

Iterative Refinement of Project-Level Code Context for Precise Code Generation with Compiler Feedback

Zhangqian Bi^{1*} Yao Wan^{1*†} Zheng Wang² Hongyu Zhang³ Batu Guan¹
Fangxin Lu⁴ Zili Zhang⁵ Yulei Sui⁶ Hai Jin^{1*} Xuanhua Shi^{1*}

¹Huazhong University of Science and Technology ²University of Leeds

³Chongqing University ⁴South-Central Minzu College for Nationalities

⁵Shanghai Jiao Tong University ⁶University of New South Wales

{zqbi, wanyao, hjin, xhshi}@hust.edu.cn

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have shown remarkable progress in automated code generation. Yet, incorporating LLM-based code generation into real-life software projects poses challenges, as the generated code may contain errors in API usage, class, data structure, or missing project-specific information. As much of this project-specific context cannot fit into the prompts of LLMs, we must find ways to allow the model to explore the project-level code context. To this end, this paper puts forward a novel approach, termed PROCODER, which iteratively refines the project-level code context for precise code generation, guided by the compiler feedback. In particular, PROCODER first leverages compiler techniques to identify a mismatch between the generated code and the project’s context. It then iteratively aligns and fixes the identified errors using information extracted from the code repository. We integrate PROCODER with two representative LLMs, i.e., GPT-3.5-Turbo and Code Llama (13B), and apply it to Python code generation. Experimental results show that PROCODER significantly improves the vanilla LLMs by over 80% in generating code dependent on project context, and consistently outperforms the existing retrieval-based code generation baselines.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs), especially those pre-trained on code, as demonstrated by tools such as GitHub Copilot (Friedman, 2021), Amazon’s CodeWhisperer (Amazon, 2023), and ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2023a), are revolutionizing how developers approach programming by automatically generating code based on natural language intent and the context of surrounding code. While exist-

* Also with Services Computing Technology and System Lab, Big Data Technology and System Lab, Cluster and Grid Computing Lab, School of Computer Science and Technology, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China

† Corresponding Author.




Figure 1: Example illustrating limitations of LLM-based code generation: (a) task prompt, (b) wrong solution and error identification, and (c) correct solution utilizing project context.

ing LLM-based code generation tools excel in handling small code samples, such as completing the current line or the body of a method or giving examples of a standard API, integrating LLM-based code generation into real-life software projects remains challenging (Li et al., 2024).

Practical code generation for software projects requires using project-specific contexts like classes, methods, and data structures due to modularity, maintenance, and code independence requirements. However, the repository’s size often exceeds the capacity of the prompt, challenging LLMs to comprehend extensive contexts (Liao et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024). Also, studies have demonstrated that irrelevant context in prompts potentially compromises the model performance (Shi et al., 2023). Inputting only the task requirements can lead LLMs to overlook project-specific APIs, classes, data structures, or type information specific to a software project’s repository, risking omitting essential logic during code generation (Gifany et al., 2013).

As a motivation example, consider the case shown in Figure 1. In this case, we use the OpenAI GPT-3.5-Turbo API to generate an image-enhancing function by first reducing the noise and then adjusting brightness and contrast. Given the prompt in Figure 1a, the LLM will produce a code snippet of calling a `reduce_noise` method as depicted in Figure 1b. Although the generated code follows a standard workflow specified in the task prompt, it leads to a compilation error in our application context because `reduce_noise` is not implemented. This is unsurprising as the prompt does not provide enough project-level context for the LLM, and can be fixed by providing the project-specific function `denoising.denoise` as context, as illustrated in Figure 1c. While a carefully engineered prompt may resolve this issue, it is not always possible for the user to generate such prompts, and the project context may be too large to fit into the prompt. As we will show later in the paper, such errors are commonly found when applying LLMs to repository-level code generation (Li et al., 2024).

This paper investigates a way to effectively integrate LLM-based code generation with existing code implementations within a software project. Our solution is to leverage project-level contextual information, such as project-specific implementation of classes, methods, and data structures, to reduce compilation errors and improve code quality. Directly incorporating the entire project code into a language model is infeasible due to model input sequence length limitations. Instead, we use compiler-based analysis to post-process the model-generated code by first detecting discrepancies between the generated code and the project’s context. We then utilize information extracted from the project code base to rectify the mismatches in using modules, APIs, and classes. Our approach combines well-established compiler techniques with emerging generative methods, allowing software developers to leverage the power of LLMs without being overwhelmed and discouraged by the frequent compilation and semantic errors in the model-generated code.

We present PROCODER, a method to allow an LLM to leverage the code repository of a software project to enhance the quality of the generated code. For a given LLM-generated code sample, PROCODER first compiles it and identifies context-related errors. It then retrieves the related context

from the code repository to fix the errors. This iterative generation and verification process proceeds repetitively until no error is identified in the generated solution. We demonstrate that PROCODER enhances the accuracy of generation (as indicated by pass rates) by bridging the gap between the repository context and the intended solution.

We evaluate PROCODER by applying it to the CoderEval benchmarking dataset (Yu et al., 2023), which consists of code generation tasks utilizing project-specific context. We test PROCODER on two popular code generation models: the GPT-3.5-Turbo (OpenAI, 2023a) and Code Llama (Rozière et al., 2023). Experimental results demonstrate that PROCODER significantly improves the repository-level code generation performance of different dependency levels, outperforming the baseline by over 80% relative pass rates in generating functions dependent on project-specific contexts. Moreover, our iterative method consistently enhances the performance of vanilla retrieval-augmented generation. We also provide a comprehensive analysis of the effectiveness and limitations of PROCODER, offering insights for future research.

This paper makes the following contributions:

- An empirical study to analyze the error distribution in self-contained and repository-level code generation, highlighting the significance of precise and grounded program context in generating code at the project level (Section 2.2);
- A new iterative generation-verification-retrieval method that leverages the program compiler to eliminate context-related errors in repository-level code generation (Section 3);
- Extensive experiments and analysis based on two LLMs, i.e., GPT-3.5-Turbo and Code Llama (13B), validate the effectiveness of our proposed PROCODER (Section 5).

2 Background

2.1 LLM-based Code Generation

Our work targets the code generation task, which produces source code from a natural-language description complemented by programming context (e.g., project-specific APIs, data structures, and so on). We denote such input as x . Given x , it is first converted to a sequence of tokens $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, \dots, x_{|\mathbf{x}|}]$, and a generation model $p_{\text{LM}}(\mathbf{x})$ predict new tokens sequentially. At each step t , the LM calculates the probability distribution of

Table 1: Several typical errors reported in compilation and execution.

| Error Type | Example |
|---------------|---|
| <i>UNDEF</i> | No name 'AsyncBolt5x0' in module 'neo4j_sync.io_bolt5' |
| <i>API</i> | No value for argument 'xmls' in function call |
| <i>OBJECT</i> | 'function' object is not subscriptable |
| <i>FUNC</i> | The generated function not passes a test case |
| <i>OTHER</i> | Parsing failed: 'expected an indented block after function definition |

the next token as $p_{\text{LM}}(x_t|x_{1:t-1})$. The probability of generating a program y with token sequence $\mathbf{y} = [x_{|x|+1}, \dots, x_{|x|+|y|}]$ is computed as a product of next-token distributions given left context:

$$P(y|x) = \prod_{t=|x|+1}^{|x|+|y|} p_{\text{LM}}(x_t|x_{1:t}). \quad (1)$$

For few-shot learning with large LMs, the generation is also often conditioned on a fixed set of m exemplars, $\{\langle x_i, y_i \rangle\}_{i \leq m}$. Thus, the LLM-based code generation can be formulated as:

$$P_{\text{LM}}(y|x) = P(y|x, \{\langle x_i, y_i \rangle\}_{i \leq m}). \quad (2)$$

Practically, the probability of the next token x_t depends on a fixed number of preceding tokens $x_{\max(1, t-w)} : x_{t-1}$, defined by the model’s window length w , which may not encompass the entire software project’s code base.

