TESTEVAL: Benchmarking Large Language Models for Test Case Generation

Wenhan Wang^{1∗} Chenyuan Yang^{2∗} Zhijie Wang^{1∗} Yuheng Huang³ Zhaoyang Chu⁴
Da Song¹ Lingming Zhang² An Ran Chen¹ Lei Ma^{3,1} Da Song¹ Lingming Zhang² An Ran Chen¹ ¹University of Alberta ²University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign ³The University of Tokyo ⁴Huazhong University of Science and Technology {wenhan12, zhijie.wang, dsong4, anran6}@ualberta.ca {cy54, lingming}@illinois.edu yuhenghuang42@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp chuzhaoyang@hust.edu.cn ma.lei@acm.org

Abstract

Testing plays a crucial role in the software development cycle, enabling the detection of bugs, vulnerabilities, and other undesirable behaviors. To perform software testing, testers need to write code snippets that execute the program under test. Recently, researchers have recognized the potential of large language models (LLMs) in software testing. However, there remains a lack of fair comparisons between different LLMs in terms of test case generation capabilities.

In this paper, we propose TESTEVAL, a novel benchmark for test case generation with LLMs. We collect 210 Python programs from an online programming platform, LeetCode, and design three different tasks: overall coverage, targeted line/branch coverage, and targeted path coverage. We further evaluate sixteen popular LLMs, including both commercial and open-source ones, on TESTEVAL. We find that generating test cases to cover specific program lines/branches/paths is still challenging for current LLMs, indicating a lack of ability to comprehend program logic and execution paths. We have open-sourced our dataset and benchmark pipelines at <https://llm4softwaretesting.github.io> to contribute and accelerate future research on LLMs for software testing.

1 Introduction

Software testing is a crucial aspect of software development, allowing developers to identify potential bugs and verify that the program's behavior meets expectations. A key task in software testing is test case generation, which involves creating test inputs to cover different statements and branches in the program under test. Previous research indicates that test case generation can be extremely time-consuming, accounting for over 15% of the time spent in software development [\[1\]](#page-8-0).

Therefore, automated test case generation has been a long-standing challenge in software engineering research. Various methods have been developed to address this issue, including symbolic execution testing [\[2,](#page-8-1) [3\]](#page-8-2), model-based testing [\[4,](#page-8-3) [5\]](#page-8-4), random testing [\[6,](#page-8-5) [7\]](#page-8-6), and search-based testing [\[8–](#page-8-7)[10\]](#page-9-0). Recently, large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated promising performance on several coderelated tasks, e.g., code generation [\[11](#page-9-1)[–15\]](#page-9-2), code translation [\[16–](#page-9-3)[18\]](#page-9-4), and code summarization [\[19–](#page-9-5) [21\]](#page-9-6). At the same time, researchers have been exploring the potential of using LLMs to generate unit test cases [\[22](#page-9-7)[–24\]](#page-10-0). However, despite the rapid development of LLM-based test case generation, there is still a lack of public benchmarks to evaluate different LLMs' capabilities in this area. Hence, there

[∗] equal contribution

Figure 1: The pipeline for running and evaluating LLMs for test case generation on TESTEVAL.

is a need for a comprehensive analysis to determine whether current LLMs can (1) generate diverse test cases to achieve high coverage on a program under test, (2) generate test cases to cover a specific line or branch, and (3) generate test cases to cover a specific execution path by following the tester's intent.

To bridge this gap, we present a new benchmark, TESTEVAL, which focuses on evaluating LLMs' test case generation capabilities. To construct our benchmark, we collected a dataset of 210 Python programs from the online coding platform LeetCode. To address the aforementioned challenges, we designed three benchmark tasks: (1) overall coverage, (2) targeted line/branch coverage, and (3) targeted path coverage.

Notably, unlike popular code generation benchmarks such as HumanEval [\[25\]](#page-10-1) and MBPP [\[26\]](#page-10-2), the tasks in our TESTEVAL benchmark require LLMs to comprehend the program's logic. This comprehension enables LLMs to generate inputs that invoke specific branches or paths in the program under test. Furthermore, our tasks emphasize program logic analysis rather than merely simulating numerical operations, as seen in benchmarks designed for predicting a program's input/output [\[27\]](#page-10-3).

We perform extensive experiments on TESTEVAL with both commercial and open-source LLMs. Our results indicate that while state-of-the-art LLMs can generate executable and diverse test cases, they struggle to identify which specific statements or branches need to be covered. For example, in targeted line coverage, 12 out of 16 LLMs' performances are not significantly improved (improvements $\leq 5\%$) compared to the results when the target line information is even **not** given. Quantitative results show that commercial LLMs, such as GPT-4, generally outperform open-source LLMs in both overall coverage and targeted line/branch/path coverage. These findings suggest that future work on test case generation should focus on developing advanced LLM-based reasoning frameworks to enhance the understanding of program behaviors during testing.

Our work makes the following contributions:

- Benchmark. We propose TESTEVAL, a benchmark focused on evaluating LLMs' capabilities in generating test cases for a given program under test, encompassing three different tasks. Our benchmark is publicly available at <https://llm4softwaretesting.github.io>.
- Evaluation. We design new metrics to measure the performance of test generation for LLMs and conduct extensive experiments with 16 popular LLMs.
- Analysis. We perform a systematic analysis of 16 LLMs' performance on TESTEVAL and discuss the challenges and opportunities in test case generation using LLMs.

2 Approach

In this section, we first introduce the tasks included in our benchmark $(\S 2.1)$ $(\S 2.1)$. Following that, we provide an overview of the dataset used (§ [2.2\)](#page-3-0).

2.1 Benchmark Tasks

Figure [1](#page-1-1) shows the workflow of TESTEVAL. We consider three distinct tasks in our benchmark: (1) overall coverage, (2) targeted line and branch coverage, and (3) targeted path coverage. For each

task, we prompt an LLM to generate test cases for a specified program based on the task description in natural language. Specifically, in each query round, we prompt the LLM to generate a testing function containing a single test case (Appendix [A](#page-13-0) presents the complete prompt template for each task). Then, we filter out any non-code content that may have been generated outside the testing function, retaining only the first test case generated in each query round to ensure a fair comparison across different LLMs.

