

Multi-language Unit Test Generation using LLMs

Rangeet Pan
rangeet.pan@ibm.com
IBM Research
Yorktown Heights, NY, USA

Myeongsoo Kim*
wardballoon@gatech.edu
Georgia Tech
Atlanta, GA, USA

Rahul Krishna
rkrsn@ibm.com
IBM Research
Yorktown Heights, NY, USA

Raju Pavuluri
pavuluri@us.ibm.com
IBM Research
Yorktown Heights, NY, USA

Saurabh Sinha
sinhas@us.ibm.com
IBM Research
Yorktown Heights, NY, USA

ABSTRACT

Implementing automated unit tests is an important but time consuming activity in software development. Developers dedicate substantial time to writing tests for validating an application and preventing regressions. To support developers in this task, software engineering research over the past few decades has developed many techniques for automating unit test generation. However, despite this effort, usable tools exist for very few programming languages—mainly Java, C, and C# and, more recently, for Python. Moreover, studies have found that automatically generated tests suffer poor readability and often do not resemble developer-written tests. In this work, we present a rigorous investigation of how large language models (LLMs) can help bridge the gap. We describe a generic pipeline that incorporates static analysis to guide LLMs in generating compilable and high-coverage test cases. We illustrate how the pipeline can be applied to different programming languages, specifically Java and Python, and to complex software requiring environment mocking. We conducted a through empirical study to assess the quality of the generated tests in terms of coverage, mutation score, and test naturalness—evaluating them on standard as well as enterprise Java applications and a large Python benchmark. Our results demonstrate that LLM-based test generation, when guided by static analysis, can be competitive with, and even outperform, state-of-the-art test-generation techniques in coverage achieved while also producing considerably more natural test cases that developers find easy to read and understand. We also present the results of a user study, conducted with 161 professional developers, that highlights the naturalness characteristics of the tests generated by our approach.

CCS CONCEPTS

• General and reference → Empirical studies; • Computing methodologies → Neural networks.

*Author was an intern at IBM Research at the time of this work.

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 ACM 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.

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00

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

KEYWORDS

unit test, java, python, llm

ACM Reference Format:

Rangeet Pan, Myeongsoo Kim, Rahul Krishna, Raju Pavuluri, and Saurabh Sinha. 2024. Multi-language Unit Test Generation using LLMs. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference (Conference'17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 13 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Unit testing is a key activity in software development that serves as the first line of defense against the introduction of software bugs. Manually writing high-coverage and effective unit tests can be tedious and time consuming. To address this, many automated test generation techniques have been developed, aimed at reducing the cost of manual test suite development: over the last few decades, this research has produced a variety of approaches based on symbolic analysis (e.g., [8, 27, 50, 54, 57, 66, 70]), search-based techniques (e.g., [24, 28, 34, 36, 38, 58]), random and adaptive-random techniques (e.g., [3, 10, 11, 35, 37, 44]), and learning-based approaches [20].

These techniques have achieved considerable success in generating high-coverage test suites with good fault-detection ability, but they still have several key limitations—with respect to test readability, test scenarios covered, and test assertions created. Previous studies (e.g., [25]) have shown that developers find automatically generated tests lacking in these characteristics, suffering poor readability and comprehensibility, covering uninteresting sequences, and containing trivial or ineffective assertions. Automatically generated tests are also known to contain anti-patterns or test smells [45] and generally not perceived as being “natural” in the sense that they do not resemble the kinds of tests that developers write.

Recently, researchers have started to explore the potential of leveraging large language models (LLMs) to overcome these limitations of conventional test-generation techniques [68]. Given the inherent ability of LLMs in synthesizing natural-looking code (having been trained on massive amounts of human-written code), this is a promising research direction toward development of techniques that generate natural test cases. Early work in this area has focused on empirical studies of different LLMs for unit test generation using simple prompts or experimenting with various prompting strategies by including different types of context information suitable for test generation (e.g., [29, 53, 55, 56, 62]), and investigation of




Figure 1: Illustration of naturalness (in terms of test names, variable names, and assertions) and mocking in test cases generated by the LLM-assisted technique of ASTER (right) compared with tests generated by EvoSuite [24] and CodaMosa [33] (left).

feedback mechanisms for generating compilable code or achieving specific testing goals, such as increasing coverage or killing surviving mutants (e.g., [18, 49, 52, 53]).

Although these explorations have demonstrated the potential of LLMs in generating natural-looking test cases, they have also highlighted drawbacks of LLM-based test generation, such as the LLM’s tendency to generate tests that often do not compile, achieve low coverage, contain testing anti-patterns, or are redundant in a generated test suite. Moreover, much of this early work explores LLMs off-the-shelf as tools for test generation without considering complete solutions that generate tests with some guarantees (e.g., tests that compile) as conventional tools, such as EvoSuite [22], do. Finally, the empirical studies conducted so far are limited in the LLMs considered, the investigation of test naturalness, and the complexity of code targeted for test generation.

In this work, we present a technique for performing LLM-assisted test generation guided by program analysis. The technique consists of preprocessing and postprocessing phases that wrap LLM interactions. The *preprocessing phase* performs static program analysis to compute relevant information to be included in LLM prompts for a given method under test. This ensures that the LLM prompt has sufficient context (similar to the information that a developer would use while writing test cases for a method) and increases the chances that it generates compilable and meaningful test cases. The *postprocessing phase* checks the generated tests for compilation and runtime errors and constructs new prompts aimed at fixing the errors. At the end of the test-repair process, the technique produces a set of passing test cases and a set of failing tests for the *focal method* (i.e., method under test). To increase code coverage, the technique includes a *coverage-augmentation phase*, in which prompts are crafted for instructing the LLM to generate test cases aimed at exercising uncovered lines of code.

We implemented the technique in a tool, called ASTER, for two programming languages (PL), Java and Python, thus demonstrating

the feasibility of building multi-lingual unit test generators with LLMs guided by lightweight program analysis. ASTER also incorporates mocking capability for Java unit test generation, which makes it applicable to applications that perform database operations, implement services, or use complex libraries. We present a generic approach for generation of test with mocks that is extensible to different library APIs. The approach performs static analysis to identify types in the *focal class* (i.e., the class under test) that need mocking and constructs a structured prompt, which includes a test skeleton with mocking setup, fixtures, and partial test code created and leaves the test-completion task for the LLM. With such prompts, LLMs are able, in many cases, to generate usable tests for scenarios involving Java Servlet API [32], etc.

We performed a comprehensive empirical evaluation of ASTER, using six general-purpose and code LLMs, to study the generated tests in terms of code coverage achieved, mutation score, and naturalness of test code; we also compared ASTER against state-of-the-art Java and Python unit test generators. Our results show that ASTER performs very competitive (+2.0%, -0.5%, and +5.1% line, branch, and method coverage) for Java SE applications while performing significantly better (+26.4%, +10.6%, and +18.5%, line, branch, and method coverage) for Java EE applications. For Python, ASTER has a high coverage gain compared to CodaMosa (+9.8%, +26.5%, and +22.5% line, branch, and method coverage). In terms of naturalness, both our automated evaluation and developers’ survey identified that ASTER-generated test cases are more natural compared to EvoSuite and CodaMosa-generated tests and, surprisingly, better than even developer-written test cases. The results of our experiments and the naturalness evaluator are available in our artifact-source [4]

The main contributions of this work include:

- **Generic pipeline supporting multiple PLs.** We present a generic LLM-assisted test-generation pipeline fueled by static analysis that can be extended for multiple PLs. We evaluate ASTER

for Java and Python and compare it against state-of-the-art test generators (EvoSuite and CodaMosa).

- **Complex enterprise application.** We evaluated ASTER on complex enterprise applications that often require special test generation capabilities such as mocking.
- **Multiple models.** Our evaluation includes a wide variety of models ranging from closed-source (GPT) to open-source (Llama, Granite) as well as small and large models (8B to >1T).
- **Evaluation of test naturalness.** We performed an in-depth quantitative and qualitative analysis of test naturalness by developing an automated approach and conducting a survey of 161 professional developers.

