

# Analyzing Declarative Deployment Code with Large Language Models

Giacomo Lanciano<sup>1,\*</sup>, Manuel Stein<sup>2</sup>, Volker Hilt<sup>2</sup> and Tommaso Cucinotta<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, Italy

<sup>2</sup>Nokia Bell Labs, Stuttgart, Germany

<sup>3</sup>Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna, Pisa, Italy

**Keywords:** Large Language Models, Infrastructure-as-Code, DevOps, Kubernetes, Machine Learning, Quality Assurance.

**Abstract:** In the *cloud-native* era, developers have at their disposal an unprecedented landscape of services to build scalable distributed systems. The *DevOps* paradigm emerged as a response to the increasing necessity of better automations, capable of dealing with the complexity of modern cloud systems. For instance, Infrastructure-as-Code tools provide a declarative way to define, track, and automate changes to the infrastructure underlying a cloud application. Assuring the quality of this part of a code base is of utmost importance. However, learning to produce robust deployment specifications is not an easy feat, and for the domain experts it is time-consuming to conduct code-reviews and transfer the appropriate knowledge to novice members of the team. Given the abundance of data generated throughout the DevOps cycle, machine learning (ML) techniques seem a promising way to tackle this problem. In this work, we propose an approach based on Large Language Models to analyze declarative deployment code and automatically provide QA-related recommendations to developers, such that they can benefit of established best practices and design patterns. We developed a prototype of our proposed ML pipeline, and empirically evaluated our approach on a collection of Kubernetes manifests exported from a repository of internal projects at Nokia Bell Labs.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PUBLICATIONS

## 1 INTRODUCTION

During the last decade, cloud technologies have been evolving at an impressive pace, such that we are now living in a *cloud-native* era where developers can leverage on an unprecedented landscape of advanced services to build highly-resilient distributed systems, providing compute, storage, networking, load-balancing, security, monitoring and orchestration functionality, among others. To keep up with this pace, development and operations practices have undergone very significant transformations, especially in terms of improving the automations that make releasing new software, and responding to unforeseen issues, faster and sustainable at scale. The resulting paradigm is nowadays referred to as *DevOps* (Alnafessah et al., 2021).

Quality assurance (QA) is obviously a fundamental part of the DevOps cycle. However, the complex-

ity of modern cloud frameworks and services makes a developer's job unprecedentedly hard. On top of that, development teams are typically composed by persons with very diverse backgrounds, and varying levels of expertise. As a team, this makes adhering to best practices everything but straightforward, because transferring knowledge from experts to novice members takes a lot of time. Therefore, in line with the DevOps philosophy, automating this process as much as possible seems the right approach. Indeed, there exist a vast amount of tools that provide (static) code analysis functionality, and that can be seamlessly integrated in existing continuous-integration/continuous-delivery (CI/CD) pipelines to address QA concerns. However, given the impressive abundance of data generated throughout the DevOps cycle, applying machine learning (ML) techniques in this context seems a promising path towards providing developers with high-quality feedbacks and recommendations, automatically.

When developing a cloud-native application, the definition of its *deployment* plays a fundamental role. Modern cloud management frameworks, like Kuber-

<sup>a</sup> <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7431-8041>

<sup>b</sup> <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1826-8297>

<sup>c</sup> <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0362-0657>

\*Giacomo Lanciano was an intern at Nokia Bell Labs.

netes and OpenStack (two of the most well-known open-source and widely adopted projects), typically offer at least an Infrastructure-as-Code (IaC) solution (e.g., deployment manifests and Heat templates, respectively). Such a mechanism allows for specifying the desired properties and the relations among the components of the deployment via *declarative* code, that can then be versioned and treated in the same way as the code that implements the actual application logic. It is obviously very important to follow best practices when, e.g., specifying a Kubernetes deployment manifest, as failing to do so may lead the applications to experience many types of issues (Mumtaz et al., 2021; Li et al., 2022). Static analysis tools for manifest files, like for instance Polaris<sup>1</sup> or Kubesec,<sup>2</sup> allow for mitigating the risk that such issues may actually occur. However, they are typically designed to run relatively simplistic checks, that do not take into account complex design patterns.