After generation, all test cases must undergo a correctness check. This check assesses both *syntactic correctness* and *execution correctness*. Syntactic correctness determines if the generated test case is free of syntax errors, while execution correctness evaluates if the test case can be executed successfully without encountering any runtime errors. Regarding execution correctness, we do not consider incorrect test assertion statements as failed cases. This is because we observed that even state-of-the-art models struggled to reliably produce test oracles in our early exploration. Finally, we evaluate coverage metrics on test cases that pass the correctness check. We now illustrate our three benchmark tasks in detail.

Overall coverage. In this task, we query each LLM for N rounds given a program under test. During the *i*th $(1 \lt i \leq N)$ round, we prompt the LLM to generate a test method different from the $i - 1$ th round. After all rounds of query, we obtain N test cases for each program under test. The overall coverage for a program is computed by the proportion of lines/branches in the program that have been covered by at least one test case.

We further propose a new metric, $cov@k$, to measure the diversity of LLM's generated test cases for a given program. Intuitively, $cov@k$ measures the line/branch coverage with a subset of the generated test cases with a size of k $(k < M)$. To achieve this, we randomly split M executable test cases into $max(M//k, 1)$ subsets. Then for each of these subsets, we calculate its overall line/branch coverage. In our experiments, we choose k as 1, 2, and 5. When k increases, the improvements of $cov@k$ can measure the diversity of the LLM's generated test cases. We summarize the calculation of the average line/branch $cov@k$ for a set of programs under test in Algorithm [1.](#page-2-0)

Targeted line and branch coverage. Different from overall coverage, *targeted line and branch*

Algorithm 1: Computing the average line/branch $cov@k$ given a set of programs

coverage requires the LLM to generate test cases that could cover a specific branch, or a line inside this branch. This simulates the scenario in which a human tester is asked to craft test cases to cover a specific part of the program. Figure [2](#page-2-1) shows an example of targeted branches and lines in a given program. To measure the targeted line/path coverage, we prompt the LLMs by including the line number(s) in the instruction (see prompt templates in Appendix [A\)](#page-13-0). For each targeted line/branch, an LLM is prompted to generate one test case.

Targeted path coverage. In real-world software development, testers sometimes need to craft test cases to cover a specific execution path that includes multiple branches. We refer to this task as the *target path coverage*. We show an example program in Figure [3](#page-3-1) to demonstrate the importance of the target path coverage. In Line 6, a bug (divided by zero) will occur only if branches "condition 1" and "condition 2" are

Figure 2: An example for selecting targeted lines and branches from programs under test.

both not executed. In this case, only covering the two conditional branches is not sufficient.

By contrast, if we can cover all three paths (Figure [3\)](#page-3-1), we can successfully detect the "divided by zero" bug. To obtain the target path coverage, we prompt an LLM by including a specific execution path (see Appendix [A](#page-13-0) for the prompt template). For each path, an LLM is queried to generate one test case.

Figure 3: A motivating example of why path coverage is important (left), and examples of execution paths extracted from this program (right).

further propose two metrics to evaluate the performance of target path coverage. Firs target path, we measure whether the generated test case covers the target path completely. Second, we We further propose two metrics to evaluate the performance of target path coverage. First, for a given measure the similarity between the given target path $PATH_{td}$ and the execution path of the LLM's generated test case $PATH_{gen}$ by Eq. [1.](#page-3-2)

$$
sim(\text{PATH}_{gen}, \text{PATH}_{tgt}) = \frac{lcs(\text{PATH}_{gen}, \text{PATH}_{tgt})}{len(\text{PATH}_{tgt})},
$$
\n(1)

where $lcs()$ calculates the length of the longest common sub-sequence (continuous) between two paths and len() calculates the length of a path.

2.2 Benchmark Dataset

Data collection. To construct our benchmark dataset, we first collect programs from LeetCode 2 2 , an online platform for evaluating a programmer's coding performance. We choose LeetCode as our data source since it has a clear task description and input constraint for each programming task. We collect all publicly available tasks on LeetCode (up to Apr. 2024). For each task, we collect its Python solution from a GitHub project^{[3](#page-3-4)} since LeetCode does not publish official solutions. At this stage, we collect 3,123 programs under test.

The goal of our benchmark is to evaluate LLMs' capability of generating test cases to cover specific statements/branches. Therefore, we filter out programs that are too simple (e.g., programs that only have one branch) according to the cyclomatic complexity [\[28\]](#page-10-4). Given the control flow graph of a program, the cyclomatic complexity V of this program is measured by: $V = e - n + p$, where e is the number of edges in the graph, n is the number of nodes, and p is the number of connected components. The cyclomatic complexity is positively correlated with the number of branches/loops in a program. In this work, we consider programs with the cyclomatic complexity ≥ 10 . Finally, we collect 210 Python programs for our benchmark, consisting of 9 easy problems, 100 medium problems, and 101 hard problems according to LeetCode's difficulty label. Each program under test is also paired with its task description in natural language. Note that most programs already have test cases in their task descriptions. We remove these cases to prevent LLMs from directly copying these test cases.

For each program, we perform the following pre-processing steps:

- We add all necessary import statements for the packages required by the problem solutions.
- Python programmers often split long statements into multiple physical lines. For all statements split into multiple lines, we remove the newline symbols from these statements and write them

² https://leetcode.com

³https://github.com/walkccc/LeetCode. The repository is under MIT license.

in a single line. This ensures each statement only corresponds to one line when measuring line coverage.

- We reformat the in-line conditional statements (e.g., the ternary conditional operator) into multi-line blocks. This ensures that each line of the program is one statement that belongs to one specific branch.
- We remove natural language comments in the program.

Targeted line/branch/path identification. To obtain targeted lines/branches, we first extract all *conditional* branches of a given program based on its abstract syntax tree (AST). Since loop branches (i.e., for/while loops) are usually easy to cover, we only consider conditional branches in our task. Specifically, we extract all if, elif, and else branches. We refer to these branches as our targeted branches. Then, we consider all statements within these targeted branches as our targeted lines (see Figure [2](#page-2-1) for the example). Overall, we identified 983 target branches in 210 programs under test (4.7 target branches per program on average). The total number of target lines in 210 programs is 1,312 (6.2 target lines per program on average). The detailed algorithm for extracting target lines/branches can be found in Appendix [B.](#page-14-0)

In a given program under test, certain branches could be hard to cover without carefully crafting the test cases. Therefore, we label each targeted branch in a program as easy, medium, or hard according to the average coverage after executing 100 randomly generated inputs. The number of easy, medium, and hard target branches are 498, 225, and 260. We refer to Appendix [C](#page-15-0) for more details.

