

# LLM-CODEVAL: A Framework for Verifying Implementations of Mathematical Functions Using Language Models [Supplementary material]

Felipe Cunha<sup>1</sup>, Mirko Perkusich<sup>1</sup>, Danyllo Albuquerque<sup>1</sup>, Kyller Gorgonio<sup>1</sup>, Angelo Perkusich<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Federal University of Campina Grande - Intelligent Software Engineering Group (ISE/VIRTUS) - Paraíba, Brazil

July 2025

## About this Supplementary Material

This document provides examples of **LLM-generated implementations before and after manual review** within the LLM-CODEVAL framework. All examples are based on the `wmean` function to illustrate the type of corrections typically introduced during the human-in-the-loop stage.

Table 1: Examples of LLM Output Before and After Manual Review (`wmean` Function)

Before Review (LLM Output)	After Review (Validated)
<b>Example 1 – Missing Weight Validation:</b> The LLM-generated code computed the weighted mean correctly but did not enforce that weights $w_i \geq 0$ . Negative weights would silently pass.	<b>Example 1 – Correction:</b> Introduced explicit check: <code>if w &lt; 0: raise ValueError("Weights must be non-negative.")</code> This ensures compliance with the functional contract and prevents semantic violations.
<b>Example 2 – Lack of Type Checking:</b> The initial code assumed all inputs were numeric. Passing a string or <code>None</code> caused runtime errors without clear messages.	<b>Example 2 – Correction:</b> Added type validation: <code>if not isinstance(w,(int,float)) or not isinstance(x,(int,float)):</code> <code>raise ValueError("Arguments must be numeric.")</code> This avoids silent failures and improves robustness.