

# Can Large Language Models Write Parallel Code?

Daniel Nichols  
Department of Computer Science,  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland, USA  
dnicho@umd.edu

Joshua H. Davis  
Department of Computer Science,  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland, USA  
jhdavis@umd.edu

Zhaojun Xie  
Department of Computer Science,  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland, USA  
zxie12@umd.edu

Arjun Rajaram  
Department of Computer Science,  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland, USA  
arajara1@umd.edu

Abhinav Bhatele  
Department of Computer Science,  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland, USA  
bhatele@cs.umd.edu

## ABSTRACT

Large Language Models are becoming an increasingly popular tool for software development. Their ability to model and generate source code has been demonstrated in a variety of contexts, including code completion, summarization, translation, and lookup. However, they often struggle to generate code for more complex tasks. In this paper, we explore the ability of state-of-the-art language models to generate parallel code. We propose a benchmark, PCGBENCH, consisting of a set of 420 tasks for evaluating the ability of language models to generate parallel code, and we evaluate the performance of several state-of-the-art open- and closed-source language models on these tasks. We introduce novel metrics for comparing parallel code generation performance and use them to explore how well each LLM performs on various parallel programming models and computational problem types.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Large Language Model (LLM)-based coding tools are quickly becoming critical components in software development workflows. They have been demonstrated to be effective at a variety of tasks, including code completion, summarization, translation, and lookup. Popular models, such as StarCoder [22], span a wide range of programming languages and domains and can be used to complete or generate code rapidly during the development process. This makes them a promising tool for improving developer productivity and the overall quality of software. However, despite the rapid advancement and scaling of LLMs in recent years, they still struggle with more complicated tasks such as reasoning and planning. One particular complex task LLMs struggle with is generating parallel code. This task involves reasoning about data distributions, parallel algorithms, and parallel programming models.

Parallel code is essential to modern software development with the ongoing rise of multi-core processors and distributed systems. However, writing parallel code is difficult and error-prone. Parallel algorithms are generally more complicated than their sequential counterparts, and parallel bugs such as race conditions and deadlocks are notoriously non-trivial to debug. Furthermore, it can be challenging to reason about the performance of parallel code and identify "performance bugs" [18]. LLMs have the potential to assist developers with these issues and write more efficient parallel code at a faster rate. In order to accomplish this goal, however, we must

first understand the current capabilities and limitations of LLMs when it comes to generating parallel code.

There are several existing benchmarks for evaluating the performance of LLMs on code generation tasks; however, none of them test the ability of the model to generate parallel code. Most focus on short array or string manipulation tasks and are predominantly in Python (or translated to other languages from Python [7]). Only more recent benchmarks, such as DS-1000 [20], test the ability of LLMs to correctly use APIs, which is critical for properly using parallel programming models. Furthermore, these benchmarks do not test the performance of the generated code, instead testing only functional correctness. While correctness is a crucial metric, performance is also vital for developers writing parallel and HPC code. Thus, it is imperative to design new benchmarks and metrics in order to study the performance of LLMs on parallel code generation tasks.

Benchmarking LLM capabilities, however, poses many difficulties. Developing a set of benchmarks that fully covers the space of desired capabilities is non-trivial. Identifying the best model for parallel code generation requires testing problems that cover shared- and distributed-memory programming models, different computational problem types, and different parallel algorithms. This can quickly lead to a large number of benchmarks that need to be manually designed. Furthermore, this becomes difficult to test – whereas traditional Python code generation benchmarks are tested by running *eval* on the generated code for a couple small unit tests, we need to compile C/C++ code, link against one or more parallel libraries, and run the code in the proper parallel environment. Additionally, if we want to test the performance of the generated code, then we must choose reasonable input sizes for each benchmark. Apart from the difficulty of designing and testing the benchmark problems, there is also the difficulty of prompt design. For instance, StarCoder is a capable, state-of-the-art code LLM, but when prompted with a simple standalone function generation task, it tends to complete it with `// TODO: implement comments` [22]. This can be overcome with prompt engineering, but the solutions are often programming language-, prompt-, and model-dependent, making it difficult to fairly compare a wide range of models on many problems.

To explore the current capabilities and limitations of LLMs when it comes to generating parallel code, we propose the Parallel Code

Generation Benchmark (PCGBENCH): a set of benchmarks for evaluating the ability of LLMs to generate parallel code. These benchmarks are manually designed to test a variety of computational problem types and cover seven different execution models: Serial, OpenMP, Kokkos, MPI, MPI+OpenMP, CUDA, and HIP. We evaluate the performance of several state-of-the-art open- and closed-source LLMs on these benchmarks and report the *correctness* and *performance* of the generated code. To compare the models we introduce novel code generation metrics for performance and parallel scaling. We further analyze how each model performs on the various distributed programming models and computational problem types. We discuss the areas where current state-of-the-art LLMs are already performing well and the areas where they can improve.

In this paper we make the following contributions:

- We propose the PCGBENCH benchmark for evaluating the ability of LLMs to generate parallel code.
- We introduce two novel metrics,  $\text{speedup}_n@k$  and  $\text{efficiency}_n@k$ , for evaluating performance and scaling of LLM generated code.
- We evaluate the performance of several state-of-the-art open- and closed-source LLMs on PCGBENCH.
- We identify several areas where current state-of-the-art LLMs can improve their performance on parallel code generation.

In addition to these contributions, we also explore the following research questions:

- RQ1** *How well do state-of-the-art LLMs generate parallel code and which models are best?* We show that all tested LLMs, both open- and closed-source, struggle to generate parallel code. Amongst the tested models GPT-3.5 performs the best with a  $\text{pass}@1$  of 76% for serial code generation and a  $\text{pass}@1$  of 40% for parallel code generation.
- RQ2** *Which parallel execution models and problem types are most challenging for LLMs?* We demonstrate that LLMs struggle most with MPI code generation and perform best for OpenMP and Kokkos code generation. Additionally, we show that LLMs have a difficult time generating parallel code for sparse, unstructured problems.
- RQ3** *How performant and scalable is the parallel code generated by LLMs?* We show that the parallel code generated by LLMs has poor parallel speedup and efficiency. Additionally, we show that the LLMs that generate correct parallel code most often do not necessarily generate the most performant parallel code.

## 2 RELATED WORK

This section details related work in benchmarking LLMs for code related tasks and applying LLMs to parallel and HPC code.

### 2.1 Benchmarking LLMs for Code Related Tasks

Since the introduction of the Codex model and HumanEval benchmark [10], many works have proposed new LLMs for code and evaluated them on a variety of tasks. The number of code specific models has grown rapidly as open-source models and data sets become more available and low-rank training techniques, such as LoRA [16], make training large models more feasible. These

models are usually evaluated on code generation tasks such as HumanEval [10], MBPP [5], and DS-1000 [20].

The first of these, HumanEval [10], is a set of 164 code generation tasks that are designed to evaluate the ability of LLMs to write short Python functions that solve a variety of problems. The model is given a description of the problem as a docstring and the function signature and is tasked to write the body of the function. The model is evaluated on the functional correctness of the generated code based on a set of test cases associated with each test. Similar to HumanEval is the Mostly Basic Python Problems (MBPP) [5] benchmark which is a set of 1000 simple Python problems. These problems are designed to be simple and are formatted and tested the same as HumanEval. MBPP is often evaluated with few-shot prompts, where example correct solutions to other problems are included in the prompts. A common extension of these benchmarks is MultiPL-E [7] which extends the set of HumanEval and MBPP tests to 18 programming languages.