2 MOTIVATION

The primary motivation for LLM-assisted test generation is to overcome the limitation of conventional test generation w.r.t lack of naturalness in the tests they create. By leveraging the LLM’s inherent ability of creating natural-looking code, we can generate more readable, comprehensible, and meaningful test cases. Another motivation for LLM-assisted test generation is to build multi-lingual unit test generators—leveraging the LLM’s understanding of the syntax and semantics of multiple PLs on which the models are typically trained. Building such test generators using conventional approaches (e.g., symbolic or evolutionary techniques) can be challenging and no such test generators exist. In contrast, with lightweight static analysis guiding LLM interactions, a multi-lingual unit test generator can be easily implemented. Finally, an LLM-assisted approach can also address test generation for scenarios requiring mocking.

To illustrate these benefits, Fig. 1 presents sample ASTER-generated test cases and tests generated by two conventional techniques: EvoSuite [24] for Java and CodaMosa [33] for Python. The ASTER-generated test cases have more meaningful test names ①, variable names ②, and assertions ③ than the EvoSuite- or CodaMosa-generated tests. For instance, consider the test cases for Apache Commons CLI [14]. The variable storing the return value from `flatten()` is called `flattenedArguments` in the ASTER test—clearly capturing the meaning of the stored data—whereas the corresponding variable in the EvoSuite test is called `stringArray1` (line 5), which captures simply the data structure type instead of any meaning of the stored data. Similarly, the Python test case generated by ASTER, shown in Fig. 1(c), has meaningful test name and variable names. Moreover, the assertion in the test case is generated taking into account the expected transformation of the input by the focal method, converting the input `hour` value to minutes. Fig. 1(b) shows a unit test case with mocking of library APIs generated for Apache Commons JXPath [17]. The test mocks the behavior of the `org.w3c.dom.Node` library class ④. As we describe later, by creating a test skeleton containing mocking-related fixture via static analysis, our approach can generate usable test cases for complex applications requiring mocking of API calls.

3 OUR APPROACH

Figure 2 illustrates our LLM-based test-generation technique, guided by program analysis. The process comprises two phases, both utilizing stage-specific prompting: (1) *Preprocessing*, in which static




Figure 2: Overview of ASTER. ①, ②, ③ represent test-generation, test-repair, and coverage-augmentation prompts.

analysis extracts context and template (Fig. 3) constructs initial prompts for LLM-driven unit test generation in Java and Python and (2) *Postprocessing*, where the generated tests undergo code fixing for correctness and code coverage. The prompt template is modified with relevant content. This iterative approach leverages LLM capabilities while ensuring test suite robustness through systematic analysis and refinement.

3.1 Preprocessing

The preprocessing phase performs static analysis of the application to gather all the context that an LLM might require to generate unit tests for Java and Python. The key objective of this stage is to gather all the necessary information pertaining to the focal method and its broader context within the application. This information is used to populate fields ① and ② of the prompt template shown in Figure 3. In this section, we discuss the preprocessing steps for Java and how those steps help construct a prompt for the LLM.

Testing scope. The first step in the preprocessing phase identifies the testing scope given a Java class under test (i.e., the focal class) f_c . The testing scope lists the set of focal methods to be targeted for test generation. This set consists of (1) public, protected, and package-visibility methods declared in f_c and (2) any inherited method implementations from an abstract super class of f_c . The set excludes inherited methods from a non-abstract super class as those methods are targeted for test generation in the context of their declaring class as the focal class. If f_c is an abstract class, the testing scope consists of static methods, if any, declared in f_c . The focal class and method are used to populate part ① of the test-generation prompt.

Relevant constructors. ASTER next identifies the relevant constructors for a focal method so that their signatures can be specified to the LLM, enabling it to create required objects for invoking the focal method. The relevant constructors for a focal method m include the constructors of the focal class (if m is a virtual method), along with the constructors of the each formal parameter type of m , considering application types only (i.e., ignoring library types). The analysis is done transitively for the formal parameter types of each identified constructor, thus ensuring that the LLM prompt includes comprehensive context information about how to create instances of application types that may be needed for testing m . The discovered constructors are used to populate part ② of the test-generation prompt in Fig. 3.

Base Prompt	Test Generation Prompt	Repair/Coverage Prompt
<pre> 1. {% set mocking = true %} 2. 3. {% set previous_context %} 4. 5. {{ test_gen_prompt }} 6. 7. {% if mocking %} 8. {{ mocking_prompt }} 9. {% endif %} 10. 11. {% endset %} 12. 13. {{ previous_context }} 14. 15. {% if error %} 16. {{ previous_context }} 17. {{ repair_prompt }} 18. {% endif %} 19. 20. {% if coverage %} 21. {{ previous_context }} 22. {{ coverage_prompt }} 23. {% endif %} </pre>	<pre> 1. {% if language="java"%} 2. 3. # Insert all used constructors 4. {{constructors}} 5. 6. # Insert all accessor methods 7. {{accessor_methods}} 8. 9. # Insert methods in formal parameter types 10. {{parameter_return_type_methods}} 11. 12. # Focal class 13. public class {{cut_name}} { 14. 15. # Focal method body 16. {{mut_body}} 17. 18. # Private calls to other class methods 19. {% if is_private_calls %} 20. {{private_methods}} 21. 22. {% endif %} 23. %} </pre>	<pre> 1. public class {{ test_name }} { 2. {{ private_fields }} 3. {{ non_private_fields }} 4. {{ mocking_fields }} 5. # Insert all mocked API types 6. {{ api_types }} 7. 8. @BeforeEach public void setup() throws Exception { 9. # Insert all mocked constructors 10. mocked{{ type }} = mockConstruction({{ type }}.class); 11. # Insert all static types 12. mocked{{ type }} = Mockito.mockStatic({{ type }}.class); 13. # Insert all non static types 14. {{ mock_other_receiver_types }} 15. # Use reflection to access private fields 16. {{ java_reflection_set_accessible }} 17. 18. @Test public void test{{ focal_method }}() 19. {{ for when_then in when_then_clauses %}} {{ when_then }} 20. {{ servlet_param_gen_comments }} 21. 22. 23. } </pre>
		<pre> 1. The above test case has the following error: 2. ... 3. {{error_line}} 4. ... 5. The error message is: 6. ... 7. {{error_message}} 8. 9. Please fix the error given the above 10. information and regenerate the test the 11. output. </pre>
		<pre> 1. In the above method {{mut_name}}, test cases 2. cannot cover the below lines: 3. 4. {{ if is_line_uncovered %}} 5. {{ line_uncovered }} 6. {{ endif %}} 7. {{ if is_branch_uncovered %}} 8. and the branch starting with 9. {{branch_uncovered}} 10. {{ endif %}} 11. </pre>

Figure 3: Templates for composing prompts for test generation, test repair, and coverage augmentation.

Relevant auxiliary methods. Accessor methods, which consist of getters and setters, provide a mechanism for reading and modifying internal object state, while preserving encapsulation. Our approach identifies setter methods in the focal class and in each formal parameter type of the focal method (if the type is an application class). Signatures of these setters are added to the LLM prompt to help with setting up suitable object states for invoking the focal method in the generated test case. For reading object state, our approach computes getters of the focal class and the return type of the focal method (limiting to application return types), and includes their signatures in the LLM prompt. This can help the LLM generate suitable assertion statements for verifying relevant object state after the focal method call—the assertions can check state of the receiver object of, or the object returned by, the focal method call. This information is used to fill section **b** of the test-generation prompt in Fig. 3.

Private methods. Private methods are inaccessible outside the class and therefore, to test them, we need to invoke them through a non-private method of the class. To facilitate this, we compute the class call graph of the focal class, identify call chains from non-private methods to private methods, and provide these call chains to the LLM to enable it to generate test cases that invoke private methods through externally visible methods. This information is used to populate part **e** of the test-generation prompt in Fig. 3.

Facilitating Mocking. Mocking enables the creation of simulated objects that mimic the behavior of actual components. These are particularly useful for simulating external services, databases, or third-party API calls. By facilitating mocking, LLM-generated tests can attempt to verify code behavior and ensure proper component interaction without having to reflect on the full implementation details of all dependencies in the application. Our approach uses a deterministic methodology (shown in Alg. 1) to identify relevant candidates for mocking given a focal method (M_{focal}), its corresponding focal class (\mathcal{T}_{focal}), and user-specified mockable third-party APIs (\mathcal{T}_{api}). The computed information is used to construct a test skeleton that is included in the test-generation prompt (shown in sections **f**, **g**, and **h** of Fig. 3). The skeleton includes mocking-related definitions and setup code, leaving the task of filling the test inputs, sequence, and assertions to the LLM.