For the targeted path coverage task, as the number of execution paths in a program can be enormous or even undecidable, it is impossible to collect all execution paths. Instead, we collect the target execution paths from the example test cases given by LeetCode problem descriptions. For each example test case, we execute it and record its execution path using all the condition/loop branches it executed. The complete execution path would be too long and difficult for LLMs to understand, so we perform clipping after obtaining full paths. For each execution path, we randomly sample two sub-paths with at most 5 branches. We further remove duplicated sampled paths, resulting in an average of 4.1 target paths per question.

3 Evaluation

In this section, we first introduce our experiment setup $(\S 3.1)$ $(\S 3.1)$. Then we present the results on three benchmark tasks.

3.1 Experiment Setup

We evaluate sixteen popular instruction-following LLMs, including both commercial and open-source ones. The parameter sizes of open-source models range from 1.3B to 34B. The temperature is set to 0 or 1e-5 (for models on Huggingface that do not support temperature=0) to ensure that the evaluation results can be reproduced. All experiments on open-source LLMs are run on two NVIDIA A6000 GPUs. We set the length limit of outputs to 256 tokens. We use the pytest-cov^{[4](#page-4-1)} to measure the code coverage.

3.2 Overall Coverage

In this experiment, we query every model 20 rounds $(N = 20)$ to generate test cases (one test case per round) for each program under test. Table [1](#page-5-0) shows the evaluation results on the overall coverage task.

Regarding correctness metrics, we observe that most models can achieve high syntactical correctness and acceptable execution correctness. Regarding the coverage performance, fourteen out of sixteen LLMs (except DeepSeek-coder-1.3b and Mistral-0.3-7b) are able to generate test cases that cover over 80% lines/branches per program under test. Notably, the latest GPT-4o achieves the best overall line (98.65%) and branch (97.16%) coverage. We also notice that the open-source model, DeepSeek-coder-33b, outperforms the commercial LLM, Gemini-1.0-pro, on both overall line and branch coverage.

⁴ https://github.com/pytest-dev/pytest-cov

	Size		Correctness	Overall coverage			Line $cov@k$		Branch $cov@k$			
			syntax execution	line	branch	$k=1$	$k=2$	$k=5$	$k=1$	$k=2$	$k=5$	
GPT-3.5-turbo GPT-4	N/A N/A	100 100	97.43 92.33	96.27 94.94	93.65 92.81	88.35 85.65		90.02 (1.67) 92.14 (3.79) 87.77 (2.12) 90.04 (4.39)	81.87 78.89	84.32 (2.45) 87.55 (5.68) 81.93 (3.04) 85.39 (6.50)		
GPT-4-turbo GPT-40	N/A N/A	100 99.59	94.79 98.30	96.08 98.65	94.81 97.16	85.46 90.23		87.87 (2.41) 90.81 (5.35) 92.16 (1.93) 94.33 (4.10)	78.62	82.06 (3.44) 86.64 (8.02) 84.05 86.89 (2.84) 90.31 (6.26)		
Gemini-1.0-pro	N/A	93.05	71.93	93.01	90.66	84.48		86.60 (2.12) 88.47 (3.99)		78.35 81.29 (2.94) 84.11 (5.76)		
CodeLlama	7b 13 _b 34 _b	99.52 67.55 66.33	73.86 50.40 46.86	86.09 85.66 87.96	81.56 80.55 83.74	79.46 80.49 78.83		80.72 (1.26) 82.04 (2.58) 82.26 (1.77) 83.44 (2.95) 81.25 (2.42) 83.71 (4.88)		72.28 73.96 (1.68) 75.90 (3.62) 73.21 75.54 (2.33) 77.13 (3.92) 71.37 74.50 (3.13) 77.80 (6.43)		
Llama3	8b	99.25	82.24	90.98	89.02	77.40		80.08 (2.68) 84.42 (7.02)		69.47 73.37 (3.90) 79.22 (9.75)		
Gemma	7b	98.98	64.64	93.16	91.46	76.23		80.54 (4.31) 85.90 (9.67)			67.15 72.94 (5.79) 80.29 (13.14)	
Starcoder-2-Instruct 15b		97.07	94.07	89.84	84.41	88.03		88.22 (0.19) 88.50 (0.47)	81.80	82.09 (0.29) 82.50 (0.70)		
DeepSeek-coder	1.3 _b 6.7 _b 33 _b	96.05 97.42 99.21	82.48 82.43 83.57	81.22 93.48 94.86	75.99 91.61 91.92	75.89 82.40 85.47		76.50 (0.61) 77.09 (1.20) 84.74 (2.34) 87.97 (5.57) 87.38 (1.91) 90.30 (4.83)	69.06 75.29 78.49	69.90 (0.84) 70.70 (1.64) 78.73 (3.44) 83.46 (8.17) 81.23 (2.74) 85.12 (6.63)		
CodeQwen	7b	100	84.26	90.73	86.90	84.53		85.33 (0.80) 86.71 (2.18)		77.66 78.94 (1.28) 80.95 (3.29)		
Mistral-0.3	7b	24.45	10.67	60.59	57.73	53.69		55.72 (2.03) 57.44 (3.75)		48.14 50.92 (2.78) 53.37 (5.23)		

Table 1: Result on the overall coverage task. The results in () are the improvements over $cov@1$.

Table 2: Results for targeted line coverage. Results in () are the improvements over baselines.