While these benchmarks test the ability of the model to generate simpler, more general code, the DS-1000 benchmark [20] tests the ability of the model to generate more complex, data science related code. This includes a set of 1000 data science tasks in Python that make use of common data science libraries such as NumPy, Pandas, and Matplotlib. Other similar benchmarks that evaluate coding LLMs on more complex tasks are GSM8K [11] and GSM-HARD [14], which use PAL [14] to evaluate the ability of LLMs to generate Python code snippets to assist in chains of reasoning. In these tasks the model is required to make multi-step reasoning decisions where it needs to generate code that will be executed and then use the output of that code to make further decisions. The CoderEval benchmarks [41] are a set of 230 Java and 230 Python code generation tasks that require the model to write context-dependent functions, rather than the standalone functions required by HumanEval and MBPP.

Additionally, there have been several domain specific benchmarks that evaluate more narrow uses of LLM code generation. VerilogEval [23] tests the ability of LLMs to generate Verilog code for hardware design and verification. ClassEval [12] introduces 100 class level code generation tasks in Python to understand how well LLMs can write code within a class. BioCoder [35] is a set of tasks that evaluate the ability of an LLM to write bioinformatics code. All of these benchmarks make use of tasks manually created by experts to test more specific use cases of LLMs.

### 2.2 Applying LLMs to Parallel and HPC Code

Recently there has been a growing interest in applying LLMs to parallel and High Performance Computing (HPC) code. Several works have looked at creating smaller specialized HPC models [17, 25] or applying existing LLMs to HPC tasks [8, 9, 24]. Nichols et al [25] introduce HPCCoder, a model fine-tuned on HPC code, and evaluate its ability to generate HPC code, label OpenMP pragmas, and predict performance. Kadosh et al [17] introduce TOKOMPILER, an HPC specific tokenizer for LLMs, and use it to train COMPCODER, a model trained on C, C++, and Fortran code.

Other works have looked at applying existing LLMs to HPC tasks. Munley et al [24] evaluate the ability of LLMs to generate compiler verification tests for parallel OpenACC code. Chen et al [8] use

LLMs to identify data races in parallel code and propose the DRB-ML data set, which is integrated into the LM4HPC framework [9]. None of these works comprehensively evaluate and compare the ability of LLMs to generate parallel code, which is the focus of this work.

### 3 BACKGROUND

In this section we provide background information on large language models and how they are used for text generation. We further discuss how large language models can be used for code generation.

#### 3.1 Large Language Models

Natural Language Processing (NLP) has largely been dominated by transformer-based models since their introduction in 2017 by Vaswani et al. [38]. Transformer networks are designed to model sequential data, such as text, much like their predecessors, Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) and Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks. However, unlike RNNs and LSTMs, transformers do not use recurrence to model sequential data, but instead rely on *self-attention* mechanisms to model the relationships between values in the sequence. This enables the modeling of long-range dependencies in the data without the vanishing gradient and scaling issues [21] that prohibited RNNs and LSTMs from becoming mainstream. Most notably, self-attention in transformers allows for each sequence element to be processed in parallel, which further permits much faster training and inference, and, thus, the use of significantly larger models with more weights.

Self-attention, also called scaled dot-product attention, works by projecting input sequences onto three different spaces: query, key, and value. These projections are defined by the weight matrices  $W_q$ ,  $W_k$ , and  $W_v$ , respectively. Once the input sequence  $\mathbf{x}$  has been converted into a sequence of numbers, or *tokens*, by a *tokenizer*, the input sequence is projected onto the query, key, and value spaces. If  $\mathbf{x}^{(i)}$  is the  $i$ -th token in the input sequence, then the query, key, and value projections can be computed as  $\mathbf{q}^{(i)} = W_q \mathbf{x}^{(i)}$ ,  $\mathbf{k}^{(i)} = W_k \mathbf{x}^{(i)}$ , and  $\mathbf{v}^{(i)} = W_v \mathbf{x}^{(i)}$ . Each of these vectors can be stacked into matrices  $\mathbf{Q}$ ,  $\mathbf{K}$ , and  $\mathbf{V}$ , where each row is the projection of a single token in the input sequence. This allows us to compute the attention score between each pair of tokens in the input sequence as shown in Equation (1).

$$\text{Attention}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{V}) = \text{softmax} \left( \frac{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{K}^T}{\sqrt{d_k}} \right) \mathbf{V} \quad (1)$$

Here  $d_k$  is the dimensionality of the query and key vectors. These attention scores intuitively represent how much each input token should *attend*, or pay attention, to each other. Attention scores are a learned feature of the model, so the weight matrices  $W_q$ ,  $W_k$ , and  $W_v$  are optimized during training via backpropagation. Most large transformer models make use of *multi-head attention*. This variant uses multiple attention heads, as shown previously, and concatenates the results of each head before projecting them back to the input dimensionality. This allows the model to learn multiple attention representations of the input sequence.

These large transformer models are generally trained to model the distribution of a text corpus, for instance, the English language. For *auto-regressive models* this is accomplished by training the

model to predict the next token in a sequence given the previous tokens, such that *perplexity* is minimized. Perplexity is a measure of how well a probability distribution predicts a sample. For a sequence of tokens  $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  we can calculate perplexity as the model’s ability to predict the next token  $x_t$  given the previous tokens  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{t-1}$  as shown in Equation (2).

$$\text{Perplexity}(\mathcal{X}) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{t} \sum_i^t \log p_\theta (x_i | x_{<i}) \right\} \quad (2)$$

Here  $p_\theta (x_i | x_{<i})$  is the log-likelihood of  $x_i$  given the previous tokens  $x_{<i}$  and model parameters  $\theta$ . Intuitively, a lower perplexity indicates that the model is more certain in its predictions, where a higher perplexity indicates less certainty. Conveniently, Equation (2) is the exponential of the cross-entropy loss function. This allows us to train LLMs by minimizing cross-entropy loss, and thus minimizing perplexity.

#### 3.2 Large Language Models for Code

An LLM trained on a large corpus of code can be used to generate code by giving it a code input prompt and asking it to predict the next token. Generally, code LLMs are trained on a large corpus of code, such as The Stack [19], that covers a wide range of programming languages and application types. Sometimes the pre-training corpus includes natural language as well, such as The Pile [13], as it has been shown that this can improve the performance of the model on code generation tasks [40]. In some instances, such as CodeLlama [33], the code LLM is a natural language model that has been further fine-tuned on a corpus of code.

The model architectures used for code models are generally the same as those used for natural language models. However, there are usually differences in the way text is tokenized before being fed into the model. For instance, multiple recurring whitespaces are ubiquitous in code, but rare in natural language. Tokenizers for code often collapse multiple whitespaces into a single whitespace or add new tokens to represent spans of whitespace [10]. This reduces noise and the quantity of tokens in the input, making the input easier to learn from. These tokenizers also often add special tokens to the vocabulary that are specific to code, such as `<filename>` or `<reponame>` [22]. Code-specific tokenizers help LLMs model code distributions more effectively.