2.2 Error Analysis in Code Generation

The performance of simple function-level code generation has significantly improved, evidenced by an increase in the pass rate from a pass rate of 31.6% with CodeT5 (Wang et al., 2021) to 94.7% in the state-of-the-art Code Llama model (Rozière et al., 2023) on the widely-used HumanEval benchmark (Chen et al., 2021). However, a recent study (Yu et al., 2023) shows that existing LLMs for code generation struggle to generate code snippets that are dependent on the project context information, such as private APIs, types, and variables. To this end, various benchmarks, including ClassEval (Du et al., 2023) and CoderEval (Yu et al., 2023), have been devised to assess the performance of Language Models in generating context-dependent code within the project.

To better illustrate our motivation, we perform an empirical analysis of when the LLMs fail to generate complex code that is dependent on project-level context, on the CoderEval dataset (Yu et al., 2023). This dataset comprises 85 function-level tasks and 145 project-level tasks. Specifically, we select the GPT-3.5-TURBO (OpenAI, 2023a) as a target LLM




Figure 2: Distribution of error types in the generated solutions on CoderEval dataset.

for function-level code generation. Based on it, we choose a state-of-the-art method, termed RepoCoder (Zhang et al., 2023a), which retrieves the project-level context as augmentation and feeds 5 code fragments that have the highest DPR similarity score (Karpukhin et al., 2020) in prompt for better code generation.

As the code is generated, we compile the code and collect the errors reported by the compiler or in testing. We have generated 10 candidate solutions for a task, comprising 850 solutions for function-level tasks and 1450 for project-level tasks. We report the Pass@10 rate as 53.57% for function-level tasks and 39.73% for project-level tasks. The code that did not pass the test has been taken into error analysis. Each generated code snippet contains precisely one type of error. If multiple errors are reported by the compiler, the most common error type is selected for analysis. The error distribution revealed that four specific types of errors constitute the majority of all errors encountered. We categorize these errors into: 1) *UNDEF*, involving Use of Undefined Symbol, 2) *API*, involving Incorrect Use of APIs, 3) *OBJECT*, involving Improper Use of an Object, 4) *FUNC*, involving Runtime or Functional Errors, and 5) *OTHER*, involving Other Syntax and Semantic Errors. Table 1 presents several errors encountered in compiling and testing. One example is the “*UNDEF*” error, where a variable `AsyncBolt5x0` is referenced but does not exist in the specified module.

Figure 2 illustrates the distribution of error types, under the scenario of function-level code generation and project-level code generation. From this figure, we can observe that the majority of errors are runtime or functional errors, accounting for 72% and 34% for function-level and project-level code generation, respectively. Furthermore, the *UNDEF* errors and the *API* errors account for substantially high portions of 21% and 64% for




Figure 3: Overview of the PROCODER method: (a) the project-level code context extraction process, and (b) iterative refinement to fix compiler-reported errors.

function-level and project-level code generation, respectively. PROCODER addresses both types of errors associated with project context by supplying the relevant project context. Experiments demonstrate that PROCODER not only fixes these two types of error but also mitigates other compilation errors by providing feedback on error messages to the language model, leading directly to an improvement in prediction accuracy.

3 Methodology

3.1 Overview

Figure 3 depicts the workflow of PROCODER, consisting of two crucial components: 1) a method for extracting project-level code context through both syntactic and semantic approaches, and 2) a component responsible for iterative generation and evaluation of solutions. This process refines the solutions incrementally, ensuring they evolve towards an error-free state that seamlessly aligns with the project’s environment.

3.2 Project-Level Code Context Extraction

Supposing that the code generation tools are activated at a specific juncture. In light of the natural language requirement and the code produced by LLMs after an initial iteration, our objective is to extract the semantic context of the generated code from the project’s code base.

Unlike plain texts, source code has syntactic structures that enable precise identification of elements in a project. Thus, in practice, we employ syntax-directed program analysis (Harrold

and Rothermel, 1996) at various points throughout the offline stage to extract the code context at the project level. We initially employ a parser to transform each source code file within the project into an Abstract Syntax Tree (AST), extracting tree nodes that correspond to classes, functions, or variables. Subsequently, if a node of these types is found to be a child of another node (e.g., the function `get_handler` and the class `AsyncBolt` in Figure 3(a)’s AST), an edge is created from the parent node to the child node, establishing a hierarchical relationship.

Take the function f_1 from Figure 3(a) as an example. From this figure, we can see that both its semantics (e.g., its docstring), and its syntactic relation between the parent class `AsyncBolt` and file `async/bolt.py` are captured. This establishes finding the function from the project syntactically using its qualified name `async/bolt.py:AsyncBolt.get_handler`, or semantically according to its docstring “Return Bolt protocol handlers.”.

3.3 Retrieval-Augmented Code Generation

We leverage project-level code context in the retrieval-augmented generation paradigm (Zhang et al., 2023a; Ding et al., 2022; Karpukhin et al., 2020), which has been widely adopted to integrate factual knowledge into LLMs and address hallucination issues. In practice, we commence by extracting project-level context from the database through the construction of a Structured Query Language (SQL) query. Following this, we en-




Figure 4: Prompt examples for SQL synthesize and code generation.

hance the acquired context by retrieving similar code snippets based on the dense passage retrieval techniques (Karpukhin et al., 2020).

Based on the compiler feedback, we aim to retrieve the relevant project-level context from all extracted ones. We implement this by transforming the textual compiler feedback into an SQL query using the ChatGPT. The prompt used is presented in Figure 4(a). Here, several examples of paired compiler feedback and SQL queries are provided as demonstrations for in-context learning¹.

For instance, consider the compiler feedback: *No name 'SyncBolt3' found in module 'async._bolt3'*, the resulting SQL query generated by ChatGPT is as follows:

```
FROM Module m, Class c
WHERE m.contains(c)
and m.getName() = 'async._bolt3'
SELECT m, c
```

Using this SQL query, the code snippets that involve the implementations of `AsyncBolt3` will be returned from our constructed database. The detailed process of constructing and querying such SQL database is refer to Appendix C.

¹Only one demonstration example is illustrated in Figure 3(b), the full list of examples can be found in Appendix C.2.

Semantic Search. In addition to returning the project-level level retrieved by the SQL query, we also enhance the acquired context by retrieving similar code snippets using dense passage retrieval. In the initial search round, no compilation error is reported, and PROCODER utilizes the task description string for retrieval. In subsequent searches, PROCODER employs the error report and the corresponding error line.

