

AXIOM: Benchmarking LLM-as-a-Judge for Code via Rule-Based Perturbation and Multisource Quality Calibration

RUIQI WANG, Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, China

XINCHEN WANG, Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, China

CUIYUN GAO*, Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, China

CHUN YONG CHONG, Monash University Malaysia, Malaysia

XIN XIA, Zhejiang University, China

QING LIAO, Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, China

Large language models (LLMs) have been increasingly deployed in real-world software engineering, fostering the development of code evaluation metrics to study the quality of LLM-generated code. Conventional rule-based metrics merely score programs based on their surface-level similarities with reference programs instead of analyzing functionality and code quality in depth. To address this limitation, researchers have developed LLM-as-a-judge metrics, prompting LLMs to evaluate and score code, and curated various code evaluation benchmarks to validate their effectiveness. However, these benchmarks suffer from critical limitations, hindering reliable assessments of evaluation capability: Some feature coarse-grained binary labels, which reduce rich code behavior to a single bit of information, obscuring subtle errors. Others propose fine-grained but subjective, vaguely-defined evaluation criteria, introducing unreliability in manually-annotated scores, which is the ground-truth they rely on. Furthermore, they often use uncontrolled data synthesis methods, leading to unbalanced score distributions that poorly represent real-world code generation scenarios.

To curate a diverse benchmark with programs of well-balanced distributions across various quality levels and streamline the manual annotation procedure, we propose **AXIOM**, a novel perturbation-based framework for synthesizing code evaluation benchmarks at scale. It reframes program scores as the refinement effort needed for deployment, consisting of two stages: (1) **Rule-guided perturbation**, which prompts LLMs to apply sequences of predefined perturbation rules to existing high-quality programs to modify their functionality and code quality, enabling us to precisely control each program's target score to achieve balanced score distributions. (2) **Multisource quality calibration**, which first selects a subset of semantically distinct programs to ensure benchmark diversity, and then performs a streamlined manual annotation procedure with multisource context from LLMs, static analysis, and execution report. Based on the proposed framework, we curate **AXIOMBench**, a large-scale multilingual benchmark with 1,962 code evaluation problems in a balanced score distribution and reliable annotated scores. Experiments with the constructed benchmark reveal that current LLM-as-a-judge metrics, while powerful at relative ranking, suffer from issues such as hallucinating flaws in functionality and code quality, and high score variance with complex agentic setups.

CCS Concepts: • **Software and its engineering**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Artificial intelligence**;

*Corresponding author.

Authors' Contact Information: Ruiqi Wang, Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, China, 24s151158@stu.hit.edu.cn; Xincheng Wang, Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, China, 200111115@stu.hit.edu.cn; Cuiyun Gao, Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, China, gaocuiyun@hit.edu.cn; Chun Yong Chong, Monash University Malaysia, Malaysia, chunyong@ieee.org; Xin Xia, Zhejiang University, China, xin.xia@acm.org; Qing Liao, Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, China, liaoping@hit.edu.cn.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than 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/2025/12-ART

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

Additional Key Words and Phrases: code evaluation, large language models, data synthesis

ACM Reference Format:

Ruiqi Wang, Xincheng Wang, Cuiyun Gao, Chun Yong Chong, Xin Xia, and Qing Liao. 2025. AXIOM: Benchmarking LLM-as-a-Judge for Code via Rule-Based Perturbation and Multisource Quality Calibration. 1, 1 (December 2025), 21 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnnn>

1 Introduction

Recently, large language models (LLMs) have been widely deployed in software engineering. With comprehensive pre- and post-training, these colossal models possess strong reasoning [4, 15] and tool use [18] capabilities, enabling them to function as helpful assistants to maintain complex repositories. Besides powerful LLMs like Google’s Gemini 2.5 [22] and OpenAI’s GPT-4o [14], the industry has developed agentic applications like Cursor and Claude Code, automating certain development processes. However, LLM-generated code can be defective, with potential issues like API hallucinations [2] and social bias [12], eventually leading to functional incorrectness or suboptimal code quality. Therefore, evaluating LLM-generated code remains crucial before deployment, and researchers have developed various metrics to quantify the code’s overall quality.

While execution accuracy (Pass@ k in code generation benchmarks) [1] is the standard metric for validating program behavior, it requires manually constructing environments and test cases, which is labor-intensive with numerous programs for testing. Rule-based metrics like CodeBLEU [19] and RUBY [26] compare programs against reference programs. While efficient to compute, they merely measure superficial similarity and require reference programs. Manual approaches require human experts to thoroughly review the code, which is expensive and demands high-levels of domain understanding. To reduce human reliance, researchers propose LLM-as-a-judge metrics for code evaluation, leveraging LLMs’ rich domain knowledge and instruction-following ability, bypassing the need for reference programs and test cases.

Naturally, researchers curate code evaluation benchmarks [9, 27, 32] to verify whether these LLM-as-a-judge metrics truly provide human-level code evaluation. These benchmarks typically input requirements and programs into the metrics, and compare scores from metrics against human-labeled or automatically-generated scores. However, they suffer from two fundamental limitations, hindering comprehensive assessments: (1) **Subjectivity and limited granularity in evaluation criteria.** Existing benchmarks’ scoring systems are either too simplistic or subjective. Some use a coarse-grained binary label (pass/fail) to indicate the program’s functional correctness [25, 29], completely ignoring non-behavioral code quality and the value of partially correct or repairable programs; others apply fine-grained scales [28, 33] like a 5-point Likert scale, but with vague descriptions like “mostly clear” and “slightly helpful”, instead of detailed and objective definitions. This vagueness introduces high subjectivity and inconsistency in human annotation, making the supposed “ground-truth” unreliable. (2) **Unbalanced quality distribution and inefficient curation.** While code generation benchmarks often exclusively feature programs from open-source repositories [6], this approach is unsuitable for code evaluation benchmarks, as these programs lack ground-truth scores and are highly skewed towards higher quality. The standard approach to mitigate this involves synthesizing programs of varying quality and then labeling them. However, the generation phase often prompts LLMs without controlled constraints [27, 28], suffering from the same skew towards higher-quality code and failing to adequately represent the long tail of errors and quality levels in real-world scenarios. The subsequent scoring phase exacerbates the problem. While binary benchmarks can be labeled automatically by unit testing, fine-grained evaluation relies on human annotators, which is prohibitively expensive, and prone to quality control issues. This stems from its immense cognitive loads on annotators, requiring deep domain knowledge to meticulously reason about code logic at scale, a task inherently susceptible to error. Consequently, the resulting

benchmarks are often small, unbalanced, and annotated with unreliable scores, highlighting the need for a novel method to curate a large, high-quality, and reliably-grounded benchmark for meta-evaluating LLM-as-a-judge metrics.

Therefore, we propose **AXIOM**¹, a novel framework to automate the creation of code evaluation benchmarks. AXIOM addresses the shortcomings of existing scoring systems by reframing code evaluation into measuring the hypothetical effort needed to repair programs for deployment. This results in a fine-grained, interpretable score where higher values signify more polished and deployable programs. By clearly defining each possible score based on the scope of required fixes (e.g., a localized tweak or a structural refactor), our evaluation criteria provides the necessary foundation for a robust two-stage methodology: (1) **Rule-guided perturbation**. Instead of prompting LLMs to generate code from scratch, which yields uncontrollable results, we utilize a perturbation-based pipeline that requires LLMs to modify existing programs. This process applies a sequence of predefined rules to existing high-quality programs, prompting an LLM to alter the program's functionality or code quality in a specific way by a specific scope. This rule-guided approach enables us to precisely generate programs of predetermined target scores, resulting in a diverse and balanced benchmark where each program's functionality is checked via test cases. (2) **Multisource quality calibration**. Due to the sheer number of programs generated in the previous stage, we first select a subset of representative programs by greedily choosing semantically distinct candidates to ensure diversity. Afterwards, we perform a streamlined annotation procedure, where instead of functionality evaluation involving complex logic reasoning and dependency knowledge, the human annotator simply determines the code quality and the scope of changes to label the final score. This procedure greatly reduces the burden of annotators, allowing us to produce a large, verified benchmark even with limited human resources.