– *Identifying fields to be mocked.* First, we discover all the candidate fields (\mathcal{T}_m) and types (\mathcal{T}_m) in the application that need to be mocked.

Algorithm 1: Identifying mockable fields, types, and scope

Input : focal method f_m , focal class f_c , mockable APIs \mathcal{T}_{api}
Output : Candidate mockable Types \mathcal{T}_m , and mockable Fields \mathcal{F}_m

- 1 **Function** IdentifyMockedFieldsAndParameterTypes:
 - Identify mockable fields.
 - 2 $\mathcal{F}_m, \mathcal{T}_m \leftarrow \emptyset, \emptyset;$
 - 3 **foreach** $f \in f_c.fields$ **do**
 - 4 **if** $f.type \in \mathcal{T}_{api}$ **then**
 - 5 $\mathcal{F}_m \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_m \cup \{f\};$
 - Identify all mockable Types
 - 6 $T \leftarrow \{f_c\} \cup formalParamTypes(f_m);$
 - 7 **while** $T \neq \emptyset$ **do**
 - 8 $t \leftarrow T.pop();$
 - 9 $\mathcal{T}_m \leftarrow \mathcal{T}_m \cup \{t : t \in \mathcal{T}_{api}\};$
 - 10 **foreach** $c \in t.constructors$ **do**
 - 11 $T \leftarrow T \cup formalParamTypes(c);$
- 12 **return** $\mathcal{T}_m, \mathcal{F}_m;$
- Input** : focal method f_m , focal class f_c , and mockable types \mathcal{T}_{api} .
Output : Mockable constructor calls \mathcal{M}_c , static calls \mathcal{M}_s , API calls \mathcal{M}_a
- 13 **Function** IdentifyMockingScope:
 - 14 $S, \mathcal{M}_c, \mathcal{M}_s, \mathcal{M}_a \leftarrow \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset;$
 - Add focal method and constructor to scope
 - 15 $S \leftarrow S \cup \{f_m, f_c.constructors\};$
 - Add methods reachable from f_m within f_c
 - 16 $S \leftarrow S \cup \{m \in f_c.methods : isReachable(f_m, m)\};$
 - Add service entry class methods to scope
 - 17 **if** $isServiceEntryClass(f_c)$ **then**
 - 18 $S \leftarrow S \cup \{m \in f_c.methods : isOverriden(m)\};$
 - Iterate over all callsites.
 - 19 **foreach** $m \in S$ **do**
 - 20 **foreach** $cs \in callSites(m)$ **do**
 - 21 **if** $isConstructor(cs) \wedge cs.type \in \mathcal{T}_{api}$ **then**
 - 22 $\mathcal{M}_c \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_c \cup cs;$
 - 23 **if** $isStatic(cs) \wedge cs.type \in \mathcal{T}_{api}$ **then**
 - 24 $\mathcal{M}_s \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_s \cup cs;$
 - 25 **if** $receiverType(cs) \in \mathcal{T}_{api}$ **then**
 - 26 $\mathcal{M}_a \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_a \cup cs;$
 - 27 **return** $\mathcal{M}_c, \mathcal{M}_s, \mathcal{M}_a;$

To determine the candidate fields, we iterate through the fields defined in the focal class, identifying each field whose type occurs in \mathcal{T}_{api} (lines 3–5). To identify all types that need to be mocked, we begin by examining the formal parameter types of the focal method f_m and the focal class f_c (line 6). We then perform a transitive search (lines 7–11), iterating through each type to determine whether it belongs to \mathcal{T}_{api} . For each identified type, we also consider the parameter types of its constructors. This process ensures that all relevant types are included. The identified fields and types

to be mocked are used to populate section ④ of the test-generation prompt (Fig. 3).

– *Identifying methods to be stubbed.* Next, we identify the scope for creating stubs for mocking. These stubs emulate method calls with “when” and “then” clauses. The “when” clauses define the conditions under which a mock should return a specified value and the “then” clauses specify the expected behavior once the conditions are met. Our approach for determining this scope is shown in Function `IdentifyMockingScope` of Alg. 1: we start by adding the focal method (f_m) and its class constructors to the scope set. We then include methods reachable from f_m within the focal class. If f_c is a service entry class, we also add its overridden methods. We iterate over all methods in the scope set, examining their call sites to classify them as mockable constructor calls, static calls, or API calls based on their types. Information about these classes of calls are used to populate parts ⑤ and ⑥ of the test-generation prompt (Fig. 3).

Preprocessing for Python. Unlike Java, Python’s more flexible structure, where a single file or module can contain a mix of functions, classes, and standalone code, lends itself better to module-scoped test generation. Therefore, for Python test generation, ASTER targets a module as a whole for test generation, including all classes, methods, and functions declared in the module. This module-level approach together with distinct language features of Python allows us to omit some preprocessing steps that are necessary for Java but irrelevant for Python. Because our approach provides the entire module to the LLM, instructing the LLMs about calls to private methods is unnecessary. Member visibility in Python is specified via naming conventions (names beginning with single underscore for protected members and double underscores for private members) and there is no strict encapsulation as these members can be accessed via name mangling. Python’s properties feature (using `@property` decorators) also lets private members to be accessed directly. Thus, identification of accessors is also unnecessary for Python test generation. In terms of relevant constructors, the constructor definitions in the focal module are already available to the LLM. Additionally, we add constructors for all imported modules to the LLM prompt. Also, we found that, for Python, adding a few examples of tests helps LLMs produce more predictable output, thus, making the postprocessing steps easier. For Java, this was not necessary, but investigation of RAG-based approaches for incorporating in-context learning for test generation is an interesting future research direction.

3.2 Postprocessing

3.2.1 Output sanitization. Generated tests undergo sanitization to remove extraneous content (such as natural language text) and ensure syntactic correctness of the generated test cases.

3.2.2 Error remediation. The sanitized code is compiled to identify any compilation errors. If errors occur, the error message as well as the compiler feedback is analyzed to identify the cause of the error. Section ③ of the LLM template updated with the erroneous line as well as the previous context to reprompt the LLM in a targeted manner to address the specified problems. Then, the compilable code is executed and runtime issues (assertion failure or runtime error) are fed to LLM for fixing. We use a similar prompt to provide the context related to the focal method and the error details.

Table 1: Models used in the evaluation.

Model Name	Provider	Update Date	Model Size	License	Data Type
GPT-4-turbo	OpenAI	May-24	1.76T [†]	Closed-source	Generic
Llama3-70b	Meta	Apr-24	70B	Llama-3 License*	Generic
CodeLlama-34b	Meta	Aug-23	34B	Llama-2 License*	Code
Granite-34b	IBM	May-24	34B	Apace 2.0 License*	Code
Llama3-8b	Meta	Apr-24	8B	Llama-3 License*	Generic
Granite-8b	IBM	May-24	8B	Apace 2.0 License*	Code

*Open-source with different licenses. [†]Model size not confirmed.

Table 2: Java and Python datasets used in the evaluation.

	Dataset	Classes/Modules	Methods	NCLOC
Java SE	Commons CLI	31	305	2498
	Commons Codec	97	776	9681
	Commons Compress	500	3650	43545
	Commons JXPath	180	1502	20142
Java EE	CargoTracker	107	482	5445
	DayTrader	148	1067	11409
	PetClinic	23	84	805
	App X	140	2111	21655
	Python Dataset	283	2216	38633

3.2.3 Increasing coverage of generated tests. Error-free test cases are executed to measure code coverage, which is further analyzed to identify uncovered code segments and then used to update the LLM prompt template (Fig. 3) to guide the LLM to generate test cases that exercise the uncovered code segments. The process is repeated iteratively until the desired code coverage is achieved.

Postprocessing for Python. For Python, we use Pylint [51], for identifying compilation and parsing error.

Specifically, ASTER focuses on the error category of Pylint and uses this information to guide LLMs in the task of fixing compilation and parsing issues. Then, tests are executed using Pytest and the output is used to provide feedback to the LLMs in case of failures. Finally, Coverage.py [6] is leveraged to perform the coverage-augmentation step.

4 EXPERIMENT SETUP

4.1 Research Questions

Our evaluation focuses on the following research questions:

- RQ1:** How effective is ASTER in code coverage achieved with different models?
- RQ2:** How natural are ASTER-generated tests?
- RQ3:** How effective is ASTER in mutation scores achieved?
- RQ4:** What is the effect of different types context information and postprocessing steps on coverage achieved?
- RQ5:** How do developers perceive ASTER-generated tests in terms of their comprehensibility and usability?