Presumably, a well-trained LLM should be able to predict the next token in the code sequence with high certainty. In practice, however, there is significant subtlety involved in getting trained models to generate good outputs. For instance, given an output of token probabilities from the model, it may seem intuitive to simply select the most probable next token. However, this often leads to repetitive, low-quality outputs [15]. Numerous techniques have been introduced to combat this issue such as *top-k sampling*, *nucleus sampling*, and *model temperature*.

*Top-k Sampling.* In top-k sampling the next token is sampled from the top  $k$  most probable tokens. This drastically reduces the repetitiveness of the generated text by sampling from several of the most likely tokens rather than just one. However, depending on the skew of the distribution, the selected  $k$  value may exclude or include too many tokens in the sampling range. A common value of  $k$  is 50.

*Nucleus Sampling.* Nucleus sampling [15], also called *top-p sampling*, fixes the issues with top-*k* sampling by instead sampling from the distribution up to some cut-off *p* in the cumulative distribution function. This ensures the selection of a more representative sample of tokens from the distribution. Nucleus sampling is often used in code generation tasks with a value of  $p = 0.95$  and is sometimes combined with top-*k* sampling.

*Model Temperature.* Generation temperature can be used to control the quality of output from the model. Temperature is a scaling value that is applied to the raw model outputs, or *logits*, before they are converted to a probability distribution. Equation (3) shows how probabilities are calculated from the *logits* using the temperature value. As the temperature value tends toward zero, the probability distribution becomes more peaked, and eventually, the argmax function. Lower temperatures lead to only the most probable few tokens being selected. As the temperature value tends toward infinity the probability distribution becomes more uniform and eventually a uniform distribution at infinity. Higher temperatures lead to a more diverse set of tokens being selected.

$$probs = \text{softmax} \left( \frac{logits}{temperature} \right) \quad (3)$$

Intuitively, lower temperatures can be thought of as yielding more conservative generations that the model is more *confident* in. Higher temperatures will lead to more *creative* generations with a larger variety of possible outputs. For code generation tasks, a low temperature value of 0.2 is often used.

## 4 PCGBENCH: PROMPTS FOR PARALLEL CODE GENERATION

To evaluate the ability of LLMs to generate parallel code, we propose the Parallel Code Generation Benchmark (PCGBENCH). In this section we discuss the motivation behind each task within PCGBENCH and how prompts are formatted before being used for code generation.

To disambiguate the use of the terms *prompt*, *task*, *problem*, *problem type*, and *benchmark* we define them as follows.

*Task/Prompt:* An individual text prompt that is given to the LLM to generate code for. The output can be compiled, run, and scored as either correct or incorrect.

*Problem:* A set of tasks or prompts that test the LLM performance on implementing the same computational work, but each task or prompt may use a different programming model.

*Problem Type:* A set of problems that test computational problems with similar work or from similar domains, i.e. *sorting* problems.

*Benchmark:* A set of prompts that are all tested together to evaluate the performance of the LLM. We introduce the PCGBENCH benchmark.

*Benchmark Requirements.* The goal of PCGBENCH is to evaluate the ability of LLMs to generate parallel code. To do this, we need to (1) test a variety of computational problem types and (2) different parallel programming models. Since there will be many different tasks, they also (3) need to be able to be evaluated automatically. The prompts should be (4) simple enough that they can be generated as a standalone function, but complex enough that they are not too

trivial to solve. Finally, to prevent the LLMs from simply copying solutions from their training data the prompts (5) should not exist within any of the LLMs’ training data sets.

*PCGBENCH Overview.* To these ends we propose, PCGBENCH, a set of 420 prompts that cover twelve different computational problem types and seven different execution models. Each problem type has five different problems, and each problem has a prompt for each of the seven execution models, resulting in 420 total prompts. Each prompt in PCGBENCH is a standalone function that requires the LLM to generate code that solves the problem in parallel.

*Problem Types.* The problem types are listed and described in Table 1. These were hand-selected by the authors and represent a wide variety of common computational problems that are often parallelized. Each requires different strategies or APIs to solve in parallel. For instance, the problems in the *Sort* problem type requires the LLM to generate code that sorts an array of values in parallel.

**Table 1: The categories of problems in PCGBENCH. Each category has 5 problems and each problem has a prompt for all 7 programming models.**

Problem Type	Description
Sort	Sort an array or sub-array of values; in-place and out-of-place.
Scan	Scan operations, such as prefix sum, over an array of values.
Dense Matrix Algebra	Dense matrix algebra functions from all 3 levels of BLAS.
Sparse Matrix Algebra	Sparse matrix algebra functions from all 3 levels of BLAS.
Search	Search for an element or property in an array of values.
Reduce	Reduction operation over an array dimension, such as computing a sum.
Histogram	Binning values based on a property of the data.
Stencil	1 iteration of 1D and 2D stencil problems, such as Jacobi stencil.
Graph	Graph algorithms, such as component counting.
Geometry	Compute geometric properties, such as convex hull.
Fourier Transform	Compute standard and inverse Fourier transforms.
Transform	Map a constant function to each element of an array.

*Problems.* The five problems for each problem type are designed to test the core functionality of the problem type. To prevent prompting the model for a function that is already in its training data set, the five problems are slight variations of the usual problem type. For example, one of the scan problems is to compute the *reverse* prefix sum of an array, rather than directly computing the prefix sum. These variations still test the model’s understanding of the

core computational problem, but mitigate the likelihood of it simply copying code from its training data set. Listing 1 shows another example of these problem variations. Another benefit of having five problems per problem type is that it provides more data points for evaluating the LLM’s performance on that problem type, but not so many that it becomes infeasible to implement and maintain.

*Prompts.* Each problem has a prompt for each of the seven execution models that the LLM is required to generate code for. The seven execution models we test are: Serial, OpenMP [30], MPI [34], MPI+OpenMP, Kokkos [37], CUDA [26], and HIP [2]. All the prompts are in C++, CUDA, or HIP. These represent both shared and distributed memory programming models, as well as GPU programming models. The prompts for each programming model are designed to be as similar to the other prompts for that problem as possible, while still being idiomatic for the programming model. For Serial, OpenMP, MPI, and MPI+OpenMP prompts we use STL data structures such as `std::vector` and `std::array`. For Kokkos we utilize the `Kokkos::View` data structure (as shown in Listing 1). The CUDA and HIP prompts use raw pointers to represent array structures.

```
#include <Kokkos_Core.hpp>

/* Replace the i-th element of the array x with the minimum
   value from indices 0 through i.
   Use Kokkos to compute in parallel. Assume Kokkos has
   already been initialized.
   Examples:

   input: [8, 6, -1, 7, 3, 4, 4]
   output: [8, 6, -1, -1, -1, -1, -1]

   input: [5, 4, 6, 4, 3, 6, 1, 1]
   output: [5, 4, 4, 4, 3, 3, 1, 1]
*/
void partialMinimums(Kokkos::View<float*> &x) {
```

**Listing 1: An example *Scan* prompt for Kokkos. The LLM will be tasked with completing the function body.**

We list an example Kokkos prompt in Listing 1 for a variant of a scan problem. The goal of this problem is to compute the minimum value of the array up to each index. We include example inputs and outputs in the prompt as this can significantly improve the quality of the generated code [5]. The necessary `#include` statements are also prepended to the prompt as we found that this improves the likelihood of the LLM correctly using the required programming model.