	Size		Targeted line		Baseline: no targeted line				
		syntax	execution	cov. acc.	Syntax	execution	cov. acc.		
GPT-3.5-turbo	N/A	99.40	95.67	$67.76(-1.27)$	100	100	69.03		
$GPT-4$	N/A	100	98.81	78.20 (10.14)	100	99.52	68.06		
GPT-4-turbo	N/A	99.20	98.73	80.52 (11.64)	100	100	68.88		
GPT-40	N/A	99.63	98.96	80.97(9.48)	100	100	71.49		
Gemini-1.0-pro	N/A	100	96.04	70.75 (4.93)	100	95.71	65.82		
	7 _h	99.85	90.97	58.13 (0.89)	99.52	93.81	57.24		
CodeLlama	13 _b	99.63	85.22	$54.63 (+4.03)$	99.05	94.76	58.66		
	34 _b	98.66	90.60	59.48 (-0.29)	100	96.19	59.77		
Llama3	8b	98.96	85.52	$60.22(-0.60)$	99.52	95.24	60.82		
Gemma	7b	99.78	88.21	62.91 (4.92)	99.52	89.52	57.99		
Starcoder-2-Instruct	15 _b	98.36	92.84	$64.40(-2.39)$	100	99.05	66.79		
	1.3 _b	98.81	91.04	58.81 (2.69)	94.76	90.0	56.12		
DeepSeek-coder	6.7 _b	94.78	92.99	65.60 (3.81)	99.05	96.67	61.79		
	33 _b	99.63	97.61	70.52 (2.09)	100	99.52	68.43		
CodeQwen	7 _b	94.78	92.99	65.60 (3.81)	99.05	96.67	61.79		
Mistral-0.3	7 _b	99.40	64.40	45.60 (16.94)	99.52	40.95	28.66		

We further use $cov@k$ to measure the diversity of each LLM's generated test cases. Similar to the overall coverage results, GPT-4o has the best line and branch $cov@1$, demonstrating its ability to craft complex test cases that are able to cover most of the program branches within a single attempt. We also find all LLMs have a higher $cov@2$ and $cov@5$ compared with $cov@1$. This indicates that the LLMs are able to generate different test cases. Gemma-7b shows the most significant improvements in the line (+9.67%) and branch (+13.14%) cov@5 compared with its line and branch cov@1. We also notice that Starcoder-2-Instruct has the least improvement on $cov@5$ compared with $cov@1$ (+0.47% and +0.70% for line and branch coverage, respectively). By manually checking the test cases generated by Starcoder-2-Instruct, we find that it frequently repeat previously generated cases despite being instructed to generate different ones.

3.3 Targeted Line and Branch Coverage

Table [2](#page-5-1) and Table [3](#page-6-0) show the evaluation results for the targeted line and branch coverage, respectively. For each subject LLM, we also include a baseline by excluding the information about the targeted lines/branches in the text prompt. For each program under test, we reuse the first test case generated

			Targeted branch								Baseline: no targeted branch			
	Size	Correctness		Coverage							Coverage			
			syntax execution	total		easy		medium		hard	total		easy medium hard	
GPT-3.5-turbo	N/A	100	98.78	70.40 (4.38) 82.93 (0.40)				65.33 (1.77)		50.77 (14.23)		66.02 82.53	63.56	36.54
GPT-4	N/A	100	98.17	78.23 (13.33) 86.14 (4.41)				79.56 (16.89)		61.92 (27.30)		64.90 81.73	62.67	34.62
GPT-4-turbo	N/A	100	98.67	80.77 (15.15) 88.35 (5.42)				79.11 (16.00)		67.69(33.07)	65.62 82.93		63.11	34.62
GPT-40	N/A	100	99.08	80.87 (12.61) 87.55 (3.21)				83.11 (11.55)		66.15 (31.53)		68.26 84.34	71.56	34.62
Gemini-1.0-pro	N/A	100	97.04	$68.97(5.80)$ $82.13(2.21)$				69.78 (6.22)		43.08 (12.31)	63.17 79.92		63.56	30.77
	7b	100	81.99	50.97 (-4.17) 64.25 (-8.04) 51.11 (-3.56)						25.38 (2.69)		55.14 72.29	54.67	22.69
CodeLlama	13 _b	99.29	82.91	51.58 (-4.68) 64.86 (-7.83) 46.67 (-11.55) 30.39 (5.78)								56.26 72.69	58.22	24.61
	34b	99.39	95.02	63.17 (5.69) 78.51 (2.20) 60.44 (6.22)						36.15 (11.92)		57.48 76.31	54.22	24.23
Llama3	8b	98.88	84.94	58.39 (-0.31) 73.09 (-0.61) 59.11 (0.89)						29.26 (-1.12)		58.70 73.70	58.22	30.38
Gemma	7 _b	99.59	85.35	56.15 (1.11) 71.89 (2.01)				49.78 (0.45)		31.54 (0.00)		55.04 69.88	49.33	31.54
Starcoder-2-Instruct 15b		98.68	95.42	64.19 (-0.41) 78.71 (0.20)				63.56 (-1.33)		36.92 (-0.77)	64.60 78.51		64.89	37.69
	1.3 _b	97.05	89.32	54.22 (0.81)	68.67 (1.20)			52.89 (-1.78)		27.69(2.31)		53.41 67.47	54.67	25.38
DeepSeek-coder	6.7 _b	96.74	93.79	66.43 (7.22)	77.11 (5.62)			69.33 (4.89)		43.46 (12.31)		59.21 71.49	64.44	31.15
	33 _b	100	97.05	68.46 (2.54)		80.12 (-2.21) 66.22 (4.00)				48.08 (10.39)		65.92 82.33	62.22	37.69
CodeOwen	7b	99.49	95.02	65.82(0.51)				$81.12(1.60)$ 63.56 (-3.55)		38.46 (1.92)	65.31 79.52		67.11	36.54
Mistral-0.3	7b	98.17	69.28	46.90 (20.45) 58.03 (25.10) 40.00 (16.44) 31.54 (15.10)							26.45 32.93		23.56	16.54

Table 3: Results for targeted branch coverage. Results in () are the improvements over the baseline. We omit the correctness metrics of the baseline because they are the same as the targeted line coverage task.

for the overall coverage task and measure its coverage accuracy on the targeted lines/branches. The intuition is that, if an LLM could not outperform the baseline, it might be struggling with identifying the line/branch that is expected to cover when generating the test case.