We use our framework and four challenging code corpora to curate AXIOMBench, a large-scale multilingual benchmark with 1962 programs in C++, Java, and Python and their corresponding scores. Compared to previous work, our benchmark provides a balanced score distribution owing to the controllable nature, as well as more reliable human-calibrated scores. Using this benchmark, we study existing LLM-as-a-judge metrics for code evaluation, and conclude the following discoveries:

- Performance of LLM-as-a-judge metrics reveals a trade-off between LLM capability and metric complexity, and is constrained by systematic biases, preventing full human alignment.
- LLM-as-a-judge metrics often hallucinate flaws in functionality and code quality, and cannot reliably estimate refinement effort by distinguishing tweaks from refactors.
- Scoring consistency of LLM-as-a-judge metrics inversely relates to its procedural complexity, where complex agentic frameworks suffer more from notable scoring variance.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We present AXIOM, a data synthesis framework for generating code evaluation benchmarks at scale to address unreliability of previous evaluation criteria, data curation, and score annotation procedures.
- We design a two-stage procedure for AXIOM, where the first guides LLMs to perform program perturbation to generate diverse data, whereas the second calibrates the scores using a multisource approach with reduced human effort.
- We curate a code evaluation benchmark AXIOMBench, conduct extensive experiments with it and existing LLM-as-a-judge metrics for code evaluation, and summarize our findings.

¹AXIOM: Assessment via X (cross)-verIfication and Oracle-guided Mutation. Although "mutation" is used in this full form, we use the word "perturbation" for the remainder of this paper.

2 Related Work

2.1 LLMs for Code Generation

Many LLMs have been specifically trained for code-related tasks, sometimes referred to as large code models (LCMs). CodeT5+ [30] is an early attempt at instruction-tuning LCMs. Code Llama [20] is a LCM family with 7-70B LCMs trained on 500B tokens, providing improved performance on benchmarks like HumanEval [1]. Qwen3-Coder [23] is a recent 480B Mixture-of-Expert (MoE) LCM, providing state-of-the-art performance on agentic coding and tool use.

Meanwhile, many general-purpose LLMs deliver exceptional coding performance, especially with the internal reasoning capability, thanks to inference scaling [21]. DeepSeek-V3.1 [3] is an open-source LLM that supports both non-reasoning and reasoning mode, providing higher token efficiency than its predecessor DeepSeek-R1 [4]. Gemini 2.5 [22] is a large multimodal model family from Google with state-of-the-art coding and reasoning capability in complex scenarios.

2.2 Code Evaluation Metrics

Rule-based metrics measure the lexical similarity between the program to evaluate and the reference program with predefined rules. CodeBLEU [19] introduces three new components in addition to BLEU, namely weighted n-gram match, syntactic abstract syntax tree (AST) match, and semantic data-flow match. CrystalBLEU [5] collects common n-grams from a code corpus, and excludes them during BLEU computation to focus on crucial tokens only.

LLM-as-a-judge metrics prompt LLMs to score the code and provide the rationale. ICE-Score [33] is one of the first attempts to apply LLM-as-a-judge to code evaluation, which prompts the LLM to follow several predefined evaluation steps without external tools or reference programs. CodeJudge [25] proposes an analysis and summary pipeline for binary classification on functional correctness, and a JSON report template with manually-curated fault categories for evaluation on requirement adherence. CodeVisionary [28] designs an agentic workflow with tool use and negotiation to evaluate LLM-generated code. MCTS-Judge [29] introduces a Monte-Carlo tree search (MCTS) framework to predict whether the given code is functionally correct.

2.3 Code Transformation

Code transformation refers to the process of generating new code with a language model based on existing code and a transforming instruction. Researchers have applied code transformation to address multiple tasks in software engineering, such as code review [24] and program repair [11].

Recent studies use code transformation to synthesize clone detection benchmarks, which require models to predict whether two programs are functionally identical. SeqCoBench [13] designs 20 types of single-step Python transformations. EquiBench [31] deploys domain-specific transformations in four domains such as CUDA and x86-64 assembly, in at most two transformation steps. CETBench [16] performs up to seven transformation steps with seven transformation types.

While these transformation workflows can synthesize data for reference-based code evaluation, they are inadequate for our fine-grained evaluation criteria. We contend that modern LLMs are capable enough to perform significantly more intricate and varied transformations. This allows for the development of diverse, general-purpose transformations applicable across various domains.

3 AXIOM: Methodology

In this section, we introduce our framework AXIOM for synthesizing code evaluation data. We formulate the code evaluation task, and then introduce the two stages of AXIOM, namely rule-guided perturbation and multisource quality calibration. An overview is available in Figure 1.




Fig. 1. Overview of AXIOM. Rule(s) refer to the perturbation rules indicating how the perturbation should be performed, and SC refers to the score ceiling of each rule, as described in Section 3.2.1.

3.1 Task Formulation

Given a program p , the code evaluation task requires a metric f to score the program as $y = f(p)$. Previous work often uses a binary scale $y \in \{0, 1\}$ to indicate whether p is functionally correct, or a 5- or 10-point scale with vaguely-defined aspects like readability and usefulness [25]. We argue that formulating scores as the effort needed to refine a program to production-readiness provides a more concrete and interpretable metric than relying on abstract definitions of quality.

To this end, we use an ordinal scale² to measure the refinement effort as our evaluation criteria:

- 5/5: Production-ready; no effort needed.
- 4/5: Perfect in functionality; requires minor tweaking to enhance code quality.
- 3/5: Perfect in functionality; requires major refactoring to enhance code quality.
- 2/5: Requires minor tweaking to repair functionality.
- 1/5: Requires major refactoring to repair functionality.
- 0/5: Fundamentally flawed; rewriting is more efficient than repairing.

Here, a “minor tweaking” refers to small, localized changes like adding a boundary check, and a “major refactoring” involves significant structural changes like rewriting an entire code block.

This scale evaluates the program on two aspects:

- **Functionality** measures the alignment between program behavior and the requirement, including its input/output, efficiency, resource consumption, and security.
- **Code quality** measures non-behavioral attributes like readability and architectural design.

²An ordinal scale guarantees a natural order, but the intervals between scores are not necessarily equal, unlike interval scales. Thus, the difference between scores of 5 and 4 is not quantitatively the same as the difference between 2 and 1.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Score Ceiling: 5 (Functionally & quality equivalent) | | Score Ceiling: 3 (Quality issue requiring major refactoring) | | Score Ceiling: 1 (Functional flaws requiring major refactoring) | |
| Refactor with functional programming style. | | Introduce duplicated code. | | Remove a crucial processing step. | |
| Old | <pre>lst = [] for item in items: if cond(item): lst.append(f(item))</pre> | Old | <pre>def append_if(arg, lst: list): if arg is not None: lst.append(arg) append_if(item.name, lst) append_if(item.description, lst) # ...</pre> | Old | <pre>def load_data(stdout_bytes: bytes) data = json.loads(stdout_bytes.decode()) for item in data: ... # validate item if not flag: return None return data</pre> |
| New | <pre>lst = list(map(f, filter(cond, lst)))</pre> | New | <pre>if item.name is not None: lst.append(item.name) if item.description is not None: lst.append(item.description) # ...</pre> | New | <pre>def load_data(stdout_bytes: bytes): return json.loads(stdout_bytes.decode())</pre> |
| Score Ceiling: 4 (Quality issue requiring minor tweaking) | | Score Ceiling: 2 (Functional flaws requiring minor tweaking) | | Score Ceiling | |
| Introduce ambiguous operator precedence. | | Change an initialization to be plausible but wrong. | | 5 | 5 |
| Old | <pre>S ^= mask & (1 << bit);</pre> | Old | <pre>vector<int> primes = {2, 3, 5, 7};</pre> | 4 | 10 |
| New | <pre>S ^= mask & 1 << bit;</pre> | New | <pre>vector<int> primes = {1, 2, 3, 5, 7};</pre> | 3 | 9 |
| | | | | 2 | 11 |
| | | | | 1 | 10 |

Fig. 2. Examples of perturbation rules.

We use functionality as the primary criterion. A score of 3 or higher signifies a functionally correct program to be immediately deployed, though it may still require quality improvements.