Given a natural language query q , PROCODER first convert it into an embedding vector by utilizing an encoder network, as follows:

$$\mathbf{h}_q = \text{ENCODER}(q). \quad (3)$$

In our experiments, the pre-trained Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) is adopted as the encoder network.

After generating the query vector, PROCODER calculate the cosine similarity between the query and embedding vectors of each context entry \mathbf{h}_c . This similarity measure is defined as:

$$\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_q, \mathbf{h}_c) = \frac{\mathbf{h}_q^\top \mathbf{h}_c}{\|\mathbf{h}_q\| \cdot \|\mathbf{h}_c\|}. \quad (4)$$

The top- n entries exhibiting the highest similarity to the query are retrieved as results.

3.4 Refinement with Compiler Feedback

Figure 3(b) showcases the iterative refinement pipeline. Given the task requirement and partial function f_1 , a semantic retrieval is activated to identify similar functions. Specifically, the function f_2 , which provides equivalent functionality in synchronous scenario, is identified. Utilizing both the retrieved context and the prompt illustrated in Figure 4(b), the language model generates a solution; However, the generated output mistakenly invokes `SyncBolt3` due to its intended use in asynchronous scenarios, not aligning with the synchronous scenario in f_2 . The compiler’s feedback highlights this error. With this feedback, PROCODER conducts the structural and semantic search, leading to the discovery of the correct function f_3 for asynchronous scenarios. Incorporating the error details and context into the next iteration ensures accurate function invocation. This process goes iterative until no error is reported by the compiler, resulting in an error-free solution that aligns with the project’s environment. It is noteworthy that PROCODER does not take into account FUNC

errors, which arise during execution despite successful compilation. PROCODER focusing on addressing compilation errors, which constitute 66% of the total errors in the context of project-level code generation, as shown in Figure 6.

4 Experimental Setup

4.1 Datasets

To validate the effectiveness of PROCODER, we conducted experiments using the CoderEval benchmark (Yu et al., 2023), a recently developed benchmark designed to evaluate models within realistic software development scenarios. Without loss of generalizability, we concentrate on the Python programming language within this dataset. This benchmark categories 230 test samples into six levels of context dependency: 1) *self-contained*: built-in types/functions, no imports required; 2) *slib-runnable*: standard libraries/modules, no installation needed; 3) *plib-runnable*: publicly-available libraries on PyPI/Maven; 4) *class-runnable*: code outside the function but within a class; 5) *file-runnable*: code outside the class but within the file; and 6) *project-runnable*: code in other source files. We concentrate on the last three dependency types, where the solutions are dependent on project-specific contexts. There are 55, 68, and 23 tasks associated with each dependency level, respectively.

4.2 Baseline Methods

PROCODER can function seamlessly be integrated into existing LLMs, requiring only black-box access to these models. In this paper, we select two state-of-the-art LLMs for code generation, namely GPT-3.5-Turbo (OpenAI, 2023a) and Code Llama (13B) (Rozière et al., 2023), as our base models. To validate the effectiveness of PROCODER, we compare it with the following baselines:

- ▷ **Direct Generation** (Yu et al., 2023). This line of method denotes directly inputting the task requirements into LLM for code generation, without providing additional context.
- ▷ **ReACC** (Lu et al., 2022). We employ the retrieval-augmented generation technique introduced in this baseline for code generation tasks. More precisely, we retrieve semantic contexts aligned with the task instructions and leverage them to augment the prompts of LLMs for better code generation.
- ▷ **RepoCoder** (Zhang et al., 2023a). Similar to our work, the referenced baseline also proposes the

iterative refinement of generated code. Specifically, it involves retrieving similar code snippets derived from the previously generated ones, and employing them to augment the prompts of LLMs. One distinguishing feature is that this baseline does not leverage compiler feedback.

4.3 Implementation Details

We have selected GPT-3.5-turbo and Code-Llama 13B for investigation. For GPT-3.5-turbo, the invocation is performed through an online API. For Code-Llama 13B, we utilize its base variant, specifically designed for general code synthesis and understanding.²

In the inference process, we set the decoding temperature to 0.7, and adopt a top- k sampling strategy. We implement the retrieval modules based on the *text-ada* model introduced by OpenAI (OpenAI, 2023b), which is effective in both natural language search and code search. The dimension for each embedding is 1,536. We retrieve at most 5 entries for each query. All the experiments in this paper are conducted on a Linux server with 128GB memory, with a single 32GB Tesla V100 GPU.

4.4 Evaluation Metrics

Following previous studies (Chen et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2023), we evaluate the functional correctness of the generated code by executing test cases. We employ the Pass@ k metric, where k denotes the number of programs generated for each task. A task is solved if at least one solution passes all unit tests, and we report the overall proportion of solved tasks. To reduce sampling variance, we generate $n \geq k$ solutions (for this study, $n = 20$ and $k = 1, 5, 10$) for each task, count the number of correct solutions $c \leq n$ that pass the unit tests, and calculate the unbiased estimator:

$$\text{Pass@}k = \mathbb{E} \left[1 - \frac{\binom{n-c}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} \right]. \quad (5)$$

5 Results and Analysis

5.1 Overall Performance of PROCODER

Table 2 shows the overall performance of PROCODER based on two LLMs, i.e., GPT-3.5-Turbo and Code Llama (13B), assessed against various baselines across different data splits. This

²The model can be accessed via <https://huggingface.co/codellama/CodeLlama-13b-hf>.

Table 2: Pass rates of PROCODER based on two LLMs, i.e., GPT-3.5-Turbo and Code Llama (13B), assessed against various baselines across different data splits of CoderEval.

| Data Split | Class Runnable | | | File Runnable | | | Project Runnable | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Method | Pass@1 | Pass@5 | Pass@10 | Pass@1 | Pass@5 | Pass@10 | Pass@1 | Pass@5 | Pass@10 |
| LLM: GPT-3.5-Turbo | | | | | | | | | |
| Direct | 8.73 | 12.57 | 14.55 | 19.85 | 27.62 | 30.88 | 9.57 | 12.08 | 13.04 |
| ReACC | 20.36 | 33.27 | 38.18 | 17.65 | 28.92 | 33.82 | 11.30 | 19.53 | 21.74 |
| RepoCoder | 35.45 | 40.46 | 41.82 | 29.41 | 34.61 | 36.76 | 16.96 | 19.57 | 21.74 |
| PROCODER | 28.00 | 44.92 | 49.09 | 30.29 | 43.58 | 47.06 | 21.30 | 36.73 | 39.13 |
| LLM: Code Llama (13B) | | | | | | | | | |
| Direct | 18.91 | 30.65 | 34.55 | 18.53 | 27.82 | 29.41 | 5.22 | 8.70 | 13.04 |
| ReACC | 20.36 | 33.27 | 38.18 | 17.65 | 27.61 | 33.82 | 11.30 | 19.53 | 21.74 |
| RepoCoder | 17.82 | 35.22 | 40.00 | 15.00 | 28.31 | 32.35 | 16.09 | 21.36 | 21.74 |
| PROCODER | 26.36 | 39.42 | 41.82 | 17.06 | 29.39 | 33.82 | 13.04 | 28.04 | 34.78 |

Table 3: Pass Rates on CoderEval-Python of each approach with or without compiler feedback.