In this work, we propose an approach to declarative deployment code analysis based on Large Language Models (LLMs), that can automatically provide QA-related recommendations to developers, based on established best practices and design patterns, building on top of standard (static) analysis approaches. To the best of our knowledge, our approach is novel, in the sense that we did not find in the research literature any other proposal to specialize LLMs on deployment code to specifically address QA-related concerns. Also, while we mainly focus on deployment code, it is interesting to consider that this information could eventually be integrated with the other available data sources in the DevOps cycle to consider a more comprehensive picture, like: version control system history, code review feedbacks, tests measurements and logs, etc.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of the existing related works in the space of code analysis with LLMs. Section 3 presents the main features of our proposed approach and the prototype ML pipeline we implemented. Section 4 presents the results of our preliminary validation on a set of Kubernetes manifest files exported from a Nokia Bell Labs repository. Section 5 concludes the paper and provides indications for future research directions.

## 2 RELATED WORKS

In this work, we propose the use of Natural Language Processing (NLP) models to detect architec-

tural smells and issues in declarative deployment code. Indeed, language models are nowadays extensively used in practice to analyze and generate source code (Sharma et al., 2021; MacNeil et al., 2022). In particular, we focus on LLMs, that are models based on the *transformer* architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017), consisting of *millions*, or even *billions*, of learnable parameters. During the last years, in fact, this class of models has been gaining a lot of attention from the research community, due to their fascinating emergent properties like *unsupervised multitask* (Radford et al., 2019) and *few-shot* (Brown et al., 2020) learning.

In (Zhang et al., 2021), the authors propose an LLM-based approach to automatically fix textual and semantic merge conflicts in a version-controlled codebase. Their approach leverages entirely on few-shot learning, and exhibits remarkable performance without requiring fine-tuning. In (Chen et al., 2021), the authors propose *Codex*, a GPT (Radford et al., 2018) model extensively fine-tuned on open-source code retrieved from GitHub, that exhibits remarkable performance in generating source code when prompted with the corresponding textual description. Similarly, in (Heyman et al., 2021), the authors propose an LLM-based approach to code generation that takes into account both the code already written by developers and their *intent*, expressed in plain natural language. In particular, such model is empirically validated on Python code generation for data science applications. In (Shorten and Khoshgoftaar, 2023), *KerasBERT* is proposed. Such model is trained on a considerable amount of code examples, notebooks, blog posts and forum threads regarding the Keras deep learning framework, to provide an automatic tool to analyze and generate documentation for related code snippets. The authors of (Jain et al., 2022) propose *Jigsaw*, an approach based on program synthesis techniques, to post-process the source code generated by specialized LLMs in order to provide quality guarantees.

The work presented in (Thapa et al., 2022) demonstrates how LLMs can also be used for detecting software vulnerabilities. Indeed, the authors provide the results of an empirical analysis, conducted on vulnerability datasets for C/C++ source code, showing how LLMs outperform other neural models like those based on long short-term memory (LSTM) and gated recurrent units (GRUs). Similarly, the authors of (Demirci et al., 2022) propose a malware detection mechanism that leverages on a combination of LSTM and LLMs to discover malicious instructions in assembly code.

In (Ma et al., 2022), the authors investigate on the reasons behind the emergent capability of LLMs to

<sup>1</sup><https://www.fairwinds.com/polaris>

<sup>2</sup><https://kubesec.io/>

learn code syntax and semantic. In particular, they rely on Abstract Syntax Trees (AST) and static analysis to deeply understand the role that the self-attention mechanism plays in learning the dependencies among code tokens. On a related note, in (Wan et al., 2022), the authors approach the problem of interpreting pre-trained LLMs for code analysis. Remarkably, their results show that, in a transformer architecture, the code syntax structure is typically preserved in the intermediate representations of each layer and, as a result, that such LLMs are able to induce ASTs.

The authors of (Sarsa et al., 2022) empirically demonstrated how LLMs can be successfully used to generate, and explain, code for programming exercises that is both novel and reasonable. On the other hand, in (Sontakke et al., 2022), the authors provide evidence that the same type of models heavily rely on contextual cues (e.g., natural-language comments, or function names) and that, by masking such information, their summarization performance drops significantly.