## 5 MODELS USED FOR EVALUATION

With the set of prompts defined in PCGBENCH we can generate outputs from LLMs and evaluate the quality of the generated code. This section details the LLMs used in our evaluation and their properties. We choose to compare state-of-the-art open-source and closed-source LLMs, as well as smaller LLMs that are more practical for use in production. Table 2 lists and describes the models used in our evaluation.

*CodeLlama — 7B, 13B, 34B.* Rozière et al. originally introduced CodeLlama models in [33] as variants of the Llama 2 model [36], fine-tuned for code. All 3 models started with Llama 2 weights and were then fine-tuned on 500 billion tokens from a data set of predominantly code. The Llama 2 models were also extended to support longer context lengths of 16k and infilling to generate code in the middle of sequences. We select these models as they are amongst the top performing open-source LLMs. Additionally, the CodeLlama models are very accessible as there are small model sizes available and there exists a thriving software ecosystem surrounding llama2-based models.

*StarCoderBase.* The StarCoderBase model [22] is a 15.5B parameter model trained on 1 trillion tokens from The Stack [19]. In addition to code from 80+ programming languages, its data set includes natural language in git commits and Jupyter notebooks. StarCoder supports infilling as well as a multitude of custom tokens specific to code text data. The model architecture is based on the SantaCoder model [4] and it has a context length of 8K tokens. We select StarCoderBase as it is one of the best performing open-source models near its size and is a frequent model of comparison in related literature.

*Phind-CodeLlama-V2.* The Phind-CodeLlama-V2 model [32] is a CodeLlama-34B model fine-tuned on over 1.5 billion tokens of code data. It currently tops the BigCode Models Leaderboard [1] of open-access models on HumanEval with a pass@1 score of 71.95; however, the fine-tuning data set is not publicly available, so it is not possible to ensure that the BigCode benchmarks themselves are not included in Phind’s fine-tuning data set.

*GPT-3.5 and GPT-4.* GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 are closed-source LLMs from OpenAI [6, 27]. Most information about these models is not publicly available, however, they are usable for inference via a paid API. We use the most up-to-date versions of these models available at the time of writing, the *gpt-3.5-turbo-1106* and *gpt-4-1106-preview* models. Unlike the other models tested, these are instruction-tuned and aligned to human preferences. Rather than using them for direct code generation, they are interacted with via a chat interface. As with the Phind-CodeLlama-V2 model, the data used to train these models is not publicly available, so it is difficult to fairly compare them with the other models as they might have seen some prompts during training.

## 6 METRICS FOR EVALUATION

After having selected the models it is important to be able to meaningfully study their performance at generating correct and efficient code for the prompts in PCGBENCH. This section details how we accomplish this by adopting a common correctness metric for code LLMs and defining two new performance related metrics.

### 6.1 Correctness Metrics

To measure correctness we adopt the  $\text{pass}@k$  metric from [10]. For a given prompt,  $\text{pass}@k$  estimates the probability that the model will generate a correct solution given  $k$  attempts. Often the average  $\text{pass}@k$  over all prompts in a benchmark is reported. To estimate the  $\text{pass}@k$  over a set of prompts, we first generate  $N$  samples from the model for each prompt, where  $N > k$ . These samples are then

Name	No. Parameters	Weights Available	License	HumanEval <sup>†</sup> (pass@1)	MBPP <sup>‡</sup> (pass@1)
CodeLlama-7B [33]	7B	✓	llama2	29.98	41.4
CodeLlama-13B [33]	13B	✓	llama2	35.07	47.0
StarCoderBase [22]	15.5B	✓	BigCode OpenRAIL-M	30.35	49.0
CodeLlama-34B [33]	34B	✓	llama2	45.11	55.0
Phind-CodeLlama-V2 [32]	34B	✓	llama2	71.95	—
GPT-3.5 [6]	—	✗	—	61.50	52.2
GPT-4 [27]	—	✗	—	84.10	—

<sup>†</sup>HumanEval results are from the BigCode Models Leaderboard [1], except for GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 which are from [3].

<sup>‡</sup>MBPP results are from [33].

**Table 2: The models compared in our evaluation. CodeLlama and its variants currently represent state-of-the-art open-source LLMs and GPT-4 represents closed-source LLMs. OpenAI does not publish the numbers of parameters in their models.**

evaluated for correctness. The number of correct samples can be used to estimate the pass@ $k$  value as shown in Equation (4).

$$\text{pass}@k = \frac{1}{|P|} \sum_{p \in P} \left[ 1 - \binom{N - c_p}{k} / \binom{N}{k} \right] \quad (4)$$

Number of samples generated per prompt  
Set of prompts  
Number of correct samples for prompt  $p$

This metric provides insight into how frequently models are generating correct code. The probability that the model will generate a correct solution in one attempt, pass@1, is the most useful metric for end-users as it aligns with how LLMs are used in practice. Additionally, as models have become more capable, studies have shifted towards only reporting pass@1 values. However, pass@ $k$  values for  $k > 1$  are still useful for understanding how models perform on more difficult prompts. Commonly reported values of  $k$  are 1, 5, 10, 20, and 100. Additionally, it is common to report pass@1 values using a generation temperature of 0.2 and pass@ $k$  for higher values of  $k$  using a generation temperature of 0.8. This higher temperature allows the model to more extensively explore the solution space when generating a larger number of attempts.

## 6.2 Performance Metrics

With parallel and HPC code it is important to consider both the correctness and performance of the generated code. To this end we introduce two new metrics for comparing the performance of LLM generated code: speedup $_n$ @ $k$  and efficiency $_n$ @ $k$ . The first, speedup $_n$ @ $k$ , measures the expected best relative improvement of the performance of the generated code over a sequential baseline if the model is given  $k$  attempts to generate the code. For a given prompt  $p$  the expected best relative improvement over a sequential baseline  $T_p^*$  is given by Equation (5).

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max \left\{ \frac{T_p^*}{T_{p,s_1,n}}, \dots, \frac{T_p^*}{T_{p,s_k,n}} \right\} \right] = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\binom{j-1}{k-1}}{\binom{N}{k}} \frac{T_p^*}{T_{p,j,n}} \quad (5)$$

runtime of sequential baseline for prompt  $p$   
runtime of sample  $j$  of prompt  $p$  on  $n$  processors

To demonstrate that Equation (5) represents the desired quantity, consider the set of  $N$  generated samples is in order from slowest to fastest. This is without loss of generality as we assume the  $k$  samples are selected uniformly and, thus, all size  $k$  permutations are equally likely. The probability that the max is the  $j$ th sample is given by  $\binom{j-1}{k-1} / \binom{N}{k}$ , as there must be  $j - 1$  elements before  $j$  and, thus,  $\binom{j-1}{k-1}$  ways to select the remaining elements. The weighted sum of these probabilities with their respective runtimes gives the expected runtime of the max of  $k$  samples. Taking the average of Equation (5) over all prompts we can define the speedup $_n$ @ $k$  metric as shown in Equation (6).

$$\text{speedup}_n@k = \frac{1}{|P|} \sum_{p \in P} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\binom{j-1}{k-1}}{\binom{N}{k}} \frac{T_p^*}{T_{p,j,n}} \quad (6)$$

For a single LLM the speedup $_n$ @ $k$  metric can be used to understand how well its generated code performs compared to sequential baselines. A value greater than 1 indicates that the generated code is faster than the baseline on average, while a value less than 1 indicates that the generated code is generally slower than the baseline. When comparing between LLMs, a higher value of speedup $_n$ @ $k$  signifies more performant generated code. It is important to note that this metric is hardware dependent and, thus, to compare models fairly all the run times need to be collected on the same hardware.