This precisely defined scale not only improves upon previous evaluation criteria, but also enables our framework to synthesize code evaluation data at scale through specifically-designed perturbation and calibration procedures.

3.2 Rule-Guided Perturbation

Given a code generation benchmark, where each sample is a triplet (r, p_{ref}, t) , where r is the requirement, p_{ref} is the reference program, and t is the unit tests, this stage creates a code evaluation benchmark of $(r, p, s(p))$ where p is a program whose target score is $s(p)$ under our evaluation criteria. Previous work [27, 28] often directly prompts LLMs to generate programs for requirement r , leading to uncontrolled error types and unbalanced score distributions. To address these issues, we propose a novel perturbation stage to synthesize program p and compute score $s(p)$.

In this section, we first introduce our perturbation design, and then describe the three steps in this stage, illustrated as 1 (A), 1 (B), and 1 (C) in Figure 1:

- **Exemplar augmentation:** generates more production-ready (5-point) programs besides the reference programs in the original code generation benchmark.
- **Deteriorative perturbation:** synthesizes 1- to 4-point programs from 5-point ones.
- **Context disruption:** produces worthless 0-point programs.

3.2.1 Perturbation. In this subsection, we introduce the perturbation process, which helps create a diverse set of requirement-program-quality triples, enhancing data variability and quantity, which is essential for comprehensively evaluating LLM-as-a-judge metrics.

A perturbation step $p' = f_u(p)$ transforms program p into p' with perturbation rule u . u consists of a natural language instruction on how to perform the code transformation, and a score ceiling $c(u) \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, indicating that the perturbed program's score $s(p')$ is capped at $c(u)$.

The score ceiling is designed to match our evaluation criteria. For instance, $c(u) = 5$ means that the perturbation reimplements the program with negligible impact on its functionality and quality, while $c(u) = 1$ indicates the introduction of a functionality fault requiring major refactoring to

Algorithm 1 Multi-Step Perturbation**Input:** Production-ready program p , Perturbation rule set U_* , Target score $s(p')$ **Output:** Perturbed program p'

// Generate step count & perturbation score ceilings

 $N \leftarrow \text{random}(1, N_{\max})$ **for** $i = 1$ to N **do** $c_i = \text{random}(s(p'), 5)$ **end for** $c_{\text{random}(1,N)} = s(p')$

// Perform randomly-selected perturbation rules

 $p_0 \leftarrow p$ **for** $i = 1$ to N **do** $u \leftarrow \text{random}(U_{c_i})$ $flag \leftarrow \text{LLM_feasible}(p, u)$ **if not** $flag$ **then**

// Perturbation fails

return null**end if** $p_i \leftarrow \text{LLM_perturb}(p_{i-1})$ **end for** $p' \leftarrow p_N$ **return** p'

repair. Therefore, given the original program p and its score $s(p)$, after a perturbation sequence u_1, \dots, u_n , the score of the resulting program $p' = f_{u_n}(\dots f_{u_1}(p))$ equals to $\min(s(p), c(u_1), \dots, c(u_n))$.

We manually curate 45 perturbation rules. Examples of perturbation rules with each possible score ceiling are shown in Figure 2. The remaining rules can be found in our repository. Each rule is designed with the following goals:

- **Generalizability.** All rules should be generalizable across programming languages and domains, instead of relying on certain language or library features.
- **Authenticity.** Rules with score ceilings $c(u) < 5$ should mimic common real-world errors.
- **Controllability.** Each rule defines a specific transformation mapping to a specific score indicated by its score ceiling, allowing us to precisely control the resulting program's score.

Due to modern LLMs' powerful code editing capabilities, we prompt an LLM with a multi-step process to perform perturbation. The LLM is instructed to first analyze the original program p , and determine whether the given rule u is feasible. If not, the LLM refuses to perturb. Otherwise, it plans the changes and outputs the perturbed program p' . We demonstrate the multistep perturbation process in Algorithm 1, which performs at most N_{\max} perturbation steps, each with a perturbation rule. In the algorithm, we first randomly select the score ceilings c of all rules given the target score $s(p')$. During step i , we sample a rule with score ceiling c_i and invoke the LLM to perturb. We return the final program if all steps succeed.

3.2.2 Exemplar Augmentation. Code generation benchmarks typically provide a single reference program per requirement. Relying on this solitary seed would artificially constrain perturbation diversity, limiting benchmark comprehensiveness. Thus, we implement this step to enrich the initial seed pool with additional 5-point programs, ensuring a varied foundation for future perturbation.

The process begins with a pre-perturbation check to verify the initial reference programs with unit tests. Failing programs due to incorrect outputs or environmental incompatibilities are discarded. We only keep requirements with at least one verified reference program for subsequent perturbation.

For each remaining requirement, we then augment the initial seed pool of 5-point programs until collecting a minimum of M high-quality programs. To generate a new program p' , we invoke Algorithm 1 with target score $s(p') = 5$ and randomly select an existing program as seed p . The algorithm utilizes the perturbation rule set U_5 (U_c means the rule set with score ceiling c), which instructs the LLM to rewrite the given program while preserving its functionality. The rules in U_5 produce significant structural changes, such as shifting programming paradigms (e.g., to functional programming) or implementing an alternative algorithm. Therefore, one perturbation step ($N_{\max} = 1$) is considered sufficient. The resulting program p' is verified via unit testing.

3.2.3 Deteriorative Perturbation. This step generates suboptimal programs scored from 1 to 4 by perturbing 5-point programs. Previous code transformation work [13] often applies a single, minor change like altering an operator, which results in a benchmark with low diversity and overly localized flaws. In contrast, we design our approach with richer defect categories by incorporating both localized and structural changes, to better reflect complex real-world coding errors.

To generate a suboptimal program p' with target score $s(p') \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, we begin by randomly selecting a 5-point program p . We then apply Algorithm 1, which executes a sequence of up to $N_{\max} = 5$ perturbation steps to p . This multi-step process is designed to create programs with more complex and realistic flaws than a single change. For each successfully generated program, we confirm that its functional status aligns with its target score via unit testing: programs targeting scores of 3 and 4 must pass all tests, while those targeting scores of 1 or 2 must fail at least one. Any programs failing to meet this condition are discarded. This generation and validation cycle is repeated until we have collected at least M programs for each target score per requirement.

A key advantage of this approach is its efficiency. We are concerned only with the final functional status of the generated program—whether it passes or fails tests as required by its target score. This outcome-based approach eliminates the expensive need to verify each intermediate perturbation step. While each program’s functional status is confirmed at this stage, we leave the assessment of its code quality and the determination of its final, calibrated score to Section 3.3.

3.2.4 Context Disruption. In this final generation step, we create 0-point programs. Instead of intentionally generating buggy code, we pair a program from one requirement with another semantically unrelated requirement. This approach creates challenging test cases that assess an LLM-as-a-judge’s ability to detect fundamental contextual irrelevance. Furthermore, because these pairings are incorrect by definition, their 0-point score is absolute, allowing this step to bypass the manual calibration required for other scores.

Specifically, we first use an embedding model E to embed requirements r_1, \dots, r_n into representation vectors $E(r_1), \dots, E(r_n)$. We then compute a pairwise distance matrix D with cosine distance, where higher values indicate greater semantic dissimilarity:

$$d_{ij} = 1 - \frac{E(r_i) \cdot E(r_j)}{\|E(r_i)\| \|E(r_j)\|} \in [0, 2], \quad i \neq j, \quad (1)$$

$$d_{ij} = -\infty, \quad i = j. \quad (2)$$

For a given requirement r_i , we then sample M distinct requirements by applying the following softmax distribution over D with temperature $\tau = 0.03$. This method increases the probability of

selecting conceptually distant requirements, creating unambiguous 0-point pairings:

$$p_{ij} = \frac{\exp(d_{ij}/\tau)}{\sum_{k=1}^n \exp(d_{ik}/\tau)}. \quad (3)$$

Finally, for each of the M sampled requirements, we randomly select one of its associated programs, regardless of its target score, to serve as a 0-point program for requirement r_i .