The works referenced in this section generally use LLMs to either provide general-purpose code generation solutions (e.g., (Chen et al., 2021; Heyman et al., 2021)), or realize code analysis tools for specific programming languages and/or frameworks (e.g., (Thapa et al., 2022; Shorten and Khoshgoftaar, 2023)). However, none of them proposes an approach to detect, or recommend, the usage of specific best-practices and high-level design patterns, that are very important for QA. Furthermore, none of the aforementioned works specializes LLMs to analyze declarative deployment code that, nowadays, is ubiquitously used to configure modern cloud environments. Therefore, we believe our work addresses a very relevant problem and constitutes an innovative solution.

### 3 PROPOSED APPROACH

Our work focuses on the analysis of Kubernetes deployment manifest files. In particular, our goal is to provide non-expert developers with recommendations regarding the (mis-)usage of relevant Kubernetes architectural patterns (e.g., the *Operator* pattern). We identified a set of fundamental features that such a tool should have in order to achieve our goal:

- F1: Classifying *good*- and *bad*-quality manifests.
- F2: *Explaining* which characteristics contribute the most to the outcome of the classification.
- F3: *Pinpointing* design smells and issues, and possibly recommending a suitable fix.

- F4: Leveraging on the *relations* specified among the components to detect highly complex architectural patterns.

We assume that a (possibly small) set of *annotated* manifest examples is available. This is reasonable to assume in a scenario where DevOps teams conduct code reviews, such that useful annotations could even be automatically extracted from the platform used for such activities. Therefore, implementing F1 can be approached as a *supervised* learning problem. In this context, the notions of *good* and *bad* can be interpreted in many ways, also according to the nature of the available annotations. An expert developer can generally tell “at a glance” whether a manifest seems to be poorly written or not. Although, there are possibly many reasons why a specific manifest is problematic. Therefore, it may not be actually useful to treat this problem as a simple *binary* classification task. Indeed, both F2 and F3 are concerned with *augmenting* the quality of the recommendations. However, while F2 refers to the possibility to apply specific techniques (Atanasova et al., 2020; Tenney et al., 2020; Hoover et al., 2020) to better interpret the output of an arbitrary model, F3 entails that such a model should be able to solve a more complex task than a simple classification, in order to provide the end user with fine-grained recommendations. Implementing both F2 and F3 inherently requires a trade-off to be made between the interpretability and the power/complexity of the underlying ML model. Similarly, F4 is concerned with endowing the model with the capability of detecting more convoluted design patterns, that are not easily discoverable when looking at resources in isolation. Given the set of desired features, and the fact that the input data mainly consist in source code (or text, in general), we believe that LLMs are the most suitable tools to address our problem.

#### 3.1 ML Pipeline

In order to realize the tools described in Section 3, we propose the ML pipeline that is synthetically described in Figure 1. Nowadays, Kubernetes is one of the most used cloud orchestration framework, and definitely among the most important projects backed by the Cloud Native Computing Foundation (CNCF). Therefore, it is very easy to find large open-source collections of high-quality deployment manifest files, like by considering those from CNCF graduated and incubating projects. On top of that, we have access to a vast number of (confidential) deployment manifests developed by Nokia Bell Labs research teams and business units for their products.

However, in this case, the main data quality-




Figure 1: The proposed ML pipeline.

related problem is represented by the scarcity of annotations that could be used to train supervised ML models. To overcome this limitation, we propose to use an (*unsupervised*) clustering approach (e.g., *HDBSCAN* (McInnes and Healy, 2017)) to try and detect significant similarities among the manifests. In general, clustering approaches are not designed to handle textual data directly, so it is crucial to establish a proper feature engineering process such that manifests are transformed into appropriate feature vectors, e.g., using standard *tf-idf* scores (Rajaraman and Ullman, 2011). Even though the vector representations are typically very high-dimensional, the results of the clustering process can be easily visualized using embedding techniques, as made in *t-SNE* (Maaten and Hinton, 2008). These approaches are designed to project high-dimensional spaces onto 2 or 3 dimensions, while retaining the spatial relations among the data points as much as possible. This way, an expert can manually inspect some representatives from the discovered clusters and provide initial annotations.