The speedup $_n$ @ $k$  metric also gives insight into how well the generated code makes use of parallelism in its computation. It is fixed to a given number of processors,  $n$ , which can either be threads, cores, or processes depending on the model of parallelism being used. It also adds another axis to vary when comparing models. When studying a singular model, the speedup $_n$ @ $k$  metric can be compared at numerous values of  $n$  to understand the complete scaling behavior of that model. When comparing multiple models, it is typically most useful to fix  $n$  to a single value. One could also average over many values of  $n$ , but this risks hiding too much information to be useful.

To further understand the parallel performance of the generated code, we define the efficiency $_n$ @ $k$  metric. This metric measures the expected max speedup per processor if the model is given  $k$  attempts to generate the code. This is easily defined by modifying Equation (6) to divide by  $n$  as shown in Equation (7). This metric

ranges between 0 and 1, with 1 representing a model that generates code that scales perfectly with the number of processors. This metric is useful for understanding how well the generated code makes use of parallel resources.

$$\text{efficiency}_{n@k} = \frac{1}{|P|} \sum_{p \in P} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\binom{j-1}{k-1}}{\binom{N}{k}} \frac{T_p^*}{n \cdot T_{p,j,n}} \quad (7)$$

Even though we explore parallel code generation in this paper, these metrics can be used to consider the performance of sequential code generation as well. For example, examining  $\text{speedup}_1@k$  for the HumanEval, MBPP, or DS-1000 benchmarks will lead to a better understanding of how efficient the generated Python code is. Additionally, both performance metrics could be modified to be parameterized by problem size instead of number of processors in order to study the computational complexity of the generated code.

## 7 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

Now that we have described a set of prompts (Section 4) and LLMs (Section 5), we can evaluate the LLMs on the prompts. This section details how we generated outputs from each of the LLMs and how we evaluated the generated code. We additionally describe how we use the PCGBENCH prompts from Section 4 to evaluate the performance of the LLMs described in Section 5 on code generation.

### 7.1 LLM Inference: Generating the Outputs

To generate outputs with the open-source models we use the HuggingFace library [39] with PyTorch [31] as the backend to load the LLMs and use them for inference. Specifically, we create a PyTorch Dataset object that wraps the set of prompts and we pass this as input to a Huggingface Pipeline object, which then runs the models and generates the outputs. We run this on a single NVIDIA A100-80GB GPU using 16-bit floating point precision. Since the prompt workloads are fairly regular, we get the best inference performance for larger batch sizes. So for each model, we use the largest batch size that fits in GPU memory. To generate the GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 outputs we use the OpenAI API [28] via OpenAI’s Python client [29].

For all of the tasks, we use nucleus sampling with a value of  $p = 0.95$ . Additionally, we limit the max number of new tokens generated to 1024. We experimentally found this to be long enough for all of the tasks to be completed, but short enough to limit long, repetitive outputs. Using this configuration, we create two sets of outputs for each model: one with 20 samples per prompt and a temperature of 0.2 and the other with 200 samples per prompt and a temperature of 0.8. The former is used to calculate the metrics at  $k = 1$  (such as  $\text{pass}@1$ ) and the latter for larger values of  $k$ . This is in line with the generation configurations in related literature [22, 33]. Note that we exclude the evaluation of GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 with 200 samples per prompt and a temperature of 0.8 due to the high monetary cost of generating these outputs.

### 7.2 Evaluating the Generated Code

To evaluate the generated code, we use the PCGBENCH test harness. This is a set of scripts that compile and run the generated code using manually written test drivers for each problem. The scripts

handle recording the compile status, correctness, and execution time of the generated code.

To compile the generated code we use the GNU Compiler Collection (GCC) version 9.4.0. For Serial, OpenMP, and Kokkos we use this as the primary compiler, whereas we use it as the backend to the respective frontend compiler for the other models (i.e. the backend compiler to *mpicxx*). All compilations use the flags `-O3 -std=c++17` and the OpenMP tasks add the `-fopenmp` flag. For Kokkos, we use version 4.1.0 and the *threads* execution space, which uses C++ threads for parallelism. MPI tasks are compiled with OpenMPI version 4.1.1. The CUDA tasks are compiled with *nvcc* and CUDA version 12.1.1. Likewise, the HIP tasks are compiled with *hipcc* and ROCm version 5.7.0.

Before compiling an output, the prompt and generated code are written to a header file that is included by the driver script for that task. Once compiled, the generated binary is run by the test harness. The output of the program includes the correctness of the generated code and the average runtime of the generated code and the sequential baseline over 10 runs. We use the default timer for each execution model to measure its run time. The sequential baselines are handwritten, optimal implementations of the prompt that are used by the performance metrics (see Section 6.2) and to evaluate the correctness of the generated code. A code is also marked as incorrect if it does not compile or it takes longer than 3 minutes to run. We choose the problem sizes for each prompt such that any reasonable implementations take much less than 3 minutes to complete. Additionally, a code is marked incorrect if it does not use its respective parallel programming model. For example, if the model generates a sequential implementation rather than using OpenMP. We utilize several string matching criteria to implement this check.

The CPU runs are conducted on an AMD EPYC 7763, 2.45 GHz CPU with 64 physical cores and 512 GB of RAM. We run with 1, 2, 4, . . . , 32 threads for OpenMP and Kokkos. For MPI we run with 1, 2, 4, . . . , 512 processes across multiple nodes with one rank per physical core. For MPI+OpenMP we run on 1, 2, 3, and 4 nodes with 1 process per node and 1, 2, 4, . . . , 64 threads per node. The CUDA runs are completed on an NVIDIA A100-80GB GPU and the AMD runs on an AMD MI50 GPU. Kernels are launched with the number of threads indicated in the prompt text (i.e. *at least as many threads as values in the array*).

### 7.3 Parallel Code Generation

We evaluate the models on how well they can generate the code for the prompts in PCGBENCH. We do so by asking the model to complete the function started in the prompt and then evaluating the generated code. Using these results we report the  $\text{pass}@k$ ,  $\text{build}@k$ , and  $\text{speedup}_n@k$  metrics. These are computed over the combined results from the OpenMP, MPI, MPI+OpenMP, Kokkos, CUDA, and HIP execution models and compared with the same metrics computed over the Serial results. These results will provide insight into how well the model can write parallel code based on natural language descriptions. The results can also be compared along the axes of execution model and problem type.






Figure 1: pass@1 for each execution model. The LLMs generally follow the same distribution of scores across the execution models: serial (best), OpenMP, CUDA/HIP, and MPI/MPI+OpenMP (worst) with Kokkos varying between LLMs.

## 8 RESULTS

In this section we detail the results from evaluating the LLMs described in Section 5 on PCGBENCH.

### 8.1 PCGBENCH Results

**RQ1** How well do state-of-the-art LLMs generate parallel code and which models are best?




Figure 2: Each LLM’s pass@1 score over PCGBENCH. All of the LLMs score significantly worse for parallel code generation than serial.