3.3 Multisource Quality Calibration

The preceding stage yields a large corpus of programs, where each program p is associated with requirement r and target score $s(p)$. While its functional status is confirmed to align with $s(p)$, its non-behavioral code quality remains unexamined. To determine the final score s , the conventional annotation procedure would require human experts to assess both the functionality and code quality of each program. This process is prohibitively slow and often unreliable due to the immense cognitive load and the deep domain knowledge required.

To address these challenges, we design the multisource quality calibration stage for both efficiency and reliability. Its core principle is to decouple the assessment of functionality and code quality. Since the functional status has already been examined in the previous stage, human annotators are freed from the burden of reasoning through the program's complex logic. Instead, their task is narrowed to a much simpler and more objective judgment: reviewing the `diff` between a program p and its 5-point pre-perturbation parent, determining p 's code quality with multisource information, and calibrating $s(p)$ into the final score s .

This decoupled approach dramatically reduces the cognitive load on human annotators, which both accelerates the annotation process and increases scoring reliability. This efficiency allows us to curate a much larger verified benchmark than a few hundred samples, like in previous work [27], while maintaining our fine-grained evaluation criteria.

This stage consists of two steps, illustrated as 2 (A) and 2 (B) in Figure 1. We first select a high-quality and representative subset of programs, and then perform the final, streamlined manual annotation to calibrate the scores.

3.3.1 Representative Candidate Selection. The goal of this step is to select a balanced and diverse subset of candidate programs. For each target score, the synthesis process yields a large pool of $N = nM$ programs, where n is the number of requirements, and M is the number of programs per target score. From this pool, our objective is to curate a smaller, representative subset of m programs for each target score for the final calibration.

To ensure a diverse and non-redundant subset, we quantify the dissimilarity between all programs with normalized token edit distance, which is more semantically aware than character-wise metrics. We first tokenize each program into a sequence of tokens, discarding comments and whitespace. Afterwards, we compute a distance matrix L , where each element l_{ij} is the minimum number of token edits to transform p_i into p_j , where the allowed edit operations are token insertions, deletions, and substitutions, which is then normalized by the token count of the longer program.

With the distance matrix L , we proceed to select m candidates from the N programs with the same target score with a greedy approach described in Algorithm 2, which employs a farthest-point heuristic. This algorithm begins by selecting a random program, and iteratively add the remaining $m - 1$ to the candidate set A . In each iteration, we aim to select the most dissimilar program to A . To achieve this, we first compute the minimum distance from each program to any selected candidates, and then greedily choose an unselected program to maximize this minimum distance. We repeat this process until m representative and diverse programs are selected.

Algorithm 2 Candidate Selection

Input: Distance matrix L , Number of programs N , Number of candidates m

Output: Set of selected candidates A

```

// Begin with a random program
 $A = \{\text{random}(1, N)\}$ 
// Iteratively select the remaining
for  $i = 2$  to  $m$  do
  for  $j = 1$  to  $N$  do
    //  $d_j$  is the minimum distance from program  $j$  to selected candidates
     $d_j = \min_{k \in A} l_{jk}$ 
  end for
  // Maximize the “minimum distance” among unselected programs
   $A \leftarrow A \cup \{\text{argmax}_{j \notin A} d_j\}$ 
end for
return  $A$ 

```

3.3.2 Multisource-Informed Score Calibration. This final step concludes the data curation process by calibrating the target score $s(p)$ of each candidate program p into a final, human-verified ground-truth score s . To facilitate an evidence-informed calibration, the human annotator is provided with a multisource diagnosis report, including the following contents:

- The diff comparison between p and its 5-point parent.
- The target score $s(p)$.
- The sequence of perturbation rules.
- A static analysis report.
- The full execution and test report, including any exceptions and stack traces.
- An LLM-generated code quality report.

The annotator’s task is not to score from scratch, but to calibrate the target score to align with the provided report and our evaluation criteria. As the functional status of each program has already been confirmed via automated testing, the annotator’s judgment is focused entirely on the code quality and the scope of changes in the diff. Specifically, for programs with functional flaws, the annotator verifies whether the functional changes in the diff is a structural refactor for $s(p) = 1$, or a localized tweak for $s(p) = 2$; for functionally correct programs, the annotator first assesses whether the code quality is perfect³, and similarly judges the scope of changes to distinguish programs with target scores between 3 and 5.

After calibrating the target score $s(p)$ into the final score s , we obtain the final benchmark, each sample being a triplet of requirement r , program p , and its final, ground-truth score s .

4 Benchmark and Study Design

This section elaborates on AXIOMBench, a new benchmark for code evaluation synthesized by AXIOM. It then outlines the design of our empirical study, which leverages AXIOMBench to evaluate recent LLM-as-a-judge metrics for code.

4.1 AXIOMBench: Curation and Statistics

We use four recent and challenging code generation benchmarks as our data source for AXIOM:

³The outputs from static analysis tools and the LLM are strictly advisory. The final judgment on code quality depends solely on the human annotator.

- **BigCodeBench** [34] is a Python benchmark emphasizing the LLM capability of using diverse API invocations as tools, and understanding complex instructions. It features 1140 coding tasks with APIs from 139 libraries, each accompanied by tests with high branch coverage. We use the **Hard** subset, featuring 148 difficult tasks with multiple API calls and longer reference programs.
- **LiveCodeBench** [8] features competitive programming problems from CodeForces, AtCoder, and LeetCode, challenging LLMs' capability to reason about complicated algorithms. The authors provide continuous updates with newly released problems to mitigate data contamination. We use problems from versions **v3–v6** utilizing standard input/output and with **Hard** difficulty. For these problems, we use C++ as the target language to increase language diversity and reflect its dominance in competitive programming⁴.
- **APPS** [7] is a Python benchmark with a comprehensive test set of 5000 problems of various difficulty, from platforms including Kattis and Codeforces. Each problem comes with a natural language description and high-quality test cases. We select **competition-level** problems that come with reference programs, leaving us with 310 problems.
- **Aider-Polyglot**⁵ is a multilingual benchmark based on 225 difficult problems from Exercism, challenging the LLMs' reasoning and code editing capabilities. While Aider-polyglot is a code editing benchmark, we adapt it for code generation by extracting the problem statements and treating each as a challenge to implement from scratch. We select the 107 problems configured for Java, Python, and C++.

To curate a diverse code evaluation benchmark, we begin by randomly sampling up to 100 coding tasks from each selected code generation benchmark as the requirements r . Their accompanying reference programs p_{ref} serve as the initial, 5-point programs for our benchmark after being verified on test cases. Since LiveCodeBench does not contain reference programs, we generate one per requirement using GPT-5 and Claude-Sonnet-4⁶, and verify the generated program via testing.

During the rule-guided perturbation stage in Section 3.2, we randomly sample a cost-efficient LLM from Table 1 for each perturbation step. We generate $M = 2$ programs per target score per requirement with temperature $T = 0.3$ and output length limit to 8192 tokens. For the final context disruption step, we use OpenAI's text-embedding-3-large as the embedding model.

While all LLM invocations are made online via API providers, unit tests are executed locally on an Ubuntu server with two Intel Xeon Platinum 8276 CPUs and 256 GB RAM, during which we construct a sandbox environment with Bubblewrap⁷, restricting writing access outside the working and temporary directories. If a requirement's reference program p_{ref} attempts to bypass this restriction, the requirement and all associated programs are discarded.

In the multisource quality calibration stage in Section 3.3, we use lexers from Pygments⁸ to tokenize programs before computing distances and selecting up to $m = 90$ programs per benchmark per target score. For multisource-informed score calibration, the LLM report comes from DeepSeek-V3.1, and the static analysis report is from cppcheck for C++, PMD for Java, and Pylint for Python.

To validate the objectivity of our scoring criteria, we conduct a preliminary annotation study with 10% randomly selected data (196 programs) from AXIOMBench, and calibrate the scores with three experts, each with more than five years of programming experience. The inter-rater reliability results demonstrate high agreement among them, with a Krippendorff's α of 96.40%, an ICC(2, 1)

⁴For instance, most recent submissions at <https://codeforces.com/problemset/status> are in C++.

⁵<https://aider.chat/2024/12/21/polyglot.html>

⁶We use GPT-5-20250807 with minimal reasoning effort and Claude-Sonnet-4-20250514 without reasoning for all experiments.