Depending on the actual task to be solved, the annotated data must then be transformed in a way that they can be consumed by a supervised learning model. In the case of LLMs, there exist two main strategies that can be used to solve a supervised learning task: *fine-tuning* or *few-shot* learning. LLMs generally require a very large amount of resources to be trained, due to their impressive size, that directly affects their computational complexity, and the (humongous) amount of textual training data needed to make them exhibit the properties they are famous for. Therefore, it is typically too expensive to train them from scratch. However, provided that a checkpoint of the weights of such a model is publicly available, it is still possible to benefit from them to solve specific tasks, even though the original training process was optimized for another type of task and/or was conducted on textual data unrelated with the application domain. Indeed, one could choose the *fine-tuning* option, that is an example of *transfer learning*, and use the original model as the initial part of a bigger architecture. The remaining part is typically optimized for solving the problem at hand (e.g., a sequence classification task), and trained using domain-specific textual data. Such an approach may generally obtain impres-

sive performance even though the amount of available data is small. On the other hand, LLMs trained for *causal* language modeling (i.e., open-end text generation) are also capable of *few-shot* learning. This property consists in such a model being able to extrapolate how to solve a given learning task, provided that its description and *a few* input-output examples can be specified as a textual *prompt* (see the examples provided in Section 5). In this way, one does not even need to develop (and allocate resources for) a training pipeline, as the LLM is only used in inference mode.

## 4 PRELIMINARY EXPERIMENTS

In order to validate the ideas presented in Section 3, we developed some prototypes of the different parts of the proposed pipeline, and conducted some preliminary experiments considering a simplified version of our problem. Specifically, we gathered a set of ~100 manifest files from internal Nokia Bell Labs projects and ran our clustering pipeline on them. While our initial intent was to try and see whether the clustering output exposed interesting similarities that could be used to obtain a tentative data labeling, this step was particularly useful to filter out some *noise* from our data. Figure 2a shows our initial clustering results. As described in Section 3.1, we obtained *tf-idf*-based representations of the manifests and used Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to get the *top-10* dimensions, to limit the amount of data to be fed to HDBSCAN. After using t-SNE to project the clustered vectors in a 2D space, we observed that our data included a (strangely) regularly-shaped cluster of manifests (in the top-right corner). Upon inspecting the corresponding manifests, we realized that their contents were not adding valuable information to our analysis. Figure 2b reports the result we obtained by re-running the clustering pipeline after filtering out the uninteresting manifests.

Given the limited dimension of our data sample, we were not able to use the clustering results to derive interesting annotations at this stage. Therefore, we decided to run Polaris on our manifests and considered the output of the (boolean) `cpuLimitsMissing` check, that reports whether CPU




Figure 2: Results of the clustering process, before and after filtering out the uninteresting manifest files. The clustered manifests are projected onto a 2D space by using t-SNE (i.e., the axes do not directly refer to any specific feature).

usage limits were correctly specified for Kubernetes resources like Deployment and Service. In this way, we were able to quickly obtain an annotated dataset, that allowed us to reduce our problem to a binary sequence classification task and conduct some experiments with LLMs. Given the impressive computational complexity of such models, we accelerated our experiments using the following GPUs:

- NVIDIA Quadro RTX 6000 (Turing), 24 GB memory;
- NVIDIA Quadro RTX 8000 (Turing), 48 GB memory.

In order to do that, we extensively leveraged on the HuggingFace *transformers* library (Wolf et al., 2020) and the pre-trained model checkpoints available on the associated model hub.<sup>3</sup> Essentially, we focused our experiments on two LLMs: *GPT-2 (medium)*<sup>4</sup> and *GPT-J-6B*.<sup>5</sup>

The medium-sized version of GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019), consists of 355M parameters, and accepts a maximum of 1024 tokens as input. During our few-shot learning tests, such an input token limit allowed us to provide just a couple of examples, as we had to save enough space for the actual input to be processed (see Section 5). Furthermore, given that the kind of outputs we obtained were not related in any way to the labels we specified in the prompt, we concluded that this model is not particularly suitable for declarative code analysis via few-shot learning. This is likely due to the fact that the model was trained on English natural language only, and probably never observed any code example. However, as we were able to run fine-tuning jobs even on our smaller GPU, we believe that this model could be easily fine-tuned on a

bigger declarative code training set and yield significant results, similarly to what done in (Heyman et al., 2021).