Figure 2 shows the pass@1 score for each model on PCGBENCH for the serial execution model and the 6 parallel execution models. Notably, all of the LLMs score significantly worse for parallel code generation than they do for serial code generation. The best performing models, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, both achieve 76% pass@1 on the serial prompts, which is a strong score in the context of other benchmarks, such as HumanEval. However, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 only achieve 40% and 38% pass@1, respectively, on the parallel prompts. The open-source models show a significant decrease in performance for parallel code generation with all of them except for Phind-V2 scoring between 10% and 19%. Phind-V2 does much better than the other open-source models, achieving 32% pass@1 on the

parallel prompts. This suggests that further fine-tuning of the open-source code models can improve their performance. Additionally, it is significant that an open-source model performs near to the closed-source models on parallel code generation. Open-source models are more accessible and, thus, having a strong open-source model for parallel code generation would be beneficial to the community.

Another interesting trend in the pass@1 results is that CodeLlama-34B and GPT-4 both perform worse than their smaller counterparts on parallel code generation. It is difficult to directly interpret the reason for this decrease in performance. However, we observe that CodeLlama-34B and GPT-4 often generate the same output for a given prompt for most or all of the 20 samples. This is due to the larger models being more "confident" in their outputs, but has an adverse effect on the pass@1 score when the output is incorrect.

Ultimately, the closed-source models outperform the open-source models on parallel code generation. Interestingly, GPT-3.5 outperforms GPT-4 on the parallel prompts by 2 percentage points, suggesting it may be better suited for parallel code generation tasks. Amongst the open-source models Phind-V2 performs the best, but still lags behind the closed-source models by 8 percentage points.

In addition to pass@1 it is also useful to consider pass@k for  $k > 1$  to understand how the LLMs perform provided more attempts at a problem. Figure 4 shows the pass@k for each LLM for  $k = 1, 5, 10, 20$  with 200 samples and a temperature of 0.8 for  $k \neq 1$ . The same relative ordering as in Figure 2 is maintained for all values of  $k$  with Phind-V2 leading the open-source LLMs. At  $k = 20$  Phind-V2 achieves a pass@k of 46% meaning that on average it is able to generate a correct answer to one of the parallel prompts in 20 attempts 46% of the time. Each LLM improving as  $k$  increases is expected. The fact that each LLM begins to plateau suggests that there is an upper limit to their ability to generate correct parallel code.

**RQ2** Which parallel execution models and problem types are most challenging for LLMs?

The pass@1 results for each execution model are further broken down in Figure 1. From this data we can see that every LLM follows






Figure 3: pass@1 for each problem type. The LLMs always perform best on transform problems, while they perform worst on sparse linear algebra problems.




Figure 4: The pass@k for various values of k. The relative order of the LLMs is the same for all values of k with Phind-V2 leading the group.

a similar distribution of scores across the execution models: Serial (best), OpenMP, CUDA/HIP, and MPI/MPI+OpenMP (worst) with Kokkos varying between LLMs.

OpenMP being the best performing parallel execution model is likely due to the fact that it is the most similar to serial code. For many problems it only requires adding an OpenMP pragma and sometimes a reduction clause. GPT-4 gets nearly as many OpenMP problems correct as serial problems, with an OpenMP pass@1 of 60% vs a 76% serial pass@1. The other top performers, GPT-3.5 and Phind-V2, also perform nearly as well on OpenMP problems as serial problems. StarCoderBase and the CodeLlama models have a larger gap between their serial and OpenMP pass@1 scores, but still perform better on OpenMP than the other parallel execution models.

For the larger models Kokkos consistently performs just behind OpenMP. Like OpenMP, Kokkos is a shared memory parallel programming model that relies mostly on high-level abstract constructs

to parallelize code. These high-level abstractions make it simpler for the LLM to translate the prompt text to code. The smaller LLMs struggle with Kokkos, likely due to the fact that Kokkos is more verbose than OpenMP and is more niche than the other parallel execution models leading to less inclusion in their training data. With fewer Kokkos examples in their data sets the smaller LLMs likely struggle to learn how to model Kokkos code well.

Following Kokkos, CUDA/HIP is the next best performing parallel execution model for all the LLMs. These two always have a similar pass@1 score, which is likely due to the similarity of CUDA and HIP. All of the open-source LLMs perform slightly better with HIP than CUDA, while the closed-source LLMs perform slightly better with CUDA than HIP. CUDA/HIP kernels are more complex than OpenMP and Kokkos, but the parallelism is intrinsic to the kernel making it easier than MPI, since the LLM does not need to reason about large changes to the underlying algorithm. The code within a CUDA/HIP kernel is also more similar to the code within an OpenMP for loop than the code within an MPI rank.

MPI and MPI+OpenMP are generally the worst performing parallel execution models for all the LLMs (except for CodeLlama 7B and 13B where they are second and third worst). Compared to the other execution models in our testing, MPI implementations often differ the most from their sequential counterparts. This complexity makes it difficult for the LLMs to generate correct MPI code. Based on the results for all the execution models we hypothesize that this trend generalizes to all parallel execution models: the more different a parallel programming model’s code is from serial code the more difficult it is for the LLMs to generate correct code in that programming model.

In addition to execution models it is also important to understand what types of computational problems LLMs struggle to parallelize. Figure 3 shows the pass@1 score for each problem type across all the LLMs. As a general trend the LLMs perform best on structured, dense problems and worse for unstructured, sparse problems.

All of the LLMs perform best for transform problems with the exception of GPT-3.5 where it is the second best. Transform problems are the simplest as they are completely data parallel. In addition




Figure 5:  $\text{efficiency}_n@k$  for MPI (left), OpenMP (middle), and Kokkos (right) prompts across rank and thread counts. Phind-V2 is most efficient for MPI prompts, but is one of the least efficient for OpenMP and Kokkos. GPT-4 is the most efficient for OpenMP and Kokkos prompts.<sup>1</sup>

to transform, all of the LLMs generally perform well on reduction and search. These are also fairly simple to parallelize as searching requires little to no communication and reductions are often offered as high-level constructs in parallel programming models.

Phind-V2 and the GPT LLMs score well on histogram, stencil, and dense linear algebra problems. These problems are all structured and dense, which makes them easier for the LLMs to parallelize. These three problems are in the middle of the group for StarCoderBase and the CodeLlama LLMs coming after transform, search, and reduce. This suggests that the larger LLMs are better at parallelizing these types of problems. Interestingly, StarCoderBase and the CodeLlama LLMs all have graph problems in their top four to five problem types, which is not the case for Phind-V2 and the GPTs.

The bottom five problem types for all of the LLMs are sparse linear algebra, scan, fft, geometry, and sort. GPT-4 is the exception with graph instead of sort as the fifth-worst problem type. Sparse linear algebra is generally the worst problem type, which is likely due to the difficulty in parallelizing sparse computations. FFT and geometry problems are also generally more difficult to parallelize so it readily follows that the LLMs would also struggle. The sorting and scan results are more surprising. Parallel implementations for sort and scan are well known and certain execution models like OpenMP and MPI even offer high level abstractions for scan.