Regarding the targeted line coverage, we find that GPT-4 series (i.e., GPT-4, GPT-4-turbo, and GPT-4o) has the best performance improvement (around 10%) over their baselines. The best-performing LLM is GPT-4o, reaching a coverage accuracy of 80.97% on average. We also notice that Mistral-0.3 also has the most significant performance improvement over the baseline (16.94%). However, considering its low execution correctness, such results may become less meaningful. We also find that five out of sixteen LLMs do not improve over their baseline and seven out of sixteen LLMs only have marginal improvement (less than 5%). These results suggest that the majority of the popular LLMs may have trouble with multi-step reasoning. Specifically, to reach a specific line inside a branch, the LLM needs to first identify which the targeted line belongs to. Then, the LLM needs to generate a valid test input to invoke this branch. In future work, one may consider leveraging advanced prompting technologies such as in-context learning and chain-of-thought prompting [\[29\]](#page-10-5), or building LLM-based agents to decompose the targeted line coverage task into multiple fine-grained steps.

We observe a similar trend in the targeted branch coverage (Table [3\)](#page-6-0). Specifically, the GPT-4 series has the best performance improvement (12%~15%) over their baselines. GPT4-turbo and GPT-4o are the best-performed LLMs, which can cover 80.77% and 80.87% branches per program under test on average, respectively. By contrast, eight LLMs only exhibit marginal improvements and four LLMs do not improve compared with the baselines. Regarding branches with different difficulties, we find that branches more likely to be covered by random test cases are also easier for LLMs to cover (recall we use random testing to label each branch's difficulty level in § [2.2\)](#page-3-0). The GPT-4 series shows the smallest performance gap between branches with different difficulty levels. We also notice that twelve out of sixteen LLMs show the largest performance improvements over the baselines on those "hard" branches. These results indicate that providing additional branch information can indeed help us to cover branches that are hard to reach by random testing.

3.4 Targeted Path Coverage

Table [4](#page-7-0) presents the results of the targeted path coverage task. We adopt a similar baseline as in our targeted line/branch coverage tasks by excluding the targeted path in the text prompts. Overall, GPT-4o and Gemini-1.0-pro have the best performance on the path coverage, reaching 56.67% and

	Size		Given target path	Baseline: no target path			
		syntax	execution	path cov	path similarity	path cov	path similarity
GPT-3.5-turbo	N/A	99.88	98.95	$49.30(-5.97)$	$77.35(-2.39)$	55.27	79.74
$GPT-4$	N/A	100	99.18	$54.10(-0.94)$	80.77(3.23)	55.04	77.54
$GPT-4$ -turbo	N/A	100	99.41	$50.47(-3.74)$	79.82(1.08)	54.21	78.74
$GPT-40$	N/A	100	99.53	$56.67(-1.76)$	82.35(1.29)	58.43	81.06
Gemini-1.0-pro	N/A	100	96.02	56.09(0.70)	$77.59(-0.23)$	55.39	77.82
	7 _b	99.76	90.98	$41.57(-1.05)$	67.66(0.14)	42.62	67.52
CodeLlama	13 _b	99.06	82.67	$38.88(-5.50)$	$61.76(-7.85)$	44.38	69.61
	34 _b	98.83	92.15	45.32(0.24)	$69.52(-0.12)$	45.08	69.64
Llama3	8b	98.24	89.46	41.92(1.29)	68.03(0.40)	40.63	67.63
Gemma	7b	100	88.06	37.11(4.09)	64.54(2.29)	33.02	62.25
Starcoder-2-Instruct	15 _b	96.83	90.28	$48.48(-5.38)$	70.91(-6.78)	53.86	77.69
	1.3 _b	97.89	88.99	40.16(0.46)	64.91(0.67)	39.70	64.24
DeepSeek-coder	6.7 _b	99.06	95.90	53.04(0.23)	76.77(1.56)	52.81	75.21
	33 _b	100	96.49	$54.10(-4.33)$	$77.99(-2.73)$	58.43	80.72
CodeQwen	7b	99.77	94.96	$55.97(-3.16)$	$77.46(-2.67)$	59.13	80.13
Mistral-0.3	7b	97.19	45.32	22.01(5.38)	32.98(3.69)	16.63	29.29

Table 4: Results for targeted path coverage. Results in () are the improvements over the baseline.

56.09% on average, respectively. However, they do not outperform their baselines. Generally, we do not find any LLMs except Mistral-0.3 show obvious performance improvement (more than 5%) on the path coverage compared with the baselines. Nine out of sixteen LLMs do not outperform the baselines. Regarding the path similarity, we also do not find any LLMs exhibiting large performance improvement compared with the baselines. These results suggest that comprehending the program logic and identifying a specific execution path is still a challenging task for the current LLMs.

Targeted path coverage is considerably more complicated compared with overall coverage and targeted line/branch coverage. Specifically, the LLM needs to identify a sequence of multiple branches, and create a test input that can execute these branches following a certain order, which is challenging even for human programmers. In future work, to fully unleash an LLM's capability of generating test cases covering specific program execution paths, designing more complex prompts and reasoning frameworks is worth investigating.

4 Related Work

Code-related Benchmarks for LLMs. In recent years, researchers have endeavored to develop more rigorous and comprehensive evaluation frameworks for LLMs on coding abilities from various perspectives. One of the earliest attempts is HumanEval [\[25\]](#page-10-1), which consists of 164 hand-craft programming challenges that evaluate LLMs' ability to understand natural language descriptions and generate the corresponding functional correct code. Since then, there have been several studies attempting to construct benchmarks with more diverse problems [\[26\]](#page-10-2), more rigorous evaluations [\[30\]](#page-10-6), and more complex scenarios [\[31,](#page-10-7) [32\]](#page-10-8). Beyond these established code-generation scenarios, numerous studies are expanding their focus to include a broader range of real-world applications, such as reviewing code [\[33\]](#page-10-9), performing repo-level code completion [\[34](#page-10-10)[–37\]](#page-10-11), and resolving GitHub issues [\[38\]](#page-10-12). While all the aforementioned studies examine the coding abilities of LLMs from different perspectives, none specifically target test case generation, a crucial phase in the software engineering lifecycle. The most relevant study is DevBench [\[39\]](#page-11-0), which evaluates LLMs across software development stages, including testing. Unlike DevBench, our benchmark provides more comprehensive evaluations specifically tailored to test case generation using coverage-guided tasks and includes a broader range of studied models.