As the name suggests, GPT-J-6B is instead a 6B parameters model, inspired by the success of GPT-2/GPT-3, developed and open-sourced by EleutherAI.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, such model is trained on *The Pile* (Gao et al., 2020), an 800+ GB open dataset containing a very diverse set of textual documents, including source code. Given the significantly bigger size and input token limit (2048), our few-shot learning tests were rather successful. We observed that the model was indeed able to understand the specified classification task and output a correct label in most of the cases. Furthermore, we did not have any problem with running the float16 revision of the model on our smaller GPU, as the model took only ~12 out of the available 24 GB of memory. It is also quite impressive that we obtained comparable results using the 8-bit quantized version of the same model, that almost halves the memory requirements, by leveraging on a recently-added feature<sup>7</sup> of *transformers*, whose details are described in (Dettmers et al., 2022). However, using the few-shot learning strategy still imposes great limitations in terms of the amount of training examples that the model can observe. This way, the ability of the model to generalize is in turn quite limited. At the time of writing, the 8-bit quantized version seems not to support fine-tuning. Therefore, for our fine-tuning tests, we used the float16 revision. Although, to avoid getting CUDA out-of-memory errors on our GPU setup, it was necessary to use *DeepSpeed* (Rasley et al., 2020),<sup>8</sup> a framework that leverages on Zero Redundancy Optimizer (ZeRO) (Rajb-

<sup>3</sup><https://huggingface.co/models>

<sup>4</sup><https://huggingface.co/gpt2-medium>

<sup>5</sup><https://huggingface.co/EleutherAI/gpt-j-6B>

<sup>6</sup><https://www.eleuther.ai/>

<sup>7</sup><https://huggingface.co/blog/hf-bitsandbytes-integration>

<sup>8</sup><https://www.deepspeed.ai/>

handari et al., 2020; Rajbhandari et al., 2021) to optimize model training memory footprint, either on a single or multiple GPUs, at the expense of speed. Setting up effective fine-tuning jobs, and properly assessing the resulting model performance, is still a work in progress. Contrary to few-shot learning tests, they require more, and better annotated, input data than the limited sample we were able to generate from one of the repository of internal projects at Nokia Bell Labs.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS

In this work, we proposed a method for analyzing declarative deployment code (specifically, Kubernetes deployment manifest files), such that non-expert developers can benefit from design patterns recommendations. To the best of our knowledge, our proposed approach is a novel way to address QA-related issues by specializing LLMs on declarative deployment code analysis. We conducted a preliminary validation of our ML pipeline on a simplified version of the problem, that shows that LLMs are indeed a viable and promising option for achieving our end goal.

We plan to extend the approach beyond recommendations that can be obtained with standard static analysis tools (e.g., Polaris), by considering more convoluted design patterns and architectural smells (Carrasco et al., 2018; Neri et al., 2020), that involve a potentially large number of Kubernetes resources, possibly taking into account also security concerns (Ponce et al., 2022). In these regards, framing our problem as an *extractive question-answering* task seems a promising avenue. However, it would also be interesting to investigate the feasibility of a hybrid approach that combines LLMs with other types of models that can leverage on existing structures (e.g., relations among Kubernetes resources) in the input data, like Graph Neural Networks (Bacciu et al., 2020). We also plan to conduct a more thorough comparison of different types of LLMs and their usage modes (e.g., few-shot learning vs fine-tuning vs re-training). On a related note, it would be interesting to explore methods for deriving more compact representations of the inputs, to work around the maximum input tokens limit (e.g., YAML vs JSON encoding; optimize tokenizers for declarative code, similarly to the approach used for the natural language-guided programming model proposed by (Heyman et al., 2021)). As Kubernetes is not the only cloud computing framework that leverages on declarative code for its configuration, we want to generalize our approach to other forms of deployment configuration

files like, for instance, *Heat Orchestration Templates* for OpenStack. Finally, we believe it would be interesting to integrate active learning (Ren et al., 2021) techniques into our approach, to facilitate expert architects with sharing and embedding their knowledge into the underlying model.