| Method | Pass@1 | Pass@5 | Pass@10 |
|--------------|--------|--------|---------|
| Direct | 20.65 | 26.66 | 29.13 |
| Direct+CF | 32.34 | 38.43 | 40.43 |
| ReACC | 34.13 | 41.44 | 43.48 |
| ReACC+CF | 36.60 | 44.05 | 46.52 |
| RepoCoder | 36.82 | 40.73 | 42.17 |
| RepoCoder+CF | 38.00 | 45.38 | 48.26 |

figure shows that the PROCODER can significantly outperform other baselines on the project-level code generation across different data splits. This trend persists, with a few exceptions noted specifically in terms of Pass@1. We attribute such exceptions to variations in the generated solutions. Selecting a significantly larger n (e.g., 1000), as discussed in (Li et al., 2022), stabilizes expectations. Significantly, according to Code Llama (13B), when evaluated on the intricate project-runnable dataset, PROCODER demonstrates superior performance compared to the state-of-the-art RepoCoder, achieving an 87.7% higher success rate at Pass@5 and a 79.9% improvement at Pass@10. Moreover, it becomes evident that models incorporating contextual information, such as ReACC, RepoCoder, and PROCODER, exhibit a noteworthy performance superiority over the vanilla model, thereby affirming the practical value of contextual information.

5.2 Usefulness of Compiler Feedback

Here, we examine the usefulness of compiler feedback by integrating it into three baseline models: Vanilla, ReACC, and RepoCoder, each considered separately. We conducted experiments using the GPT-3.5-Turbo and subsequently reported the av-




Figure 5: Performance of PROCODER, RepoCoder, and No Feedback baseline across three dependency levels.

erage score across the entire CoderEval dataset, as shown in Table 3. The table provides clear evidence that incorporating compiler feedback yields a notable enhancement in model performance for code generation. Specifically, a comparison between RepoCoder with and without compiler feedback reveals a substantial increase in Pass@1 from 36.82 to 38.00. More analytic experiments including the ablation study, PROCODER’s performance on function-level code generation, efficiency of static analysis and SQL queries, could be found in Appendix D

5.3 Effectiveness of the Iterative Refinement

Here, we investigate the effectiveness of iterative refinement in code generation with compiler feedback. We conduct an ablation analysis on both RepoCoder and PROCODER, via removing or retaining the iterative refinement process. Figure 5 shows the performance of RepoCoder and PROCODER, with respect to varying iterations, on different data splits. This figure clearly illustrates that as the number of iterations increases, the performance of PROCODER also exhibits a corresponding improvement. It substantiates the efficacy of our suggested iterative refinement process, demonstrating its abil-




Figure 6: Compilation errors reported and fixed per iteration of PROCODER, RepoCoder, and No Feedback baselines.

ity to enhance the generated code through multiple iterations progressively.

5.4 Error Analysis and Case Study

We also perform an error analysis of the generated code in iterative generation. We follow the categorization of errors defined in Section 2.2, examples of each error type can be found in Table 1. We exclude *FUNC* errors because they are reported in execution instead of by the compiler. Figure 6 shows the distribution of errors resolved iteratively by our PROCODER and two baselines. From this figure, we can see that the errors of various types can be effectively resolved after a single iteration of refinement. For instance, *UNDEF* errors were notably reduced from 5133 to 1042 after one iteration. Additionally, it was observed that the RepoCoder baseline, which operates without compiler feedback, managed to rectify API and syntax errors, corroborating the findings in Zhang et al. (2023a). Nonetheless, it proved ineffective against *UNDEF* and *OBJECT* errors, likely due to the model’s lack of awareness regarding these errors in the absence of compiler feedback.

To thoroughly evaluate PROCODER’s effectiveness, we focused on scenarios where compilation was successful, but execution failed. In the case illustrated in Figure 7, PROCODER incorrectly excludes the `microseconds` field and erroneously adds a `month` field. This error stems from ambiguously stated task requirements and the model’s lack of familiarity with the `Structure` class’s format, despite its definition being available, resulting in

| | |
|---|--|
| Task Requirement Use the value in <code>timedelta</code> to generate the <code>Structure</code> class. <code>def dehydrate_timedelta(value):</code> :param value: :type value: timedelta | |
| Context <code>class timedelta: self.days</code> <code>self.seconds ...</code> class Structure: <code>def __init__(self, tag, fields)</code> | |
| Reference Solution <code>def dehydrate_timedelta(value):</code> <code>days = value.days</code> <code>seconds = value.seconds</code> <code>microseconds = value.microseconds</code> <code>nanoseconds = microseconds * 1000</code> <code>return Structure(b"E", days, seconds, 0, nanoseconds)</code> | |
| CoCoGen's Solution: <code>def dehydrate_timedelta(value):</code> <code>months = 0</code> <code>days = value.days</code> <code>seconds = value.seconds</code> <code>nanoseconds = 1000 * value.microseconds</code> <code>return Structure(b"E", months, days, seconds, nanoseconds)</code> | |

Figure 7: An error case from CoderEval-Python.

misinterpretation of the intended functionality. Further examples are detailed in Appendix A. This observation inspires us to integrate a comprehensive reference comprising both documentation and web search results to provide explicit usage guidelines in our future work.

6 Related Work

LLM-based Code Generation. Automated code generation has a history spanning several decades, with initial endeavors utilizing rule-based systems (Backus et al., 1957; Woods, 1973) and structured prediction (Zelle and Mooney, 1996; Zettlemoyer and Collins, 2005). In recent years, the development of large-scale language models has led to the emergence of many prominent models in coding tasks. These include open-access models such as DeepSeek Coder (Bi et al., 2024), Code Llama (Rozière et al., 2023), and StarCoder (Li et al., 2023), alongside commercial offerings like GPT-3.5 (OpenAI, 2023a), and GitHub Copilot (Microsoft, 2024). These models and tools have demonstrated significant promise in enhancing code generation capabilities.

Project-level Code Generation. Generating accurate code within a project poses challenges due to the modular design of software engineering, which results in cross-file dependency patterns (Parnas, 1972). Early work augmented N-gram, RNN, and LSTM models with an additional cache model to track local changes (Tu et al., 2014; Hellenadoorn and Devanbu, 2017). Zhang et al. (2021) incorporate context from parent class to generate comments for the child class. Pashakhanloo et al. (2022) transforms projects into a relational database and proposed a graph walking method to traverse relation path and incorporate all relevant attributes along the way. Lyu et al. (2021) constructs an API dependency graph and utilizes a sequence-

to-sequence model that incorporates graph embedding to predict the global-context-aware target code. [Zan et al. \(2022\)](#) first use private API documentation to improve code generation, and [Zan et al. \(2023\)](#) investigates how various components of API documentation influence the prediction accuracy. [Shrivastava et al. \(2023\)](#) proposes a code completion framework using repository-level prompt proposals, and then applying a classifier to classify useful proposals. ([Lu et al., 2022](#); [Zhang et al., 2023a](#)) propose to use single or multiple levels of retrieval-augmented generation mechanisms for code generation. [Liao et al. \(2023\)](#) proposes A³-CodGen, which utilize local, global, and third-party-library information for better context retrieval. ([Yu et al., 2023](#); [Liu et al., 2023](#); [Zhou et al., 2022](#); [Ding et al., 2024](#)) proposes benchmarks and datasets for repository-level code synthesis tasks.