4.2 Baseline test-generation tools

We evaluated ASTER against two state-of-the-art unit test generators. For Java, we used EvoSuite [22], specifically Release 1.2.0. For Python, we selected CodaMosa and used the latest version from




Figure 4: Line, branch, and method coverage achieved on Java SE and Java EE applications by ASTER (configured with different LLMs) and EvoSuite (GPT-4 run excluded for App X for confidentiality reasons).

its repository [12]. CodaMosa is built on Pynguin [36], a search-based test-generation tool, and improves upon it by leveraging LLM-generated test cases to expand the search space on reaching coverage plateaus. The available version of CodaMosa works with the deprecated code-davinci-002 model; we, therefore, updated the tool to work with GPT-3.5-turbo-instruct, the recommended replacement model for code-davinci-002 [41].

4.3 Models

We selected six models for evaluation, including LLMs of different sizes (ranging from 8B to over 1T parameters), open-source and closed-source LLMs, and LLMs from different model families (GPT [42], Llama-3 [39], and Granite [31]), considering general-purpose and code models. Table 1 provide details of the selected models. Our emphasis was on selecting open-source models along with one frontier model.

4.4 Datasets

Table 2 lists the datasets used in the evaluation. The Java dataset is split into Java Standard Edition (SE) and Enterprise Edition (EE) applications. For Java SE, we selected four Apache Commons projects: Commons CLI [14], Commons Codec [15], Commons Compress [16], and Commons JXPath [17]. For Java EE, we used three open-source applications (CargoTracker [9], DayTrader [19], PetClinic [47]), covering different Java frameworks and a proprietary enterprise application (called “App X” for confidentiality).

For Python, we started with 486 modules from the CodaMosa artifact [13]. We ran CodaMosa on this dataset, but encountered crashes on 203 of the modules. We excluded those modules, resulting 286 modules from 20 projects.

4.5 Evaluation metrics

4.5.1 Code coverage and mutation scores. To measure code coverage, we used JaCoCo [21] for Java and Coverage.py [6] for Python. Because Coverage.py does not report method coverage, we implemented custom code for inferring method coverage from line coverage. For both Java and Python, we report data on line, branch, and method coverage. To compute mutation scores, we used PIT [48] for Java and mutmut [30] for Python. Both of these tools take an application and a test suite as inputs, generate mutants for the application by introducing small changes using mutation operators, and compute mutation scores for the test suite. We used the default set of mutation operators available in the tools.

4.5.2 Naturalness. For test cases, we consider naturalness to encompass different characteristics, such as (1) readability in terms of meaningfulness of test and variable names, (2) quality of test assertions, (3) meaningfulness of test sequences, (4) quality of input values, and (5) occurrences of test smells or anti-patterns. Our evaluation focuses on assessing characteristics 1 and 2 quantitatively; additionally, we conducted a developer survey, which provides developer perspectives on characteristics 1–4. For studying occurrences of test smells, we attempted to use a test-smell detection tool for Java, TSDetect [46, 61], but ran into numerous issues with the tool, such as identification of spurious test smells (false positives) and incorrect counts of test smells. We therefore chose to not use the tool, and perform our quantitative evaluation with a custom naturalness checker for characteristics (1) and (2) implemented using Tree-sitter [60] and WALA [67]. We note that our metrics for assessing test assertion quality include some of the test smells detected by TSDetect.

Measuring assertion quality. For assessing test assertion quality, our implementation uses the following metrics.

- *Assertion ratio.* This measures the percentage of lines of code with assertions in a test case.
- *Tests with no assertions.* The percentage of test cases in a test file that have no assertions.
- *Tests with duplicate assertions.* For a test file, the percentage of tests with assertions that contain duplicate assertions.
- *Tests with null assertions.* For a test file, the percentage of tests with assertions that contain a null assertion.
- *Tests with exception assertions.* For a test file, the percentage of tests with assertions that contain an exception assertion.

Measuring meaningfulness of test method name. A unit test name should clearly capture the functionality being tested, by including the focal method name and the functionality being tested if necessary. For example, a test that checks whether command-line options are correctly populated when long option values are provided can be named `test_getOptions_longOptions`. However, tools such as EvoSuite and CodaMosa often generate non-descriptive test names (e.g., `test01`) that do not reflect the functionality being tested. We developed the following approach for measuring the meaningfulness of test names. First, for a given test file, we identify the focal class, similar to the Method2Test approach [62]. For Python, we skip this step because focal methods can exist inside or outside of classes, and resolving imports is more complex. Instead, we directly identify focal methods, assuming any function call could be a focal method. For Java, we examine all call sites in the test case, matching them with testable methods in the focal classes. This step results in a list of potential focal methods. We then check if one of these methods is mentioned in the test name. If it is, we assign a 50% score for the match. Next, we tokenize the remaining part of the test name after removing “test” keywords. We use camel-case and underscore splitting and generate all possible word combinations by merging them sequentially. For example, `test_addOption_longArgs_throwsException` is first matched with the focal method `addOption`, then the name is broken into `long`, `args`, and `longargs`. For exceptions, we match them separately with exceptions thrown in the test body. We calculate the closeness score using the Levenshtein distance by matching these tokens with all code identifiers.

Measuring meaningfulness of variable names in tests. Consider the below illustrative example, showing two test cases that have the same set of steps. Our premise is that the name of a variable of a data structure type (e.g., `String`, `List`) can be meaningful based on its context, whereas the meaningfulness of a variable name for a non-data structure type depends on both type and context.

```

1 public void testFlattenArguments() {
2     BasicParser parser = new BasicParser();
3     Options options = new Options();
4     String[] arguments = new String[0];
5     String[] result = parser.flatten(options, arguments, true);
6     assertEquals(new String[0], result);
7 public void test0() {
8     BasicParser basicparser0 = new BasicParser();
9     Options option0 = new Options();
10    String[] arr0 = new String[0];
11    String[] arr1 = parser.flatten(options, arguments, true);
12    assertEquals(new String[0], arr1);

```

Figure 5: Example of two tests with meaningfulness of method name and variable name.

For instance, a variable of type `String` named `str` is not meaningful as it is not capturing any information about the stored data. In contrast, variable `BasicParser parser` is meaningful as type name itself conveys meaning of the stored data. Additionally, a variable name’s meaningfulness can depend on the context in which it is used. For example, in the case of `String[]` arguments, the variable name depends on the formal parameter names of the method `flatten(Options options, String[] arguments, boolean stopAtNonOption)` whose returned value is stored in the variable. Based on this premise, we categorize variables into two groups. Then, depending on the group, we determine whether to match with the data type name, assignment context, and formal parameter names, or simply the assignment context and formal parameter names. Finally, we use the Levenshtein distance to compute the closeness score.

4.6 Experiment environment

The experiments were conducted on cloud VMs, each equipped with a 48-core Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 8260 processor; the RAM ranged from 128 to 384 GB. We used the OpenAI API [40] to access the GPT models and an internal (proprietary) cloud service to access the other models. We used v1.2.0 of EvoSuite and our updated version of CodaMosa. We performed three runs of test generation with each model for both Java dataset and the Python dataset. We use temperature = 0.2, which has been used for code generation tasks [64], and for generating more predictable outputs, with max token length set to 1024 for reducing cost. We use the same settings for all the models.

5 EVALUATION RESULTS

5.1 RQ1: Code Coverage

We collected code coverage in two steps, configuring ASTER to run with each of the six models. In the first step, we ran ASTER with its preprocessing and prompting components, followed by the postprocessing, i.e., to fix parsing/compilation/runtime errors and test failures. This step resulted in the initial generated test suite. Next, we performed coverage augmentation, asking the LLM to generate tests targeting lines of code not covered initially. We restricted augmentation to partially covered methods, omitting uncovered methods—the rationale is that methods that remain uncovered after the first step are unlikely to be covered during augmentation.