⁷<https://github.com/containers/bubblewrap>

⁸<https://pygments.org/>

Table 1. LLMs used for perturbation. Prices are collected from official documentation without considering context caching or third-party API providers.

| LLM | Release Date | Size | Reasoning | Price/M tokens | | Developer |
|----------------------|--------------|------|-----------|----------------|--------|-------------|
| | | | | Input | Output | |
| DeepSeek-V3.1 | 2025.8 | 671B | Disabled | \$0.56 | \$1.68 | DeepSeek AI |
| Qwen3-Coder-Instruct | 2025.7 | 480B | No | \$1.50 | \$7.50 | Alibaba |
| Kimi-K2-Preview | 2025.7 | 1T | No | \$0.60 | \$2.50 | Moonshot AI |
| Gemini-2.5-Flash | 2025.6 | - | Disabled | \$0.30 | \$1.00 | Google |

Table 2. Benchmark statistics. Unv. and V. refer to AXIOMBench-Unverified (before the multisource quality calibration stage) and the final verified AXIOMBench, respectively. LoC, CC, and # Tokens refer to the average lines-of-code, cyclomatic complexity, and number of tokens per program. # Req. and Total refer to the number of requirements and programs. We only use the verified version for later experiments.

| Version | Programs per Score | | | | | | LoC | CC | # Tokens | # Req. | Total |
|---------|--------------------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-------|------|-----|----------|--------|-------|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | |
| Unv. | 1,158 | 909 | 1,038 | 942 | 1,045 | 2,597 | 40.1 | 6.3 | 330 | 398 | 7,689 |
| V. | 330 | 316 | 335 | 363 | 361 | 257 | 58.4 | 8.5 | 477 | 388 | 1,962 |

of 96.47%, and an Exact Match score⁹ of 76.02%. The final calibration is performed by a primary expert with more than 10 years of programming experience, after which 1,431 programs (73% of all 1,962 programs) retain their target scores without manual modification, indicating that the target scores are already highly accurate. The final statistics of AXIOMBench are available in Table 2.

4.2 Research Questions

We investigate the following research questions (RQs) with AXIOMBench:

- **RQ1: How do existing code evaluation metrics perform on AXIOMBench?**

This question assesses the performance of existing metrics by measuring the alignment between scores from each metric and ground-truth scores. To achieve this, we use two correlation coefficients, Spearman’s ρ and Kendall’s τ , which measure their ranked relationship¹⁰, as well as an inter-rater agreement coefficient, Krippendorff’s α , which measures their absolute agreement. We also measure the mean and standard deviation of scores from each metric to study their mathematical characteristics.

- **RQ2: How effectively do metrics assess the fine-grained aspects of code quality, functionality, and refinement effort?**

This question provides a fine-grained analysis of metric performance by isolating each evaluation aspect: code quality, functionality, and refinement effort. Each can be formulated as a binary classification subtask: defective (positive) or non-defective (negative) for the first two, and refactor (positive) or tweak (negative) for the latter. We use four meta-metrics: F_1 -score with its components precision and recall, measuring how well an LLM-as-a-judge metric performs on the positive class; Matthews Correlation Coefficient (MCC), providing a more balanced assessment by considering both positive and negative classes.

⁹The percentage of programs where all experts assign the same final score.

¹⁰Pearson’s r is not used, since it measures linear relationships and requires interval scales. Applying to our ordinal-scaled scores would incorrectly assume identical gaps between consecutive scores, as explained in Footnote 2.

- **RQ3: Can these metrics evaluate code consistently?**

A reliable evaluation metric must behave consistently, assigning highly similar scores to the same program. To measure metric consistency, we run each metric five times on the same program on the Aider-Polyglot subset, before quantifying consistency with two agreement coefficients, namely Krippendorff’s α and intra-class correlation (specifically, ICC(3, 1)).

4.3 Experimental Setup

We study a variety of code evaluation metrics with AXIOMBench:

4.3.1 Rule-Based Metrics. These metrics design rules to compute the similarity between program p and the corresponding reference program p_{ref} .

- **ChrF++** [17] computes precisions and recalls of character n -grams ($1 \leq n \leq 6$) and token n -grams ($1 \leq n \leq 2$), and averages into the final precision and recall before computing the F_2 -score. While less frequently used than BLEU, a previous study [27] has demonstrated its better performance on code evaluation.
- **CodeBLEU** [19] is a metric commonly-used in code evaluation, which combines four components into the final score, namely BLEU, weighted n -gram match, syntactic AST match, and semantic data-flow match.
- **Edit Similarity** [10] is a metric quantifying the similarity between two sequences, measured using the edit distance, which computes the minimum number of token edits, including insertion, deletion, and substitution, to transform one sequence into the other. Assuming the token edit distance between p and p_{ref} is $d(p, p_{\text{ref}})$, then their edit similarity is $1 - d(p, p_{\text{ref}}) / \max(|p|, |p_{\text{ref}}|)$.

To standardize these metrics for a fair comparison, we first tokenize each program p with Pygments lexers instead of general-purpose LLM tokenizers to better capture the syntactic code structure. After discarding whitespace and comments, we compute raw score s_p with the metric. As these metrics produce continuous scores on varying scales, we normalize them into our 0–5 integer scale with the formula $\text{round}(5(s_p - s_{\min}) / (s_{\max} - s_{\min}))$, where s_{\min} and s_{\max} are the minimum and maximum raw scores from that metric across the benchmark.

4.3.2 LLM-as-a-Judge Metrics. These metrics prompt the LLM to respond with a score, sometimes using a predefined workflow to collect additional context before scoring.

- **ICE-Score** [33] prompts the LLM to follow several predefined evaluation steps and assign the final score on code usefulness and functional correctness.
- **CodeJudge**¹¹ [25] proposes a fault-localization method for fine-grained evaluation, which first prompts an LLM to detect faults and report in JSON, and then computes the final score with predefined rules. As the second rule-based step misaligns with our evaluation criteria, we replace it with another LLM invocation which requires the LLM to generate the final score with the JSON report and our evaluation criteria.
- **CodeVisionary** [28] presents an agentic workflow that gathers context, such as testing results and linting reports, with external tools, before entering a negotiation stage, where several judges discuss from different perspectives and determine the final score. Due to resource constraints, the maximum number of tool invocations was reduced to 20. We disable the screenshot and interaction actions due to the absence of frontend development in our benchmark.

¹¹The original work also designs another “analyze-then-summarize” pipeline for binary classification on functional correctness. We do not use this pipeline as our work focuses on a more fine-grained evaluation.

Table 3. Performance of each metric. Std. refers to the standard deviation. In each column, the highest result is underlined and marked bold, while results at most 3% lower than it are underlined.

| Metric | Mean \pm Std. | Python | | | C++ | | | Java | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | ρ | τ | α | ρ | τ | α | ρ | τ | α |
| Ground-Truth | 2.45 \pm 1.65 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Rule-Based Metrics | | | | | | | | | | |
| ChrF++ | 2.70 \pm 1.45 | 42.6 | 34.5 | 42.1 | 50.3 | 41.1 | 44.4 | 55.1 | 45.3 | 47.7 |
| CodeBLEU | 2.48 \pm 1.31 | 39.5 | 32.2 | 37.4 | 49.2 | 40.3 | 44.1 | 55.3 | 45.4 | 51.3 |
| Edit Similarity | 2.10 \pm 1.48 | 40.7 | 33.2 | 36.1 | 46.2 | 37.2 | 46.1 | 54.1 | 44.2 | 53.4 |
| LLM-as-a-Judge: DeepSeek-V3.1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| ICE-Score | 1.96 \pm 1.26 | 69.4 | 60.4 | 63.0 | 58.6 | 49.6 | 53.3 | 65.1 | 56.3 | 62.5 |
| CodeJudge | 1.42 \pm 1.05 | 63.2 | 54.6 | 46.1 | 58.7 | 50.4 | 40.3 | <u>63.8</u> | <u>55.1</u> | 48.4 |
| CodeVisionary | 1.33 \pm 1.50 | <u>66.7</u> | 56.3 | 49.5 | 58.5 | 49.3 | 37.0 | 42.8 | 35.4 | 13.6 |
| LLM-as-a-Judge: Gemini-2.5-Flash | | | | | | | | | | |
| ICE-Score | 1.53 \pm 1.40 | 59.4 | 49.6 | 46.6 | 58.9 | 49.0 | 45.4 | <u>62.7</u> | 53.0 | 49.4 |
| CodeJudge | 1.16 \pm 1.10 | 63.1 | 53.9 | 40.3 | 57.7 | 49.7 | 24.7 | 57.7 | 49.1 | 33.7 |
| CodeVisionary | 1.45 \pm 1.34 | 65.4 | 55.7 | 49.2 | 63.2 | 53.7 | <u>51.2</u> | 52.6 | 44.6 | 29.2 |

We use DeepSeek-V3.1 and Gemini-2.5-Flash to study all metrics above, both without reasoning. We adhere to their original prompt strategies and hyper-parameter configurations, except replacing their original evaluation criteria with ours, as described in Section 3.1. For the ease of reading, we multiply the coefficients by 100.