## REFERENCES

- Alnafessah, A., Gias, A. U., Wang, R., Zhu, L., Casale, G., and Filieri, A. (2021). Quality-Aware DevOps Research: Where Do We Stand? *IEEE Access*, 9:44476–44489.
- Atanasova, P., Simonsen, J. G., Lioma, C., and Augenstein, I. (2020). A Diagnostic Study of Explainability Techniques for Text Classification. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 3256–3274. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bacciu, D., Errica, F., Micheli, A., and Poda, M. (2020). A gentle introduction to deep learning for graphs. *Neural Networks*, 129:203–221.
- Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., and Amodei, D. (2020). Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Carrasco, A., Bladel, B. v., and Demeyer, S. (2018). Migrating towards microservices: migration and architecture smells. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Refactoring*, pages 1–6. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Chen, M., Tworek, J., Jun, H., Yuan, Q., Pinto, H. P. d. O., Kaplan, J., Edwards, H., Burda, Y., Joseph, N., Brockman, G., Ray, A., Puri, R., Krueger, G., Petrov, M., Khlaaf, H., Sastry, G., Mishkin, P., Chan, B., Gray, S., Ryder, N., Pavlov, M., Power, A., Kaiser, L., Bavarian, M., Winter, C., Tillett, P., Such, F. P., Cummings, D., Plappert, M., Chantzis, F., Barnes, E., Herbert-Voss, A., Guss, W. H., Nichol, A., Paino, A., Tezak, N., Tang, J., Babuschkin, I., Balaji, S., Jain, S., Saunders, W., Hesse, C., Carr, A. N., Leike, J., Achiam, J., Misra, V., Morikawa, E., Radford, A., Knight, M., Brundage, M., Murati, M., Mayer, K., Welinder, P., McGrew, B., Amodei, D., McCandlish, S., Sutskever, I., and Zaremba, W. (2021). Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code.
- Demirci, D., şahin, N., şirlancı, M., and Acarturk, C. (2022). Static Malware Detection Using Stacked BiLSTM and GPT-2. *IEEE Access*, 10:58488–58502.
- Dettmers, T., Lewis, M., Belkada, Y., and Zettlemoyer, L. (2022). LLM.int8(): 8-bit Matrix Multiplication for Transformers at Scale.

- Gao, L., Biderman, S., Black, S., Golding, L., Hoppe, T., Foster, C., Phang, J., He, H., Thite, A., Nabeshima, N., Presser, S., and Leahy, C. (2020). The Pile: An 800GB Dataset of Diverse Text for Language Modeling.
- Heyman, G., Huysegems, R., Justen, P., and Van Cutsem, T. (2021). Natural language-guided programming. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on New Ideas, New Paradigms, and Reflections on Programming and Software*, pages 39–55. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Hoover, B., Strobelt, H., and Gehrmann, S. (2020). exBERT: A Visual Analysis Tool to Explore Learned Representations in Transformer Models. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 187–196. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jain, N., Vaidyanath, S., Iyer, A., Natarajan, N., Parthasarathy, S., Rajamani, S., and Sharma, R. (2022). Jigsaw: large language models meet program synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 1219–1231. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Li, R., Soliman, M., Liang, P., and Avgeriou, P. (2022). Symptoms of Architecture Erosion in Code Reviews: A Study of Two OpenStack Projects. In *2022 IEEE 19th International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA)*, pages 24–35.
- Ma, W., Zhao, M., Xie, X., Hu, Q., Liu, S., Zhang, J., Wang, W., and Liu, Y. (2022). Is Self-Attention Powerful to Learn Code Syntax and Semantics?
- Maaten, L. v. d. and Hinton, G. (2008). Visualizing Data using t-SNE. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(86):2579–2605.
- MacNeil, S., Tran, A., Mogil, D., Bernstein, S., Ross, E., and Huang, Z. (2022). Generating Diverse Code Explanations using the GPT-3 Large Language Model. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on International Computing Education Research - Volume 2*, volume 2, pages 37–39. Association for Computing Machinery.
- McInnes, L. and Healy, J. (2017). Accelerated Hierarchical Density Based Clustering. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*, pages 33–42.
- Mumtaz, H., Singh, P., and Blincoe, K. (2021). A systematic mapping study on architectural smells detection. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 173:110885.
- Neri, D., Soldani, J., Zimmermann, O., and Brogi, A. (2020). Design principles, architectural smells and refactorings for microservices: a multivocal review. *SICS Software-Intensive Cyber-Physical Systems*, 35(1):3–15.
- Ponce, F., Soldani, J., Astudillo, H., and Brogi, A. (2022). Smells and refactorings for microservices security: A multivocal literature review. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 192:111393.
- Radford, A., Narasimhan, K., Salimans, T., and Sutskever, I. (2018). Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-Training. Technical report.
- Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., and Sutskever, I. (2019). Language models are unsupervised multitask learners.
- Rajaraman, A. and Ullman, J. D. (2011). Data Mining. In *Mining of Massive Datasets*, pages 1–17. Cambridge University Press.
- Rajbhandari, S., Rasley, J., Ruwase, O., and He, Y. (2020). ZeRO: memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–16. IEEE Press.
- Rajbhandari, S., Ruwase, O., Rasley, J., Smith, S., and He, Y. (2021). ZeRO-infinity: breaking the GPU memory wall for extreme scale deep learning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–14. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Rasley, J., Rajbhandari, S., Ruwase, O., and He, Y. (2020). DeepSpeed: System Optimizations Enable Training Deep Learning Models with Over 100 Billion Parameters. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 3505–3506. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Ren, P., Xiao, Y., Chang, X., Huang, P.-Y., Li, Z., Gupta, B. B., Chen, X., and Wang, X. (2021). A Survey of Deep Active Learning. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 54(9):180:1–180:40.
- Sarsa, S., Denny, P., Hellas, A., and Leinonen, J. (2022). Automatic Generation of Programming Exercises and Code Explanations Using Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on International Computing Education Research - Volume 1*, volume 1, pages 27–43. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Sharma, T., Kechagia, M., Georgiou, S., Tiwari, R., and Sarro, F. (2021). A Survey on Machine Learning Techniques for Source Code Analysis.
- Shorten, C. and Khoshgoftaar, T. M. (2023). Language Models for Deep Learning Programming: A Case Study with Keras. In Wani, M. A. and Palade, V., editors, *Deep Learning Applications, Volume 4*, pages 135–161. Springer Nature.
- Sontakke, A. N., Patwardhan, M., Vig, L., Medicherla, R. K., Naik, R., and Shroff, G. (2022). Code Summarization: Do Transformers Really Understand Code? In *Deep Learning for Code Workshop*.
- Tenney, I., Wexler, J., Bastings, J., Bolukbasi, T., Coenen, A., Gehrmann, S., Jiang, E., Pushkarna, M., Radbaugh, C., Reif, E., and Yuan, A. (2020). The Language Interpretability Tool: Extensible, Interactive Visualizations and Analysis for NLP Models. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 107–118. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thapa, C., Jang, S. I., Ahmed, M. E., Camtepe, S., Pieprzyk, J., and Nepal, S. (2022). Transformer-Based Language Models for Software Vulnerability Detection. In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual Computer Se-*