**RQ3** How performant and scalable is the parallel code generated by LLMs?

When writing parallel code it is generally important to consider performance in addition to correctness. A parallel implementation that is correct, but makes inefficient use of resources is not useful in practice. To this end we compare the  $\text{speedup}_n@k$  and  $\text{efficiency}_n@k$  for each LLM.

Figure 6 shows the  $\text{speedup}_n@1$  for each LLM for the parallel execution models. For comparison we use the highest value of  $n$  for each execution model:  $n = 32$  threads for OpenMP and Kokkos,  $n = 512$  ranks for MPI, and  $n = (4 \text{ ranks}) \times (64 \text{ threads})$





Figure 6:  $\text{speedup}_n@1$  for parallel prompts. Results are shown for  $n = 32$  threads for OpenMP and Kokkos,  $n = 512$  ranks for MPI, and  $n = (4 \text{ ranks}) \times (64 \text{ threads})$  for MPI+OpenMP. For CUDA/HIP  $n$  is set to the number of kernel threads, which varies across prompts.<sup>1</sup>

for MPI+OpenMP. For CUDA/HIP  $n$  is set to the number of kernel threads, which varies across prompts.<sup>1</sup>

We see a similar trend to the  $\text{pass}@1$  scores in Figure 2 with the GPT models scoring the highest and the CodeLlama models scoring the lowest. Despite GPT-3.5 having the highest  $\text{pass}@1$  for parallel prompts GPT-4 has the highest  $\text{speedup}_n@1$  for all parallel execution models at 20.28. This means that on average GPT-4’s parallel code achieves a 20.28x speedup over the sequential benchmark. To help interpret this result we show the  $\text{efficiency}_n@1$  for each LLM for the parallel prompts in Figure 7. From this we see that none of the LLMs efficiently use parallel resources. The best  $\text{efficiency}_n@1$  is 0.13 for GPT-4 meaning that on average GPT-4’s parallel code achieves 13% of the maximum possible speedup. CodeLlama-34B has the worst  $\text{efficiency}_n@1$  at 0.06. From the results in Figures 6 and 7 we can conclude that the parallel code produced by LLMs is generally inefficient even when correct.

How  $\text{efficiency}_n@1$  varies across  $n$  is also important to consider. Figure 5 compares the  $\text{efficiency}_n@1$  curves for MPI, OpenMP, and Kokkos. We see Phind-V2 is the most efficient at MPI prompts,

<sup>1</sup> Search problems are omitted from  $\text{speedup}_n@k$  and  $\text{efficiency}_n@k$  results due to their high super-linear speedups preventing a meaningful analysis of the performance results for other problem types.



**Figure 7: efficiency@1 for serial and parallel prompts. Results are shown for  $n = 32$  threads for OpenMP and Kokkos,  $n = 512$  ranks for MPI, and  $n = (4 \text{ ranks}) \times (64 \text{ threads})$  for MPI+OpenMP. For CUDA/HIP  $n$  is set to the number of kernel threads, which varies across prompts.**<sup>1</sup>

while the least efficient at OpenMP and second to least for Kokkos. GPT-4 produces the most efficient code on average as its one of the top two most efficient for all three execution models. All of the models start with better efficiency<sub>n</sub>@1 for OpenMP than Kokkos, but rapidly decline towards an efficiency<sub>n</sub>@1 of  $\approx 0.2$ . On the other hand, the Kokkos efficiency<sub>n</sub>@1 values stay roughly consistent across  $n$ , showing efficient use of threads.

## 9 CONCLUSION

In this paper we have proposed Parallel Code Generation Benchmark (PCGBENCH) for evaluating the ability of LLMs to generate parallel code. We additionally introduced novel metrics for evaluating the runtime performance and scaling behavior of the generated parallel code. Using PCGBENCH and these metrics, we have evaluated the ability of state-of-the-art open- and closed-source LLMs to generate parallel code. We find that LLMs are significantly worse at generating parallel code than they are at generating serial code. Furthermore, we show that closed-source models outperform all the open-source models we tested. We also showed that even when LLMs generate correct parallel code it is often not performant or scalable.

## REFERENCES

- [1] 2023. Big Code Models Leaderboard - a Hugging Face Space by bigcode. <https://huggingface.co/spaces/bigcode/bigcode-models-leaderboard>
- [2] 2023. HIP Documentation. <https://rocm.docs.amd.com/projects/HIP/en/latest/>
- [3] 2023. Zero-Shot Replication Framework. <https://github.com/emrgnt-cmplxy/zero-shot-replication>
- [4] Loubna Ben Allal, Raymond Li, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Christopher Akiki, Carlos Munoz Ferrandis, Niklas Muennighoff, Mayank Mishra, Alex Gu, Manan Dey, et al. 2023. SantaCoder: don't reach for the stars! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.03988* (2023).
- [5] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell I. Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie J. Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc V. Le, and Charles Sutton. 2021. Program Synthesis with Large Language Models. *CoRR abs/2108.07732* (2021). [arXiv:2108.07732](https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.07732) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.07732>
- [6] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners.

- [7] Federico Cassano, John Gouwar, Daniel Nguyen, Sydney Nguyen, Luna Phipps-Costin, Donald Pinckney, Ming-Ho Yee, Yangtian Zi, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Molly Q Feldman, Arjun Guha, Michael Greenberg, and Abhinav Jangda. 2023. MultiPL-E: A Scalable and Polyglot Approach to Benchmarking Neural Code Generation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 49, 7 (2023), 3675–3691. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2023.3267446>
- [8] Le Chen, Xianzhong Ding, Murali Emani, Tristan Vanderbruggen, Pei hung Lin, and Chuanhua Liao. 2023. Data Race Detection Using Large Language Models. *arXiv:2308.07505* [cs.LG]
- [9] Le Chen, Pei-Hung Lin, Tristan Vanderbruggen, Chunhua Liao, Murali Emani, and Bronis de Supinski. 2023. LM4HPC: Towards Effective Language Model Application in High-Performance Computing. In *OpenMP: Advanced Task-Based, Device and Compiler Programming*, Simon McIntosh-Smith, Michael Klemm, Bronis R. de Supinski, Tom Deakin, and Jannis Klinkenberg (Eds.). Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 18–33.
- [10] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. *arXiv:arXiv:2107.03374*
- [11] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. Training Verifiers to Solve Math Word Problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168* (2021).
- [12] Xueying Du, Mingwei Liu, Kaixin Wang, Hanlin Wang, Junwei Liu, Yixuan Chen, Jiayi Feng, Chaofeng Sha, Xin Peng, and Yiling Lou. 2023. ClassEval: A Manually-Crafted Benchmark for Evaluating LLMs on Class-level Code Generation. *arXiv:2308.01861* [cs.CL]
- [13] Leo Gao, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Laurence Golding, Travis Hoppe, Charles Foster, Jason Phang, Horace He, Anish Thite, Noa Nabeshima, Shawn Presser, and Connor Leahy. 2021. The Pile: An 800GB Dataset of Diverse Text for Language Modeling. *CoRR abs/2101.00027* (2021). [arXiv:2101.00027](https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.00027) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.00027>
- [14] Luyu Gao, Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Pengfei Liu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. 2022. PAL: Program-aided Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.10435* (2022).
- [15] Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Li Du, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. 2020. The Curious Case of Neural Text Degeneration. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rygGQyrFvH>
- [16] Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models. *CoRR abs/2106.09685* (2021). [arXiv:2106.09685](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.09685) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.09685>
- [17] Tal Kadosh, Niranjan Hasabnis, Vy A. Vo, Nadav Schneider, Neva Krien, Abdul Wasay, Nesreen Ahmed, Ted Willeke, Guy Tamir, Yuval Pinter, Timothy Mattson, and Gal Oren. 2023. Scope is all you need: Transforming LLMs for HPC Code. *arXiv:2308.09440* [cs.CL]
- [18] Md Abul Kalam Azad, Nafees Iqbal, Foyzul Hassan, and Probir Roy. 2023. An Empirical Study of High Performance Computing (HPC) Performance Bugs. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 20th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*, 194–206. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSR59073.2023.00037>
- [19] Denis Kocetkov, Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Jia Li, Chenghao Mou, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Yacine Jernite, Margaret Mitchell, Sean Hughes, Thomas Wolf, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Leandro von Werra, and Harm de Vries. 2022. The Stack: 3 TB of permissively licensed source code. *Preprint* (2022).
- [20] Yuhang Lai, Chengxi Li, Yiming Wang, Tianyi Zhang, Ruiqi Zhong, Luke Zettlemoyer, Scott Wen tau Yih, Daniel Fried, Sida Wang, and Tao Yu. 2022. DS-1000: A Natural and Reliable Benchmark for Data Science Code Generation. *arXiv:2211.11501* [cs.SE]
- [21] Phong Le and Willem Zuidema. 2016. Quantifying the Vanishing Gradient and Long Distance Dependency Problem in Recursive Neural Networks and Recursive LSTMs. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP*, Phil Blunsom, Kyunghyun Cho, Shay Cohen, Edward Grefenstette, Karl Moritz Hermann, Laura Rimell, Jason Weston, and Scott Wen-tau Yih (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Berlin, Germany, 87–93. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W16-1610>
- [22] Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Jia Li, Jenny Chim, Qian Liu, Evgenii Zheltonozhskii, Terry Yue Zhuo, Thomas Wang, Olivier Dehaene, Mishig