5 Study Results

5.1 RQ1: Metric Performance

We measure the performance of each metric with the correlation between the ground-truth scores and the metric scores. The results are available in Table 3.

We consider ICE-Score as the baseline for both LLMs, which is a simple LLM-as-a-judge metric requiring one inference pass. CodeVisionary, a complex agentic metric, yields a 10.1% improvement for Python from 59.4 to 65.4 in Spearman’s ρ and a 7.3% improvement for C++ from 58.9 to 63.2, when used with Gemini-2.5-Flash. However, when we switch to DeepSeek-V3.1, it decreases the performance by 3.9% and 0.2% in ρ for Python and C++. Given that DeepSeek performs better than Gemini with ICE-Score, this indicates that simple LLM-as-a-judge metrics like ICE-Score are already sufficient for LLMs with stronger evaluation capabilities, while the agentic workflow from CodeVisionary notably boosts the performance of less capable LLMs. The results are completely different for Java, where CodeVisionary degrades ρ by 34.3% and 16.1% for both LLMs, respectively. This can potentially be attributed to the complexity of testing Java projects, as CodeVisionary’s agentic approach requires constructing the environment, generating test cases, and executing the program, which is more likely to fail for Java than for Python and C++.

For other metrics, CodeJudge generally underperforms ICE-Score. Specifically, performance with DeepSeek decreases by 8.9% for Python and 2.0% for Java, though it shows marginal improvement for C++. Similarly, performance with Gemini drops by 2.0% for C++ and 8.0% for Java. This hints that CodeJudge’s JSON error report and manually-curated error types may misalign with our

evaluation criteria, leading to unsatisfactory results. On the other hand, previous work [27] has revealed that LLM-as-a-judge metrics show remarkable performance boosts over rule-based metrics, which is further validated by our experimental results. For instance, ICE-Score combined with Gemini increases Spearman's ρ by 13.8%–39.4% over the best-aligning rule-based metrics, ChrF++, which outperforms CodeBLEU and Edit Similarity in most cases except for Java. The results in Kendall's τ demonstrate a similar trend to Spearman's ρ .

Finding 1: The choice of the optimal code evaluation metric reveals a trade-off between LLM capability and metric complexity. LLMs with stronger evaluation capabilities achieve peak performance with simple metrics with a single inference pass. Conversely, less capable LLMs benefit from sophisticated agentic workflows to gather more context, but this improvement may fail for complex environments like Java.

We shift our attention towards Krippendorff's α , which measures the absolute agreement between metric scores and ground-truth scores, requiring LLM-as-a-judge metrics to not only rank programs correctly, but also suppress systematic biases and assign scores close to the ground-truth. We discover that the baseline metric, ICE-Score, exhibits the highest α values for DeepSeek at 63.0, 53.3, and 62.5 for Python, C++, and Java, respectively. On the contrary, more complex metrics like CodeJudge and CodeVisionary notably decrease α by 21.4%–30.6% in most cases, except that CodeVisionary devastatingly drops α by 78.2% to merely 13.6 for Java. These metrics also feature remarkably lower mean scores of 1.33 for CodeVisionary and 1.42 for CodeJudge compared to the ground-truth's mean score of 2.45, indicating a severe systematic bias that results in lower scores than intended. Results of Gemini demonstrate a similar trend, where more complex metrics feature lower mean scores, although CodeVisionary conversely increases α by 5.6% for Python and 12.8% for C++, aligning with the previous discovery that this agentic workflow boosts Gemini's performance in languages with less complex environments.

Finding 2: LLM-as-a-judge metrics demonstrate a notable gap between their ability to rank programs and to adhere to human scoring criteria, indicating systematic biases in these metrics. While most LLM-as-a-judge metrics exhibit mid-high rank correlation, their absolute agreement with ground-truth scores is considerably lower, with simpler metrics yielding higher agreement.

5.2 RQ2: Fine-Grained Assessment

In Table 4, LLM-as-a-judge metrics have slightly higher F_1 -scores of 71.1–81.8 on code quality evaluation than F_1 of 68.9–76.0 (6.2% lower on average) on functionality evaluation, with similar levels of recall at 85.2–99.4 for the latter and 81.5–99.1 (3.1% lower on average) for the former. The difference is primarily caused by lower precision in functionality evaluation at 52.8–64.0 (59.3 on average) versus 63.1–70.2 (67.6 on average) in code quality evaluation. While this seems to indicate that LLM-as-a-judge metrics are better in determining code quality than functionality, the MCC results reveal a contrasting story. All metrics with both LLMs achieve lower than 15 on MCC in code quality evaluation, but in functionality evaluation, they achieve 22.1–46.4 MCC, demonstrating 96.9%–269.0% higher results except for CodeVisionary with Gemini-2.5-Flash, which exhibits an astonishing 804.2% higher MCC in functionality evaluation. This discrepancy stems from our intuitive definition of “defective” as the positive class, which creates a class imbalance during code quality evaluation where non-defective, 5-point programs are the minority, negative samples. This renders F_1 results less reliable, since it emphasizes the positive, majority class instead.

Table 4. Fine-grained analysis of LLM-as-a-judge metrics. *P* and *R* refer to precision and recall respectively. The highest result is marked bold and underlined.

| Metric | Code Quality Evaluation | | | | Functionality Evaluation | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | MCC | <i>F</i> ₁ | <i>P</i> | <i>R</i> | MCC | <i>F</i> ₁ | <i>P</i> | <i>R</i> |
| DeepSeek-V3.1 | | | | | | | | |
| ICE-Score | 10.7 | 79.7 | 66.6 | <u>99.1</u> | 39.5 | 73.1 | 64.0 | 85.2 |
| CodeJudge | 9.2 | 71.1 | 63.1 | 81.5 | 22.1 | 68.9 | 52.8 | <u>99.4</u> |
| CodeVisionary | 13.7 | 79.0 | 67.9 | 94.6 | 46.4 | 76.0 | 62.8 | 96.3 |
| Gemini-2.5-Flash | | | | | | | | |
| ICE-Score | 13.7 | 74.8 | 68.4 | 82.6 | 35.9 | 72.5 | 59.8 | 92.3 |
| CodeJudge | <u>14.7</u> | 78.9 | 69.2 | 91.7 | 28.8 | 70.5 | 54.8 | 98.8 |
| CodeVisionary | 4.8 | 81.8 | 70.2 | 98.2 | 43.4 | 75.0 | 61.5 | 96.0 |

While the mid-high *F*₁ demonstrates these metrics’ decent capabilities in catching defects, the low MCC score offers a more complete picture, revealing a critical deficiency in correctly identifying non-defective programs. This tendency to be an overly pessimistic, harsh grader aligns with the lower mean scores observed in Table 3 from RQ1, suggesting that current LLM-as-a-judge metrics are prone to hallucinating defects in the code, especially in code quality evaluation.

Finding 3: LLM-as-a-judge metrics exhibit a strong bias towards defect detection. While they demonstrate proficiency at identifying defective code, they often misclassify non-defective programs as defective, especially with code quality defects, compromising the overall reliability by this tendency to produce false positives.