Post-processing of LLMs for Code Generation

To identify correct code generated by LLM, researchers employ post-processing techniques to further rank and filter the generated code. [Inala et al. \(2022\)](#) trained a fault-aware neural ranker that ranks multiple code samples based on compilation feedback. AlphaCode ([Li et al., 2022](#)) and Shi et al. ([Shi et al., 2022](#)) employ clustering and filtering methods based on the execution output of the generated program. [Tsai et al. \(2023\)](#) proposes to retrieve compilation error patches from a database of human expert guidance documents for RTL assembly. [Zhang et al. \(2023c\)](#) rerank LLM outputs based on back translation. SelfEdit ([Zhang et al., 2023b](#)) employs a generate-and-edit approach that utilizes execution results to improve the competitive programming task code quality. [Chen et al. \(2023\)](#) propose a rubber duck debugging mechanism without human feedback, which identifies mistakes by investigating the execution results and explaining the generated code in natural language.

7 Conclusion

In this work, we show how to use project-specific context information, indexed structural and semantic, to fix compilation errors generated by compilers and improve the quality of code generated by LLMs. Our experimental results show the increased prevalence of errors related to project contexts in project-level code generation compared to function-level code generation. The presented PROCODER can effectively fix the compilation errors by retrieving related context from the project, thus significantly

improving the native LLM baselines on over 80% relative pass rates in generating functions dependent on project-specific contexts.

Limitations

In this study, we utilize compilation information as a means to validate programs. However, it is important to note that even programs that compile successfully can experience execution failures. Furthermore, the successful compilation of programs does not guarantee their safety for execution. As a result, while our findings indicate improvements in quality metrics through the correction of code to properly leverage context, it is imperative to undertake additional verification methods such as testing and manual review to ascertain the functional correctness of the generated code. The challenge of ensuring functional correctness of code encompasses various aspects, including compliance with task requirements, adherence to pre/post-conditions and security requirements, and preserving robustness in generating code. With many questions unanswered, we hope our study can promote a broader view of utilizing computational linguistic technologies in the realm of automated software engineering.

Ethics Statements

We meticulously ensured that all code and models integrated into our research adhere to open access policies as outlined by the Creative Commons license. The methodology ensures full compliance with copyright and intellectual property laws, thereby eliminating any potential for infringement or unauthorized use of protected materials. By exclusively utilizing resources that are freely available and legally distributable, we maintain the highest standards of ethical conduct in research. This approach fosters an environment of transparency and respect for the intellectual property rights of others. Our commitment to these principles ensures that our work advances the frontiers of knowledge in a manner that is both legally sound and ethically responsible.

References

- C Amazon. 2023. Ai code generator—amazon code-whisperer.
- Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. 2021.

- Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*.
- J. W. Backus, R. J. Beeber, S. Best, R. Goldberg, L. M. Haibt, H. L. Herrick, R. A. Nelson, D. Sayre, P. B. Sheridan, H. Stern, I. Ziller, R. A. Hughes, and R. Nutt. 1957. *The fortran automatic coding system*. In *Papers Presented at the February 26-28, 1957, Western Joint Computer Conference: Techniques for Reliability*, IRE-AIEE-ACM '57 (Western), page 188–198, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Xiao Bi, Deli Chen, Guanting Chen, Shanhuang Chen, Damai Dai, Chengqi Deng, Honghui Ding, Kai Dong, Qiushi Du, Zhe Fu, et al. 2024. Deepseek llm: Scaling open-source language models with longtermism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02954*.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*.
- Xinyun Chen, Maxwell Lin, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Teaching large language models to self-debug. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05128*.
- Yangruibo Ding, Zijian Wang, Wasi Ahmad, Hantian Ding, Ming Tan, Nihal Jain, Murali Krishna Ramanathan, Ramesh Nallapati, Parminder Bhatia, Dan Roth, et al. 2024. Crosscodeeval: A diverse and multilingual benchmark for cross-file code completion. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Yangruibo Ding, Zijian Wang, Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Murali Krishna Ramanathan, Ramesh Nallapati, Parminder Bhatia, Dan Roth, and Bing Xiang. 2022. Cocomic: Code completion by jointly modeling in-file and cross-file context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10007*.
- Xueying Du, Mingwei Liu, Kaixin Wang, Hanlin Wang, Junwei Liu, Yixuan Chen, Jiayi Feng, Chaofeng Sha, Xin Peng, and Yiling Lou. 2023. Classeval: A manually-crafted benchmark for evaluating llms on class-level code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01861*.
- Nat Friedman. 2021. Introducing github copilot: your ai pair programmer. URL <https://github.blog/2021-06-29-introducing-github-copilot-ai-pair-programmer>.
- D Gifany, IS Amiri, M Ranjbar, and J Ali. 2013. Logic codes generation and transmission using an encoding-decoding system. *International Journal of Advances in Engineering & Technology*, 5(2):37.
- Mary Jean Harrold and Gregg Rothermel. 1996. Syntax-directed construction of program dependence graphs. *Technical Report OSU-CISRC-5/96-TR32*.
- Vincent J Hellendoorn and Premkumar Devanbu. 2017. Are deep neural networks the best choice for modeling source code? In *Proceedings of the 2017 11th Joint meeting on foundations of software engineering*, pages 763–773.
- Jeevana Priya Inala, Chenglong Wang, Mei Yang, Andres Codas, Mark Encarnación, Shuvendu Lahiri, Madanlal Musuvathi, and Jianfeng Gao. 2022. Fault-aware neural code rankers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:13419–13432.
- Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oğuz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04906*.
- Jia Li, Ge Li, Yunfei Zhao, Yongmin Li, Zhi Jin, Hao Zhu, Huanyu Liu, Kaibo Liu, Lecheng Wang, Zheng Fang, et al. 2024. Deval: Evaluating code generation in practical software projects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06401*.
- Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Jia Li, Jenny Chim, et al. 2023. Starcoder: may the source be with you! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06161*.
- Yujia Li, David Choi, Junyoung Chung, Nate Kushman, Julian Schrittwieser, Rémi Leblond, Tom Eccles, James Keeling, Felix Gimeno, Agustin Dal Lago, et al. 2022. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. *Science*, 378(6624):1092–1097.
- Dianshu Liao, Shidong Pan, Qing Huang, Xiaoxue Ren, Zhenchang Xing, Huan Jin, and Qinying Li. 2023. Context-aware code generation framework for code repositories: Local, global, and third-party library awareness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05772*.
- Tianyang Liu, Canwen Xu, and Julian McAuley. 2023. Repobench: Benchmarking repository-level code auto-completion systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03091*.
- Shuai Lu, Nan Duan, Hojae Han, Daya Guo, Seungwon Hwang, and Alexey Svyatkovskiy. 2022. Reacc: A retrieval-augmented code completion framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.07722*.
- Chen Lyu, Ruyun Wang, Hongyu Zhang, Hanwen Zhang, and Songlin Hu. 2021. Embedding api dependency graph for neural code generation. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 26:1–51.
- Microsoft. 2024. Microsoft Copilot. <https://www.microsoft.com/zh-cn/microsoft-copilot>. [Online; accessed 1-Feb-2024].
- OpenAI. 2023a. chatgpt. <http://chat.openai.com>. [Online; accessed 1-Feb-2023].