1. Java SE applications: The top part of Figure 4 presents coverage results for the Java SE applications in our dataset. The charts show, for each application, line, branch, and method coverage achieved by ASTER configured with different LLMs and by EvoSuite. ASTER is, in general, very competitive with EvoSuite—within a few percentage points, and even outperforming it, on different coverage metrics—with the best-performing model. For instance, for Commons CLI, ASTER with Llama3-70B achieves only slightly lower line coverage (-4%) and higher branch coverage (+3%) than EvoSuite. Similarly, on Commons Codec, ASTER with GPT-4 has slightly lower on line coverage (-7%) and branch coverage (-7%). On Commons Compress, both tools achieve much lower coverage, due to application complexity (Commons Compress provides an API for different




Figure 6: Line, branch, and method coverage achieved on Python projects by ASTER (with different LLMs) and CodaMosa.

file compression and archive formats), but there is not much difference between them. Finally, Commons JXPath highlights the case where ASTER significantly outperforms EvoSuite, achieving 4x–5x more line and branch coverage with different models. On examining the test cases for Commons JXPath, we found ASTER’s support for mocking to be one of the factors contributing to its superior performance; Figure 1(b) illustrates an example test case. To understand the effect of our mock-generation approach, we conducted an ablation with Commons JXPath. We found that, on average, there is a (relative) loss of 13.7%, 17.4%, and 10.5% in line, branch, and method coverage.

Overall, these results are positive and indicate that LLM-based test generation can match conventional test-generation tools on their one of their key strengths (code coverage), while also producing considerably more natural test cases (§5.2) that are preferred by developers (§5.5).

Finding 1: LLM-based test generation guided by static analysis is very competitive with EvoSuite in coverage achieved for Java SE projects, being slightly lower in some cases (-7%) and considerably higher in other cases (4x–5x).

Among the LLMs, we observe that all models perform roughly similar with respect to line and method coverage, but some differences become apparent on examining branch coverage. Another noteworthy result is that despite GPT-4’s significantly larger size compared to the other models, its performance is not far superior to the smaller models; in some cases, the smaller models in fact perform better GPT-4 (Llama-70b: +1.2%, CodeLlama-34b: +0.1%, Granite-34b: -1.2%, Llama-8b: -1.35%, Granite-8b: -4.7% w.r.t line coverage).

2. Java EE applications: The bottom part of Figure 4 presents coverage results for Java EE applications. The result for CargoTracker is similar to that for Java SE applications, with ASTER being competitive with EvoSuite and, in some instances, performing better than it. For PetClinic, EvoSuite could not be run because PetClinic requires Java 17, which is not supported by EvoSuite. This highlights the benefit of LLM-based test generation that it can inherently support more language versions than conventional tools.

On DayTrader and App X, ASTER consistently achieves higher scores on all coverage metrics, with the difference for App X being especially significant—7x more line coverage and 84x more branch coverage with the best-performing model, Granite-34B. We investigated the reasons for this difference and found ASTER’s mocking capability and handling of multiple frameworks (stemming from the LLM’s inherent knowledge) as the two primary reasons.

An older release of EvoSuite (1.0.6) supports Java EE features but works with Java 8 only. Among the Java EE applications in our dataset, DayTrader is the only one that can be built with Java 8. Thus, we applied EvoSuite 1.0.6 to DayTrader, which yielded much better results, raising EvoSuite’s performance to a similar level as ASTER, as shown in Figure 4(g).

Finding 2: For Java EE projects, ASTER significantly outperforms EvoSuite for most applications (10.6%-26.4% coverage) and is capable of generating test cases for applications where existing approaches fail to do so.

Our findings suggest that smaller models (8b, 34b) can outperform or match the performance of larger models such as Llama3-70b or GPT-4. This is promising because the major drawback of LLM-based test generation is the associated cost. Because this process involves thousands of LLM calls with token-based billing for accessing models through their APIs, the cost can be significantly high. We found that running ASTER against all the Java applications in our dataset—generating tests, fixing compilation/runtime errors, and performing coverage augmentation—requires >20K LLM calls per model, which can cost thousands of dollars and is not a feasible option for long-term usability.

Finding 3: Smaller models (Granite-34b and Llama-3-8b) demonstrate competitive performance, with only 0.1%, 6.3%, and 2.7% loss in line, branch, and method coverage, compared to larger models (Llama-70b and GPT-4).

3. Python applications: Figure 6 presents coverage results for Python: it shows line, branch, and method coverage achieved by ASTER configured with the six LLMs compared with CodaMosa over the Python dataset. ASTER performs considerably better than CodaMosa (CodaMosa: 44%, 53.7%, and 61.2% line, branch, and method coverage, ASTER + GPT-4: 78% line coverage, 77.2% branch coverage, and 86.7% method coverage). ASTER with Granite-34B performed even better in method coverage, reaching 89.9%. Notably, the smaller models performed well too. With Granite-8b, ASTER achieved method, branch, and line coverage of 83%, 71.9%, and 48.3%, respectively. These results validate the effectiveness of ASTER’s LLM-driven approach, demonstrating a clear advantage over conventional techniques.

Finding 4: ASTER generates Python tests with higher coverage (+9.8%, +26.5%, and +22.5%) for all the models compared to CodaMosa.




Figure 7: Naturalness metrics for Java SE and EE applications (1: GPT-4, 2: Llama3-70b, 3: CodeLlama-34b, 4: Granite-34b, 5: Llama-8b, 6: Granite-8b, 7: EvoSuite, 8: Developer).




Figure 8: Naturalness results for Python (legends are same as Figure 7).

5.2 RQ2: Test Naturalness

1. *Java applications:* We discovered that both EvoSuite-generated and LLM-generated tests exhibit test smells. Interestingly, LLM-generated tests tend to have more cases without assertions compared to those generated by EvoSuite. This opens up an intriguing avenue for enhancing LLM-generated tests to reduce smells while maintaining coverage. Notably, ASTER-generated test cases contain significantly fewer exception-related tests than those generated by EvoSuite. In terms of readability metrics, ASTER-generated test cases outperform those generated by EvoSuite. However, there are still several instances where ASTER-generated tests have names that lack meaningfulness. Additionally, our automated approach has certain limitations, such as not capturing natural language descriptions in test names effectively. For example, in `testPrintGainHTML_PositiveGain`, the term `PositiveGain` indicates a positive computation result, which is not directly reflected in the code body. Improving the technique to better capture natural-language intents in test and variable names could be another direction for future work.

2. *Python applications:* CodaMosa consistently generated test cases without any assertions, whereas ASTER generates test cases with assertions in most cases. None of the developer-written, ASTER-generated, or CodaMosa-generated tests contain null assertions or exception assertions. Our analysis found that developers prefer to have around 4–5 lines of test code for each assertion, which is similar to ASTER-generated cases. For both variable and test name naturalness, ASTER achieved scores very similar to developer-written test cases, while CodaMosa had a much lower naturalness scores (figure in artifact).

Finding 5: ASTER-generated test cases have more meaningful test and variable names compared to EvoSuite and CodaMosa tests but still lack in terms of test smells, although ASTER produces fewer exception-related assertions.

Table 3: Mutation scores.

App	CM	ES	GPT4	LL-70b	CL-34b	GR-34b	LL-8b	GR-8b
Commons CLI	–	60.0	29.7	33.7	24.3	30.7	22.3	26.7
Commons Codec	–	75.0	35.0	30.3	24.7	25.3	31.0	29.3
CargoTracker	–	16.0	22.7	17.0	16.0	21.0	10.3	12.7
DayTrader	–	5.0	17.3	10.3	9.0	10.7	13.7	12.0
PetClinic	–	–	9.7	11.3	9.5	8.7	7.0	7.0
App X	–	1.0	–	2.0	6.0	14.0	4.7	5.0
Python Dataset	8.8	–	7.6	6.1	6.4	2.9	4.0	4.5

CM: CodaMosa, ES: EvoSuite, GR: Granite, LL: Llama, CL: CodeLlama
Commons Compress and Commons JXPath are excluded due to failures in mutation analysis.

Table 4: Ablation results: coverage difference by excluding context during preprocessing and adding postprocessing steps.

Coverage	Preprocessing					Postprocessing							
	CS	EAC	PM	AM	NAC	Python CS	FS	CF	RF	CA	Python CF	RF	CA
Line	-13.3	-7.2	-8.5	-7.5	-22.4	-17.0	-18.9	+11.9	+2.3	+17.6	+20.3	+4.3	+20.1
Branch	-23.1	-26.1	-28.9	-21.3	-43.3	-8.9	-7.6	+14.9	+2.4	+26.3	+10.9	+1.1	+8.5
Method	-9.9	-0.2	-3.0	-1.4	-14.8	-10.6	-8.9	+10.1	+1.6	+12.5	+13.1	-0.3	+10.3

CS: Constructor, EAC: extend abstract class, PM: private methods, AM: auxiliary methods, NAC: no additional context, FS: few shot, CF: compilation error fix, RF: runtime error fix, CA: coverage augmentation. All data are in %.