To evaluate refinement effort estimation on each metric, we only retain programs whose functionality and code quality are correctly evaluated by the metric. These programs feature a balanced distribution between the refactor (positive) and tweak (negative) classes. The results are available in Figure 3.

The results reveal that no tested metric can reliably perform this task, with extremely low MCC below 10.0, which is barely better than random guessing. A deeper look at precision and recall reveals their failure patterns. While all combinations of metrics and LLMs yield similarly poor precision from 45.2 to 49.1, their recall values differ notably. For example, DeepSeek-V3.1 estimates the effort more conservatively, resulting in a lower recall of 40.0–47.0 except for CodeVisionary at 67.9. On the other hand, Gemini-2.5-Flash exhibits much higher recall from 67.7 to 78.3, suggesting that it aggressively labels many more changes as refactors. However, the near-zero MCC confirms that neither strategy is effective, since MCC additionally considers true negatives (tweaks) compared to the *F*₁-score, and both LLMs’ overestimation of refinement effort demonstrates their fundamental inability in this task.

Finding 4: A critical shortcoming of current LLM-as-a-judge metrics is their unreliable estimation of code refinement effort. They exhibit a pronounced tendency to overestimate the scope of changes, frequently misclassifying simple localized corrections as substantial architectural changes.




Fig. 3. Analysis of refinement effort estimation.

Table 5. Consistency of each metric. Eq% refers to the percentage of samples where five metric runs generate the same score. The highest result is marked bold and underlined.

| Metric | Python | | | C++ | | | Java | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | α | ICC | Eq% | α | ICC | Eq% | α | ICC | Eq% |
| LLM-as-a-Judge: Gemini-2.5-Flash | | | | | | | | | |
| ICE-Score | 87.0 | <u>82.6</u> | 60.0 | <u>90.5</u> | <u>89.4</u> | 51.5 | <u>91.4</u> | 90.0 | 60.6 |
| CodeJudge | <u>87.3</u> | 80.2 | <u>80.6</u> | 81.9 | 78.6 | <u>63.8</u> | 88.2 | <u>90.9</u> | <u>68.9</u> |
| CodeVisionary | 69.6 | 59.4 | 38.3 | 70.7 | 66.2 | 29.4 | 64.7 | 61.4 | 36.7 |

5.3 RQ3: Scoring Consistency

We study the scoring consistency of each metric with Gemini-2.5-Flash in Table 5, where each metric is executed five times on each program.

Both simpler metrics, ICE-Score and CodeJudge, demonstrate high consistency in all languages. Specifically, they achieve over 85 in α in most scenarios except for CodeJudge with C++, and over 78 in ICC in all languages. This suggests that even when they generate inconsistent evaluation results for the same program, the scoring variance will likely remain low. Notably, CodeJudge provides the highest Eq% of over 80 for Python and over 60 for C++ and Java, indicating perfect consistency in most scenarios. This suggests that CodeJudge’s JSON error report and predefined fault types effectively constrain the LLM’s output and reduce randomness compared to ICE-Score’s more open-ended approach.




Fig. 4. Case study on AXIOMBench.

In contrast, the complex agentic metric, CodeVisionary, behaves notably more inconsistently than the other two metrics with 20.3%–29.2% lower α and 46.7%–53.9% lower Eq%. This can be attributed to accumulated uncertainty; each step during CodeVisionary’s multi-step process of planning actions and calling various tools introduces stochasticity, leading to high variance in the final scores, in contrast to other metrics, which only include one or two LLM invocations, minimizing this uncertainty accumulation.

Finding 5: The procedural complexity of an LLM-as-a-judge metric directly impacts its scoring consistency. Simpler metrics that require only a few LLM invocations exhibit high consistency, producing stable scores across repeated runs. In contrast, complex agentic metrics requiring multiple tool interactions suffer from enlarged scoring variance, a consequence of accumulated uncertainty where the stochasticity from each step compounds, leading to a less controllable final evaluation.

6 Discussion

6.1 Case Study

To provide more insights into data samples and LLM-as-a-judge metric outputs, we present a case study in Figure 4. The left program is a 5-point, production-ready code, while the right program undergoes two perturbations: introducing an intermediate variable *is_valid*, which has no effect on functionality or code quality, and adds a redundant step that converts string *text* into integer *num* without discarding non-digit characters, breaking the functionality. Since this functional flaw is easy to repair, the program serves as a standard 2-point example. Unfortunately, CodeJudge with Gemini-2.5-Flash only detects other less relevant issues in the JSON error report, resulting in a final score of 3, failing to notice the broken functionality.

6.2 Threats to Validity

- **Programming Languages.** Our benchmark covers three prevalent, multi-paradigm languages, namely C++, Python, and Java. Consequently, our findings may not directly generalize to languages with distinct paradigms or domains, such as Rust for system programming and JavaScript for web development. We mitigate this by selecting languages representing a

significant portion of modern software development, and leave extensions to other languages as future work.

- **Domain Generalizability.** Some data sources mainly feature algorithmic problems or usage of popular libraries, which may not fully represent the complexity of real-world projects with private, repository-level dependencies. We mitigate this by adopting sources with cross-file dependencies like Aider-Polyglot and designing perturbation rules to be dependency-agnostic. This allows our framework to readily extend to more complex, real-world codebases.
- **Subjectivity in Criteria Interpretation.** Our evaluation criteria rely on human distinction between minor tweaks and major refactors, potentially introducing subjectivity in our ground-truth labels. We mitigate this with multisource-informed score calibration, providing the annotator with a wide range of objective evidence, like static analysis results and `diff`. This reframes the annotating task from open-ended scoring to a more objective verification.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose AXIOM, a framework to synthesize code evaluation data to meta-evaluate existing LLM-as-a-judge metrics for code. AXIOM involves a rule-guided perturbation stage to synthesize programs and a multisource quality calibration stage to calibrate scores, addressing issues of previous benchmarks. We use this framework to craft a larger-scale benchmark, AXIOMBench, conduct experiments with multiple recent LLM-as-a-judge metrics, and summarize our findings.

Data Availability

We publicize our synthesis framework and benchmark at <https://github.com/BackOnTruck/axiom-llm-judge>.

References

- [1] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Pondé de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Joshua Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. *CoRR* abs/2107.03374 (2021).
- [2] Yujia Chen, Mingyu Chen, Cuiyun Gao, Zhihan Jiang, Zhongqi Li, and Yuchi Ma. 2025. Towards Mitigating API Hallucination in Code Generated by LLMs with Hierarchical Dependency Aware. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on the Foundations of Software Engineering, FSE Companion 2025, Clarion Hotel Trondheim, Trondheim, Norway, June 23-28, 2025*. ACM, 468–479.
- [3] DeepSeek-AI. 2024. DeepSeek-V3 Technical Report. *CoRR* abs/2412.19437 (2024).
- [4] DeepSeek-AI. 2025. DeepSeek-R1: Incentivizing Reasoning Capability in LLMs via Reinforcement Learning. *CoRR* abs/2501.12948 (2025).
- [5] Aryaz Eghbali and Michael Pradel. 2022. CrystalBLEU: Precisely and Efficiently Measuring the Similarity of Code. In *44th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings, ICSE Companion 2022, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, May 22-24, 2022*. ACM/IEEE, 341–342.
- [6] Jia Feng, Jiachen Liu, Cuiyun Gao, Chun Yong Chong, Chaozheng Wang, Shan Gao, and Xin Xia. 2024. ComplexCodeEval: A Benchmark for Evaluating Large Code Models on More Complex Code. In *Proceedings of the 39th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2024, Sacramento, CA, USA, October 27 - November 1, 2024*. ACM, 1895–1906.
- [7] Dan Hendrycks, Steven Basart, Saurav Kadavath, Mantas Mazeika, Akul Arora, Ethan Guo, Collin Burns, Samir Puranik, Horace He, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring Coding Challenge Competence With APPS. In *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks 1, NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks 2021, December 2021, virtual*, Joaquin Vanschoren and Sai-Kit Yeung (Eds.).