- OpenAI. 2023b. New and improved embedding model. <https://openai.com/blog/new-and-improved-embedding-model>. [Online; accessed 1-Feb-2023].
- David Lorge Parnas. 1972. On the criteria to be used in decomposing systems into modules. *Communications of the ACM*, 15(12):1053–1058.
- Pardis Pashakhanloo, Aaditya Naik, Yuepeng Wang, Hanjun Dai, Petros Maniatis, and Mayur Naik. 2022. Codetrek: Flexible modeling of code using an extensible relational representation.
- Baptiste Rozière, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*.
- Freda Shi, Xinyun Chen, Kanishka Misra, Nathan Scales, David Dohan, Ed H Chi, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Large language models can be easily distracted by irrelevant context. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 31210–31227. PMLR.
- Freda Shi, Daniel Fried, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Sida I Wang. 2022. Natural language to code translation with execution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.11454*.
- Disha Shrivastava, Hugo Larochelle, and Daniel Tarlow. 2023. Repository-level prompt generation for large language models of code. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 31693–31715. PMLR.
- YunDa Tsai, Mingjie Liu, and Haoxing Ren. 2023. Rtlfixer: Automatically fixing rtl syntax errors with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16543*.
- Zhaopeng Tu, Zhendong Su, and Premkumar Devanbu. 2014. On the localness of software. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 269–280.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Proceedings of Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 5998–6008.
- Yue Wang, Weishi Wang, Shafiq Joty, and Steven CH Hoi. 2021. Codet5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8696–8708.
- W. A. Woods. 1973. *Progress in natural language understanding: an application to lunar geology*. In *Proceedings of the June 4-8, 1973, National Computer Conference and Exposition, AFIPS '73*, page 441–450, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Hao Yu, Bo Shen, Dezhi Ran, Jiaxin Zhang, Qi Zhang, Yuchi Ma, Guangtai Liang, Ying Li, Tao Xie, and Qianxiang Wang. 2023. Codereval: A benchmark of pragmatic code generation with generative pre-trained models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00288*.
- Daoguang Zan, Bei Chen, Yongshun Gong, Junzhi Cao, Fengji Zhang, Bingchao Wu, Bei Guan, Yilong Yin, and Yongji Wang. 2023. Private-library-oriented code generation with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15370*.
- Daoguang Zan, Bei Chen, Zeqi Lin, Bei Guan, Yongji Wang, and Jian-Guang Lou. 2022. When language model meets private library. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.17236*.
- John M. Zelle and Raymond J. Mooney. 1996. Learning to parse database queries using inductive logic programming. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence - Volume 2, AAAI'96*, page 1050–1055. AAAI Press.
- Luke S. Zettlemoyer and Michael Collins. 2005. Learning to map sentences to logical form: structured classification with probabilistic categorial grammars. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, UAI'05*, page 658–666, Arlington, Virginia, USA. AUAI Press.
- Fengji Zhang, Bei Chen, Yue Zhang, Jin Liu, Daoguang Zan, Yi Mao, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. 2023a. Repocoder: Repository-level code completion through iterative retrieval and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12570*.
- Jiyang Zhang, Sheena Panthaplackel, Pengyu Nie, Raymond J Mooney, Junyi Jessy Li, and Milos Gligoric. 2021. Learning to generate code comments from class hierarchies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.13426*.
- Kechi Zhang, Zhuo Li, Jia Li, Ge Li, and Zhi Jin. 2023b. Self-edit: Fault-aware code editor for code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04087*.
- Tianyi Zhang, Tao Yu, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Daniel Fried, and Sida Wang. 2023c. Codex reviewer reranking for code generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 41832–41846. PMLR.
- Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Frank F Xu, Zhengbao Jiang, and Graham Neubig. 2022. Docprompting: Generating code by retrieving the docs. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.

A More details about the Error Cases

In this section, we delve into additional cases where PROCODER struggles to generate viable solutions, elucidating the underlying causes to foster further research. We identify two primary factors leading

| | |
|--|--|
| Task Requirement: Returns the key in the form of int. def index(self, key): :param key: a key :return: index :rtype: int | Context: class Record(): __keys: t.Tuple[str] |
| Reference Solution: def index(self, key): if isinstance(key, int): if 0 <= key < len(self.__keys): return key raise IndexError(key) elif isinstance(key, str): try: return self.__keys.index(key) except ValueError: raise KeyError(key) else: raise TypeError(key) | |
| CoCoGen's Solution: def index(self, key): return int(key) | |

Figure A1: An error case of degenerate solution.

to execution errors despite successful compilation: degenerate solutions, such as overly simplistic or redundant code. This phenomenon is discovered and explored in (Zhang et al., 2023c). Figure A1 exemplifies this issue, showcasing a solution that omits necessary validity checks and error handling, neither of which are specified in the task requirements, nor produced by PROCODER’s outputs. Our analysis reveals that degenerate solutions frequently pass compilation, rendering compiler-based verification ineffective.

Another prevalent mistake involves misinterpreting task requirements, resulting in solutions that lack logical coherence. Figure A2 depicts an instance where the assignment was to leverage the pre-existing `Point` class; instead, the language model disregards this specification and redundantly recreates the class. This underscores the challenge large language models (LLMs) face in accurately comprehending prompts and generating appropriate solutions.

B Errors Reported by the Compiler

We utilize `pylint` for error checking; it is a static code analyzer designed to inspect code within a project without executing it. The analyzer accepts the entire file containing the solution along with associated source files as input, and then it extracts errors that pertain directly to the lines in the generated solution from the entirety of identified errors. `pylint` generates a range of diagnostic messages, encompassing errors, warnings, recommendations for adhering to language conventions, and suggestions for refactoring to adhere to best coding practices. However, our focus is solely on the errors.

Each error is identified by an error code and described with an error message. The error code is a numerical identifier that reflects the error’s nature, while the error message provides a concise descrip-

| | |
|--|---|
| Task Requirement: Dynamically Generating Point Class. def dehydrate_timedelta(value): :param value: :type value: timedelta | Context: class Point srid_table = {} srid_table_lock = Lock() |
| Reference Solution: def point_type(name, fields, srid_map): def srid(self): try: return srid_map[len(self)] except KeyError: return None attributes = {"srid": property(srid)} for index, subclass_field in enumerate(fields): def accessor(self, i=index, f=subclass_field): try: return self[i] except IndexError: raise AttributeError(f) for field_alias in {subclass_field, "xyz"[index]}: attributes[field_alias] = property(accessor) cls = type(name, (Point,), attributes) with srid_table_lock: for dim, srid in srid_map.items(): srid_table[srid] = (cls, dim) return cls | |
| CoCoGen's Solution: def point_type(name, fields, srid_map): fields_dict = {f: i for i, f in enumerate(fields)} srid = srid_map.get(len(fields), None) class Point: def __init__(self, *args): if len(args) != len(fields): raise ValueError("\Wrong number of arguments") self.coordinates = tuple(args) self.srid = srid @property def srid(self): return self.srid @srid.setter def srid(self, value): self.srid = value def __iter__(self): return iter(self.coordinates) def __eq__(self, other): return isinstance(other, Point) and self.coordinates == other.coordinates def __repr__(self): return f"{name}({', '.join(map(str, self.coordinates))})" | |
| return Point | |

Figure A2: An error case of misinterpreting task requirements.

tion of the error. `Pylint` recognizes 133 distinct error types, and only 12 of these are reported frequently on the `CoderEval` dataset. We have categorized these errors into four groups based on their characteristics, detailed in Table 1. The *FUNC* error category is also included in the error distribution analysis but is excluded from the compiler feedback pipeline. This exclusion is because such errors can only be identified with execution, a process that extends beyond the scope of static analysis and is unsuitable for the real-time generation and refinement pipeline. The specific types of each error and corresponding error codes are documented in Table A1.