LLMs for Software Testing. Recent studies have extensively utilized LLMs to develop efficient and effective testing pipelines for various software applications [\[40,](#page-11-1) [41\]](#page-11-2). Unit test case generation [\[42\]](#page-11-3), which aims to test individual software components independently, is the primary focus of current LLMaided software testing. One line of research tries to pre-train/fine-tune LLMs on focal methods and related assertion statements to enhance their test-generation capabilities [\[43–](#page-11-4)[46\]](#page-11-5). Although effective, these methods can be cost-intensive and challenging to scale. Alternatively, some researchers focus on

crafting effective prompts that instruct LLMs to analyze relevant information, such as code [\[24,](#page-10-0) [23,](#page-9-8) [47–](#page-11-6) [49\]](#page-11-7) or documentation [\[50,](#page-11-8) [51\]](#page-11-9), and generate test cases accordingly. Such LLM-enabled testing has achieved state-of-the-art performance compared to traditional tools [\[22\]](#page-9-7). Beyond unit test case generation, related works explore creating test inputs for specific types of software systems. For example, LLMs have been proven effective in testing deep learning libraries [\[52](#page-11-10)[–54\]](#page-11-11), compilers [\[55\]](#page-11-12), OS kernels [\[56\]](#page-12-0), SMT solvers [\[57\]](#page-12-1), and graphical user interfaces [\[58](#page-12-2)[–60\]](#page-12-3), etc. These studies highlight the potential of LLMs as core components of general-purpose intelligent testing engines.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

We present TESTEVAL, a novel benchmark for evaluating automated test case generation with LLMs for Python programs. Our benchmark dataset is created from on online programming platform LeetCode, consisting of 210 Python programs. Base on this dataset, we propose three different tasks and standardized evaluation pipelines. Our targeted branch/line/path tasks enable the evaluation and assessment on the LLM's capabilities in comprehending complex program logic and execution path and generating test cases following the tester's intent, which is not considered in previous works on either benchmarking LLMs or test case generation with LLMs. To contribute to the broader LLM and SE research communities, we release our dataset and benchmark pipelines on <https://llm4softwaretesting.github.io>.

We further conduct extensive experiments with sixteen popular LLMs on TESTEVAL. We find that although LLMs can achieve high overall coverage by generating diverse test cases, generating test cases to cover a specific branch/line/path is still challenging. Our results reveal that there is a common lack of abilities in comprehending program logic among current LLMs, despite their promising performance on other code-related tasks (e.g., code generation).

In the future, we plan to maintain an open leaderboard and continuously evaluate new LLMs. We also plan to compare LLMs with existing traditional test case generation tools, as well as crafting more advanced prompt templates and reasoning frameworks to enable LLMs for better test case generation.