5.3 RQ3: Mutation Scores

1. *Java applications:* Table 3 shows the mutation scores achieved by CodaMosa, EvoSuite, and ASTER, indicating the effectiveness of each tool in detecting code mutations. For Java SE applications, EvoSuite consistently demonstrates superior performance (60%–75%), whereas ASTER achieved 22.3%–35.0% mutation coverage. This is expected, as EvoSuite sets mutation goals during test generation and improves the tests to enhance mutation coverage, and indicates scope for improving LLM-based test generation with mutation-coverage goals. Conversely, ASTER outperforms EvoSuite consistently on the EE applications, which correlates with ASTER’s higher code coverage achieved on these applications than EvoSuite.

2. *Python applications:* CodaMosa performed the best with 8.8% mutation scores, followed by ASTER with GPT-4, which achieved 7.6% mutation coverage. Similar to EvoSuite, CodaMosa uses mutation coverage to evolve test cases during generation, thus benefiting from this approach. Overall, both tools achieve low mutation scores.

Finding 6: EvoSuite achieves considerably higher mutation scores than ASTER on Java SE applications due to its use of mutation-coverage goals during test generation, whereas ASTER outperforms EvoSuite on the EE applications.





Figure 9: Survey responses on test quality (Q10–Q17) for Java test cases (left) and Python test cases (right).

5.4 RQ4: Ablation Study

Our approach performs test generation by including various contexts in the LLM prompts during preprocessing and performing the postprocessing steps. To investigate the effect of these steps, we conducted an ablation study using two Java applications (Commons CLI and PetClinic) and the Python dataset. We used Granite-34B, as it offers a good balance between size and competitiveness compared to other model.




Figure 10: Survey response on Q18 (whether developers would add such test cases to their test suites).

1. *Java ablation*: In terms of preprocessing, the ablation removes: (1) the constructor chain details (cs), (2) non-abstract inherited methods (EAC), (3) private method call details (PM), (4) signatures of auxiliary methods (AM), and (5) all of the context gathered through static analysis (NAC). The NAC configuration, thus, provides only the focal method body along with an instruction (e.g., “Generate unit test cases for the following Java method”). In each ablation configuration, we remove the context related to that configuration, keeping everything else intact, to understand the individual effect. For postprocessing, we measured coverage gains contributed by compilation error fix (CF), runtime error fix (RF), and coverage augmentation (CA). Table 4 presents results. we found that excluding all context (NAC) leads to significant loss in coverage, with reductions of 43.3% branch coverage. In terms of different types of contexts, cs has a larger effect across all coverage metrics, but the other context types also have considerable effect.

Among the postprocessing steps, CA has the largest effect, leading to coverage gains of 26.3% branch coverage. CF also provides notable improvement, with coverage gains of at least 10% on all metrics. Conversely, RF has a small impact on coverage, at most 2.4%. In

Table 5: Survey questions categorized into two groups.

Type	Question	Format
Background	Q1. Current Professional Role	Open
	Q2. Years of experience in software engineering (incl. education)	MCQ
	Q3. Years of experience in industry	MCQ
	Q4. Level of expertise in Java	MCQ
	Q5. Level of expertise in Python	MCQ
	Q6. Prior experience with automated test generation	MCQ
	Q7. Prior experience with automated test generation (if yes, list the tools used in the past)	MCQ
	Q8. How often do you write unit tests for your code?	MCQ
	Q9. On average, how long do you spend writing good unit tests for a single method?	MCQ
Test Quality	Q10. I understand what this test case is doing	Likert
	Q11. I understand what the assertions in this test are checking	Likert
	Q12. I can describe the purpose of this test case	Likert
	Q13. This test case adds value	Likert
	Q14. The test name correctly describes what is being tested	Likert
	Q15. The names of variables in the test case are meaningful	Likert
	Q16. The input values (e.g., string literals, integer constants), if any, used in the test case are meaningful	Likert
	Q17. The test sequence (i.e., the sequence of method calls in the test case) makes sense	Likert
	Q18. Would you add this test case to your unit test bucket?	MCQ
	Q19. Please provide any descriptive feedback.	Open

general, assertion fixes in test cases would not be expected to have a large effect on coverage (as much of a test’s coverage is typically achieved prior to reaching assert statements).

2. *Python ablation*: For Python ablation, we exclude constructor information (cs) and few-shot examples (FS) from the prompt, and perform similar evaluation for postprocessing step. cs and FC have a similar effect, with roughly the same loss in coverage across the metrics. The postprocessing results are similar to the Java result.

Finding 7: ASTER’s preprocessing steps to add relevant contexts to LLM prompts have a significant effect on coverage. ASTER’s postprocessing steps of compilation error fix and coverage augmentation result in significant coverage gains, while runtime error fix causes a small gain.

5.5 RQ5: Developer Survey

To understand developer perspectives on comprehensibility and usability of ASTER-generated tests compared to EvoSuite (or CodaMosa)-generated and developer-written tests, we conducted an anonymous online survey in an industry setting. The survey consists of a set of background questions, followed by a series of focal methods together with two test cases for each method, and a set of questions for each focal method and its test pair. Figure 5 shows the survey

Table generated by Excel2LaTeX from sheet ‘Sheet8’

We used two Java (Commons CLI and Commons JXPath) and three Python applications (Ansible [1], Tornado Web [59], and Flutes [23]) for the study. We designed the survey to present, for each focal method, a pair of test cases, where the pair could be (ASTER, EvoSuite/CodaMosa), (ASTER, developer), or (developer, EvoSuite/CodaMosa) tests—without indicating the source of a test case. To select focal methods, first we mapped each test case, from the three sources, to its focal method, and removed focal methods that did not have at least one source-pair test. Then, we randomly selected focal methods and a pair of tests for each method, while ensuring that the participant would see an equal number of tests from the three sources. In total, the survey had 9 focal methods and 18 test cases, with 6 tests from each test source. The survey presents the participant with the focal method’s body, a brief task description, and a GitHub repository URL (using which the participant could, if needed, browse the focal class and its broader context).

The survey received 161 responses, with participants coming various roles, such as software developer, QA engineer, principal solution architect, research scientist, etc. In terms of experience, 69.7% of the participants have >10 years of experience, with 22.2% exceeding 25 years. Most participants have very strong industry experience, with 48.1% of the participants being in industry for 10+ years. Participants also have high level of proficiency in Java and Python, with 71% and 62% reporting professional or experienced levels, respectively. A few participants reported having previously code assistant, such as JetBrains Code with Me [7] and GitHub Copilot [26], as aids in test generation. Additionally, all participants agreed that writing test cases is a tedious task and 90.4% said that writing a good unit test takes more than five minutes.

For Q10–Q18, participants provided responses on a five-point scale, ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”. The results, shown in Figure 9, indicate a strong preference for ASTER-generated test cases over EvoSuite and CodaMosa for all aspects evaluated. For example, on Q10, 91.6% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they understood the ASTER-generated Java test cases, which is considerably higher than their ratings for EvoSuite tests (67.7%) and the developer-written tests (69.1%). On this question, the difference for the Python tests is much higher, with 100% positive responses on ASTER-generated tests, compared with 84.0% for developer-written tests and only 45.1% for the CodaMosa tests. Overall, on all the questions, the participants rated ASTER-generated tests higher than EvoSuite/CodaMosa-generated tests and even developer-written test cases in most cases. Finally, on Q18 (Figure 10), participants indicated a significantly stronger preference for incorporating tests similar to ASTER-generated ones into their test suites with minor or no changes—70% for Java and 88% for Python—compared to EvoSuite and CodaMosa tests. On this question too, ASTER-generated tests score higher than developer-written tests.

Finding 8: Developers prefer ASTER-generated tests over EvoSuite and CodaMosa tests, with over 70% also willing to add such tests with minor or no changes to their test buckets. ASTER-generated tests are also favored slightly over developer-written tests in these characteristics.