C Technical Details of Structural Query System

C.1 The Design Principle

In PROCODER, we employ the Structural Query Language (SQL) to perform structured queries on code repositories. The SQL syntax is derived from CodeQL, which is an analysis tool designed for vulnerability mining through structured queries, capable of conducting complex analyses on code repositories. We extracted 11 error codes from

Table A1: A complete list of frequently occurred errors reported by the compiler

| Error Category | Error ID | Corresponding Error Code | Error Reason |
|----------------|-----------|--------------------------|--|
| UNDEF | UNDEF-P | E0401 | Unable to import a Package. |
| | UNDEF-CM | E1101 | A Class is accessed for an nonexistent Member. |
| | UNDEF-API | E0611 | A function or API cannot be found in a module. |
| | UNDEF-O | E0602 | An undefined variable or Object is accessed. |
| API | API-TMA | E1121 | A function call passes Too Many positional Arguments. |
| | API-IA | E1120 | A function call passes Insufficient Arguments. |
| | API-WA | E1111 | Assignment from the function that doesn't return anything. |
| | | E1123 | A function call passes a keyword argument which has no corresponding formal parameter. |
| OBJ | OBJ-NI | E1133 | A Non-Iterable value is used in place where iterable is expected. |
| | OBJ-NC | E1102 | An object being called is a Non-Callable object. |
| | OBJ-NS | E1136 | A subscripted value does Not support Subscription. |
| OTHER | OTHER | | Other errors reported by analyzer. |

Table A2: Tables pre-computed by PROCODER for error correction.

| Table Name | Description | Element Example |
|------------|--|---|
| M | Stores the a module and its hierarchy in project. | tests.unit.async_work.__init__ |
| M_C | Stores a module and a class inside the module | Module neo4j_codec.packstream.v1.__init__, Class PackableBuffer |
| M_C_CF | Stores a class, its parent module, and its member functions. | Module neo4j.time.__init__, Class Clock, Function local_offset |
| M_C_V | Stores a class variable, its parent class and module. | Module neo4j_sync.io.tmphoug1of, Class Bolt, Variable is_reset |
| M_GF | Store a global function and its parent module. | Module neo4j.time._arithmetic, Function nano_add |
| M_GV | Stores a global variable and its parent module. | neo4j.__init__, Global Variable TRUST_SYSTEM_CA_SIGNED_CERTIFICATES |

compiler (shown in Table A1), each corresponding to one of four error categories as in Section 2.2. Two authors manually inspected these error codes, and constructed 6 SQL data tables from the project graph, based on the characteristics of the errors. All tables are presented in Table A2. Whenever an error is reported by the compiler, the LLM generates an SQL query statement for it, where the modules and functions to be queried are extracted using a tree-sitter-based parser¹. In the PROCODER with iteration rounds set to 3, 93.2% of the SQL queries generated by the LLM pass the parsing utility, and these queries are similar to the demonstration example SQL queries. Subsequently, according to the entity from the query, it is mapped to one of the six SQL data tables. We store these six tables in a relational database for flexible retrieval.

C.2 Demonstration Examples of Structural Queries

We present a demonstration example in Section 3.3 to compose the structural query. The example focuses on identifying and addressing instances of missing or incorrectly utilized context entries. We detail several example error messages along with their corresponding structural queries. A comprehensive list of these examples can be found in Ta-

ble A3.

D More Analytic Experiments

D.1 Ablation on Components

To explore the impact of each component within PROCODER on overall performance, we remove various components from PROCODER, including the compiler, SQL retriever, and semantic retriever. Notably, the configuration that excludes the compiler and SQL, relying solely on semantic retrieval, is known as RepoCoder (Zhang et al., 2023a).

Tables A4, A5, and A6 demonstrate the Pass Rates of PROCODER across CoderEval-python. The data indicates that incorporating Compiler Feedback does improve accuracy, although not markedly substantial. The reason is that highlighting compilation errors alone does not provide related context for resolving them, which is important in project-level coding problems. Also, compared to RepoCoder—which relies solely on Semantic Retrieval, integrating Compiler Feedback with contextual information results in a dramatic performance improvement.

D.2 Varying the Number of Iterations

To investigate whether iteration could continuously improve performance, we increased the number of iterations to ten. As shown in Table A7, with more iterations, the performance of PROCODER reaches

¹<https://github.com/tree-sitter/tree-sitter-ql>

Table A3: A complete list of demonstration examples prompted to the language model

| Error Type | Example Error Message | Action | Example Structural Query |
|------------|--|--|--|
| UNDEF-P | Unable to import 'keys' | Confine the search scope in all modules | from Module m where m.inSource() and v.getScope() = m select m |
| UNDEF-CM | Instance of 'RootLogger' has no 'loggerDict' member | Confine the search scope in all members in the class | from Module m, Class c, Function cf where m.inSource() and m.contains(c) and c.contains(cf) and cf.getScope() = c and c.getName = 'RootLogger' and not cf.isInitMethod() select m, c, cf |
| UNDEF-API | No name 'AsyncBolt5x0' in module 'neo4j._sync.io._bolt5' | Confine the search scope in all names in the module | from Module m, Variable v where m.inSource() and v.getScope() = m and m.getName() = 'neo4j._sync.io._bolt5' select m, v.getDefinition() |
| API | No value for argument 'xmls' in function call 'dumpXML' | Return the information of the function | from Module m, Function f where m.inSource() and m.contains(f) and f.getName() = 'dumpXML' select m, f |

Table A4: Pass rates of PROCODER on Class Runnable Test.

| Data Split | Class Runnable | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Method | Pass@1 | Pass@5 | Pass@10 |
| PROCODER | 28.00 | 44.92 | 49.09 |
| PROCODER w/o CF and SQL (Re-poCoder) | 35.45 | 40.46 | 41.82 |
| w/ CF | 30.00 | 42.58 | 45.45 |
| w/ CF+SQL | 30.36 | 44.61 | 49.09 |
| w/ CF+Semantic | 31.45 | 45.00 | 47.27 |

Table A5: Pass rates of PROCODER on File Runnable Test.

| Data Split | File Runnable | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| Method | Pass@1 | Pass@5 | Pass@10 |
| PROCODER | 30.29 | 43.58 | 47.06 |
| PROCODER w/o CF and SQL (Re-poCoder) | 29.41 | 34.61 | 36.76 |
| w/ CF | 26.03 | 37.41 | 42.65 |
| w/ CF+SQL | 26.76 | 37.68 | 39.71 |
| w/ CF+Semantic | 27.35 | 39.90 | 45.45 |

a plateau. This indicates that there are still errors that cannot be repaired by PROCODER, leaving for further research.