- Davaadorj, Joel Lamy-Poirier, João Monteiro, Oleh Shliazhko, Nicolas Gontier, Nicholas Meade, Arnel Zebaze, Ming-Ho Yee, Logesh Kumar Umaphathi, Jian Zhu, Benjamin Lipkin, Muhtasham Oblokulov, Zhiruo Wang, Rudra Murthy, Jason Stillerman, Siva Sankalp Patel, Dmitry Abulkhanov, Marco Zocca, Manan Dey, Zhihan Zhang, Nour Fahmy, Urvashi Bhattacharyya, Wenhao Yu, Swayam Singh, Sasha Luccioni, Paulo Villegas, Maxim Kunakov, Fedor Zhdanov, Manuel Romero, Tony Lee, Nadav Timor, Jennifer Ding, Claire Schlesinger, Hailey Schoelkopf, Jan Ebert, Tri Dao, Mayank Mishra, Alex Gu, Jennifer Robinson, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, Danish Contractor, Siva Reddy, Daniel Fried, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Yacine Jernite, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Sean Hughes, Thomas Wolf, Arjun Guha, Leandro von Werra, and Harm de Vries. 2023. StarCoder: may the source be with you! (2023). arXiv:2305.06161 [cs.CL]
- [23] Mingjie Liu, Nathaniel Pinckney, Brucek Khailany, and Haoxing Ren. 2023. VerilogEval: Evaluating Large Language Models for Verilog Code Generation. arXiv:2309.07544 [cs.LG]
- [24] Christian Munley, Aaron Jarmusch, and Sunita Chandrasekaran. 2023. LLM4VV: Developing LLM-Driven Testsuite for Compiler Validation. arXiv:2310.04963 [cs.AI]
- [25] Daniel Nichols, Aniruddha Marathe, Harshitha Menon, Todd Gamblin, and Abhinav Bhatele. 2023. Modeling Parallel Programs using Large Language Models. arXiv:2306.17281 [cs.DC]
- [26] NVIDIA, Péter Vingelmann, and Frank H.P. Fitzek. 2020. CUDA, release: 10.2.89. <https://developer.nvidia.com/cuda-toolkit>
- [27] OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. arXiv:2303.08774 [cs.CL]
- [28] OpenAI. 2023. *OpenAI API*. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/api-reference/>
- [29] OpenAI. 2023. *OpenAI Python API library*. <https://github.com/openai/openai-python>
- [30] OpenMP4 2013. OpenMP Application Program Interface. Version 4.0. July 2013.
- [31] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Köpf, Edward Yang, Zach DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. 2019. PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library. arXiv:1912.01703 [cs.LG]
- [32] Phind. 2023. *Phind-CodeLlama-34B-v2*. <https://huggingface.co/Phind/Phind-CodeLlama-34B-v2>
- [33] Baptiste Rozière, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xi-aoping Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, Artyom Kozhevnikov, Ivan Evtimov, Joanna Bitton, Manish Bhatt, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Aaron Grattafiori, Wenhan Xiong, Alexandre Défossez, Jade Copet, Faisal Azhar, Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Nicolas Usunier, Thomas Scialom, and Gabriel Synnaeve. 2023. Code Llama: Open Foundation Models for Code. arXiv:2308.12950 [cs.CL]
- [34] M. Snir. 1998. *MPI—the Complete Reference: The MPI core*. Mass. <https://books.google.com/books?id=x79puj2YkroC>
- [35] Xiangru Tang, Bill Qian, Rick Gao, Jiakang Chen, Xinyun Chen, and Mark Gerstein. 2023. BioCoder: A Benchmark for Bioinformatics Code Generation with Contextual Pragmatic Knowledge. arXiv:2308.16458 [cs.LG]
- [36] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutu Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models. arXiv:2307.09288 [cs.CL]
- [37] Christian R. Trott, Damien Lebrun-Grandié, Daniel Arndt, Jan Ciesko, Vinh Dang, Nathan Ellingwood, Rahul Kumar Gayatri, Evan Harvey, Daisy S. Hollman, Dan Ibanez, Nevin Liber, Jonathan Madsen, Jeff Miles, David Poliakoff, Amy Powell, Sivasankaran Rajamanickam, Mikael Simberg, Dan Sunderland, Bruno Turcksin, and Jeremiah Wilke. 2022. Kokkos 3: Programming Model Extensions for the Exascale Era. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 33, 4 (2022), 805–817. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPDS.2021.3097283>
- [38] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention Is All You Need. *CoRR* abs/1706.03762 (2017). arXiv:1706.03762 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1706.03762>
- [39] Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander M. Rush. 2020. Transformers: State-of-the-Art Natural Language Processing. Association for Computational Linguistics, 38–45. <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.emnlp-demos.6>
- [40] Frank F. Xu, Uri Alon, Graham Neubig, and Vincent J. Hellendoorn. 2022. *A Systematic Evaluation of Large Language Models of Code*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6363556> <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.13169>
- [41] Hao Yu, Bo Shen, Dezhi Ran, Jiaxin Zhang, Qi Zhang, Yuchi Ma, Guangtai Liang, Ying Li, Tao Xie, and Qianxiang Wang. 2023. CoderEval: A Benchmark of Pragmatic Code Generation with Generative Pre-trained Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00288* (2023).