, H., Raghothaman, M., Naik, M., Song, L.: Learning loop invariants for program verification. In: NeurIPS. pp. 7762–7773 (2018)
77. Singleton, J.L., Leavens, G.T., Rajan, H., Cok, D.R.: An algorithm and tool to infer practical postconditions. In: ICSE (Companion Volume). pp. 313–314 (2018)

78. Su, J., Arafat, M., Dyer, R.: Using consensus to automatically infer post-conditions. In: ICSE (Companion Volume). pp. 202–203 (2018)
79. Team, G.: Gemini 2.5: Pushing the frontier with advanced reasoning, multimodality, long context, and next generation agentic capabilities. CoRR **abs/2507.06261** (2025)
80. Ung, G., Amilon, J., Gurov, D., Lidström, C., Nyberg, M., Palmskog, K.: Post-hoc formal verification of automotive software with informal requirements: An experience report. In: RE. pp. 287–298 (2024)
81. Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A.N., Kaiser, L., Polosukhin, I.: Attention is all you need. In: NIPS. pp. 5998–6008 (2017)
82. Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Ichter, B., Xia, F., Chi, E.H., Le, Q.V., Zhou, D.: Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In: NeurIPS (2022)
83. Wen, C., Cao, J., Su, J., Xu, Z., Qin, S., He, M., Li, H., Cheung, S., Tian, C.: Enchanting program specification synthesis by large language models using static analysis and program verification. In: CAV. vol. 14682, pp. 302–328 (2024)
84. Wu, G., Cao, W., Yao, Y., Wei, H., Chen, T., Ma, X.: LLM meets bounded model checking: Neuro-symbolic loop invariant inference. In: ASE. pp. 406–417 (2024)
85. Wu, H., Barrett, C.W., Narodytska, N.: Lemur: Integrating large language models in automated program verification. In: ICLR (2024)
86. Wu, Y., Jiang, A.Q., Li, W., Rabe, M.N., Staats, C., Jamnik, M., Szegedy, C.: Autoformalization with large language models. In: NeurIPS (2022)
87. Yang, A., Li, A., Yang, B., Zhang, B., Hui, B., Zheng, B., Yu, B., Gao, C., Huang, C., Lv, C., Zheng, C., Liu, D., Zhou, F., Huang, F., Hu, F., Ge, H., Wei, H., Lin, H., Tang, J., Yang, J., Tu, J., Zhang, J., Yang, J., Yang, J., Zhou, J., Lin, J., Dang, K., Bao, K., Yang, K., Yu, L., Deng, L., Li, M., Xue, M., Li, M., Zhang, P., Wang, P., Zhu, Q., Men, R., Gao, R., Liu, S., Luo, S., Li, T., Tang, T., Yin, W., Ren, X., Wang, X., Zhang, X., Ren, X., Fan, Y., Su, Y., Zhang, Y., Zhang, Y., Wan, Y., Liu, Y., Wang, Z., Cui, Z., Zhang, Z., Zhou, Z., Qiu, Z.: Qwen3 technical report. CoRR **abs/2505.09388** (2025)
88. Yang, A., Yang, B., Zhang, B., Hui, B., Zheng, B., Yu, B., Li, C., Liu, D., Huang, F., Wei, H., Lin, H., Yang, J., Tu, J., Zhang, J., Yang, J., Yang, J., Zhou, J., Lin, J., Dang, K., Lu, K., Bao, K., Yang, K., Yu, L., Li, M., Xue, M., Zhang, P., Zhu, Q., Men, R., Lin, R., Li, T., Xia, T., Ren, X., Ren, X., Fan, Y., Su, Y., Zhang, Y., Wan, Y., Liu, Y., Cui, Z., Zhang, Z., Qiu, Z.: Qwen2.5 technical report. CoRR **abs/2412.15115** (2024)
89. Yang, K., Swope, A.M., Gu, A., Chalamala, R., Song, P., Yu, S., Godil, S., Prenger, R.J., Anandkumar, A.: Leandjo: Theorem proving with retrieval-augmented language models. In: NeurIPS (2023)
90. Yao, J., Ryan, G., Wong, J., Jana, S., Gu, R.: Learning nonlinear loop invariants with gated continuous logic networks. In: PLDI. pp. 106–120 (2020)
91. Ye, H., Wang, J., Cao, Z., Berto, F., Hua, C., Kim, H., Park, J., Song, G.: Reevo: Large language models as hyper-heuristics with reflective evolution. In: NeurIPS (2024)
92. Yu, S., Liu, Z., Wang, T., Wang, J.: Neural solving uninterpreted predicates with abstract gradient descent. ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol. **33**(8), 215:1–215:47 (2024)
93. Yu, S., Wang, T., Wang, J.: Loop invariant inference through SMT solving enhanced reinforcement learning. In: ISSTA. pp. 175–187 (2023)

- 94. Yu, Y., Manolios, P., Lamport, L.: Model checking tla^+ specifications. In: CHARME. vol. 1703, pp. 54–66 (1999)
- 95. Yüksekönl, M., Bianchi, F., Boen, J., Liu, S., Huang, Z., Guestrin, C., Zou, J.: Textgrad: Automatic "differentiation" via text. CoRR **abs/2406.07496** (2024)
- 96. Zeng, J., Meng, F., Yin, Y., Zhou, J.: Teaching large language models to translate with comparison. In: AAAI. pp. 19488–19496 (2024)
- 97. Zhai, J., Shi, Y., Pan, M., Zhou, G., Liu, Y., Fang, C., Ma, S., Tan, L., Zhang, X.: C2S: translating natural language comments to formal program specifications. In: FSE. pp. 25–37 (2020)
- 98. Zheng, H.S., Mishra, S., Chen, X., Cheng, H., Chi, E.H., Le, Q.V., Zhou, D.: Take a step back: Evoking reasoning via abstraction in large language models. In: ICLR (2024)