D.3 PROCODER on Function-level Code Generation

To assess the efficacy of PROCODER in function-level code generation, we evaluated it on two commonly used datasets: HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021) and MBPP (Austin et al., 2021). We retained the compiler feedback model in PROCODER, and conduct tests in a 0-shot scenario, generating 10 code samples for each of the 163 test cases for HumanEval and 974 cases for MBPP, totaling 11,370

samples. The generation and refinement loop iterates 3 times. As shown in Table A8 and Table A9.

The data presented in the table illustrates that compilation feedback improves the accuracy of the generated code, although its efficacy is somewhat limited. We manually review 7 compilation errors not resolved in HumanEval after the first iteration, and find that 6 out of 7 instances were due to LLM erroneously generating code segments enclosed in Markdown code block markers (""), resulting in compilation failures. Additionally, another instance of compilation error was identified in the following generated solution:

Table A6: Pass rates of PROCODER on Project Runnable Test.

| Data Split | Project Runnable | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Method | Pass@1 | Pass@5 | Pass@10 |
| PROCODER | 21.30 | 36.73 | 39.13 |
| PROCODER w/o CF and SQL (Re-poCoder) | 16.96 | 19.57 | 21.74 |
| w/ CF | 14.35 | 25.62 | 30.43 |
| w/ CF+SQL | 15.65 | 25.12 | 30.43 |
| w/ CF+Semantic | 17.83 | 28.50 | 34.78 |

Table A7: Pass rates of PROCODER on varying iterations.

| Iteration | Class Level | File Level | Project Level |
|-----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| $i = 0$ | 34.55 | 30.88 | 13.04 |
| $i = 3$ | 49.09 | 47.06 | 39.13 |
| $i = 10$ | 47.27 | 45.59 | 39.13 |

```
def is_simple_power(x,
n): return x > 0 and (x
== 1 or (n != 1 and x ==
n**int(round(math.log(x, n))))
```

This code snippet contains five left parentheses and four right parentheses in the return statement, causing the syntax error. Interestingly, despite the compiler has indicated this syntax error, it was not rectified over three iterations.

In MBPP, we manually observe the 7 errors not fixed after the last iteration, and identifies that two test tasks were responsible for all 7 errors: one named "sum" contributed to six errors, and another called "month_season" resulted in one error. We detail these error cases as follows:

```
def month_season(month, day):
seasons = "spring": [(3, 20),
(6, 20)], "summer": [(6, 21),
(9, 22)], "autumn": [(9, 23),
(12, 20)], "winter": [(12, 21),
(3, 19)] for season, (start,
end) in seasons.items(): if
(month == start[0] and day >=
start[1]) or (month == end[0]
and day <= end[1]): return
season return "Invalid input"
```

The error arises because 'start' and 'end' are not included in seasons.items, which appears strange. We speculate that this issue stems from the presence of functions with the same name

Table A8: The performance of CoCoGen across varying iterations on the HumanEval benchmark. (CE: Compilation Errors, CE%: their proportion among all generated solutions)

| | Pass@1 | Pass@5 | Pass@10 | CE | CE(%) |
|------------|--------|--------|---------|----|-------|
| Direct | 61.52 | 80.56 | 83.15 | 40 | 2.38% |
| CF $i = 1$ | 71.46 | 82.46 | 85.2 | 7 | 0.42% |
| CF $i = 2$ | 71.4 | 82.56 | 85.98 | 3 | 0.18% |
| CF $i = 3$ | 71.65 | 82.49 | 85.36 | 3 | 0.18% |

Table A9: The performance of CoCoGen across varying iterations on the MBPP benchmark. (CE: Compilation Errors, CE%: their proportion among all generated solutions)

| | Pass@1 | Pass@5 | Pass@10 | CE | CE(%) |
|------------|--------|--------|---------|-----|-------|
| Direct | 49.71 | 58.50 | 60.81 | 185 | 1.90% |
| CF $i = 1$ | 52.95 | 59.58 | 61.85 | 11 | 0.11% |
| CF $i = 2$ | 53.06 | 59.87 | 62.01 | 9 | 0.09% |
| CF $i = 3$ | 52.79 | 59.80 | 62.09 | 7 | 0.07% |

within the training set.

```
def sum(a, b):
common_divisors = [i for i
in range(1, min(a, b) + 1)
if a % i == 0 and b % i == 0]
return sum(common_divisors) if
common_divisors else 0
```

The root cause of this error lies in the model's confusion when a user-defined function name coincides with that of a system library function sum, representing a category of potential issues.

D.4 Efficiency of Static Analysis

Utilizing static analysis tools to inspect code typically results in increased latency. To investigate whether the latency impacts the usability of PROCODER, we measure its latency at each test case. We have observed that in experiments, the speed of static analysis and structural query is relatively fast. It is because the semantic checker (i.e., pylint), only analyzes the current file and its dependent files. The average latency was recorded at 1.27 seconds, with a minimum of 0.359 seconds and a maximum of 6.984 seconds. We deem this latency to be acceptable.

E Algorithm for Project Database Construction

We present the comprehensive algorithm for constructing the project database and generating code with PROCODER.

The algorithm for building the project database is detailed in Algorithm 1. It involves identifying source files in the project by extracting all files that end with a `.py` extension. To parse Python source files, we employ the `tree-sitter-python` parser for generating abstract syntax trees and `codeql-python` to extract the property of a context entry node. For passage encoding, we utilize `text-embedding-ada-002`, a model provided by OpenAI and accessible via an online API.

Algorithm 1 Project Database Construction

Require: SOURCEFILESET: A set of project source files

Require: PARSE: A parser for source files

Require: ENCODER: A passage encoder transforms text to numerical vector

Ensure: databaseEntries: Entries in the project database

```
1: databaseEntries  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2: for each sourceFile in SOURCEFILESET do
3:   nodesForVisit  $\leftarrow \langle \rangle$ 
4:   propertyPrefixSeq  $\leftarrow \langle \rangle$ 
5:   astFile  $\leftarrow$  PARSE(sourceFile)
6:   nodesForVisit.ADD(astFile.rootNode)
7:   while nodesForVisit is not empty do
8:     currentNode  $\leftarrow$  nodesForVisit.POP()
9:     if currentNode is PREFIXMARK then
10:       propertyPrefixSeq.POP()
11:     end if
12:     if currentNode.type is in [VARIABLETYPE, FUNCTIONTYPE, CLASSTYPE] then
13:       nodeProperty  $\leftarrow$  GETPROPERTIES(currentNode)
14:       nodeSchema  $\leftarrow \langle$ propertyPrefixSeq, currentNode, nodeProperty $\rangle$ 
15:       nodeEmbedding  $\leftarrow$  ENCODER(nodeSchema)
16:       databaseEntries.ADD([nodeSchema, nodeEmbedding])
17:       propertyPrefixSeq.PUSH(currentNode)
18:       nodesForVisit.PUSH(PREFIXMARK)
19:     end if
20:     for childNode in currentNode.CHILDS() do
21:       nodesForVisit.PUSH(childNode)
22:     end for
23:   end while
24: end for
```