References

- [1] Ermira Daka and Gordon Fraser. A survey on unit testing practices and problems. In *2014 IEEE 25th International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering*, pages 201–211. IEEE, 2014.
- [2] Vitaly Chipounov, Volodymyr Kuznetsov, and George Candea. S2e: A platform for in-vivo multi-path analysis of software systems. *Acm Sigplan Notices*, 46(3):265–278, 2011.
- [3] Cristian Cadar, Patrice Godefroid, Sarfraz Khurshid, Corina S Păsăreanu, Koushik Sen, Nikolai Tillmann, and Willem Visser. Symbolic execution for software testing in practice: preliminary assessment. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 1066–1071, 2011.
- [4] Siddhartha R Dalal, Ashish Jain, Nachimuthu Karunanithi, JM Leaton, Christopher M Lott, Gardner C Patton, and Bruce M Horowitz. Model-based testing in practice. In *Proceedings of the 21st international conference on Software engineering*, pages 285–294, 1999.
- [5] Jeff Offutt and Aynur Abdurazik. Generating tests from uml specifications. In *International Conference on the Unified Modeling Language*, pages 416–429. Springer, 1999.
- [6] Carlos Pacheco and Michael D Ernst. Randoop: feedback-directed random testing for java. In *Companion to the 22nd ACM SIGPLAN conference on Object-oriented programming systems and applications companion*, pages 815–816, 2007.
- [7] Lei Ma, Cyrille Artho, Cheng Zhang, Hiroyuki Sato, Johannes Gmeiner, and Rudolf Ramler. Grt: Program-analysis-guided random testing (t). In *2015 30th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 212–223. IEEE, 2015.
- [8] Gordon Fraser and Andrea Arcuri. 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*, pages 416–419, 2011.
- [9] Luciano Baresi and Matteo Miraz. Testful: Automatic unit-test generation for java classes. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering-Volume 2*, pages 281–284, 2010.
- [10] Gordon Fraser and Andreas Zeller. Mutation-driven generation of unit tests and oracles. In *Proceedings of the 19th international symposium on Software testing and analysis*, pages 147–158, 2010.
- [11] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*, 2023.
- [12] Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Jia Li, Jenny Chim, et al. Starcoder: may the source be with you! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06161*, 2023.
- [13] Ziyang Luo, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Qingfeng Sun, Xiubo Geng, Wenxiang Hu, Chongyang Tao, Jing Ma, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. Wizardcoder: Empowering code large language models with evol-instruct. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08568*, 2023.
- [14] Yuxiang Wei, Zhe Wang, Jiawei Liu, Yifeng Ding, and Lingming Zhang. Magicoder: Source code is all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02120*, 2023.
- [15] Anton Lozhkov, Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Federico Cassano, Joel Lamy-Poirier, Nouamane Tazi, Ao Tang, Dmytro Pykhtar, Jiawei Liu, Yuxiang Wei, et al. Starcoder 2 and the stack v2: The next generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19173*, 2024.
- [16] Weixiang Yan, Yuchen Tian, Yunzhe Li, Qian Chen, and Wen Wang. CodeTransOcean: A comprehensive multilingual benchmark for code translation. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 5067–5089, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [17] Rangeet Pan, Ali Reza Ibrahimzada, Rahul Krishna, Divya Sankar, Lambert Pouguem Wassi, Michele Merler, Boris Sobolev, Raju Pavuluri, Saurabh Sinha, and Reyhaneh Jabbarvand. Lost in translation: A study of bugs introduced by large language models while translating code. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 1–13, 2024.
- [18] Hasan Ferit Eniser, Hanliang Zhang, Cristina David, Meng Wang, Brandon Paulsen, Joey Dodds, and Daniel Kroening. Towards translating real-world code with llms: A study of translating to rust. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11514*, 2024.
- [19] Weisong Sun, Chunrong Fang, Yudu You, Yuchen Chen, Yi Liu, Chong Wang, Jian Zhang, Quanjun Zhang, Hanwei Qian, Wei Zhao, et al. A prompt learning framework for source code summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.16066*, 2023.
- [20] Toufique Ahmed, Kunal Suresh Pai, Premkumar Devanbu, and Earl Barr. Automatic semantic augmentation of language model prompts (for code summarization). In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 1–13, 2024.
- [21] Rajarshi Haldar and Julia Hockenmaier. Analyzing the performance of large language models on code summarization. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Min-Yen Kan, Veronique Hoste, Alessandro Lenci, Sakriani Sakti, and Nianwen Xue, editors, *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 995–1008, Torino, Italia, May 2024. ELRA and ICCL.
- [22] Caroline Lemieux, Jeevana Priya Inala, Shuvendu K Lahiri, and Siddhartha Sen. Codamosa: Escaping coverage plateaus in test generation with pre-trained large language models. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 919–931. IEEE, 2023.
- [23] Zhuokui Xie, Yinghao Chen, Chen Zhi, Shuiguang Deng, and Jianwei Yin. Chatunitest: a chatgpt-based automated unit test generation tool. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04764*, 2023.
- [24] Zhiqiang Yuan, Yiling Lou, Mingwei Liu, Shiji Ding, Kaixin Wang, Yixuan Chen, and Xin Peng. No more manual tests? evaluating and improving chatgpt for unit test generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04207*, 2023.
- [25] 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. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- [26] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*, 2021.
- [27] Alex Gu, Baptiste Rozière, Hugh Leather, Armando Solar-Lezama, Gabriel Synnaeve, and Sida I Wang. Cruxeval: A benchmark for code reasoning, understanding and execution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03065*, 2024.
- [28] Thomas J McCabe. A complexity measure. *IEEE Transactions on software Engineering*, (4):308–320, 1976.
- [29] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [30] Jiawei Liu, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuyao Wang, and Lingming Zhang. Is your code generated by chatgpt really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [31] Yuhang Lai, Chengxi Li, Yiming Wang, Tianyi Zhang, Ruiqi Zhong, Luke Zettlemoyer, Wentau Yih, Daniel Fried, Sida Wang, and Tao Yu. Ds-1000: A natural and reliable benchmark for data science code generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 18319–18345. PMLR, 2023.
- [32] Qinkai Zheng, Xiao Xia, Xu Zou, Yuxiao Dong, Shan Wang, Yufei Xue, Zihan Wang, Lei Shen, Andi Wang, Yang Li, et al. Codegeex: A pre-trained model for code generation with multilingual evaluations on humaneval-x. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17568*, 2023.
- [33] Zhiyu Li, Shuai Lu, Daya Guo, Nan Duan, Shailesh Jannu, Grant Jenks, Deep Majumder, Jared Green, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Shengyu Fu, et al. Automating code review activities by large-scale pre-training. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 1035–1047, 2022.
- [34] Tianyang Liu, Canwen Xu, and Julian McAuley. Repobench: Benchmarking repository-level code auto-completion systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03091*, 2023.
- [35] Fengji Zhang, Bei Chen, Yue Zhang, Jacky Keung, Jin Liu, Daoguang Zan, Yi Mao, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. RepoCoder: Repository-level code completion through iterative retrieval and generation. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2471–2484, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [36] Daya Guo, Canwen Xu, Nan Duan, Jian Yin, and Julian McAuley. Longcoder: A long-range pre-trained language model for code completion. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12098–12107. PMLR, 2023.
- [37] Yangruibo Ding, Zijian Wang, Wasi Ahmad, Hantian Ding, Ming Tan, Nihal Jain, Murali Krishna Ramanathan, Ramesh Nallapati, Parminder Bhatia, Dan Roth, et al. Crosscodeeval: A diverse and multilingual benchmark for cross-file code completion. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [38] Carlos E Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik R Narasimhan. Swe-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [39] Bowen Li, Wenhan Wu, Ziwei Tang, Lin Shi, John Yang, Jinyang Li, Shunyu Yao, Chen Qian, Binyuan Hui, Qicheng Zhang, et al. Devbench: A comprehensive benchmark for software development. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08604*, 2024.
- [40] Chunqiu Steven Xia, Matteo Paltenghi, Jia Le Tian, Michael Pradel, and Lingming Zhang. Universal fuzzing via large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.04748*, 2023.
- [41] Junjie Wang, Yuchao Huang, Chunyang Chen, Zhe Liu, Song Wang, and Qing Wang. Software testing with large language models: Survey, landscape, and vision. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2024.
- [42] Max Schäfer, Sarah Nadi, Aryaz Eghbali, and Frank Tip. An empirical evaluation of using large language models for automated unit test generation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2023.
- [43] Saranya Alagarsamy, Chakkrit Tantithamthavorn, and Aldeida Aleti. A3test: Assertionaugmented automated test case generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10352*, 2023.
- [44] Sepehr Hashtroudi, Jiho Shin, Hadi Hemmati, and Song Wang. Automated test case generation using code models and domain adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08033*, 2023.
- [45] Nikitha Rao, Kush Jain, Uri Alon, Claire Le Goues, and Vincent J Hellendoorn. Cat-lm training language models on aligned code and tests. In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 409–420. IEEE, 2023.
- [46] Benjamin Steenhoek, Michele Tufano, Neel Sundaresan, and Alexey Svyatkovskiy. Reinforcement learning from automatic feedback for high-quality unit test generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02368*, 2023.
- [47] Ying Zhang, Wenjia Song, Zhengjie Ji, Na Meng, et al. How well does llm generate security tests? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00710*, 2023.
- [48] Vincent Li and Nick Doiron. Prompting code interpreter to write better unit tests on quixbugs functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00483*, 2023.
- [49] Arghavan Moradi Dakhel, Amin Nikanjam, Vahid Majdinasab, Foutse Khomh, and Michel C Desmarais. Effective test generation using pre-trained large language models and mutation testing. *Information and Software Technology*, 171:107468, 2024.
- [50] Vasudev Vikram, Caroline Lemieux, and Rohan Padhye. Can large language models write good property-based tests? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04346*, 2023.
- [51] Laura Plein, Wendkûuni C Ouédraogo, Jacques Klein, and Tegawendé F Bissyandé. Automatic generation of test cases based on bug reports: a feasibility study with large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings*, pages 360–361, 2024.
- [52] Sungmin Kang, Juyeon Yoon, and Shin Yoo. Large language models are few-shot testers: Exploring llm-based general bug reproduction. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 2312–2323. IEEE, 2023.
- [53] Yinlin Deng, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Haoran Peng, Chenyuan Yang, and Lingming Zhang. Large language models are zero-shot fuzzers: Fuzzing deep-learning libraries via large language models. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGSOFT international symposium on software testing and analysis*, pages 423–435, 2023.
- [54] Yinlin Deng, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Chenyuan Yang, Shizhuo Dylan Zhang, Shujing Yang, and Lingming Zhang. Large language models are edge-case generators: Crafting unusual programs for fuzzing deep learning libraries. In *Proceedings of the 46th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 1–13, 2024.
- [55] Chenyuan Yang, Yinlin Deng, Runyu Lu, Jiayi Yao, Jiawei Liu, Reyhaneh Jabbarvand, and Lingming Zhang. White-box compiler fuzzing empowered by large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15991*, 2023.
- [56] Chenyuan Yang, Zijie Zhao, and Lingming Zhang. Kernelgpt: Enhanced kernel fuzzing via large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00563*, 2023.
- [57] Maolin Sun, Yibiao Yang, Yang Wang, Ming Wen, Haoxiang Jia, and Yuming Zhou. Smt solver validation empowered by large pre-trained language models. In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 1288–1300. IEEE, 2023.
- [58] Zhe Liu, Chunyang Chen, Junjie Wang, Mengzhuo Chen, Boyu Wu, Zhilin Tian, Yuekai Huang, Jun Hu, and Qing Wang. Testing the limits: Unusual text inputs generation for mobile app crash detection with large language model. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 1–12, 2024.
- [59] Zhe Liu, Chunyang Chen, Junjie Wang, Xing Che, Yuekai Huang, Jun Hu, and Qing Wang. Fill in the blank: Context-aware automated text input generation for mobile gui testing. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 1355–1367. IEEE, 2023.
- [60] Zhe Liu, Chunyang Chen, Junjie Wang, Mengzhuo Chen, Boyu Wu, Xing Che, Dandan Wang, and Qing Wang. Make llm a testing expert: Bringing human-like interaction to mobile gui testing via functionality-aware decisions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 1–13, 2024.