- [8] Naman Jain, King Han, Alex Gu, Wen-Ding Li, Fanjia Yan, Tianjun Zhang, Sida Wang, Armando Solar-Lezama, Koushik Sen, and Ion Stoica. 2025. LiveCodeBench: Holistic and Contamination Free Evaluation of Large Language Models for Code. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2025, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025*. OpenReview.net.
- [9] Hongchao Jiang, Yiming Chen, Yushi Cao, Hung-yi Lee, and Robby T. Tan. 2025. CodeJudgeBench: Benchmarking LLM-as-a-Judge for Coding Tasks. *CoRR* abs/2507.10535 (2025).
- [10] VI Levenshtein. 1965. Binary codes capable of correcting deletions, insertions, and reversals *Probl. Inf. Transm* 1 (1965), 8–17.
- [11] Yi Li, Shaohua Wang, and Tien N. Nguyen. 2020. DLFix: context-based code transformation learning for automated program repair. In *ICSE '20: 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering, Seoul, South Korea, 27 June - 19 July, 2020*. ACM, 602–614.
- [12] Lin Ling, Fazle Rabbi, Song Wang, and Jinqiu Yang. 2025. Bias Unveiled: Investigating Social Bias in LLM-Generated Code. In *AAAI-25, Sponsored by the Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence, February 25 - March 4, 2025, Philadelphia, PA, USA*. AAAI Press, 27491–27499.
- [13] Nickil Maveli, Antonio Vergari, and Shay B. Cohen. 2025. What can Large Language Models Capture about Code Functional Equivalence?. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2025, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA, April 29 - May 4, 2025*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 6865–6903.
- [14] OpenAI. 2024. GPT-4o System Card. *CoRR* abs/2410.21276 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2410.21276> arXiv:2410.21276
- [15] OpenAI. 2024. OpenAI o1 System Card. *CoRR* abs/2412.16720 (2024).
- [16] Neeva Oza, Ishaan Govil, Parul Gupta, Dinesh Khandelwal, Dinesh Garg, and Parag Singla. 2025. CETBench: A Novel Dataset constructed via Transformations over Programs for Benchmarking LLMs for Code-Equivalence Checking. *CoRR* abs/2506.04019 (2025).
- [17] Maja Popovic. 2017. chrF++: words helping character n-grams. In *Proceedings of the Second Conference on Machine Translation, WMT 2017, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 7-8, 2017*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 612–618.
- [18] Yujia Qin, Shengding Hu, Yankai Lin, Weize Chen, Ning Ding, Ganqu Cui, Zheni Zeng, Xuanhe Zhou, Yufei Huang, Chaojun Xiao, Chi Han, Yi R. Fung, Yusheng Su, Huadong Wang, Cheng Qian, Runchu Tian, Kunlun Zhu, Shihao Liang, Xingyu Shen, Bokai Xu, Zhen Zhang, Yining Ye, Bowen Li, Ziwei Tang, Jing Yi, Yuzhang Zhu, Zhenning Dai, Lan Yan, Xin Cong, Yaxi Lu, Weilin Zhao, Yuxiang Huang, Junxi Yan, Xu Han, Xian Sun, Dahai Li, Jason Phang, Cheng Yang, Tongshuang Wu, Heng Ji, Guoliang Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2025. Tool Learning with Foundation Models. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 57, 4 (2025), 101:1–101:40.
- [19] Shuo Ren, Daya Guo, Shuai Lu, Long Zhou, Shujie Liu, Duyu Tang, Neel Sundaresan, Ming Zhou, Ambrosio Blanco, and Shuai Ma. 2020. CodeBLEU: a Method for Automatic Evaluation of Code Synthesis. *CoRR* abs/2009.10297 (2020).
- [20] Baptiste Rozière, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, Artyom Kozhevnikov, Ivan Evtimov, Joanna Bitton, Manish Bhatt, Cristian Canton-Ferrer, Aaron Grattafiori, Wenhan Xiong, Alexandre Défossez, Jade Copet, Faisal Azhar, Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Nicolas Usunier, Thomas Scialom, and Gabriel Synnaeve. 2023. Code Llama: Open Foundation Models for Code. *CoRR* abs/2308.12950 (2023).
- [21] Charlie Victor Snell, Jaehoon Lee, Kelvin Xu, and Aviral Kumar. 2025. Scaling LLM Test-Time Compute Optimally Can be More Effective than Scaling Parameters for Reasoning. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2025, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025*. OpenReview.net.
- [22] Gemini Team. 2025. Gemini 2.5: Pushing the Frontier with Advanced Reasoning, Multimodality, Long Context, and Next Generation Agentic Capabilities. *CoRR* abs/2507.06261 (2025).
- [23] Qwen Team. 2025. Qwen3 Technical Report. *CoRR* abs/2505.09388 (2025).
- [24] Patanamon Thongtanunam, Chanathip Pornprasit, and Chakkrit Tantithamthavorn. 2022. AutoTransform: Automated Code Transformation to Support Modern Code Review Process. In *44th IEEE/ACM 44th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2022, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, May 25-27, 2022*. ACM, 237–248.
- [25] Weixi Tong and Tianyi Zhang. 2024. CodeJudge: Evaluating Code Generation with Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2024, Miami, FL, USA, November 12-16, 2024*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 20032–20051.
- [26] Ngoc M. Tran, Hieu Tran, Son Nguyen, Hoan Nguyen, and Tien N. Nguyen. 2019. Does BLEU score work for code migration?. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Program Comprehension, ICPC 2019, Montreal, QC, Canada, May 25-31, 2019*. IEEE / ACM, 165–176.
- [27] Ruiqi Wang, Jiyu Guo, Cuiyun Gao, Guodong Fan, Chun Yong Chong, and Xin Xia. 2025. Can LLMs Replace Human Evaluators? An Empirical Study of LLM-as-a-Judge in Software Engineering. *Proc. ACM Softw. Eng.* 2, ISSTA (2025), 1955–1977.

- [28] Xincheng Wang, Pengfei Gao, Chao Peng, Ruida Hu, and Cuiyun Gao. 2025. CodeVisionary: An Agent-based Framework for Evaluating Large Language Models in Code Generation. *CoRR* abs/2504.13472 (2025).
- [29] Yutong Wang, Pengliang Ji, Chaoqun Yang, Kaixin Li, Ming Hu, Jiaoyang Li, and Guillaume Sartoretti. 2025. MCTS-Judge: Test-Time Scaling in LLM-as-a-Judge for Code Correctness Evaluation. *CoRR* abs/2502.12468 (2025).
- [30] Yue Wang, Hung Le, Akhilesh Gotmare, Nghi D. Q. Bui, Junnan Li, and Steven C. H. Hoi. 2023. CodeT5+: Open Code Large Language Models for Code Understanding and Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1069–1088.
- [31] Anjiang Wei, Jiannan Cao, Ran Li, Hongyu Chen, Yuhui Zhang, Ziheng Wang, Yaofeng Sun, Yuan Liu, Thiago S. F. X. Teixeira, Diyi Yang, Ke Wang, and Alex Aiken. 2025. EquiBench: Benchmarking Code Reasoning Capabilities of Large Language Models via Equivalence Checking. *CoRR* abs/2502.12466 (2025).
- [32] Yuwei Zhao, Ziyang Luo, Yuchen Tian, Hongzhan Lin, Weixiang Yan, Annan Li, and Jing Ma. 2025. CodeJudge-Eval: Can Large Language Models be Good Judges in Code Understanding?. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics, COLING 2025, Abu Dhabi, UAE, January 19-24, 2025*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 73–95.
- [33] Terry Yue Zhuo. 2024. ICE-Score: Instructing Large Language Models to Evaluate Code. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2024, St. Julian's, Malta, March 17-22, 2024*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2232–2242.
- [34] Terry Yue Zhuo, Minh Chien Vu, Jenny Chim, Han Hu, Wenhao Yu, Ratnadira Widyasari, Imam Nur Bani Yusuf, Haolan Zhan, Junda He, Indraneil Paul, Simon Brunner, Chen Gong, James Hoang, Armel Randy Zebaze, Xiaoheng Hong, Wen-Ding Li, Jean Kaddour, Ming Xu, Zhihan Zhang, Prateek Yadav, and et al. 2025. BigCodeBench: Benchmarking Code Generation with Diverse Function Calls and Complex Instructions. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2025, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025*. OpenReview.net.