

Creating Local LLMs for Test Assertion Generation: A Comparative Study of Knowledge Distillation from CodeT5

🖂 G.H.Dimitrov@student.tudelft.nl

Context



before code delivery

Find bugs in software

Replicate the logic that needs to be tested





Add assertions that define if the test passes of fails

Problem

t(name = "{index} called with: ue = "data") oosource(Value = "data") vclass tester = new MyClass(); tt m1 = data[0]; tt m2 = data[1]; nt m2 = data[1]; nt expected = data[2]; ert ???:



- Important for test effectiveness
- Time consuming to write manually
- Hard to generate if you do not depend on the code having the correct output to begin with





- Good at understanding natural language and code
- Therefore can help generate good test assertions
- But they also often are:
- Slow
- Large
- Require online connection

Bridging the Gap With Knowledge Distillation (KD)



Model sizes:

- 3 layers
- 6 layers
- 12 layers
- 0.75 1.0

• 0.0

0.25

0.5

- - **Initializations:**
 - Randomly initialized
 - Pretrained

- **Knowledge Distillation**
- Training a student model to mimic a teacher model
- Has mostly been done for classification tasks, and not for generative ones
- Goal: Create a small model (<500MB) that is specialized for test assertion generation

Specifications:

- Teacher model: CodeT5-base
- Student models: All use codet5small architecture
- Comparison of different loss function weightings, model sizes, and model initializations on performance

Results



- 83.9% of CodeBERTScore
- 25.9% of model size (231MB)
- 3x faster inference speed
- Model size seems to be the main limiting factor
- Pretrained models learn faster than randomly initialized ones
- Pretrained models perform worse than distilled models for the specific task