- urity Applications Conference, pages 481–496. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., and Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is All you Need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Wan, Y., Zhao, W., Zhang, H., Sui, Y., Xu, G., and Jin, H. (2022). What do they capture? a structural analysis of pre-trained language models for source code. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 2377–2388. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Wolf, T., Debut, L., Sanh, V., Chaumond, J., Delangue, C., Moi, A., Cistac, P., Rault, T., Louf, R., Funtowicz, M., Davison, J., Shleifer, S., von Platen, P., Ma, C., Jernite, Y., Plu, J., Xu, C., Le Scao, T., Gugger, S., Drame, M., Lhoest, Q., and Rush, A. (2020). Transformers: State-of-the-Art Natural Language Processing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhang, J., Mytkowicz, T., Kaufman, M., Piskac, R., and Lahiri, S. K. (2021). Can Pre-trained Language Models be Used to Resolve Textual and Semantic Merge Conflicts?

```

template:
spec:
  containers:
    - image: bbb-docker-registry.com/image-name-bbb
      :1.0.0
      name: image-name-bbb
Answer = cpu_limit_negative
#####

```

## APPENDIX

### FEW-SHOT LEARNING EXAMPLES

Listing 1: Example of prompt used for few-shot learning.

```

apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
spec:
  replicas: 1
  strategy: {}
  template:
    spec:
      containers:
        - image: aaa-docker-registry.com/image-name-aaa
          :0.1-dev
          name: image-name-aaa
        ports:
          - name: http
            containerPort: 80
            protocol: TCP
        resources:
          requests:
            cpu: 0.1
            memory: 2Mi
          limits:
            cpu: 2
            memory: 5Gi
        restartPolicy: Always
    status: {}

Answer = cpu_limit_positive
#####

apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
spec:
  replicas: 1

```