6 RELATED WORK

Compared to the previous works [2, 24, 27, 36, 43, 44, 54, 57, 63] on conventional testing approaches, we leverage LLM to generate more natural unit tests while supporting multiple PLs. There have been several works that attempted to use LLMs for test generations [5, 52, 53, 62, 65, 69]. The closest works are done by ChatTester [72] and ChatUnitTest [71] (arxiv), which have used the GPT model to generate test cases given the information related to the class under test and has shown that it performs competitively. However, this approach is specifically tied to GPT, and in many enterprise use cases, this approach may not work. Recent Pizzorno and Berger [49] (arxiv), use LLM as a coverage augmenting approach starting with tests generated by CodaMosa. Compared to that work, ASTER (1) supports more PLs, (2) generates tests from scratch, (3) creates more natural tests (based on our automated analysis and developers’ survey) compared to CodaMosa, which the prior work is dependent on, and (4) generates tests with higher coverage (prior work: line: +7.3%, branch: +10.3%, ASTER: line: +37.1%, branch: 24.9% (with GPT-4, on which the prior work has been evaluated)) compared to CodaMosa.

7 DISCUSSION

Our study identified several pros and cons of using LLMs for test generation. Although ASTER addresses some of them, there remains significant room for further research.

Supporting more PLs. Although LLMs are trained on various PLs, using them off-the-shelf may not always produce the best results. However, when combined with lighter-weight program analysis, their performance is often very competitive with, and sometimes surpasses, existing approaches. This reduced need for complex program analysis makes it easier to support more PLs.

Multiple frameworks and versions Another benefit of using LLMs for test generation is their ability to support multiple frameworks and PL versions. For instance, state-of-the-art tools such as EvoSuite do not support beyond Java 11—posing a significant challenge for practical usage. LLMs can play a significant role in bridging this gap.

Increasing naturalness of existing approaches. In this work, we developed an automated method to assess the naturalness of test cases and discovered that LLM-generated tests are notably more natural than those produced by existing tools or written by developers. We can leverage a similar approach to (1) enhance the naturalness of test cases generated by existing approaches and (2) guide LLMs to produce more natural code by incorporating this aspect as a pretraining objective.

Beyond unit testing. We evaluated LLMs’ capability in unit test generation. However, we believe that there is a significant potential of using LLMs to go beyond unit testing to other testing levels—module, integration, and system—for which there is limited support among the current test-generation tools, especially for white-box testing.

Affordable models. One of the main challenges of using LLMs is the associated cost. LLM-based approaches require substantial computing resources, making them less accessible for developers compared to existing methods. However, our study revealed some noteworthy findings: (1) unlike many other use cases, GPT-4 is not

the most dominant model and (2) smaller models (e.g., Granite-34b and Llama3-8b) perform competitively. We believe that more effort should be directed towards developing quantized, test-generation-specific models that can run efficiently.

8 THREATS TO VALIDITY

In this section, we identify the most relevant threats to validity and discuss how we mitigated them.

External threat. To address threat related to generalizability of ASTER, we extended support for (a) multiple PLs and (b) multiple models with varying sizes, modalities, and from different model families.

Internal threat. One potential threat to internal validity is the limited number of evaluation runs. While previous studies have performed more than ten runs, the substantial cost associated with running evaluations across several large applications and six different LLMs led us to limit the runs. Another threat can be automated naturalness evaluation, and to mitigate we conducted a survey of professional developers, and we found that the findings are very similar.

Construct threat. To ensure construct validity, we measured coverage and mutation scores using widely used tools such as JaCoCo [21], Coverage.py [6], PIT [48], and Mutmut [30].

9 SUMMARY AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we presented ASTER, a multi-lingual test-generation tool that leverages LLMs guided by lightweight static analysis to generate natural and effective unit test cases for Java and Python. Through its preprocessing component, ASTER ensures that LLM prompts have adequate context required for generating unit tests for a focal method. ASTER's postprocessing component performs iterative test repair and coverage augmentation. Our extensive evaluation, with six LLMs on a dataset of Java SE, Java EE, and Python application, showed that ASTER is competitive with state-of-the-art tools in coverage achieved on Java SE application, and outperforms them significantly on Java EE and Python applications, while also producing considerably more natural tests than those tools. Our developer survey, with over 160 participants, highlighted the naturalness characteristics of ASTER-generated tests and their usability for building automated test suites. Future research directions include extending ASTER to other PLs and levels of testing (e.g., integration testing), creating fine-tuned models for testing to reduce the cost of LLM interactions, and exploring techniques for improving fault-detection ability of the generated tests.

REFERENCES

- [1] ansible 2024. Ansible. <https://github.com/ansible/ansible>
- [2] Andrea Arcuri. 2019. RESTful API automated test case generation with EvoMaster. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)* 28, 1 (2019), 1–37.
- [3] Andrea Arcuri and Lionel Briand. 2011. Adaptive Random Testing: An Illusion of Effectiveness?. In *Proceedings of the 2011 International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 265–275. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2001420.2001452>
- [4] asterartifact 2024. ASTER Artifact. <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/aster-54FC/>
- [5] Patrick Bareiß, Beatriz Souza, Marcelo d'Amorim, and Michael Pradel. 2022. Code generation tools (almost) for free? a study of few-shot, pre-trained language models on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.01335* (2022).
- [6] Ned Batchelder. [n. d.]. Coverage.py: Code coverage measurement for Python. <https://coverage.readthedocs.io/>. Accessed: 2024-07-27.
- [7] JET Brains. 2024. Code With Me. <https://www.jetbrains.com/code-with-me>
- [8] Cristian Cadar, Daniel Dunbar, and Dawson Engler. 2008. KLEE: Unassisted and Automatic Generation of High-Coverage Tests for Complex Systems Programs. In *Proceedings of the 8th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation*. 209–224.
- [9] cargotracker 2024. Eclipse Cargo Tracker. <https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/cargotracker>
- [10] Tsong Yueh Chen, Fei-Ching Kuo, Robert G. Merkel, and T. H. Tse. 2010. Adaptive Random Testing: The ART of Test Case Diversity. *J. Syst. Softw.* 83, 1 (Jan. 2010), 60–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2009.02.022>
- [11] Ilinca Ciupa, Andreas Leitner, Manuel Oriol, and Bertrand Meyer. 2008. ARTOO: Adaptive Random Testing for Object-Oriented Software. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 71–80.
- [12] codamosa 2024. CodaMosa. <https://github.com/microsoft/codamosa>
- [13] codamosaartifact 2024. CodaMOSA Artifact. <https://github.com/microsoft/codamosa/tree/main/replication>
- [14] commonscli 2024. Apache Commons CLI. <https://github.com/apache/commons-cli>
- [15] commonscodec 2024. Apache Commons Codec. <https://github.com/apache/commons-codec>
- [16] commonscompress 2024. Apache Commons Compress. <https://github.com/apache/commons-compress>
- [17] commonsjxpath 2024. Apache Commons JXPath. <https://github.com/apache/commons-jxpath>
- [18] Arghavan Moradi Dakhel, Amin Nikanjam, Vahid Majdinasab, Foutse Khomh, and Michel C Desmarais. 2023. Effective test generation using pre-trained large language models and mutation testing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.16557* (2023).
- [19] daytrader 2024. DayTrader8 Sample. <https://github.com/OpenLiberty/sample-daytrader8>
- [20] Vinicius H. S. Durelli, Rafael S. Durelli, Simone S. Borges, Andre T. Endo, Marcelo M. Eler, Diego R. C. Dias, and Marcelo P. Guimarães. 2019. Machine Learning Applied to Software Testing: A Systematic Mapping Study. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability* 68, 3 (2019), 1189–1212. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TR.2019.2892517>
- [21] EclEmma. [n. d.]. JaCoCo: Java Code Coverage Library. Accessed: 2024-07-27.
- [22] evosuite 2024. EvoSuite: Automatic Test Suite Generation for Java. <https://www.evosuite.org/>
- [23] flutes 2024. Flutes. <https://github.com/huzecong/flutes>
- [24] Gordon Fraser and Andrea Arcuri. 2011. EvoSuite: Automatic Test Suite Generation for Object-Oriented Software. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGSOFT symposium and the 13th European conference on Foundations of software engineering*. 416–419.
- [25] Gordon Fraser, Matt Staats, Phil McMinn, Andrea Arcuri, and Frank Padberg. 2015. Does Automated Unit Test Generation Really Help Software Testers? A Controlled Empirical Study. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, Article 23 (Sept. 2015). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2699688>
- [26] GitHub. 2024. GitHub Copilot. <https://github.com/features/copilot>
- [27] Patrice Godefroid, Nils Klarlund, and Koushik Sen. 2005. DART: Directed automated random testing. In *Proceedings of the 2005 ACM SIGPLAN conference on Programming language design and implementation*. 213–223.
- [28] Mark Harman and Phil McMinn. 2010. A Theoretical and Empirical Study of Search-Based Testing: Local, Global, and Hybrid Search. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 36, 2 (2010), 226–247. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2009.71>
- [29] Sepehr Hashtroudi, Jiho Shin, Hadi Hemmati, and Song Wang. 2023. Automated test case generation using code models and domain adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08033* (2023).
- [30] Anders Hovmöller. [n. d.]. Mutmut: Mutation Testing for Python. <https://mutmut.readthedocs.io/>. Accessed: 2024-07-27.
- [31] IBM. 2024. Granite Code Models. <https://huggingface.co/collections/ibm-granite/granite-code-models-6624c5cec322e4c148c8b330>
- [32] javaservletspec 2024. Jakarta Servlet. <https://jakarta.ee/specifications/servlet>
- [33] Caroline Lemieux, Jeevana Priya Inala, Shuvendu K Lahiri, and Siddhartha Sen. 2023. Codamosa: Escaping coverage plateaus in test generation with pre-trained large language models. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 919–931.
- [34] Yun Lin, You Sheng Ong, Jun Sun, Gordon Fraser, and Jin Song Dong. 2021. Graph-Based Seed Object Synthesis for Search-Based Unit Testing. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*. 1068–1080. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3468264.3468619>
- [35] Yu Lin, Xucheng Tang, Yuting Chen, and Jianjun Zhao. 2009. A Divergence-Oriented Approach to Adaptive Random Testing of Java Programs. In *2009 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. 221–232. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2009.13>
- [36] Stephan Lukaszcyk and Gordon Fraser. 2022. Pynguin: Automated unit test generation for python. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 44th International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings*. 168–172.
- [37] Stephan Lukaszcyk, Florian Kroiß, and Gordon Fraser. 2023. An empirical study of automated unit test generation for python. *Empirical Software Engineering* 28,