A Prompt Templates

The prompt templates for TESTEVAL tasks are shown as follows. For the targeted line/branch/path coverage tasks, we add line numbers to both the program under test and the target information in order to accurately locate the position of the target line/branch/path. Notice that our prompt template is only a primary setting without advanced prompting techniques such as few-shot examples or chain-of-thought reasoning, and we encourage future researchers to design more advanced prompts for TESTEVAL.

Targeted line coverage

Please write a test method for the function '{func_name}' given the following program under test and function description. Your answer should only contain one test input. Program under test:

—- {program}

—- Function description for '{func_name}':

— description

—-

Your test case must cover line {target line}. Your test method should begin with: def test_func_name(): solution=Solution()

Targeted branch coverage

Please write a test method for the function '{func_name}' given the following program under test and function description. Your answer should only contain one test input. Program under test: —-

{program}

Function description for '{func_name}':

— description

—-

—-

Your test case must cover the branch {target branch}. Your test method should begin with: def test func name(): solution=Solution()

Targeted path coverage

Please write a test method for the function '{func_name}' given the following program under test and function description. Your answer should only contain one test input. Program under test:

{program}

—-

—-

```
Function description for '{func_name}':
—-
```
description

—-

Your test case must cover the following execution path in function {func_name}. The path is a sequence of branch conditions. When executing your test case, each branch condition in the target execution path must be satisfied sequentially.

Target execution path: {target_path} —-

Your test method should begin with: def test_func_name(): solution=Solution()

B Targeted Line/Branch Identification

The complete algorithm for extracting targeted lines/branches from a program under test is shown in Algorithm [2.](#page-14-1) At a high level, we first extract all conditional branches by locating the branches start with conditional operators (i.e., 'if', 'elif', and 'else') through parsing the program's abstract syntax tree. For each branch, we record the line numbers of its first and last lines (e.g., Lines 1:5) as one targeted branch. Then, we record the line numbers of all lines (except the line that only includes the 'else' operator) within this branch as the targeted lines (e.g., $[1, 2, 3, 4, 5]$). We repeat this process until finishing parsing all branches of a program.

Algorithm 2: Targeted Line/Branch Identification.

```
Input: Program with L lines: p = \{s_1, s_2, ..., s_L\}Output: Target lines ls, target branches bs
ls = [], bs = [], i = 1;
while i \leq L do
   if si starts with 'if', 'elif', or 'else' then
       curent branch = [];
       i = i;
       repeat
           current\_branch.append(j);
           i = i + 1until s_i not in this branch;
       bs.append(curent_branch);
   end
end
for target_branch in bs do
    for line si
in target_branch do
        if s_i is inside a branch and not s_i starts with 'else' then
          ls.append(i);end
   end
end
return ls, bs
```
C Input Generator for Measuring Branch Difficulties

Figure 4: The input constraints for a LeetCode problem (left) and its random input generator for TESTEVAL (right).

For each problem in TESTEVAL, we construct a *random input generator* to assess the difficulties of covering a specific branch. Each generator is a Python program that *uniformly* samples a valid test input for the LeetCode problem according to its constraint description. We leverage GPT-4 to initially generate these programs, followed by manual inspection and correction to ensure they adhere to the problem's constraints. An example of an input generator is shown in Figure [4.](#page-15-1) These generators are then used to sample 100 executable test cases for each problem, which are employed in the targeted branch coverage task. Branch difficulty is determined by the frequency at which a branch is covered across the 100 sampled test inputs. We categorize branches as follows: easy (covered by [99%, 100%] of test cases), medium (covered by [40%, 99%) of test cases), and hard (covered by [0, 40%) of test cases). This partitioning ensures that easy branches do not significantly outnumber other categories, and promotes a balanced distribution between medium and hard branches.