- 2 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-022-10248-w>
- [38] Phil McMin. 2004. Search-based Software Test Data Generation: A Survey: Research Articles. *Softw. Test. Verif. Reliab.* 14, 2 (June 2004), 105–156.
- [39] Meta. 2024. Meta Llama 3. <https://huggingface.co/collections/meta-llama/meta-llama-3-66214712577ca38149ebb2b6>
- [40] OpenAI. 2024. OpenAI API. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/api-reference/introduction>
- [41] OpenAI. 2024. OpenAI Deprecations. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/deprecations>
- [42] OpenAI. 2024. OpenAI Models. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-base>
- [43] Carlos Pacheco and Michael D Ernst. 2007. Randoop: feedback-directed random testing for Java. In *Companion to the 22nd ACM SIGPLAN conference on Object-oriented programming systems and applications companion*. 815–816.
- [44] Carlos Pacheco, Shuvendu K Lahiri, Michael D Ernst, and Thomas Ball. 2007. Feedback-directed random test generation. In *29th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE'07)*. IEEE, 75–84.
- [45] Annibale Panichella, Sebastiano Panichella, Gordon Fraser, Anand Ashok Sawant, and Vincent J. Hellendoorn. 2020. Revisiting Test Smells in Automatically Generated Tests: Limitations, Pitfalls, and Opportunities. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME)*. 523–533. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSME46990.2020.00056>
- [46] Anthony Peruma, Khalid Almalki, Christian D. Newman, Mohamed Wiem Mkaouer, Ali Ouni, and Fabio Palomba. 2020. tsDetect: an open source test smells detection tool. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*. 1650–1654. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3368089.3417921>
- [47] petclinic 2024. Spring PetClinic Sample Application. <https://github.com/spring-projects/spring-petclinic>
- [48] PITEST. [n. d.]. PIT Mutation Testing. Accessed: 2024-07-27.
- [49] Juan Altmayer Pizzorno and Emery D Berger. 2024. CoverUp: Coverage-Guided LLM-Based Test Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16218* (2024).
- [50] Corina S. Păsăreanu and Neha Rungta. 2010. Symbolic PathFinder: Symbolic Execution of Java Bytecode. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. 179–180. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1858996.1859035>
- [51] pylint dev. [n. d.]. Pylint. Accessed: 2024-07-27.
- [52] Gabriel Ryan, Siddhartha Jain, Mingyue Shang, Shiqi Wang, Xiaofei Ma, Murali Krishna Ramanathan, and Baishakhi Ray. 2024. Code-Aware Prompting: A study of Coverage Guided Test Generation in Regression Setting using LLM. *FSE* (2024).
- [53] Max Schäfer, Sarah Nadi, Aryaz Eghbali, and Frank Tip. 2023. An empirical evaluation of using large language models for automated unit test generation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (2023).
- [54] Koushik Sen, Darko Marinov, and Gul Agha. 2005. CUTE: A concolic unit testing engine for C. *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes* 30, 5 (2005), 263–272.
- [55] Mohammed Latif Siddiq, Joanna CS Santos, Ridwanul Hasan Tanvir, Noshin Ulfat, Fahmid Al Rifat, and Vinicius Carvalho Lopes. 2024. Using Large Language Models to Generate JUnit Tests: An Empirical Study. (2024).
- [56] Yutian Tang, Zhijie Liu, Zhichao Zhou, and Xiapu Luo. 2024. ChatGPT vs SBST: A Comparative Assessment of Unit Test Suite Generation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (2024), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2024.3382365>
- [57] Nikolai Tillmann and Jonathan De Halleux. 2008. Pex—white box test generation for. net. In *International conference on tests and proofs*. Springer, 134–153.
- [58] Paolo Tonella. 2004. Evolutionary Testing of Classes. In *Proceedings of the 2004 ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1007512.1007528>
- [59] tornadoweb 2024. Tornado Web Server. <https://github.com/tornadoweb/tornado>
- [60] treesitter 2024. Tree-sitter. <https://tree-sitter.github.io/tree-sitter>
- [61] tsdetect 2024. TSDetect. <https://github.com/TestSmells/TSDetect>
- [62] Michele Tufano, Dawn Drain, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Shao Kun Deng, and Neel Sundaresan. 2020. Unit test case generation with transformers and focal context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.05617* (2020).
- [63] Rachel Tzoref-Brill, Saurabh Sinha, Antonio Abu Nassar, Victoria Goldin, and Haim Kermany. 2022. Tackletest: A tool for amplifying test generation via type-based combinatorial coverage. In *2022 IEEE Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST)*. IEEE, 444–455.
- [64] Shubham Ugare, Tarun Suresh, Hangoo Kang, Sasa Misailovic, and Gagandeep Singh. 2024. Improving llm code generation with grammar augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.01632* (2024).
- [65] Vasudev Vikram, Caroline Lemieux, and Rohan Padhye. 2023. Can large language models write good property-based tests? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04346* (2023).
- [66] Willem Visser, Corina S. Păsăreanu, and Sarfraz Khurshid. 2004. Test Input Generation with Java PathFinder. In *Proceedings of the 2004 ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1007512.1007526>
- [67] wala 2024. WALA. <https://github.com/wala/WALA>
- [68] Junjie Wang, Yuchao Huang, Chunyang Chen, Zhe Liu, Song Wang, and Qing Wang. 2024. Software testing with large language models: Survey, landscape, and vision. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (2024).
- [69] Junjie Wang, Yuchao Huang, Chunyang Chen, Zhe Liu, Song Wang, and Qing Wang. 2024. Software testing with large language models: Survey, landscape, and vision. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (2024).
- [70] Tao Xie, Darko Marinov, Wolfram Schulte, and David Notkin. 2005. Symstra: A Framework for Generating Object-Oriented Unit Tests Using Symbolic Execution. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*. 365–381. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-31980-1_24
- [71] Zhuokui Xie, Yinghao Chen, Chen Zhi, Shuiguang Deng, and Jianwei Yin. 2023. ChatUniTest: a ChatGPT-based automated unit test generation tool. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04764* (2023).
- [72] Zhiqiang Yuan, Mingwei Liu, Shiji Ding, Kaixin Wang, Yixuan Chen, Xin Peng, and Yiling Lou. 2024. Evaluating and Improving ChatGPT for Unit Test Generation. *Proceedings of the ACM on Software Engineering* 1, FSE (2024), 1703–1726.